Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- ☐ Coloured covers / Couverture de couleur
- ☐ Covers damaged / Couverture endommagée
- ☐ Covers restored and/or laminated / Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- ☐ Cover title missing / Le titre de couverture manque
- ☐ Coloured maps / Cartes géographiques en couleur
- ☐ Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black) / Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- ☐ Coloured plates and/or illustrations / Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- ☐ Bound with other material / Relié avec d'autres documents
- ☐ Only edition available / Seule édition disponible
- ☐ Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin / La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure.
- ☐ Blank leaves added during restorations may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming / Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.
- ☑ Additional comments / Commentaires supplémentaires:

- ☐ Coloured pages / Pages de couleur
- ☐ Pages damaged / Pages endommagées
- ☐ Pages restored and/or laminated / Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- ☑ Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/ Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- ☑ Pages detached / pages détachées
- ☑ Showthrough / Transarence
- ☑ Quality of print varies / Qualité inégale de l'impression
- ☐ Includes supplementary materials Comprend du matériel supplémentaire
- ☐ Pages wholly or partially obscured by errata slips, tissues, etc., have been refilmed to ensure the best possible image / Les pages totalement ou partiellement obscurcies par un feuillet d'errata, une pelure, etc., ont été filmées à nouveau de façon à obtenir la meilleure image possible.
- ☐ Opposing pages with varying colouration or discolourations are filmed twice to ensure the best possible image / Les pages s'opposant ayant des colorations variables ou des décolorations sont filmées deux fois afin d'obtenir la meilleure image possible.

Pagination is as follows: [1], [777]-1743, [i]-cxlv p.

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA.

THIRD SESSION—FIFTH PARLIAMENT.

48-49 VICTORIÆ, 1885.

VOL. XVIII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-SEVENTH DAY OF MARCH TO THE EIGHTH DAY OF MAY, 1885.

OTTAWA:
PRINTED BY MACLEAN, ROGER & CO., WELLINGTON STREET.
1885.

House of Commons Debates

THIRD SESSION, FIFTH PARLIAMENT.—48 VIC.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 27th March, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

COURT OF CLAIMS FOR CANADA.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Tuesday next to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide (*a*) That the salary of the judge appointed under any Act to establish a Court of Claims for Canada, shall be $5,000 per annum, and that such judge, after fifteen years service, or in case of his being disabled by permanent infirmity, may be paid a superannuation allowance equal to two-thirds of his salary at time of his resignation. (*b*) That the salary of each assessor appointed under such Act shall be $1,000 per annum, and that the salary of the clerk of said court shall be $1,600 per annum, with an annual increase of $50 until such salary reaches $2,000, provided that if the officer or person holding the appointment of secretary to the official arbitrators is appointed to the office, his salary shall continue to be $2,000 per annum as at present. (*c*) That the provisions of "The Canada Civil Service Act, 1882," and the Acts amending the same, and of "The Civil Service Superannuation Act, 1883," shall, so far as applicable, extend and apply to the assessors, the clerk and the officers and servants of the said court appointed in virtue of such Act. (*d*) That the costs in any case before the said court in which the sum allowed by the court is greater than the amount tendered in compensation, or if there has been no sum tendered, when the judgment is against the Crown, may be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada."

Motion agreed to.

COMMISSIONERS REPORT—REVISION OF CANADA STATUTES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That this House do concur with the Message from the Senate requesting this House to unite with them in the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses, to examine and report upon the report of the Commissioners appointed to consolidate and revise the Statutes of Canada, and that Messrs. Abbott, Beaty, Davies, Edgar, Girouard, Landry (Kent), Laurier, Royal, Shakespeare, Tupper, Weldon and Wood (Brockville), be appointed to act on behalf of this House as members of the said Joint Committee; and that a Message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours therewith.

He said: As this commission for the consolidation of the Statutes is under the direction of the Minister of Justice, naturally, and as he has taken great personal interest in this very important work, he has thought it well, after considering the matter, to move for this joint committee. The joint committee is formed for the purpose of looking over the work and seeing that the work is really and *bonâ fide* a consolidation of the Statutes—that is to say, a rearrangement of the Statutes, altering no matter of consequence and only matters of form. The intention of the Minister of Justice is to expedite the measure in both Houses and to prevent the necessity of having a special committee sitting in either House, if possible, upon the report of this joint committee. It is the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill on this matter in the House. The committee can sit and consider and look over the report, and if it be satisfactory to both Houses they can adopt it; or, if not, take the usual course. But, in order to prevent delay in this most important matter, it is thought if both Houses be satisfied with this joint report, the measure after passing the second reading, could be considered in Committee of the Whole and be adopted *en bloc*. The Minister thought that, perhaps, he might introduce the Bill in the Upper Chamber. I am not sure that, constitutionally, he could not do so, because, although it deals with all matters of legislation—revenue, tariff and others—yet it is a mere consolidation of the Statutes, a mere readjustment, and does not impose any new burdens on the people. But, lest there might be any mistake in the matter, and in order to avoid any question arising as to the privileges of this House being interfered with, he came to the conclusion, with myself, that the better plan would be to introduce the measure here, and only to use the report as a means of information to this Chamber as well as to the other.

Mr. BLAKE. I am unable to assent to the view of the hon. gentleman, that this is a fit course to be taken in reference to this measure. The hon. gentleman has not cited any precedent for a joint committee of both Houses being appointed upon any subject of this description, nor is there to my knowledge any such precedent. When the hon. gentleman himself was charged with the duty of bringing under the consideration of the Legislature of the old Province of Canada a measure for the consolidation of the Statutes, this step was not taken, but the Government took the course of introducing a Bill for the consolidation of the Statutes of Canada and for the consolidation of the Statutes of Upper and Lower Canada, and that Bill, being introduced upon the responsibility of the Government, was after the second reading submitted to a select committee, which investigated the procedure. We have appointed joint committees of both Houses for particular purposes. We appoint a Joint Committee, under our regulations, to conduct the printing of Parliament, which is managed thus in order to avoid duplicating the printing and provide the utmost efficiency for the service of both Houses at the least cost. We also appoint a joint committee to assist you, Mr. Speaker, in the direction of the Library, which is a matter in which the Houses are jointly interested, the Library of Parliament belonging to one House as much as to the other. But, when an effort was made some years ago to carry out further the notion of joint action and to bring it into the domain of legislation by establishing a joint law department, there was a conference or a committee to consider that subject, and, after full consideration, it was agreed, I believe by the majority from each House of those who were upon it, that it was not well to make the attempt, and we have a separate law department, which had always existed heretofore and has been continued by the approval and assent of both Houses, after enquiry based, I have no doubt, on the notion that the independent action, the separate action, the separate responsibility of each House with reference to the legislation of the country required that each House should have its permanent law department under its own control. Now, the hon. gentleman proposes at one stroke to go further, and, not content with dealing with

that which is involved in this proposition—for this proposition cannot properly be applied to this exceptional case, it must stand as a precedent of much wider and more general application than one might at first suppose—proposes, I say, not merely a joint preparation of legislation, but a joint consideration of those matters which are of pure legislation. If you turn to the precedents of the Imperial Parliament, you will find that, up to a comparative recent period, there were very few joint committees, and that the joint committees which have been appointed of late years, when they have been more numerous, although still very few, have been based upon the same general principle which I have already indicated. There has been a joint committee, for example, with reference to the stationery office, there has been a joint committee with reference to the conduct of business in both Houses of Parliament, with a view to a more satisfactory distribution and a more efficient regulation of the conduct of the business. There have been several joint committees dealing with the question of certain classes of private Bills legislation, which, in England, more fortunately than with us, is based upon the principle of hearing much more evidence and requiring much more evidence as to the propriety of legislation—particularly legislation granting railway charters—than we require. Well, obviously, where the solution of the question is one dependent upon evidence, and evidence is to be taken twice over unless there be some arrangement, that is a good reason for a joint committee to arrange in some way or the other for the regulation of that class of business in such a manner as shall not necessitate the double taking of evidence. And so with regard to some questions of policy in relation to private Bills, which are matters of permanent and business regulation more than of legislation, matters of private right more than of legislation; as, for example, as to the system and plan of amalgamating railways and the arrangements with reference to the metropolitan railways, there have been joint committees. Now, I have given instances of what I understand are the principal examples of joint committees of recent years in England, and I have indicated the principle upon which they are appointed, namely, something connected with the efficient discharge of the business of legislation in general, or something connected with the taking of evidence which would have to be taken twice if some arrangement were not made between the Houses, or something connected with the establishment of the principles of legislation in matters of private right in which the House is sitting not in a purely legislative capacity. But here this is legislation of the most important character. It is nothing less than to propose the consolidation of the whole body of the law of Parliament for seventeen or eighteen Sessions, ever since Confederation. It is a legislative act of the highest importance, a legislative act, having regard to the circumstances of this Confederation, and the fact that this is the body of law passed since the Confederation was inaugurated, of the highest sort. I see no reason why such legislation should be proposed to be initiated by a joint committee of both Houses. It is not a question of evidence—it is a question of the opinion of legislators as to whether this important function which the hon. gentleman has referred to, of consolidating these Statutes truly, has taken place. Now I say that the precedent to which I alluded in Canada is a sound one, that the Government ought themselves to propose—if they are satisfied with the action of this commission, which I presume they are, as, in the discharge of its later functions, at any rate, it was a Government commission presided over by one of the Ministers—the necessary legislation to carry it out, and such legislation ought to proceed as other legislation proceeds, each of the two Houses of Parliament discharging its appropriate and independent function with reference to this as with reference to all other matters of public legislation. We are responsible, if this Bill is introduced here, for the manner and form and shape in which it leaves this House; the Senate will be responsible for the manner in which they remit it to us, and, if there be a difference, then that will have to be settled; but are we now going to lay down the rule that our independent right of action with reference to Bills is to be complicated by the formation of a joint committee which is to report upon a subject of general legislation? Sir, the hon. gentleman has indicated the reason. The reason is because the one Minister who has taken part in this matter, the Minister of Justice, happens to be a member of the Senate, not of the House of Commons; and he says it was thought convenient, as that Minister had taken a great personal interest in this matter, that a joint committee should be formed so that he might attend to the deliberations of that committee upon the consolidation of the Statutes. Well, when the hon. gentleman arranged that the Minister of Justice should be a member of the Senate instead of a member of the House of Commons, I ventured to object to that arrangement. I conceived that as the great bulk and burthen of the legislation heretofore has fallen, and, so far as we can see, will continue to fall, on this House, it was very important that the legal officer—I regret to say the sole legal officer—of the Government should be a member of the House of Commons. But the hon. gentleman said no, that it was not inconvenient, it was all right; and we have for some years been deprived of the assistance of the responsible legal officer of the Government in this House in which the great bulk of the legislation has, after all, to be effectually done. And because he is not here the hon. gentleman proposes that we should inaugurate this precedent, and establish a joint committee of both Houses to decide upon important questions of general legislation. I say then that if this was only an ordinary consolidation Bill dealing with one class of our Statutes, without any of the peculiar questions which must arise upon this consolidation, I should object to this procedure of the hon. gentleman. But this is a very special procedure. In the first place, and so far as I can judge from a very cursory perusal of a few of these Statutes, important changes are proposed. Indeed if you look at the preface, or the preliminary remarks, you will see a statement that where important—I forget the precise words, but they are something like this—that where important changes are proposed they are either italicised in the body of the Statute, or there is a note indicating it; and yet the hon. gentleman says the object is to find out if there are any changes, while the consolidators state that there are material changes suggested for the consideration of Parliament. In the second place it is not a consolidation of one class of Statutes in respect of which it would be possible to perform the work well without a very considerable amount of change, requiring a very careful investigation; but a body of all our laws for 17 or 18 years goes over such a wide range of subjects, and is composed of Statutes so variously framed, that it would not be a good consolidation if there are not in point of form, at least, as well as in substance, a very considerable change so as to mould into one harmonious whole, so far, at any rate, as the form of the Statutes is concerned, the proposals for that law. But in the third and most material place in the old Province of Canada, practically, and in the Imperial Parliament for all practical purposes, there was the absolute non-demission of power, and the questions which would arise upon consolidation were different from those which must arise in the consolidation of our Statutes—which must certainly arise on the first consolidation of our Statutes. Our constitution is a constitution of divided powers, and it is now proposed to issue to the people of Canada, as in their settled view the body of the law of the Parliament of Canada, all those Statutes which we have passed here from the day of Confederation was inaugurated. Now, during

