

the ticket cannot be issued without a vote of the council, and then it is issued as a matter of course by the Superintendent General.

Mr. LISTER. There may be some difficulties in that. Many of the bands which have councils have not always apportioned the lands with fairness. Supposing an agent refused to recommend the issue of a ticket to a man who had occupied the land for a number of years, the Superintendent General would be powerless. We must not assume that these councils will act fairly in all cases towards all the Indians. They are actuated by certain considerations in the same way as white men are. No doubt there will be cases in which they will refuse to grant the location, and then the Superintendent General has no power to come in, because his power is only confirmatory.

Mr. ROOME. I would propose that these declarations might be made before any reeve, deputy reeve, or municipal councillor, where there is no other person authorised to take them.

Mr. COLTER. Would the persons making such declaration be liable to the penalties for perjury if they made a false declaration?

Mr. EDGAR. I think the Act in reference to extrajudicial oaths would have to be amended in order to make a false declaration of that kind perjury.

Mr. IVES. Why should not the mayor and the aldermen be included?

Mr. EDGAR. It is impossible to give a fair consideration to such an important change in the law as that proposed by the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Roome), in two minutes. I do not think it is fair to the House that an important change like that should be proposed without notice. I see many advantages in the proposal of the hon. gentleman, but we must have those declarations made in proper form, and I would suggest that the amendment should stand over, as it is impossible to look into the law now.

Mr. MULOCK. The only question is whether the declarant would be liable in such case as he would be if he made his declaration before a notary or a commissioner. I think the suggestion is a very good one, but the question is whether those declarations would be affidavits within the meaning of the Act.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think it would be enough to say that these persons shall be justices of the peace for that purpose.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman is proposing to incorporate in the Act a matter of dispute. The Local Governments have been appointing magistrates for 22 years, and the Government here have acquiesced in that construction of the British North America Act. I do not say that the Government here might not appoint a magistrate for certain purposes, but it does seem to me that in declaring there shall be a justice of the peace for that purpose is simply to incorporate in the Act a contested point; and if the courts were to decide, contrary to the hon. gentleman, that we have jurisdiction here, that the Crown, as represented by the Governor in Council, may appoint a magistrate, the result would be that this would go for nothing. But if the hon. gentleman were to provide that parties taking an affidavit or a solemn declaration before a reeve or deputy reeve, shall be held amenable to the law relating to perjury, if they swear falsely, then he would accomplish what he proposes to accomplish in this way without the possibility of going wrong.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the hon. gentleman forgets when he says that we are incorporating a contested point here. The point in contest is whether the provincial

authorities can, under any circumstances, appoint a justice of the peace, but the power of the federal authority to appoint has never been questioned in any way. It is expressly conferred by Her Majesty on His Excellency.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The British North America Act provides for the appointment of a certain class with judicial authorities, amongst which magistrates are not included.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish to bring forward the motion of which I gave notice the other day, that I hope the Government will accept. It places the franchise in Prince Edward Island upon an equitable footing. I explained the other day that in the Act of 1886 the hon. gentleman conferred upon all those who were of age on the 20th day of July, 1885, and were entitled to vote under the local franchise, the right to vote; and I propose that that principle shall be made continuous. I, therefore, move:

That section 10 of said Act is hereby repealed, and the following substituted:—

"In the Provinces of British Columbia and Prince Edward Island respectively, besides the persons entitled to be registered as voters, and to vote under this Act, every person who, on the first day of June, in each year, is of the age of 21 years, and is not by this Act, or by any law of the Dominion of Canada, disqualified or prevented from voting, and is a British subject by birth or naturalisation, and resident in the said Provinces, and is entitled to vote in said Provinces respectively, by the laws which are severally enforced in the same, shall have the right to be registered as a voter, and to vote, as long as he continues to be qualified to vote, under the provisions of said last-mentioned laws respectively, and no longer."

Amendment negatived.

Mr. BRIEN. Before the Committee rises, I would like to offer a suggestion or two. I think the intention of the Act as avowed by its supporters, is to extend the franchise to every industrious citizen. That has not been done. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), who moved the address in reply to His Excellency's speech a few months ago, in speaking about the franchise, said:

"It confers the franchise on all citizens who are not confirmed paupers, or have no stake in the country."

Well, if this be the case, if that is the intention of the Act, then I think that a large number of men are excluded. The average rate of wages in the agricultural parts of the Dominion is from \$1 to \$1.25 per day. There are only 313 days in which a man can work, and if he only earns \$1 a day, his wages per year only amounts to \$313 at the most. But, as it is impossible for all men to work full time, we find that the average number of days that men work is only 250; therefore, they cannot possibly come up to the standard required by this Act, consequently, a large number of industrious citizens are disfranchised. For the information of the Committee, I would read the average wages earned by farm laborers in the Province of Ontario. In the Lake Erie district, it is \$241; Lake Huron district, \$255; Georgian Bay, \$251; West Midland, \$251; Lake Ontario, \$253; St. Lawrence and Ottawa, \$249; East Midland, \$246; northern districts, \$262; so that in the entire Province of Ontario the average rate is \$250. Out of 3,354 wage-earners in eighteen different towns, only 563 worked 300 days and over; the average number of days is only 263 in towns and cities. In cities and towns where they work in factories and shops and can work in stormy days, the average might be a little greater, but still this Bill would exclude these important classes in both town and country. We have extended the franchise to Indians, but still we propose to refuse it to our white laborers who are not less qualified to vote. I have experienced a great deal of difficulty in so far as I have had anything to do with the revision of the list. We found that but a few applicants could attain to the \$300 qualification. Besides, the present Act entails a great deal of difficulty and hardship upon many wage-earners