

tendent General and the officials of this Government, and it is the worst kind of folly to say that these men will not be influenced, more or less, by the power brought to bear on them by the Superintendent General and the officials of this Government. Sir, I hope the hon. gentleman will yet be guided by wiser counsel. I hope he will yet accept the advice of the hon. member for Algoma, the hon. member for Kent and the hon. member for King's, and not enfranchise these tribal Indians, until, at all events, they are in a position to exercise it as intelligent free men. I trust that, acting on their advice, he will so mould his Bill as to limit in to the class of Indians enfranchised under the Bill of the Ontario Government.

Amendment (Mr. Mills) negatived. Yeas, 46; nays, 67.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose to insert after the word "Indian" the words "and excluding a Chinaman." I do not know that I need discuss, at any length, the reasons for this amendment. The Chinese are not like the Indians, sons of the soil. They come from a foreign country; they have no intention, as a people, of making a domicile of any portion of Canada; they come and work or trade, and when they are tired of it they go away, taking with them their profits. They are, besides, natives of a country where representative institutions are unknown, and I think we cannot safely give them the elective franchise.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, after the observations he made about Charles James Fox, whether it is his intention to strike out property qualification altogether, since he holds that property is no indication of intelligence or capacity.

Mr. MITCHELL. Would it not be better for the right hon. gentleman to make a distinct clause about Chinamen, because some of us may entertain different opinions on that subject, and may want to vote for this Indian clause.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What do you mean?

Mr. MITCHELL. While I would be quite prepared to vote for this paragraph as it stands, I do not feel that I would be acting consistently in excluding Chinamen. I am in favor of Chinamen being placed on an equal footing with all other persons. Certainly a Chinaman is quite as good as an Indian.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot agree with my hon. friend at all. Indians are sons of the soil; they are Canadians and British subjects; and, therefore, if they have the property qualification, I think they ought to be treated as other British subjects. The Chinese are foreigners. If they come to this country, after three years' residence, they may, if they choose, be naturalised. But still we know that when the Chinaman comes here he intends to return to his own country; he does not bring his family with him; he is a stranger, a sojourner in a strange land, for his own purposes for a while; he has no common interest with us, and while he gives us his labor and is paid for it, and is valuable, the same as a threshing machine or any other agricultural implement which we may borrow from the United States on hire and return it to the owner on the south side of the line; a Chinaman gives us his labor and gets his money, but that money does not fructify in Canada; he does not invest it here, but takes it with him and returns to China; and if he cannot, his executors or his friends send his body back to the flowery land. But he has no British instincts or British feelings or aspirations, and therefore ought not to have a vote.

Mr. MITCHELL. The idea I have is that every person who comes and lives in the country, and labors and spends his money in the country, even if he is a foreigner—a Chinaman if you like, the most disliked class of foreigners—if he comes to make Canada his home, we ought to make Canada free enough to include even the Chinaman. I would

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

like to see the Bill harmonious in its character. While it is desired to make it comprehensive, I can see no reason why we should exclude the Chinamen. Of course, I know there are gentlemen here who are prejudiced against the Chinamen.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. No.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes; there are hon. gentlemen here who are prejudiced against the Chinamen; there is a strong feeling on the Pacific coast against them. Perhaps they know more about them than we do; but we have a number of them in the city of Montreal, and they are spoken of as a respectable body of men—good, peace-loving citizens. True, they are economical, and some of them are penurious; but what they do with their money after they earn it is not our business. If we can make Canada sufficiently attractive to them, I am not sure that they will go back to China; and we should make our laws comprehensive enough to include all classes of foreigners. So long as they comply with the naturalisation laws, they can become British subjects, and I would give them a vote.

Mr. CASEY. I would ask the hon. gentleman what is the technical meaning of the word Chinaman. As I understand, there is nothing to prevent a Chinaman being a British subject; would he be called a Chinaman? Of course, while he is an alien he cannot vote, whether he is excluded expressly by this Act or not. But the case may arise when a Chinaman becomes naturalised. Would a naturalised Chinaman be a Chinaman, in the meaning of this clause, or would he be a Canadian or a British subject? I should think he ceased to be a Chinaman when he became a British subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If I thought so, I would alter the words. I used the word Chinaman to designate a race. However, I am obliged to the hon. gentleman for the suggestion, and I shall word it—"Excluding a person of Mongolian or Chinese race."

Mr. EDGAR. Would that cover the case of a Chinaman born in Hong Kong, who is a British subject by birth, although he is of the Mongolian race?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Australians exclude the Chinese from Hong Kong as well as other Chinese. If they are born in Hong Kong they are in one sense British subjects; but the objection applies just as well to the Hong Kong Chinese as to any others.

Mr. CASEY. Many maintain that the Indians of British Columbia are of the Mongolian race.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is an ethnological question that I will leave the hon. gentleman to settle with Henry Bancroft.

Mr. GAULT. There are a number of Chinamen in Montreal who are industrious people. I believe they voted at the last election, and I think they should not be deprived of their votes.

Mr. HOMER. In British Columbia there are 30,000 whites, and upwards of 15,000 Chinese, who are controlled by some half dozen or ten of their principals. Those principals could be induced, probably, by some political aspiration, to convert some 4,000 or 5,000 of those Chinese into British subjects. If allowed to vote, the entire control of the Province will be in the hands of the Chinese. That is one of the principal objections we have to enlarge the franchise.

Mr. WELDON. Do the Chinese become naturalised?

Mr. HOMER. Not as a rule; but they could if they saw anything to be gained by it.

Mr. CASEY. How many are naturalised?

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. About half a dozen.