these 17 or 18 years, many constitutional questions, as to the division of powers between this Parliament and the Local Legislatures, have been raised. A good many have been settled, and several are under advisement to-day; and I maintain that we would do less than our duty if we issue, after 18 years, the body of the Statutes without taking heed to these questions which, at any rate, have been settled as to the relative jurisdiction of the two Legislatures. I maintain it would be doing a wrong to issue Statutes anew as the consolidated body of the law to the people of the land, when we know as to some, and believe as to others, that they are void laws, that they are laws which have no binding validity. Amongst these laws, for example, is the license law, which, so far as judicial authority at present goes, is held to be in all its most material effects, inoperative and void. We are to issue it at this Session as a good law, and the Government at this moment, with the assent, presumably, of the House, is appealing to us in order that the question may be tested whether it is a good law or not, but for the moment it is a law which has no validity. Now, Sir, these are questions which ought to be grappled with upon the first consolidation of the Statutes. We ought to deal, so far as we can, with the questions, at any rate, which have been settled with reference to the division of powers, and as I have said, this raises a new and a high legislative question which could not be raised effectually in the Imperial Parliament upon consolidation there, and which could not be effectually raised in the Canadian Parliament with reference to those classes of subjects involving almost all upon which that Parliament could legislate. Now I maintain that in this point of view, and in all points of view, it is fitting that this consolidation should lie over for a recess. I believe it is our duty to read this body of Statutes before we pass it into a law; but I believe it is utterly impossible for members of this House to examine this body of laws, these two thick volumes that have been presented to us, after the Session has advanced a certain stage, at any rate while we are busily engaged in the discharge of our other legislative duties. I am not at all arguing that we ought not to take consolidation, to a large extent, upon trust. I quite admit that you have to take many consolidations very largely upon trust, but I say that as to the consolidation of this body of law, involving these questions to which I have referred, that at any rate the members ought to have an opportunity of looking at it, and the country ought to have an opportunity of looking at it, as well as the profession throughout the country, and those who are interested in the legislation, before it is proposed to pass it into law. And when I found the hon. gentleman, for many weeks after the opening of the Session, making no sign, taking no step, not inviting our consideration to this subject during the comparatively slack season of the Session, I felt quite satisfied that he was about to adopt that reasonable course, and I said to myself: The hon. gentleman and myself agree for a wonder; it cannot be that he is to push consolidation through Parliament or else he would, at the very instant he laid the Statutes on the Table, have taken the first step in order to this enquiry. Why, Sir, if the plan of a joint committee to investigate this matter was the plan of the Government, why was not that committee moved immediately after these books were placed upon the Table? Why was it not moved early in the Session when a committee could have an opportunity to act? Why is it delayed until it is plain and obvious that except at the sacrifice of other and important legislative duties, the duties of this committee must be perfunctorily and unsatisfactorily discharged. We are now, I hope, in the thick of the Session, in the stress of business; in two days we shall have been sitting here for two months—two-thirds of the normal period of a Session; and we know very well that we have got to pay in this last period for the idleness of the preceding period of the Session. But it is just at that time that the hon. gentleman proposes to throw these functions upon a number of important and active members of the House who have other duties to discharge. I say, therefore, that there is not now time to discharge these duties in the way in which the hon. gentleman proposes. I want to refer you to some observations which were made not long since by those who were engaged in the consolidation of the Statute law in England. In 1871 the Statute Law Committee, a committee of very experienced men, some experienced in Parliament, including the Clerk of Parliament, Sir Thos. Erskine May, and the well known draughtsman, Hon. Sir H. Thring; Sir J. Lefevre, Mr. Reilly, with Mr. Picard and Mr. Wood, met, they being called to give advice at the request of the Lord Chancellor. A memorandum given to the Lord Chancellor pointed out that there were several classes of Statutes requiring consolidation:

"The easiest Statutes to consolidate are those in which the subsequent amending enactments can be inserted without alteration, or nearly without alteration, into the framework of the original Statute. The committee propose that this class should form the first subject of consolidation. The committee are prepared to undertake the duty of superintending the consolidation of this first class of Statutes. The second class of Statutes will be Acts principally departmental, raising no question of law, but requiring to be redrawn, either wholly or partially. The committee would proceed with this class as with the first, beginning with the report and then superintending the consolidation. The third class consists of Statutes which would raise no political questions, but which require to be reconstructed and amended on a new or partially new basis. The committee are of opinion that this class of Statutes can scarcely be consolidated except under the superintendence of a Minister charged with the duty of settling their provisions, and of passing them, when settled, through Parliament. The committee will readily give any assistance in their power in dealing with this class of Statutes, but they could not undertake the entire superintendence of the work of consolidation with a due regard to the occupations in which they are individually. The fourth and last class of Statutes are those which involve legal and political questions of gravity. Any attempt to deal with such Acts can only be made by gradual instalments, and they may be left out of consideration in connection with a scheme of systematic consolidation."

We have to deal with all of these classes. We have to deal with the four classes, the easy one, subjects which do not involve high political questions, but which involve reconstruction, and also those classes which involve constitutional and political questions of great gravity. Pointing to the third class the committee suggests that this is a class of Statutes which can scarcely be consolidated except under the superintendence of a Minister charged with the duty of passing them through Parliament. It being necessary to introduce a Bill, which the hon. gentleman says he intends to introduce, he proposes to have it supervised by the Senate; it has got to be carried on under the ægis of the Minister of Justice, who is not a member of this House, and therefore the hon. gentleman proposes this extraordinary proceeding. The suggestions given by the Statute Law Committee are suggestions which are also important as to method; and they indicate the propriety of proceeding by Bill, as I have stated. The hon. gentleman has told us to-day that he does intend to proceed by Bill. He is going to proceed two ways at once; he is going to have a committee to consider the subject and concurrently with the consideration of that committee he is going to introduce a Bill in this House. He is going to adopt two methods at once of dealing with this question, the truth being that the hon. gentleman is now attempting to make up by haste the delays which have already occurred in this matter. He says: We must go on at once with the Bill—I will give notice to-day; and we will proceed with the committee to prevent delay in regard to this important measure. Why did not the hon. gentleman, six weeks ago, if he thought delay might occur, move for a committee or bring in a Bill, whichever might be the proper way; but after waiting six weeks he comes forward and says it is very important to prevent delay, and in order to prevent delay we must now go on post-haste, we have delayed so long already; we must appoint a committee of both Houses to prevent separate

consideration by each House, and while the committee are deliberating we will introduce a Bill, in anticipation of the result of their labors, in order to avoid delay. On the whole the hon. gentleman's procedure is highly objectionable, and I cannot, for my part, assent to his motion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot see the force of the hon. gentleman's objection to the committee, and it seems to me that he is losing sight of the spirit of the connection between the two Houses when he talks of their being no precedent for this action. There may be no precedent for the consolidation of the Statutes of England and for a joint committee acting between the two Houses on that subject. There never has been a consolidation of the laws of England, and there never will be; and this the hon. gentleman knows. The report speaks of the hopelessness of there ever being such a consolidation. But there is no analogy if the question had arisen, and if it had been decided, that it was not expedient that there should be a joint committee on the matter of consolidation. Why, the Statutes cover centuries in England, from the time Simon de Montford until now, for the Statutes of England have been constant consolidation of particular branches of legislation and form a mass of original Statutes amended and reamended, repealed, and some consolidated and some readjusted, and so the idea of consolidation has been given up altogether. But the hon. gentleman gives away his whole case when he says there are subjects on which, profitably, the two Houses can appoint a joint committee. They can appoint a joint committee on matters affecting the privileges of this House, with relation to the two independent Chambers, with relation to the common practice of the two Chambers. Those are more important subjects than the consolidation of our Statutes, which fortunately cover only a few years. It is happy for us that we shall so early in the life history of this Confederation have a consolidation of the Statutes. But not only are the statements he cites an argument for a joint committee upon joint business, but it is admitted that there are certain classes of subjects with which a joint committee can deal. One class is as good as another class; but there is the case in which a joint committee sat for the purpose of settling the railway policy of all England. The hon. gentleman may say that those are private Bills to settle private rights. They are not so. They were railway Bills, and they were considered by a joint committee for the purpose of settling legislation as to the means of transport and the great commercial avenues, dealing with not only private rights, which constitute a small portion of the subject, but dealing with the rights of the people and settling the principle of general legislation in regard to the general railway system of the country, which is a question of much more practical importance than any question about the comparative dignity of the two Chambers, or the privileges of the two Chambers. The question is not whether there is any precedent for a joint committee on the consolidation of the Statutes, but whether there is any precedent against it or any principle against it. We have precedents, as the hon. gentleman has shown, for a joint committee on certain subjects of legislation. I say this is a very fitting subject for a joint committee to deal with, one on which they can sit for the purpose of looking over this elaborate work. The hon. gentleman says that this joint committee is moved for because the Minister of Justice happens to be in the other Chamber. I am not going to discuss the question, which the hon. gentleman has dragged in, as to whether the Minister of Justice should sit in this Chamber. Some of the Ministers must be in the other Chamber, and it is generally considered in England that those Ministers who are not connected with the spending departments and the collection of revenues should sit in the House of Lords. So the Lord Chancellor is the legal member of the cabinet and presides in the Upper House; the precedent is exactly the same. To be sure we are not so fortunate as to have two legal officers; the Attorney General in England sits in the Lower House and——

Mr. BLAKE. And the solicitor.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is true.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). But neither the Attorney General nor the Solicitor is a member of the Cabinet.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, they are subordinate officers. But I have no doubt if we proposed to have an Attorney-General, in addition to the Minister of Justice, that every Grit paper from one end of the Dominion to the other, would charge us with extravagance in making another officer. I have no doubt of it. The hon. gentleman speaks of precedents. I adhere, as a Conservative, as strongly to precedents as he does, and I think a little more strongly, but I do it on principle and not on mere incidents. It happens that there is a precedent for the consolidation of the Statutes, and it happens that there may be joint committees of the two Houses, acting on such a report in the manner we propose. The hon. gentleman says there is an attempt to give up the responsibility of the Government by the fact of the Minister of Justice moving the committee first, because he was in the Upper House. Well, if the Minister of Justice had been here, and not in the Upper House, the only consequence would have been that it would have been moved in the Lower House and a Message would have been sent to the Upper Chamber, instead of its being moved in the Upper Chamber and a Message sent to the Lower. In either case a joint committee would be of great value. The Government assumes the whole responsibility; they know their responsibility as well as the hon. gentleman can point it out. I was in the Government at the time, as Attorney-General for Upper Canada, when the consolidation of the Statutes for Upper Canada took place, and on the responsibility of the Government I carried through that great measure then; and holding the position I do now I intend to take the responsibility; the whole responsibility will rest on the Government. The Bill, if it receives the sanction of the House, will get a second reading, and then it is for the House to say whether they will go into Committee of the Whole or send it to a select committee. If this committee makes a report and the House thinks it will do away with the necessity of having a special, or rather two special committees, one first in this House and the other in the other House, that joint committee will look through the whole Act and settle its terms, and if the House thinks we should have a special committee the House will grant it, and there is an end of it. In the meantime there is no more harm but great use in the committee sitting and looking over the report—there is no more harm than in the original commissioners making a report. They made a report, the purpose being that experts should be chosen to consolidate the Statutes. The hon. gentleman might as well say that the issuing of the commission at all was a shirking of the responsibility of the Government. He might say it was the Government's business, that the Government should have consolidated them, that they should have prepared a measure, that they should not have handed it over to a commission. The absurdity of that proposition will address itself to every mind in the House. So in the same way, this joint commission, carefully selected, composed of gentlemen who are experts, who are experienced, intelligent, and who represent legal opinion—men who have been selected from the various Provinces of the Dominion—if they make a report we will have that report before us. It does not bind this House. They may set it aside, they may disagree with it altogether, they may insist on appointing a special committee of their own to look into the matter, but in the meantime it would be no harm to have

