

has been no pressing necessity for this measure. The hon. gentleman does not say that the law we now have has worked unsatisfactorily; he has not shown that it unduly restricts the influence or power of Parliament, or that it has prevented a proper expression of the opinion of the country in the election of Parliament. This Bill ought to have been introduced earlier than the third Session of Parliament; and the hon. gentleman, the moment he brought it into operation, should have appealed to the country, and obtained from the electors an expression of opinion. If the hon. gentlemen were to argue that this Parliament does not fairly represent the country, that it was not properly elected, that the machinery for the election was so imperfect that a proper expression of the opinion of the country could not be had, then it was important that this measure should have been introduced earlier, and that a discredited Parliament should not have continued to legislate for the general welfare of the country. We have had the present law in operation for eighteen years; no complaint has been made, and no abuse has been shown to have grown up under it; in no case has it been shown that a member returned for a constituency did not fairly represent the opinion of that constituency; so that there was really no abuse to correct. Then the hon. gentleman has proposed to confer the elective franchise upon a class on whom no one proposed to confer it at the last elections. I will venture to say there is not a single hon. gentleman sitting on that side who, at the last election, appealed to the people to return him on the ground that he would vote to confer the elective franchise upon the unfranchised Indians, or promised, if they did return him, that he would do so. The hon. gentleman himself has said that these men were not competent to exercise the elective franchise, or administer the simplest municipal matters. We know that under our system the Indians are not recognised as ordinary subjects. For instance, the tribal Indian is never punished for taking up arms against the Crown, capitally, as guilty of treason. He is not dealt with as an ordinary criminal, and there have been decisions, over and over again, during the existence of the old 13 colonies, and which have since been followed by the courts of the United States and in this country, recognising the fact that the Indian is not an ordinary citizen. I would like to know why it is we have had 150,000 of people or more disfranchised by this Bill, white men, men who have not shown themselves incompetent to exercise the elective franchise, and have had the elective franchise conferred upon men who can neither read nor write, who are not possessed of property in their own right, who pay no taxes, who are under no obligations to serve the State—men who are without public spirit, and, in many instances, are subsisting by the charities of those who are denied the right to vote under the Bill before us. That being the case, I am opposed to this Bill, and have made the motion which is in your hands. In making that motion, I have voiced the opinions of hon. gentlemen, not only on this side but also on that side. I believe that the great majority of the people who have returned the hon. gentlemen, or those who support them in this House, are not in favor of conferring the elective franchise upon men who are not possessed of the ordinary powers, capacities and responsibilities of citizens. Holding that view, Sir, I put this motion into your hands. I have not sought to delay the House in proposing this amendment; I have sought to give the country an opportunity of understanding the question. I believe it is understood, and we are ready to allow the hon. gentleman, if a majority continues to support him on the third reading, to assume the responsibility and the discredit of having put a measure of this sort on the Statute Book.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Mills.
Mr. MILLS.

YEAS :		
Messieurs		
Armstrong,	Gillmor,	Ray,
Auger,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Innes,	Scriver,
Cameron (Huron),	Irvine,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Langelier,	Somerville (Bruce),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Laurier,	Springer,
Cartwright,	Lister,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casgrain,	Livingston,	Trow,
De St. Georges,	McCraney,	Vail,
Dupont,	Mills,	Watson,
Fisher,	Mulock,	Weidon,
Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),	Wells.—37.
Gigault,		
NAYS :		
Messieurs		
Abbott,	Girouard,	Montplaisir,
Bain (Soulanges),	Gordon,	Orton,
Baker (Victoria),	Grandbois,	Paint,
Beaty,	Guillet,	Patterson (Essex),
Bell,	Hackett,	Pinsonneault,
Benoit,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bergeron,	Hickey,	Ross,
Billy,	Homer,	Royal,
Blondeau,	Jamieson,	Shakespeare,
Bowell,	Jenkins,	Small,
Campbell (Victoria),	Kaulbach,	Smyth,
Carling,	Kilvert,	Sproule,
Caron,	Kranz,	Stairs,
Cimon,	Labrosse,	Taschereau,
Cochrane,	Landry (Kent),	Tassé,
Colby,	Landry (Montmagny),	Taylor,
Costigan,	Langevin,	Temple,
Coughlin,	Lesage,	Townshend,
Curran,	Macdonald (King's),	Tupper,
Cuthbert,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Vanasse,
Daly,	Mackintosh,	Wallace (Albert),
Dawson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wallace (York),
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	McCallum,	White (Gardwell),
Desaulniers (St. Maurice),	McDougald (Picton),	White (Hastings),
Dodd,	McDougall (Cape Bre't'n),	White (Renfrew),
Dugas,	McLellan,	Wigle,
Farrow,	McNeill,	Wood (Brockville),
Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	Massue,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Foster,	Moffat,	Woodworth.—88.
Gault,		

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time and passed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is the 4th of July, a fitting day to disfranchise your own countrymen.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 1:10 a.m., Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 6th July, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at half-past One o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SOUTH GRENVILLE ELECTION.

Mr. SPEAKER announced that the Clerk had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election and return of Walter Shanly, Esq., to represent the electoral district of the south riding of the county of Grenville, in the room of the late William Thomas Benson, Esq., deceased.

DOMINION LANDS.

Mr. TROW (for Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT) asked, What sum has been received up to date on account of sales of Dominion lands, for fiscal year 1884-85? What sum has been expended up to date and charged to capital account,