

Mr. MILLS. I think the hon. gentleman will find he has more at this time than he ever had before. The constitution provides that the Province of Quebec shall return 65 representatives to this House. By whom are they to be returned? By the whole electorate. Who is to say who those electors shall be? Is it for this Parliament to determine, or should we leave it to the Province of Quebec or to the representatives of that Province to determine? Our whole system of Government is thus based upon the theory that we are self-governed.

Mr. McCALLUM. Quebec is represented in this House.

Mr. MILLS. But it may be voted down.

Mr. McCALLUM. We shall see.

Mr. MILLS. This Parliament may, under the present Bill, decide upon an elective franchise to which the people of the Province are opposed. In regard to Prince Edward Island the Bill proposed is one which its representatives do not approve. An hon. member from the island has asked that the island be exempted from the operation of that franchise. What does that mean? Does it not mean that by this Bill the island will not be allowed to determine who within it, shall exercise the electoral franchise. This matter ought to be left where it now is. Some hon. gentlemen have attacked the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) because he alluded to the constitution of the United States in this particular. Those hon. gentlemen forget that some six or seven years ago they had very great admiration for the Congress of the United States. They ridiculed the political economy of Gladstone, Bright, Lord Salisbury and Sir Stafford Northcote, and appealed to General Butler and other eminent lights in the Congress of the United States. Whenever the question of the tariff is before this House, they appeal to the extraordinary wisdom and sagacity of the men of superior information who represent the United States in Congress. But when we undertake to make any illustrations from the Constitution of the United States, they at once accuse the hon. member of American proclivities. The people of the United States were at one time colonists of Great Britain. They stood in relation to the mother country in much the same position as we stand at this moment. They became independent. The powers which the Imperial Government itself had exercised passed, by the fortunes of war, to the Congress of the United States. And the States were left in possession of the powers which belonged to the provincial establishments; and in the adopting of that constitution they provided that:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislatures."  
But with regard to the times and places of elections they make the following provisions:

"The times, places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may, at any time, by law, make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators."

Now the time and place is under the control of Congress. It is left to the State Legislatures, subject to the supervision of Congress. Congress may interfere, but with regard to the qualifications of the voters, Congress has no power to make a different rule. Now, our constitution is not the same as the United States constitution in that particular, but we have practically by an Act of this Parliament adopted the same rule, and we have undertaken to give effect in practice to exactly the same principles as are there laid down. An experience of one hundred years and upwards has shown the wisdom of the course they adopted there, and an experience of eighteen years has shown the wisdom of the course we have adopted. Sir, we have a right to profit by the experience of others. British statesmen do

so. What statesman of England does not carefully study the system of government existing elsewhere—does not watch the operation of the various measures adopted in other countries? He would be unworthy the name of statesman who would fail to profit by the experience of others, and we would be unworthy of the name of statesmen in this country, if we refused to profit by the experience of the great and powerful neighbor that exists beside us. In some respects our constitution resembles theirs, and to that extent it is our business and our duty to carefully observe the working of their institutions, and profit by them to the utmost extent possible. We find, Sir, that our whole system is based on the ground of Provincial representation. Take the representation in the Senate. It is true, the Crown has the appointment of the Senators, but the number to be appointed from the different Provinces is limited and prescribed. The Maritime Provinces, which are spoken of as one great division, have twenty-four Senators; Quebec, the second great division, has twenty-four; and Ontario, the third great division, is represented by the same number. So we find that this federal feature of our constitution is preserved, the autonomy of the Provinces is kept in view, not merely for Provincial purposes, but for Provincial representation in both branches of Parliament. Mr. Chairman, if you look at the clause before the committee, you will see that it provides certain qualifications for electors in towns and cities. Now, where do you go to find what a town or a city is? Why, Sir, to the law giving a charter to the town or city, and passed by the Provincial Legislature. In one Province a town may be 1,000 inhabitants, and in another it may be 5,000, so that the qualifications of electors in two places, both of which are called towns, and two places containing different populations, may be wholly different. And therefore, the hon. gentleman has not even in this Bill taken it out from the provincial influence, and given it a purely Dominion character. If we look at the Manitoba Act of 1870, we find there a Provincial Franchise and a franchise for the Dominion, proposed by the leader of the Government. Was that the franchise existing in any other Province of the Dominion? Not at all. He could not give such a franchise to Manitoba. He admitted that the circumstances of the population were different, and, that being the case, he was compelled to adopt a different franchise. He could not say that the electors should be on the assessor's roll for a certain sum, because there was no assessor's roll. He could not say that the property should be of a certain value, because the property was of comparatively little value. He was compelled to adopt wholly different qualifications, and if representation were given to the territories to-morrow, hon. gentlemen on that side of the House know right well that he could not apply to the territorial divisions of the North-West the franchise which the hon. gentleman is adopting in this Bill, to apply to the different Provinces of the Dominion. Sir, the hon. gentleman has undertaken to adopt the principle of uniformity, but to my mind that is rather a pretext than a reason for this Bill. I do not apprehend that the hon. gentleman is so much of a *doctrinaire*, so much of a theorist, that he would be prepared to create great inconvenience and expense to this country, merely for the purpose of adopting the same franchise in the different Provinces of the Dominion. The hon. gentleman has always taken a much more practical view of politics, and if we wish to know the reasons for this measure we must look somewhere else than to the principle of uniformity, which is expressed in the Bill. Why, Sir, we know how thoroughly this principle of uniformity failed formerly. We know that in 1841 we had a legislative union. We know that union was given a single Government; that the intention was to adopt uniform laws for the United Province of Canada. But what was the result in practice? Practically you had a double Government. You had an Attorney General for Lower