that report and to have these various Acts looked over. It will be a great assistance to hon. members in this House. The hon. gentleman says that it is introduced too late. But if the House thinks so it will say so and throw it over to another year. But all this is wide of the mark. We have been requested to appoint a certain number of members to consider and look over and report upon this report; and unless there is a constitutional objection—and there can be no constitutional objection, because if it is unconstitutional to have a joint committee on the subject of legislation it must be unconstitutional to have it on any subject of legislation—this invitation being given I think it would be churlish and wrong, and certainly without precedent, to refuse to have this committee for the purpose of reporting and assisting this House in their deliberations.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman says there are precedents for the course he is about to take, or at all events that there is no precedent against it. These instances he gives of considering railway legislation in England, the hon. gentleman will see, are precedents not to consider Bills brought before Parliament, but the principles on which legislation should proceed. Now that is a wholly different principle from the one involved in the proposition before us. Then, Mr. Speaker, we have here a certain mode of proceeding. We read in each House every Bill brought before us for consideration, a certain number of times. Those precedents in procedure are strictly adhered to, in all cases of ordinary legislation coming before us. The hon. gentleman proposes not to take an ordinary Bill, where if a mistake were made it might be reconsidered at another Session, but he proposes to take the legislation of seventeen years on every possible subject, and instead of exercising the usual care of a certain number of readings, and of certain proceedings in the two Houses, acting separately and independently of each other, he proposes that those two Houses shall practically divest themselves of their responsibility and hand over to a joint committee the most important matters that could possibly be brought before either House, for its consideration. That is practically what the hon. gentleman proposes. Now it does seem to me it is of great consequence that not only the members of this House but the people of the country should have the opportunity of reading these volumes and considering the legislation which is proposed, and the changes in the legislation which are proposed. There is no doubt whatever that many very important and valuable suggestions would be received by the representatives of the people of Parliament during the recess. It does seem to me a most extraordinary proposition that the Government should at the end of two months propose that it should divest itself of its responsibility and abandon the usual care it exercises in legislation brought before us, and hand over to a joint committee of the two Houses the consideration of those two large octavo volumes. I have looked at these volumes and I dare say those men have done fairly well the task assigned to them. I do not know what the nature of the commission was, but assuming that it was simply with a view of incorporating the different measures of the same subject into one Bill I think they have done their work fairly well. But there is no proper consolidation of the law in these volumes before us. I take as an instance the provisions in this consolidation relating to the Department of the Interior, over which the hon. gentleman for several years presided. I find here in the first volume, chapter 21, an Act respecting the Department of the Interior. I look to see what were the purposes for which the Department was created, what the functions of the Minister presiding over the Department are, and I find scarcely anything with regard to the Department. It is stated the Minister shall have charge of the public lands and so on. I turn to another Statute, that relating to the Geological Department, in another part of this volume, and I find in it this clause:

"The Minister of the Interior shall have the control and management of the Geological Survey of Canada."

In another part of the volume, relating to Indian affairs, I find a clause providing that certain functions shall be discharged by the Minister of the Interior or some other Minister who has control of Indian affairs. Now, here are different provisions on what might be called departmental law, relating to the constitution of Government itself, stating who the officers of the Government are to be, and what the duties of those officers are; and I find with regard to one important office—and precisely the same observation would apply to others – that you are obliged to look through several Statutes in order to find what duties are imposed upon a Minister of the Crown. It is perfectly obvious that anything like a proper classification of our law has not been for one moment considered by the commission appointed to consolidate the laws of Canada; and it is clear, that being the case, that if a committee is to discharge its duty in this matter efficiently, it has almost as great a task before it as if this work of consolidation had not been undertaken by a commission at all. Now, Sir, there has been nothing done in the way of consolidation in these volumes, so far as I have been able to examine them, except what might be done by an ordinary clerk with a pair of scissors. There have been certain sections picked out of one Statute and incorporated in another, and any amendment that has been incidentally made in some particular Statute, relating to any public department, or creating some new duty or function, has been allowed to stand in the position in which it stood in the Statute in which it was introduced. It is perfectly clear, therefore, that this whole work has to be done anew, as if nothing had been actually done by the commissioners, and it requires the most careful consideration of Parliament if there is any case in which it is important that Parliament should not abdicate its functions, and hand over to a committee work that properly belongs to itself under the constitution, it is in the matter of the consolidation of the Statutes. We are entitled to know, and the public are entitled to have an opportunity of knowing, what is contained in these volumes. The public are entitled to have an opportunity of considering their contents, and discussing them; and Parliament has a right to the advantage of that consideration and discussion, which would place us in a better position to consider the contents of these volumes than any committee could be in at the fag end of the Session.

Mr. DAVIES. Before the motion is adopted I just want to say a word or two, not as to the question or precedent, but more particularly as to the result that would follow from the appointment of this joint committee. It must be perfectly evident to anyone who has had anything to do with drafting or consolidating Statutes, that if the committee pretend to do their work this Session, they must abandon all other legislative functions. As my hon. friend has just remarked, to do their work other than perfunctorily, they must make up their minds to go through every chapter and every section. That is out of the question. The hon. gentleman knows he cannot take fourteen or fifteen lawyers out of this House and ask them to give up all their other legislative functions for the rest of the Session. The advantage of allowing this work to lie over for a year would be very great. I have not been able myself to look through the volumes at all yet; and I do not know whether the work is done well or badly. I understood the right hon. gentleman to state, as one reason for the appointment of this joint committee, that the Minister of Justice in the other House could preside over it, and that the very great knowledge which had been gained by him in the compilation of this report

would be of very great advantage to the committee. Well, that may be so; but I have had the advantage of reading the very elaborate speech which the Minister of Justice made when he moved for the appointment of the committee in the other House, and I find that so far from that being the case he stated that his functions were merely formal, that he took no practical part in the compilation of this report whatever, and that he was merely placed at the head of that commission for the purpose of acting as a medium between the Government and the commission from time to time. I may as well read his own language:

"I may observe that the part that I took in the commission was not of an active character, and I am free to speak of the work which they did in the terms of praise which it deserves. My name was placed on the commission simply that there might be some means of intercourse between the commission and the Government, and that we might keep control, so far as necessary, of the commission, and not that I could myself give time to assist them in their labors."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, what of that?

Mr. DAVIES. That is Sir Alexander Campbell's statement. Therefore, so far as the Minister of Justice is concerned, he has no more practical knowledge of the manner in which this report is made up, and has devoted no more time to it, than any member of this House. He was merely appointed as a figure head on the commission, and the argument the right hon. gentleman used, that his practical knowledge would be of some advantage to the joint committee——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. DAVIES. I understood him to state that the Minister of Justice had taken a great deal of pains with and devoted a great deal of time to this report.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I did not.

Mr. DAVIES. Well, I understood him to do so. I trust, therefore, that the hon. gentleman will see that this work, which must be permanent in its character, and is of vast importance to every part of the Dominien, should not be confirmed by this Parliament without those whose duties specially call upon them to investigate it having ample time to do so, and I think that that cannot be done this Session by the committee, consistent with the other duties they have to discharge to the Legislature.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is not the question now.

Mr. DAVIES. To some extent.

Motion agreed to on a division.

REPORTS ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. ABBOTT moved;

That, as the time for the reception of reports from Committees on Private Bills will expire on Thursday next, the 2nd of April, the same be extended until Wednesday, the 15th of April.

Motion agreed to.

LAND GRANTS TO RAILWAY COMPANIES IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Wednesday next to consider the following resolutions:

1. That is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant to the North-Western Coal and Navigation Company (Limited) Dominion lands to an extent not exceeding three thousand eight hundred acres for each mile of the company's railway from Medicine Hat to the coal banks on the Hudson River, about 110 miles.

2. That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant to the Manitoba South-Western Colonization Railway Company Dominion lands to an extent not exceeding six thousand four hundred acres for each mile of the company's railway from its commencement at Winnipeg to its terminus at White Water Lake, about 150 miles.

3. That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant to the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company Dominion lands to the extent of six thousand four hundred acres for each mile of the company's railway for the whole distance from Portage la Prairie to the crossing at the south branch of the River Saskatchewan, twenty miles from Prince Albert, about 430 miles.

4. That it is expedient to authorise the Governor in Council to grant to the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company Dominion lands to the extent not exceeding six thousand four hundred acres for each mile of the company's railway from its commencement near Regina to the navigable waters of Long Lake.

5. That it is expedient to provide that the said grants shall be free grants, subject only to the payment by the grantees respectively of the cost of survey of the lands and incidental expenses at the rate of 10 cents per acre in cash on the issue of the patent therefor.

He said: I will bring down the Orders in Council accompanying these resolutions.

Mr. BLAKE. The Order of the House is for more than the Orders in Council; it is for the correspondence, petitions and applications as well as Orders in Council.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is the motion for the return. I will bring down the Orders in Council separately, but will also bring down the other information.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—AREA OF LAND IN THE FORTY-EIGHT MILE BELT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will give the hon. gentleman the answer to his question of yesterday. The total area of land situated in the 48 mile belt of the Canadian Pacific Railway examined between Winnipeg and Calgary, also that portion allotted to the said company between Red River and the Dirt Hills up to the 29th December is 7,315,200 acres, out of which the company has accepted 6,561,920, equal to $88\frac{8}{10}$ per cent of the total area examined, and proposes to reject $10\frac{2}{10}$ per cent. of such area, namely, 753,280 acres as shown below:

Lands Where situated.	Area accepted, in acres.	Area rejected, in acres.
West of the 1st meridian	1,795,840	285,440
" 2nd "	3,053,440	191,360
" 3rd "	524,160	126,720
" 4th "	1,072,640	145,920
" 5th "	115,840	3,840
Totals.	6,561,920	753,280

So that on the whole region, from one end to the other, there is only 10 per cent. rejected. Whether rejected justly or not is a matter of adjustment between the Government and the company.

Mr. BLAKE. I may point out that the statement does not show how much is in the 48 mile belt and how much in southern Manitoba outside the 48 mile belt.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will take a note of it.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY RETURNS—THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. BLAKE. There are a considerable number of Canadian Pacific Railway returns which have not been presented; and in view of the present presumed condition of affairs, I think it my duty to press the hon. gentleman for them. There are also colonisation companies papers, and papers with reference to the boundary and the disputed title which ought to be down. I would also like the hon. gentleman to give us information, if he has any, about the North-West affairs. Is there any truth in the statement published that negotiations are being made with Batteries "A" and "B," to prepare for active service, that sleighs and supplies are being collected at the western end of the Canadian Pacific Railway track north of Lake Superior, for the purpose of carrying 400 more men over the 42 miles in which the track is not laid?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, arrangements are being made that, in case of necessity, the gaps, 70 miles north of Lake Superior, which are not fit for railway travel, shall be made available for the transport of a force by means of sleighs. Everything is being made ready in case of necessity. The "B" Battery at Kingston has been warned that their services may be wanted, and there may be arrangements proposed, as a matter of regimental detail, by which a portion of "A" Battery may join "B" Battery. There are some telegrams now being deciphered and I will be glad to give the House any information in my power before it rises.

HUDSON BAY EXPEDITION SUPPLIES.

Mr. VAIL. When will the Minister of Marine and Fisheries furnish me with the documents with reference to supplies furnished to the Hudson Bay expedition?

Mr. McLELAN. I have spoken about them once or twice and all due diligence will be made to bring them down.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 114) to comprise in one Act a limitation of the Share and Loan Capital of the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. Kilvert.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would suggest to the Minister of Finance that, in order to save unnecessary complications, he might state, as each separate item is called, first of all what amount of revenue is involved, if any, and next what are the reasons in particular which call for that change in the tariff to be made.

"Free list—Gas coke."

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I propose to take the free list first. There are a great number of articles which are now free by Order in Council, and we propose to include them in the Tariff Act. Gas coke is free under Order in Council.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At the same time it would be convenient to have a brief statement—I do not want to insist on unnecessary detail—of why these articles were made free. Gas coke, I suppose, is free in the interest of the gas companies, or does it include all kinds of coke in practice?

Mr. BOWELL. No, only gas coke, and it was placed upon the free list in order to assist those living on the frontier engaged in manufacturing industries. It has been imported and used only, I believe, in the Eastern Townships, in connection with mining operations.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It has nothing to do in particular with the gas companies?

Mr. BOWELL. No, it has nothing at all to do with the gas companies, nor with any other kind of coke, which is manufactured, as the hon. gentleman knows, expressly for smelting purposes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much does that cover?

Mr. BOWELL. It has been on the free list since June, 1877. I am not aware just now how much has been imported.

Sir RICHARD CARTWIGHT. These are all apparently since 1883. The words are: "By adding to the free list the following articles now admitted free by Order in Council, under authority of sub section 12 of section 230 of the Customs Act, 1883."

"Woollen rags."

Mr. BOWELL. It should have read "as amended," because the hon. gentleman will remember the Customs Act was amended in 1883. Woollen rags were placed on the free list in the same way. They are used principally, I believe, in the shoddy mills. Cotton rags were free, and it was considered that woollen rags might be placed in the same category.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But was not the object of the National Policy to turn shoddy out of the country, and give us pure woollen goods? I must say that I am quite aware that the shoddy manufacture has been gone into pretty extensively. I have been through woollen mills in which I have seen these shoddy manufacturers at work, and it seems to me to be a very dubious question whether that shoddy manufacture should be encouraged. It is certainly not in accordance with the statements we used to hear about the desirability of having a pure woollen article.

Mr. BLAKE. I remember to have been encountered on many occasions at public meetings by orators of the opposite persuasion who pointed out the grievance the people of Canada were laboring under in having cheap Yorkshire goods, cheap shoddy goods, composed of devil's dust, brought into the market, and yet it is to encourage this improper, this unclean practice that the hon. gentleman proposes to introduce the raw material of shoddy free. He says woollen rags were put on the free list because cotton rags were on the free list I suppose cotton rags are wanted generally to make paper, but woollen rags are used almost entirely to make shoddy. Is that in furtherance of the National Policy?

Mr. BOWELL. All industries are. The hon. gentleman may have been met on the stump by argument such as he mentions. I have been met on the stump with the declaration of hon. gentlemen opposite that all heavy goods, especially this class of goods, having to pay so much per pound and so much *ad valorem*, the poor man was virtually shut out from getting cheap goods. That is the argument which has always been used by hon. gentlemen opposite when discussing the question of the tariff; and, if people will wear that class of goods, it is better that it should be made at home than that they should have to pay the duty on an inferior article, a very unclean article, brought from Yorkshire. I have no doubt that, if they will wear the cheap quality, they would prefer to have it made at home.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the importation of woollen rags largely increased?

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot say.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that the free importation now is 179,000 pounds, which is a respectable growth of shoddy manufacture. I do not know how much was imported paying duty, if any.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it within the knowledge of the Minister that there has been a very considerable increase in the introduction of shoddy into the woollen goods manufactured in Canada?

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has not received the information that there is any deterioration in the character of woollen goods?

Mr. O'BRIEN. I do not agree with the Finance Minister on this question. When we have our wool at such a low price as now, it is a very poor way of carrying out the

National Policy to allow the free importation of a raw material which comes into direct competition with the wool chiefly produced in this country. As to the duties on wool in general, the argument has been very unfairly stated by the hon. gentleman opposite, because, as a matter of fact, we do not grow in this country the class of wool the manufacturers require for the finer class of goods; consequently it would be quite right to admit that class of wool into the country free of duty. That is a legitimate part of the National Policy; I admit that. But I know, as a matter of fact, that we are in this country becoming producers of a very fine class of wool, and I think the farmers will have a perfect right to say to the Government—if they are giving protection to other articles of agricultural produce, if they are giving protection to the manufacturer, and if they are giving protection to them by the admission into this country of articles which this country does not produce—we are now producing fine quality of wool, and we therefore ask that the duty shall be put upon the importation of wool which comes into direct competition with our wool. That state of things has not existed hitherto, because the finer class of wools are not produced in this country, but we are very rapidly increasing our growth of a class of wool which, to some extent, does come into competition with this fine class of wool, and that brings up the question of the duties on wool in a manner which it has never occupied hitherto in this country. But without entering into that question, which is entirely distinct from the present one, I do not think that the Finance Miuister or the Minister of Customs have shown any ground whatever for allowing these woollen rags to come into this country in direct competition, as they must necessarily do, with our low grade wools which are most generally produced here. I think the proposition is entirely inconsistent with the agricultural interest as it is affected by the National Policy, and I for one am altogether opposed to placing that article upon the free list.

Mr. IRVINE. Of course, the Finance Minister has always been the friend of the farmer and of the agriculturist, and of course he has done this in the interest of the farmers. It is very well known that during this last year, if I mistake not, 6,000,000 pounds of foreign wool have been imported free of duty, while we exported only 1,500,000 pounds of our home grown wool. Now, if I am correctly informed, a large portion of the wool imported into this country is of the very class that we raise here, and that wool, according to our Trade and Navigation Returns, which is imported into this country, gives about 20 cents a pound. Do you want shoddy cheaper than that? Do you want woollen rags cheaper than that? Would our home grown wool make clothing at the price shoddy is quoted at? With reference to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, I imagine he is not a practical farmer.

Mr. O'BRIEN. As a matter of fact he is.

Mr. IRVINE. Then all I can say is that if he is a practical farmer he has certainly shown to me that he knows very little about sheep-raising. There is nothing to prevent the Canadian farmer from raising the finer wool sheep; there is nothing to prevent the Spanish merino from coming into competition with the long wool Lincoln or Cotswold. The finer wool sheep are the hardiest, and there is nothing to prevent any class of wool being grown in this country. It is well known that the Government put forth the plea that this change is to benefit the Canadian farmer. But it does not benefit the laboring man, it does not benefit the poor man, it benefits only the rich man who wants a fine garment made out of fine wool, and, therefore he has fine wool brought into this country free of duty. We find that practical men have given up sheep-raising from the fact that there is no profit in raising sheep at the present time. Mutton has gone down, and wool is comparatively worthless. When you can import wool at 20 cents a pound, just what is reckoned in the Trade and Navigation Returns, there is no profit for the Canadian farmer in raising it. And yet this hon. gentleman poses as the friend of the farmer. Sir, he is the enemy of the farmer, the worst enemy we ever had. He taxes everything that the farmer consumes and gives him no protection on what he raises. I defy any hon. gentleman to say that the farmer has one iota of protection You will not protect him when you can. You could protect him in the article of wool, but you have refused to do so. It is a wonder to me that hon. gentlemen should be so brassy as to stand up and declare that they have protected the farmer. Why, you are the worst enemy the farmer ever had. Your National Policy has done him the greatest injury. You have given him no protection upon any article that he raises. Why, Mr. Chairman, an hon. gentleman stood up on the other side of the House the other day—he was a lawyer and you do not expect anything practical from a lawyer——

Mr. IVES. That is pretty hard on the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. IRVINE. If you want to find a man of common sense you have got to go outside the legal profession. But the hon. gentleman—I have forgotten his constituency—stated that the farmer had protection upon barley. Well, Sir, the people of this country exported last year 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 bushels of barley—I speak from memory—and there are a few bushels of barley imported into British Columbia; and I ask him how the Canadian farmer gets protection on his barley? The Government gives the farmer protection upon an article that he is exporting. Why, it is the greatest piece of folly. No person but a lawyer would be so lost to shame as to make such a statement. And now, Mr. Chairman, to help the farmer, the Government are going to put woollen rags on the free list.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I would just like to let the hon. gentleman know that there are people in this House who know a little about farming, besides himself, and who know a little about the woollen business as well as he does. I know perfectly well, as every farmer does, that we can grow merino wool in this country, but for other reasons, apart altogether from the quality of the wool, it does not pay to raise it, because the price of wool would not make it worth while. The hon. gentleman might understand, when I put the case, that it was, to some extent, in favor of his view, because I say that we are rapidly coming to grow fine wool which does, to some extent, come into competition with the imported fine wool. I think the time will come when the farmers will have a right to ask that a duty be imposed upon fine wool. I know that we can grow the finest wool in this country, but it will not pay us to do so. As to the question of these woollen rags, I think they come directly into competition with the coarser wools grown here, which many of the farmers find it most profitable to raise.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman says that by-and-bye the time may come when it may be proper, in order to carry out the National Policy, to impose a duty upon fine wool. His statement is practically this, that fine wool sheep may be raised by the farmers of Canada. After they have gone into fine wool growing and it has become an important industry of the country, and has grown up without any protection, then it will be the duty of the Government to give it protection. When it shows it can subsist alone, then it is to receive protection. Well, Sir, these hon. gentlemen stated that their object was to give better prices to the agricultural population for all the articles which they can produce. Now it will be quite possible, if these gentlemen were to put a

sufficient duty upon wool, to induce the farmers to go into raising fine wool sheep at the present time. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) said that it does not pay as well as the coarse wool, but that is simply because the fine wool sheep do not exist in Canada at the present moment in any great numbers; and if the hon. gentleman believes that it is a good thing for the people of this country to adopt a protective policy, we can have fine wool growing made profitable if he can induce his leaders before him to impose a sufficient duty and give protection to fine wool. Then the agricultural population of Canada would no doubt go into raising fine wool sheep instead of the coarse wool sheep, as they are doing now. Sir, I was reminded of a fact which, perhaps, may not be known to every hon. gentleman in the House, and that is that at the time a committee sat for the purpose of taking evidence upon the causes of the depression of trade in 1878, that committee had before it several gentlemen who were engaged in the business of woollen manufacture, and a few asked to have a higher duty imposed upon importations of heavy woollen goods into Canada. They said that was specially to keep out shoddy cloths, that it came into competition with the valuable article which they were producing in their mills. We had a prominent supporter of the hon. gentleman opposite, who, I believe, is engaged extensively in the production of woollen goods at Almonte, not far from this city, who asked to have a higher duty imposed upon heavy woollen goods with the special object of keeping out shoddy cloths. This gentleman told the committee that it would not pay to engage in the manufacture of shoddy goods in this country; in fact, that it was not an honest pursuit and a proper thing to do. You were cheating the poor man, it was said; you were giving him a good-looking article, a cheap article, which was really a very poor article, and he got very much less for his money than if he had purchased an article made of Canadian wool. Now the hon. gentleman proposes to bring shoddy rags into competition with the combing wools of Canada. He proposes that rags be admitted free of duty to encourage the manufacture of shoddy goods in this country. At whose expense? At the expense of the farmers, at the expense of those who are raising Leicester and Cotswold sheep. The hon. gentleman is not satisfied with the injury done to the farming population by the heavy duties imposed under the National Policy, but he proposes to grind them down and interfere with them still further. The hon. gentleman has reduced the price of wool from 38 cents per lb. to 15 cents or 16 cents, and he now proposes to reduce it still further in value by bringing into competition with it woollen rags that are produced abroad. He is perfectly ready to pay something to the beggars in foreign countries in order that he may still further injure the farmers in his own country.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Irvine) paid a very high compliment to the farmers, and not a very high compliment to the members of the legal profession. I do not know but that I agree to some extent with the opinion he entertains.

Mr. MILLS. That refers, of course, to your leader.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I am taking lawyers as a whole. There are some prominent gentlemen who stand head and shoulders above others of the profession. I might point to the leader of the Opposition, who is considered by his friends head and shoulders above every other legal man in the country; but it does not follow that every other lawyer possesses his astuteness and ability. I will give one of the reasons why I concur in that opinion with respect to the farmers. They showed intelligence and good judgment in 1878 by sending a majority to Parliament in favor of the National Policy. In 1882 it was endorsed by the farmers of the country, so the farmers in 1878 and 1882 have sustained the policy, and I am disposed to accept the statement of my hon. friend that the farmers are very intelligent. Great zeal has been manifested by the hon. member for Bothwell with respect to the farmers and that hon. gentleman declared that we were destroying their market for wool. I visited the county of Lennox two years since, and when the people recently endorsed the National Policy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The election courts have settled that question.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. What did I see in Lennox? In Napanee I visited a very large blanket factory, the owner of which has a lease from the hon. member for Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), who owns the land and the water power. That factory was manufacturing a blanket made in part of the wool of the country and in part of shoddy. We recollect, when the National Policy was before the House in 1879, we were told that an enormous duty was imposed on the lumberman's blankets. We were told it was desirable that lumbermen should obtain cheap blankets, as they just used them during one winter in camp and then threw them away. This manufacturer was making, by using shoddy in connection with wool, that very blanket which it was stated by some hon. gentlemen, representing lumber interests, they required. That is a practical illustration. At the establishment to which I have referred they were manufacturing blankets of all wool, as well as cheaper blankets of a mixture of wool and shoddy suitable for lumbermen.

Mr. BLAKE. You will find that the cheap heavy blankets made are not as a rule, I do not think ever, made of wool shoddy.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They are in some cases.

Mr. BLAKE. I have seen the cheap blankets submitted to the chemical test that eliminates all the wool and leaves the strips of other articles not wool, the vegetable matter. I have seen the different grades and an actual application of the test, and although I do not desire to say but that there may be some blankets made of a mixture partly of long wool and partly of wool shoddy, so far as I am informed the bulk of the heavy blankets are made of a mixture of wools and vegetable matter, not of different classes of wool shoddy and wool. With respect to the hon. gentleman's statement I would say that the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has pointed out that a time may come and will come soon, and is coming presently when the farmers will be in a position to claim a duty on fine wool. Is the hon. gentleman's policy not to protect the infant industries of this country? We thought it was because the industries were weak and struggling and puny, and because they were young that they were to be supported; and yet hon. gentlemen say, let them struggle along through their weakness and infancy till they attain strength without protection, and when they begin to be strong and powerful and of proved ability to stand alone, then they are entitled to demand protection. Then they will not need it. The hon. Minister has brought down Session after Session proposals to increase the duties because new industries were about to be started. The duty on prints was increased from 20 to 27 per cent. because there was a factory in Magog going to be started. It was not in operation, it was to be in operation by the 1st of January, and so in anticipation, before the factory wheels began to revolve, the protection was applied. Why, I recollect the hon. gentleman coming down with an increased duty on clocks. He said, I did not bring it in in the first tariff, because we did not know that there were any clocks manufactured in the country, but I have found since that there is a manufactory at Hamilton, where they make a very nice article in, I think, he said, maple cases, which they sell at seventy or eighty cents, and they are exporting them to England, and so we must increase the duty on

clocks, and so the duty was increased. There was one print factory, and the duties had to be increased on prints; there was only one clock factory, and the duties had to be increased on clocks; but the hon. gentleman refuses to increase the duty on fine wools, because there are not enough farmers who are raising that kind of wool. It must be conceded that if they are able by artificial means to increase the price to the farmer, that price will make up to him for the unprofitableness of the operation. Although we on this side may have something to say on the question of who pays the duty in that and other cases, though we may discuss what the practical operation of the increased duty would be yet, applying the hon. gentleman's own policy, applying it to their own tariff, it is clear that the course proposed to us to-day is entirely inconsistent with that policy. It may be said that it has been on the free list for some time—I do not know how long before it was buried under an Order in in Council, and I dare say the hon. gentleman is sorry that he has disentombed it and dragged it out to the light of day.

Mr. BOWELL. It was brought out before.

Mr. BLAKE. It was not fairly brought before us till now. May I ask the hon. gentleman what date it was.

Mr. BOWELL. It was the 17th of June, 1879—I cannot give the exact hour of the day.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not ask for the hour of the day, and the hon. gentleman knew I did not ask, but I suppose he intends his remark as a joke, and from him I will accept it as a very admirable joke. Under the hon. gentleman's policy we are obliged to accept inferior home-made goods, and I will accept this inferior home-made joke from the hon. gentleman. In June, 1879, shortly after the close of the Session, in order to carry out the great policy of giving us good, pure, honest, home-made Canadian goods, instead of that wretched Yorkshire shoddy, the hon. gentleman put on the free list woollen rags, which he now proposes that Parliament should assent to his continuing on the list.

Mr. IRVINE. There are some questions which I should like to ask the Finance Minister and I am sure he will answer them because I am deeply interested in getting the information. Of course no one is so deeply interested as myself, considering that I am a practical farmer, and I am one whoh as always declared at home and abroad, in the House and out of it that the National Policy is the greatest curse that ever came upon the farmer. The Government promised to give us protection, but they have given no protection to the farmers; it is true, that there are a few articles which were raised in price, but they had nothing to do with it. The hon. gentleman thought he made a good point on me when he stated—of course whether he meant it or not, and I suppose he did mean it—that the farmers were an intelligent class, and that they had voted confidence in the Government in two successive elections. I would ask the Finance Minister, when you inaugurated the National Policy did you not state at a public meeting that the National Policy had made a difference of 3 cents a bushel on oats? Now, I ask you——

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman will please address the Chair.

Mr. IRVINE. I will, Mr. Chairman. I am not accustomed to speaking, and therefore I made the mistake. I would ask him—I think I am right now, and of course being an Irishman I have the right to speak twice at any rate—I would ask him through you if they did not promise that the National Policy would be the great panacea for all the evils that the farmers were subject to? Did they not declare that this policy would enhance the price of wheat to the Canadian farmer? How has it been this year? When they went to the people of this country the first time the people were humbugged, and when they went the second time the Finance Minister told us with all his cunning and suavity that there were millions of money ready to be invested the moment this policy was ready to be carried in the country. That was the way he helped the farmers, and I would ask him if those millions have been invested in our mines and minerals as he promised. I ask him if he put the question fairly to the farmers? I ask him if in my county, where oats are 25 cents per bushel would we have only been getting 22 cents except for this National Policy, the national humbug? They deceived the people, but, if I mistake not the farmers of the country have had their eyes opened, and I doubt if the hon. gentleman with all his suavity can draw the wool over their eyes the next time. It will be shoddy the next time, a cheap article of wool. What a comfort it is to the farmer to find that wool is being imported into the country and that the price for which wool is selling in competition with the imported article is 20 cents per pound. It is said the cause is that the wools we raise here are not fine enough, but we have the very best authority for saying that a large portion of the wool which is imported is of the very class which is raised in this country. We raise every class of wool here; we have Leicesters, Lincolns, Spanish merino, Cotswold, South Downs and other kinds. But what can you expect to do for the farmer; 20 cents is enough for him. He will get to be too independent if you give him any protection. The best way is to brush him out altogether. I was sitting in my seat the other day when the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Robertson), who is a lawyer, I believe, was speaking; he was the gentleman who was speaking when a very prominent lady was in the gallery.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. IRVINE. Very well, I will not refer to that, but what did the hon. gentleman say? You will find it stated in his speech that the farmers were greatly benefited by the National Policy because they manufactured more cheese now than they did formerly. I ask the hon. gentleman and the Finance Minister what the National Policy has done for the manufacture of cheese in this country. I would like the Finance Minister to stand up and tell us if the National Policy has been any benefit to the farmer by improving the price of any one article of farm produce.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). The hon. gentleman says that wool is brought in at 20 cents per pound and that the farmers get only 20 cents per pound in competing against it. Unless this statement is carried out to the full and corrected, it conveys a wrong impression. He should have stated, in speaking of wool being imported at 20 cents per pound, that the wool when washed costs from 45 to 55 cents per pound—every pound used by the manufacturers when cleaned costs them 45 to 55 cents per pound. This wool, when brought from Australia and South America, is filled with sand, burrs and grease, and when cleaned it only returns from 36 to 41 per cent. of clean wool. This statement is necessary to be taken in connection with that of the hon. gentleman in order to convey a correct impression to this House and the country.

Mr. BOWELL. I am much obliged to the leader of the Opposition for the compliment he paid to me for the little joke, as he called it, that he said I made at his expense. If it gave any pleasure to him and to those who applauded him, I am gratified. I was somewhat amused at his dissertation on shoddy, and the effect which chemicals have upon wool. I agree with him that there are chemical preparations which will dissolve the wool from the cotton; but if there be blankets made from shoddy in this country, composed partially of woollen rags, the chemicals that would

dissolve the wool would have precisely the same effect on the shoddy.

Mr. BLAKE. No doubt.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman said that he had seen cheap blankets made from wool and shoddy, and his whole argument was intended to show that the statement of the Finance Minister was not correct because he had seen blankets tested by the chemical, which had dissolved all the wool that was in them but did not dissolve the cotton.

Mr. BLAKE. It was the wool.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is very logical on most questions that he attempts to discuss, but any person who listened to him could draw no other deduction from what he stated, than that he either intended to mislead the House, or was not aware of the article called shoddy. With regard to what the hon. gentleman says about the inferiority of shoddy, I quite agree with him; but when he says the people argued that shoddy should not be worn because it is of inferior quality and brought from the Old Country, the only answer I have to make is that shoddy is made in this country, and if that class of goods is brought into the market it is much better that it should be manufactured here than that an inferior quality should be brought from the Old Country, on which a heavy duty is paid. I was surprised to hear my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) make the statement that there was no duty on wool. I am not surprised at anything that might be said by the "common sense" gentleman who hails from Carleton (Mr. Irvine) because I have no doubt he knows all about farming. I am not a farmer, but I have paid considerable attention to farming operations in the neighborhood where I have lived, having been connected with agricultural societies, not only there but in other parts of Ontario; and I know that 20 years ago the farmers in my section of the country attempted to raise Merino sheep, and they gave up the attempt simply because it was not profitable. If the hon. gentleman turns to the the tariff, he will find that there is a duty on some classes of wool—on the wool produced from the South Down sheep, which, I think I am safe in saying, is about the only kind of sheep raised in this Dominion to any extent that produces a fine wool.

Mr. CASEY. There is no duty on South Down wool, according to the wording of the tariff.

Mr. BOWELL. South Down combing wool is South Down wool. The combing wool is generally from South Downs.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, it is the long fine wool that is sheared from the sheep. There is a duty on Leicester, Cotswold, Lincoln, and South Down combing wools.

Mr. GUNN. South Down wool is a fine, short wool.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, I am aware of that; but there is South Down combing wool.

Mr. MILLS. There is no such wool as South Down combing wool.

Mr. BOWELL. I will not discuss that with the hon. gentleman who may be better informed about wool than about some other matters. I think the tariff covers every class of wool grown in Canada. Before this paragraph was placed in the tariff, the fullest investigation was made as to the different classes of sheep raised in this country. If, as the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., says, he has good reason to know that the wool which is covered by this tariff is brought into the country without paying duty, I suppose it is brought in in the same manner as he told us a couple of years ago a large quantity of cotton and other goods were brought into his county, that is by smuggling.

Mr IRVINE. The National Policy brought them in.

Mr. BOWELL. I freely admit that wool like other classes of goods brought into the country, may pass the Customs officers and be admitted free through the misrepresentations of those who import them. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) argued very strenuously that we were now placing on the free list an article which has been on the free list since 1879. It was thought better, in bringing this question of changes or alterations in the tariff before the House, that all the articles which had been placed on the free list by Orders in Council should be included, in order that every person might see what was on the free list, instead of having the information confined to the *Official Gazette*. If there has been any error, and I am not prepared to say there has not, it is that these articles were not at each Session of Parliament placed on the free list when alterations in the tariff were made; and if in future articles are to be placed on the free list by the power given to the Governor in Council, I quite agree with hon. gentlemen opposite that they should be placed in the tariff at each Session of Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. I just wish to explain a statement which the hon. gentleman seems to have misapprehended. The chemicals alluded to destroy the woollen substance of the blanket. If you have a fine all-wool blanket, they destroy the blanket along the edge; and if that blanket has a certain quantity of cotton matter into it, that appears, and you can find the different grades by the quantity of matter remaining after the application of chemicals. I do not deny that when the wool is destroyed, whether the blanket be of all-wool or shoddy, the blanket is destroyed.

Mr. SCRIVER. I only desire to say a word or two on this subject. I think the Government could not have chosen a worse time than the present for this policy of admitting shoddy free of duty. I have been informed by woollen manufacturers that the greatest consumption by us of Canadian wool is in the manufacture of blankets; more of it is used for that purpose than for cloths. I am quite positive the price of Canadian wool has never been so low as it is this year. I heard the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) a few minutes ago speak of the price of Canadian wool being 20 cents. It may be worth that in Ontario, but certainly not in Quebec. One large manufacturer of woollen goods in the Province of Quebec told me that he had bought Canadian wool as low as 16 cents and that he could buy any quantity at 18 cents.. It seems to me to be adding insult to injury for the Government, after having refused in their tariff to grant protection to Canadian growers of wool, to open the door to the importation of an article that will come into direct competition with wool in the manufacture especially of blankets.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to correct a misunderstanding or a mistake into which the Minister of Finance has fallen. With respect to his manufactory of blankets in Napanee, I think I am entitled to speak with some authority, seeing that I am myself proprietor of the factory. I believe it is true that the party who at the time of the hon. gentleman's visit worked that factory—for a short time—combined the shoddy and the wool in the manufacture of blankets; and I may tell the hon. gentleman the result was he produced a very inferior article and to my sorrow and loss went into bankruptcy accordingly. His successor has stated to me that he intends to carry out, and no doubt will carry out in its integrity, the policy of making the blankets of honest Canadian wool.

Mr. ORTON. I concur in the opinion that it is not desirable to encourage the use of shoddy to the detriment of Canadian wool. I recollect very well the reason why a duty was not placed on all-wool coming into Canada. It was represented by the

manufacturers of woollen goods that it would prevent their manufacturing the ordinary blanket so much required in this country, and it was decided by the Government to place the duty only upon those wools which came into this country, that came into competition with our Cotswold, Lincoln and Leicesters. The duty was placed, in fact, on wool that is not imported to any extent at all, and virtually was no protection to our farmers. The object of the Government was to enable the manufacturers of woollen goods in this country to obtain short wool at a lower price, for short wool was not then raised to any great extent in this country; the wool chiefly raised was the Cotswold and Leicesters in consequence of the carcase of the sheep being much more valuable. By admitting short wool free, the Government enabled the manufacturers of blankets and other woollen goods to use up a large quantity of our own combing wool, mixing it with the short wool; it was thought perhaps best in the interests of the farmers themselves that for a time at least, until the woollen manufacturers had become firmly established, short wool should be admitted free, and the duty placed only on wool brought into direct competition with our long combing wool; but I think if the Government go still further and admit an article that will come in direct competition with the wools of this country, they will injure the farmers. Shoddy is an article that ought not to be admitted free of duty, because it encourages the manufacture of goods that are sold to the people for prices the goods are not worth; the people will not get good value for their money. The encouragement of such manufactures is not in the interest of the people at large.

Mr. IVES. The difficulty is that in the manufacture of blankets they must have a certain thickness and body in order to be saleable. To provide cheap blankets for the uses for which cheap blankets are required and to give them the necessary heaviness and body, it is found impossible, even at the low price at which wool now sells, to use all wool, and compete successfully with the imported shoddy blanket. The result is that unless the duty is increased upon the imported article, the long wools of this country will not be used to the same extent in the manufacture of cheap blankets that they would be if the raw material or shoddy is allowed to come in free of duty. My impression is that if you allow the importation of rags free of duty, you will actually bring about a larger consumption of cheap wool in the manufacture of these blankets. The position is actually this: We have a blanket manufactory in Sherbrooke, the firm of A. G. Lomas & Co.; Mr. Lomas is a most intelligent man who says what he thinks and means, and he told me that he found it impossible to make an all-wool blanket, with wool at its present prices, to compete with the shoddy blanket. He said he could not give it the body and the weight necessary, and the result was he was obliged to alter his manufactory altogether and make a different blanket. To do that, he has to do as the foreign manufacturer does, put in a lot of stuff which makes thickness and body without much cost, and therefore I undertake to say that the admission of rags free of duty, will actually create a larger consumption of our coarse wool. I am not prepared to say but what the increase of duty upon the shoddy blankets would not make it possible to make an all-wool Canadian blanket out of cheap wool with body enough to answer the purpose. With the present rate of duty on the imported blanket, you will bring about a larger use of our long wool by importing shoddy free than by putting a duty on it. As to the cheapness of wool, that is a matter entirely beyond our control. The growth of immense herds of sheep running out of doors the whole year round, summer and winter, in portions of the United States, and in South America to an enormous extent, and in South Africa and Australia to an enormous extent, has entirely revolutionised the product of wool and mutton, and it is very questionable whether it will ever be possible for the farmers here or in New England, where forage has to be cut and the sheep have to be housed for four or five months in the year, to compete in the article of wool or in mutton with those countries where sheep are raised in enormous herds without any care, in fact where they raise themselves. I do not think, therefore, it is possible for us, without very largely increasing the cost of the manufactured article, to raise the price of wool or the price of mutton.

Mr. CASEY. I hardly know which of the two last speeches has done more good to our side of the case in this argument.

Mr. McCALLUM. Will the hon. gentleman tell us which is his side?

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Orton) supported the farmers' view of the case ably and clearly. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) stated the manufacturers' case strongly and clearly, and his speech is perhaps the more damaging to the Government of the two. He says the maker of shoddy blankets cannot make as good profits out of them now as he wants to, even at the absurdly low price, the unprecedentedly low price of wool in Canada to-day. The manufacturers in his own town have told him that they cannot compete with the foreign blanket. When we have 60 per cent. duty on the imported shoddy blanket and the price of wool is 16 or 18 cents a pound, surely they have a chance to make a profit. But even then they are not satisfied. Either they must have the shoddy brought in free to be "tied together," as the hon. gentleman says, with a little Canadian wool, to hold it together long enough to be sold, or they must have a further increase in the already enormously high duty on the poor man's blanket. Neither of these things is necessary in the interest of the manufacturer. The Cornwall factory was making excellent blankets with as much body in them as anyone could desire, and with more of the spirit of honesty too than they are made with nowadays, before the National Policy was heard of—as good and better blankets than now. And what was the price of wool then? Was it 16 or 18 cents a pound. I remember that in 1872, while the elections were going on, wool was as high as 60 cents a pound, and yet the Cornwall factory went on and made excellent blankets, and did not complain so much of foreign competition as they are doing now when they have a duty of 60 per cent. on the foreign shoddy and are allowed to import shoddy free to put into their own blankets, while the price of wool is at the same time absurdly low. I agree with the statement of my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) that this proposition is adding insult to the injury already done to the farmer. The Minister of Customs has tried to leave the impression on our minds that the Canadian home grown wool is really protected to some noticeable degree. He read from the tariff that Leicester, Cotswold, Lincolnshire, Down combing wools, or wools known as lustre wools and other like combing wools such as are grown in Canada shall pay a certain duty. Whoever made up that tariff must have been familiar with a different kind of South Downs or any other Downs from those grown in Canada. I have seen a great many Down sheep, and I do not think I ever saw one that had anything like combing wool on its back.

Mr. McNEILL. Oxford Downs have.

Mr. CASEY. The wool may be a little longer on them than on the South Downs, but I do not think it is used as combing wool.

Mr. McNEILL. It is wool four or five inches long.

Mr. CASEY. The Oxford Down wool is somewhat longer than the others, and in extreme cases it may be as long as the hon. gentleman says, four or five inches, but I never saw any of that length, and I have seen the Oxford Down prize sheep at several provincial exhibitions. We know as a matter of fact, that as a general thing, the Down sheep is a short woolled sheep, including the South Down, the Oxford, Shropshire and the Hampshire Downs. As a general thing, I think a universal thing, the wool of these sheep is too short for combing. There may be exceptions, but that is the general rule, and therefore there is no protection on such wool. It is quite clear that the intention of the tariff was to avoid putting a duty on short wools, to avoid putting a duty on any wools which were not long combing wools.

Mr. BOWELL. Not grown here.

Mr. CASEY. There is no exception in regard to short wool grown in Canada. Whether it is of a kind grown in Canada or not, it comes in free, and that is what we complain of. When the tariff was first introduced, we complained of the lack of protection on wool. We were told: "We will protect it, we will protect the kind of wool that is grown in Canada and leave the other kind free until our manufactures are well established." But this protection on long wool is of no use to us, because we do not grow it, and the price has not been affected one cent and cannot be affected by any duty you put on it. On the other hand the price of short wool is within our control. We know that we do not raise enough to supply our manufactures and that a large quantity has to be imported. If you put a duty on it, you would raise the price by the full amount of that duty until the home supply was enough for the home market. Let me give a few figures to show how this affects the farmer.

Mr. IVES. What proportion of our farmers raise short wool?

Mr. CASEY. I will answer after I get through, not in the middle of a sentence. The amount of dutiable wool imported, combing and lustre wools, was 6,642 lbs., and that was imported into Ontario; nothing came into the other Provinces. There does not seem to be any great competition in that. The wool exported from Canada during that time, composed entirely of long combing wools, which go entirely to the United States, was something over 1,600,000 lbs. More than 1,600,000 lbs. of Canadian grown wool had to seek a foreign market for lack of a home market. Now, see how much wool was imported free to enter into competition with our short wool. From Great Britain, 1,667,000 lbs.; from the United States, 2,961,000 lbs. My hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe says we cannot compete with those countries where sheep run out all the year round, such as Australia and the Cape, but we find that the greatest quantity of wool imported is from the United States, where sheep are grown under about the same conditions as they are in Canada.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is not American wool; it is African wool, which comes through the United States.

Mr. CASEY. Well, it would not be a bad idea if the hon. gentleman would have the Trade and Navigation Returns show where the wool really does come from. I am well aware, however, that there is a large amount of short wool grown in the United States. In 1883-84 we imported altogether 6,182,421 lbs. of wool free of duty to enter into competition with the home grown article, and we paid for it $1,170,844, which is about 19 cents a pound. Now, Sir, in addition to that competition we find that woollen rags have been imported already to a large extent free of duty. I find that 179,047 lbs. of woollen rags have been imported at a price of $21,924, or about 12 cents a pound, all coming into competition with our wool. Fancy, these rags which are worth about 12 cents a pound, being allowed to come in free of duty, to enter into competition with our wool which is already at an absurdly low price. There is no doubt that short wool at present is bringing a higher price in our Canadian markets than long wool. It would bring that higher price for export purposes if there were no woollen manufactures in Canada at all. But it is clear that with these many millions of pounds of foreign wool coming into competition with it, and the rags coming into competition with it, any increase in the woollen manufactures of Canada under the National Policy has not increased the price of short wool. It is absurd to pretend that long wool has been increased in price. It is getting gradually lower. Now, I urge upon the Government that there is an opportunity of giving an increased price to the farmer for one of his products. This is almost the only case in which they can increase the price of any of his products, and yet it is the only instance in which they have refused to put a tax on, and therefore to increase that price; I urge upon them that if they wish to show the fair play they professed they would show to all classes of the community they should put a tax upon short wool. The hon. gentleman from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) has asked what percentage of the farmers grow short woolled sheep. I have not the Ontario returns at hand just now, which show how many of these short woolled sheep were raised in that Province during the last year. I cannot therefore tell him exactly, but in my neighborhood I may say that at least every second farmer, I think, at the present time has begun raising these sheep. In two or three years every farmer who keeps sheep at all will keep short woolled sheep and nothing else. The short wool industry is to be the wool raising industry of Canada in the future. I think at the present time the short wool in Ontario would represent nearly one-sixth of the entire clip, and perhaps one-fifth, and that proportion is growing year by year very rapidly. Short woolled sheep are growing in favor, but the long woolled sheep are being packed off as rapidly as possible, because it does not pay to keep them at the present prices of wool. I think, Sir, that is sufficient, in addition to what has been said, to make out the farmers' case. But I must insist that not only the Minister of Customs, but the Finance Minister himself, in whose hands this matter is, shall tell the country something of his intentions in regard to it, that he shall tell us whether he intends to continue this insulting and injurious treatment towards the farmers of this country from whom, after all, he draws the whole of his revenue in the last resort.

Mr. ORTON. I think I can point out to the hon. gentleman how the National Policy has benefited the farmer on the wool question. He stated just now that the price of short wool was higher than the price of long wool, and if he knew anything about the wool trade he would know that previous to the introduction of the National Policy short wool and long wool brought the same price. In consequence of the increase in the number of woollen manufactories in Canada and increased demand for wool, he would know that the value of short wool had increased until it is at least ten cents higher than the price of long wool. The reason is that in former times, though the intrinsic value of short wool was always higher, buyers of wool did not give the farmers any more for it than for long wool. The quantity of short wool raised at the time was small, it was classed with the long wool, and bought at the same price. But now, in consequence of the increase of the woollen manufactures in this country, the demand for short wool has rapidly increased, so that farmers have found it to their advantage—as I had the honor of pointing out at the time the former Government were in power—to go more largely into the raising of the various Downs, because short wool was valuable for manufacturing purposes. I am happy to say to-day that

the farmers of Canada have gone largely into the raising of the various Downs. Wool is more valuable, and its increased price is largely due to the operation of the tariff. At the same time, I do think that the introduction of this shoddy is going to have an injurious effect upon the wool market.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have to announce that I received a telegram this afternoon from Col. Irvine who had arrived at Carleton. His telegram is not dated, but it bears the date to-day of Winnipeg, so that I cannot exactly say when it was written.

"CARLTON, N.W.T.

"Party under my command just arrived. When near Fort Carlton found that Crozier with party of 100 went to Duck Lake to secure a large quantity of supplies there stored. Were met by some 200 rebels who held an advantageous position at Beardy's Reserve, and endeavored to surround police and civilians. Rebels fired first, when it became general. Crozier, owing to the disadvantage at which he was taken, retreated orderly, arriving at fort same time as my party. Ten civilians of Prince Albert and two policemen were killed, and four civilians and seven constables wounded. The following are the names:

"KILLED.

"Constables: T. J. Gibson, George Pearce Arnold. Civilians: Captain John Meriton, William Napier, S. Elliot, D. Mackenzie, Charles Newitt, Alexander Fisher, James Bakely, Robert Middleton, D. MacPhail, Joseph Anderson.

WOUNDED.

Civilians: Captain Moore, leg broken; A. MacNab, W. R. Markley, Alex. Stewart. Police: Inspector J. Howe, N.B., Corporal Gilchrist, Constables G. K. Garrett, S. F. Gordon, A. M. Smith, J. J. Moore, A. Miller.

The number of rebels killed not known. The police and civilians acted with the greatest bravery under a heavy fire."

That is the telegram from Colonel Irvine. The telegram that I mentioned as being under cipher was one from General Middleton to the Minister of Militia, merely conveying the rumor and asking that the battery be sent forward. I take this occasion to say that yesterday while the trouble was localised, I thought that reticence was the proper and politic course; but now that it has assumed the proportions it has assumed, the fullest information will be given to the House from time to time.

Mr. BLAKE. If it be at all consistent with the public interest I think it is important that the hon. gentleman should make now, or at a later hour this evening, a statement, if he has the information at hand, as to what is the condition of the food supplies at the various places where food is collected for the purpose of the police or for feeding the Indians. It is very obvious that the possibility of the Indians taking an effective part in this unhappy business must greatly depend on their food supply, and if the food supplies are in positions in which they cannot get access to them, if they are so situated, I fancy the anxiety with respect to that point will be very much diminished.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The food supply over that vast country is like such a supply being spread over Ontario and Quebec, as the hon. gentleman knows. I received a telegraphic message from the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West, he being then at Regina, stating that the Indians and every one else were quiet along the line. There was a telegram received from Mr. Egan, who is in charge of the traffic arrangements of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which says that at Oak Lake, a place on the line, a half-breed was arrested while attempting to place an obstruction on the railway—I presume for the purpose of preventing the 90th regiment going to Qu'Appelle. And he stated that Riel had 1,500 men under him and six cannon—American cannon was the expression used. That was the statement of this man, and it must be taken *quantum valeat*. I am not in a position to-night to say where the different quantities of food are collected, and perhaps it would not be wise to point out where these are stored. However, I shall get a paper prepared on that point, and will communicate it to the hon. gentleman; and I think under the circumstances I can confidently rely upon his support in this matter.

Mr. BLAKE. I suggested that question as I wished to be assured that the hon. gentleman was satisfied whether these people knew where these supplies are, or whether they did not know. If they do not know, I do not want to know.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I fancy the insurgents, if I may call them so, do not know where these stores are.

Mr. BLAKE. Then I do not want to know. I would invite the hon. gentleman, after the statement he has made, the latter statement, which I am sure the House will receive with such a measure of gratification as they can receive anything which the Government can communicate at the present time, to cause such papers to be prepared as will, in effect, answer the motion which I made yesterday, and which, under the sense of duty which animated him, he thought it not fitting at that moment to grant. The hon. gentleman has now stated that in the present condition of this unhappy business he will communicate, from time to time, all information he can without danger to the public interest. It is quite obvious, I conceive, that it can be no detriment to the public interest, whatever difference may have existed a few hours ago on that subject, to communicate to the House information as to the past; and the information which I yesterday invited the hon. gentleman to give, or such part as he conceives he can give without danger to the public interest, I ask him to furnish at the very earliest moment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I shall be very glad to give full information as to the past, so far as it does not shed too strong a light on the future.

Mr. IVES. I desire to ask: Does the hon. gentleman propose to use the Canadian route for the transportation of "B" Battery; and if so, what delay will be incurred by part of the railway not being constructed; also, whether there will be any serious delay in portaging over the portions of the road on which rails have not been laid.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Steps were taken some days ago to communicate with Mr. Harry Abbott, a brother of the hon. member for Argenteuil, who is in charge as engineer, and he has made all preparations to forward any troops that may go by that route. The troops must go by that route; and they will go quicker by that route than by any other route, after communicating with Washington. And, moreover, it is much better that they should go by that route. There are some 70 miles in all that will have to be travelled by other means than by rail. To the north of Lake Superior we may rely on the snow lying, as long as we have it here, and sleighs and teams will be got without difficulty on that line, and there is a large body of men employed on the railway who can be used. The military will be carried across the gaps and no material delay will be occasioned. They will be carried in sleighs across the gaps until they come to the place where they can be carried safely by rail to Winnipeg. Then they can go on by rail without interruption to the foot of the Rocky Mountains. So far as we know, the whole hostile force is concentrated in the vicinity of Prince Albert and Duck Lake, and thereabouts.

Mr. BLAKE. When do you expect "B" Battery to leave?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is ordered to go at once.

Mr. CARON. I may state that, after receiving the news which the leader of the Government has just communicated,

and in fact previous to the time when the news was communicated, the Department had taken precautions to provide for the transport and for the subsistence of about 500 men to be sent into the North-West. It is intended that 100 men of "B" Battery and 100 men of "A" Battery shall be conveyed immediately over the Canadian Pacific Railway, north of Lake Superior, and provision has been made so that no delay will occur in the transport. The battery has been under moving orders for the last three days, and orders have been given now that they shall leave immediately; and I expect the detachment of "A" Battery will leave Quebec to-night or to-morrow morning at the latest, and "B" Battery will meet them to-morrow night or the morning after.

Mr. BLAKE. Where is General Middleton just now?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. At Winnipeg, but he telegraphed that he was going to move west to-morrow morning.

Mr. CHARLTON. Would it not be well for the Government to remember that we are very near the opening of spring, and any force necessary to send into the North-West should be hurried forward? A sudden thaw might interrupt communication north of Lake Superior, and a serious disaster might be the result.

Mr. MILLS. I desire to enquire whether it is intended that the commission, to which the hon. gentleman has referred, should at once undertake their duties; or is it proposed that the commission should be held in abeyance until the present difficulties are disposed of.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no. The commission will go on at once without any delay, because they will deal with all questions connected with the half-breeds, not only at the scene of disturbance but at Edmonton and elsewhere. Edmonton is perhaps the chief place to which immediate attention should be paid.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the formal commission issued?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That I really cannot say.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the hon. gentleman will bring down a copy.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No 60) to incorporate the Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the Alberta and Athabaska Railway Company.—(Mr. Williams.)

Bill (No. 43) to authorize the Royal Canadian Insurance Company to reduce its capital stock, and for other purposes. —(Mr. Curran.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). With reference to allowing woollen rags to enter duty free, I cannot help thinking that the opinions expressed by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Orton) before recess will be held by the farmers of this country to be, in many respects, sound. I remember when the National Policy was inaugurated, that one of the benefits the Finance Minister claimed would be conferred upon the laboring classes of this country was that the shoddy goods would be driven out of the market by those of solid Canadian manufacture; and I remember that the Finance Minister illustrated his remark by saying that the poor man would no longer have the trouble, when he went out on a rainy day, of coming home at night with his knees through his pants. Now, it seems to me that in the abstract that is a sound principle, and I regret very much that it is being departed from and that encouragement is being given to the introduction of a low grade material. Looking at the matter from an agricultural standpoint, the sheep industry is depressed enough in its present circumstances without having this additional burden imposed upon it. At no time in the history of agriculture in the world have the prices of wool and the other products of sheep been at so low a price as at present. In the Province of Ontario the majority of our farmers last season did not realise over 17 cents a pound for their wool. If it had been from 30 to 35 cents a pound, as in old times, when there was an active demand from the American side for our long wools, there might have been some plea for encouraging the introduction of the cheaper article, for the purpose of mixing it with our high priced wools, to produce a moderate priced article for consumption. But, as a matter of fact, the world's supply of wool seems to be exceedingly abundant. I cannot understand on what principle the Finance Minister can encourage the deterioration of all woollen goods by allowing woollen rags to come in duty free. I can understand from the standpoint of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), who told us that a cheap grade of blankets could not be made to compete with the low grade of English manufacture made for exporting to this country. If we consider that the low priced English goods have to pay a duty of 7½ cents a pound and 20 per cent. additional *ad valorem*, it does seem to me that with Canadian washed wool, costing only 17 cents a pound, the Canadian manufacturer who cannot stand up in face of that competition deserves to go under. If the truth were told, I think the hon. gentleman is anxious, not so much to enable the manufacturers to furnish cheap goods, as to put a little more money into their pockets at the expense of the Canadian consumers. When the hon. gentleman tells us, so far as cultivation and stimulus of the wool production of this country is concerned, that we cannot hope to compete with those countries where they do not require to feed their flocks during winter, I would like to remind him of the large number of sheep that have found their way to the ranches at the foot-hills of the Rocky Mountains, where they expect to be able to produce wool as cheaply as anywhere else on the face of the earth; and I would like to ask him, as an expounder of the National Policy, whether he considers it equitable to those parties who are starting that industry to give them this kind of competition with the first wool of their stock that they put on the market. It appears to me that the hon. gentleman had an eye rather to the interests of the manufacturers of his district than to the production of wool in our new and growing western territory. I would like also to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance to the present condition of the sheep industry in this country. In common with the development of the cattle shipping trade, for a number of years we did a growing and profitable business in mutton with the old country markets. The industry of shipping mutton to the English and Scotch markets had steadily grown, until two years ago our shipments reached 114,000 sheep. But last season, through the competition of the Australian colonies, and through various other causes, our shipments of mutton sheep to the old country had shrunk to some 67,000, a decrease of almost $500,000 of clear receipts to the farmers of this country. Now, Sir, with the fact that our mutton is thus facing a keen and active competition from the other British colonies in the market that we have heretofore successfully occupied, and with the fact that our wools are at present at the lowest prices that they have touched for at least fifty years, it does seem to me that it is not a favorable time to place in competition with this depressed industry woollen rags imported duty free for the

purpose of still further depreciating the value of these products. If the woollen industries are still claiming to be infant, and not able to stand on their own feet, I think it is time for us to ask whether the great farming industry of this country has not some rights as well as the woollen manufacturers. In the interest of the consuming population of this country, as well as the agricultural population, we should be content to grind up rags only produced at home and not encourage the importation of woollen rags, for the purpose of protecting a few manufacturers at the expense of the great consuming population of this country.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman has taken the same line of argument in reference to this question as that pursued by those that preceded him, namely, that this is an inopportune time to place upon the free list an article which has absolutely been free ever since June, 1879. It may be, from the arguments of hon. gentlemen, a reason for striking it out of the free list; and after consultation with my colleagues, having discovered that hon. gentlemen opposite have turned protectionists, more particularly upon this particular question, and as it meets the approbation of the majority of those who represent farming constituencies who are supporting the Government, we have decided to strike it out. It is peculiarly gratifying to the Government, and must be to those who have supported its policy ever since it has been inaugurated, to know that we are gradually bringing into the fold hon. gentlemen opposite. Let me only hope they may continue in their conversion, and if possible that all of the other articles on the free list may be added to the protected list. Under the peculiar circumstances mentioned by the hon. member for North Wentworth (Mr. Bain), we will be only too glad, in the interest of protection itself and of the farming community, to strike this out and add to the protected list such other articles as may be necessary in their interest. That is the policy, and has been the policy of the Government ever since 1878. The Government are particularly delighted at the fact——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You do not look very happy.

Mr. BOWELL. The Government are always happy at the conversion to protectionist principles of their opponents, and will, in the case of every article which comes into competition, either directly or indirectly, with that which can be produced in this country, strike it out of the free list, in order that protection may be afforded to our own people.

Mr. BLAKE. The fact of the matter is, we have been able to convict the Government of being inconsistent with themselves; we have been able to prove that since 1879, by the operation of Orders in Council, they have been false to their own policy; we have been judging them in their scales, weighing them in their own balance, testing them by their own utterances, pointing out to them their own views, and have shown that they have been false to them all, from 1879 until to-day. The Administration has been touched in such a tender point, of which we have entered only the outer fringe yet, that the hon. gentleman has thought, in the interests of his clients, the woollen manufacturers, it expedient to throw a sprat to catch a whale, and is willing to give up the woollen goods in order to save the wool. All that is wanted to make this item correct and consistent with the hon. gentleman's policy; all that is wanted to make perfectly clear the principle upon which he is acting, is that we should add the words: In order to encourage the producer of Canadian wool and to secure good woollens to the Canadian consumer.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman, like all Chancery lawyers, is very fond of splitting hairs.

Mr. BLAKE. Splitting wool.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth.)

Mr. BOWELL. It is very difficult to get wool where there is only hair. The Government is not inconsistent with its policy; the Government has in the past, and we have been accused of it a dozen times during this debate, of changing the tariff every Session, in order to meet the peculiar circumstances in which the country is placed at the time. It having been conclusively shown during this debate by both sides, that under the peculiar circumstances of the wool trade at present, we should do nothing to interfere with the wool producer obtaining as large a price as possible; therefore it is directly in accord with the policy which the Government has always carried out since 1879—and which was exemplified last night in the reply of the leader of the Government to the leader of the Opposition—that we are practical politicians and not flies on the wheel, an expression the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) delights to use. It is strictly in accord with the policy of the Government that the moment circumstances present themselves which lead the Government to believe that it is in the interest of the community to adopt a certain line they at once adopt it.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is not a fly on the wheel, but a straw on the current; he saw which way the current was drifting and went with it. We now learn that this paternal Government, this Government of inspection and observation, this Government which has been making the interests of the country to flourish all over for the last few years by Acts of Parliament—we now learn that this model Government did not know until this afternoon the condition of the woollen trade. We find that common members of Parliament here have been obliged to instruct the Government on what they ought to have known.

Mr. IRVINE. In making my remarks before recess, I stated that a large quantity of the wool imported into this country was said to be a wool similar to that raised in this country. I did not mean to convey the impression that that wool was smuggled into the country, but I meant to say that it was not correctly classified. If any doubt exists in the mind of any hon. gentleman, he would, after he heard the Minister give his explanation of the various classes of wool, be satisfied that it is not a very easy matter to classify the wool correctly. The hon. Minister tried to enlighten this House, by stating that Down wool was combing wool. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) said that Oxford Down wool, 4 and 5 inches long, was combing wool. Allow me to say that none of the Down wool, either the Oxford, Shropshire, or South Down, are combing wools. The hon. Minister stated that the Oxford Down was 4 or 5 inches long; well, that which we call combing wool or Leicester wool, is 9, 10 or 11 inches long. If the hon. Minister of Customs is so ignorant of this, what can we expect of his officers at the port of entry. I am not particular how the matter is dealt with. All I have got to say is that we have to give up the raising of sheep at present, for wool is worth comparatively nothing. An hon. gentleman opposite said he could buy Canadian wool at 20 cents per pound; is there any man in the country who will attempt to raise wool for that figure? I think this is the fourth time which the hon. Minister of Customs has referred to a statement of mine, that there was considerable smuggling done in my country, in a way worthy or unworthy of the hon. gentleman. I am reminded in this of what Mr. Mill, in England, said at an election meeting once, when, standing before an audience of laborers, he was asked by one of them: "Sir, did not you state once that the laboring men were liars?" The hon. gentleman was not afraid to state again what he once stated, and he said: "I did, Sir." I stated that there was a vast amount of smuggling done. I never conveyed the impression that my people were worse or better than those in other parts of the Dominion in that respect. I state now that I believe there is a good deal of smuggling done, but it is done by a

very small portion of the community; and I state now, as I stated then, that a high tariff produces smuggling, encourages smuggling. I am quite willing to acknowledge that an amount of smuggling is done, but by a very small fraction of the community, that is, the men who do professional smuggling, who follow it for a business. I have taken the trouble to look at a return which was moved for by an hon. member on this side. I will read a few items, to show that we are no worse than our neighbors, that we are not sinners above all in Canada. This does not give the amount of goods seized or confiscated under the law, but the amount of fines imposed under the law. We cannot arrive at a very correct conclusion as to the amount of smuggling done, as to the amount of sin perpetrated in this way by the various portions of this Dominion; but, as to the fines, I will read the following figures to show that they are not much better in Ontario than they are in New Brunswick. These are the numbers and the amount of fines imposed during the past year at the places named:

	Number.	Amount.
Brockville	26	$ 978
Cornwall	14	392
Fort Erie	29	2,967
Hamilton	13	3,390
Ottawa	19	228
Toronto	26	1,554
Windsor	26	7,064
Stanstead	27	1,480
Woodstock	13	665

Woodstock is in my county. I do not think it lies in the hon. gentleman's breast to accuse us of being greater sinners than others. I am sorry there is any smuggling at all, any illicit traffic of that kind, but a high tariff offers a premium and an inducement to be dishonest.

The item of "woollen rags" was dropped.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The Minister of Customs professes to be very much rejoiced that he has been the means of converting members of this side of the House to his views on protection. I am sorry to dispel the illusion, but I have to inform him that there has been no conversion made. Hon. gentlemen on this side pointed out the hollow pretences made by the hon. gentlemen and his colleagues when they pretended to protect the farmers. Wool was one of the few things which they could protect so as to afford protection to the farmers. I need not state to the committee what has been so often proved, that it is impossible to protect articles of which we export a surplus. If we take grain, for instance, of which the farmers of Canada have a large amount to export, over and above what they consume, it is utterly impossible to afford that protection. But there is the article of wool, of which we do not raise a sufficient quantity, which they could protect and failed to protect, and not only so, but they had not the manliness to avow it. While pretending to protect the farmers they had not the manliness to say they were going to put shoddy on the free list, but they brought it in by a side wind, by Order in Council, to compete with the wool the farmer raised. It was another case in which they promised the farmer bread and gave him a stone. They damaged the farmer in another way. I read the speech of the Finance Minister in introducing this very tariff, in which he describes the wearer of shoddy cloth, which he was going to protect the people of the country against; how, when he got into a shower of rain, he would have his knees through his pants and his elbows through the sleeves of his coat; and the hon. gentleman was going to protect the people of Canada against anything of that kind in future. How has he kept his promise? I believe they were ashamed to place shoddy on the free list, but after passing the tariff, they placed it there by an Order in Council. There has not been much objection made to it, and now they thought it would be an opportune time to bring it in and make it free by Act of Parliament. As a measure of protection to the consumers of the country, there ought to have been a high tariff placed upon it, to keep it from competing with the wool raised by the farmers; and, as has been pointed out to-night, that industry is getting into a worse and worse condition. The part of the country I live in was a large wool and mutton producing district, but owing to the competition of foreign wool and shoddy, the farmers are going out of the business, and what was a source of revenue is being lost to the country. The farmers were injured by it in another way. It is within my recollection that agents of these shoddy manufacturers and dealers in shoddy cloth went around, pretending to sell the cloth at half price to the farmers, taking their notes as the price of good cloth, selling the notes to the note brokers, pocketing the money, and leaving the people with the poor cloth and the debts to pay. I am glad to think that the Government have been forced by public opinion, if not by the arguments used on this side of the House, to change their policy on this question.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman, although he declares he has converted us to his way of thinking, has abandoned the resolution which the Government have submitted to the House and the committee. It is rather an extraordinary position that, although the hon. gentleman has converted us to his way of thinking, he has abandoned his own proposition and adopted our views. Is not the hon. gentleman laboring under some hallucination? Is he not mistaken as to the party who has been converted? My impression is that the hon. gentleman and the Minister who sits beside him are the parties who have undergone a change. My hon. friend beside me says they have not been converted, but they have been convicted. At all events, it is very clear that these hon. gentlemen have a wholesome dread of public opinion, and that upon this question they know right well that the interest of the farmer and the policy of the Government do not exactly coincide, and they know very well that when the farming population discover what their interest really is, they are not likely to follow in the wake of the Administration. I rose to ask the hon. gentleman, if he strikes these goods off the free list, where does he intend to place them? Does he intend that they shall be put amongst unenumerated articles, or does he propose to place them in some specific class, and will he state precisely what the duty is to be? I think this is a favorable opportunity for the hon. gentleman to tell us in what particular list these goods are to be placed.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I wish to know whether I am under an erroneous impression in relation to the working of the tariff upon wool. By the returns, I find that there is an importation of something over 6,000,000 lbs. of free wool, and an importation of a little over 6,000 lbs. of duty-paying wool; hence, as I read it, the practical operation of the tariff is, that of 1,000 lbs. of wool imported, one pound pays duty and 999 lbs. come in free of duty. I notice further, that the duty-paying wool belongs to a class which we certainly do not raise. I find that the average price of that wool is 55 cents per pound. In regard to foreign rags, I would simply remark that I am no friend to them. We will take care of our own rags. I am neither a friend to rags nor to those who use them for shoddy. I am perfectly willing that other countries should keep their rags and their paupers as well; and I am very glad to know that we are not going to spend more money in fetching them here, and consequently shall not need the rags. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) stated that it was his belief that the exclusion of rags would tend to lessen the consumption of wool, by our being unable to manufacture that class of shoddy blankets into the manufacture of which they enter. For the sake of the argument, we will suppose it will have that effect to the extent of the importation of blankets. I find that the entire

importation of blankets amounts to 364,000 lbs. I presume that it would do to introduce one-half shoddy into the blanket; hence it reduces the quantity of wool used to a very small amount indeed, and if we entirely excluded blankets now imported we should add to the consumption of our wool but a few thousand pounds.

Mr. ALLEN. I am interested in this wool question, for I have been engaged in the wool trade for the past twenty years; and, Sir, prior to the introduction of the National Policy, the price of wool was from 30 to 40 cents, and sometimes as high as 50 or 60. Since its introduction the price has fallen until the present season. I have sold several thousand pounds of wool at very low prices. The highest price I got for the finest clean wool, free of burrs, was 18 cents per pound. The second grade, good wool, suitable for blankets or carpets, brought from 15 to 16 cents; and the unwashed wool of all kinds sold for 10 cents per pound. Now, Sir, I believe while the farmers are paying duties of from 25 to 50 per cent. on the goods required by them, wool ought not to be allowed to come in free from foreign countries. We have the very same class of wool here in Canada that they have in England. Wool that we sell at 18 cents per pound is quite equal to the wool imported from England; and it is not fair treatment that the farmers should be obliged to submit to the competition of this free wool. I know for a fact that during the past season large quantities of Canadian wool have been stored, and still remain in store, while wools imported from foreign countries are sold to the manufacturers. I believe that this is not carrying out the principle of the National Policy. The farmers have a right to expect and to receive a share of the protection which is being accorded to others. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that rags and shoddy will be excluded. We have too much of that commodity already; we do not require any more of them while we have wool at from 10 to 15 cents per pound, that can be manufactured in Canada so cheaply into blankets, tweeds and other products. We have no need of shoddy, and I hope the Government will exclude it from this list of imports.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I would not like the impression to go to the country that we import either English or American wools into this country to manufacture. The wools that are imported from England are brought from South Africa, Australia and other places. The large importers bring them to England, and they are purchased in England by our importers, but there are no English wools brought to this country for the purpose of manufacture, and none from the United States. The wools that are brought from the United States are purchased from large importers, who bring them from the southern latitudes. They are bought sometimes on commission, and sometimes imported and sold to manufacturers in this country. Now, none of this wool comes into competition with Canadian grown wool. Canadian grown wool and imported wool are used for two distinct purposes. If you were to put 10 cents a pound upon wool imported into this country you could not increase the price of Canadian wool at all by it, for the reason that no tweed goods, which is the largest product of the woollen manufacture in this country, could be produced out of Canadian grown wool, except, perhaps, from a very small quantity of wool from the Down sheep; and the South Down wool is too coarse for the use of our manufacturers of tweed goods, except in small quantities. We must have Merino wools and the finer wools that are brought from these southern countries. Another reason why these foreign wools do not come into competition with Canadian wools is this: These wools are purchased at 18 or 20 cents per pound, and are bought in a filthy, dirty condition, full of sand, grease, and every other kind of filth, which when these are cleansed out give us about 40 lbs. of clean wool out of 100 lbs. as purchased, and sometimes no more than 36 pounds of clean wool; so that when we purchase it at 20 cents we only get 40 per cent. of wool out of the original quantity that we can use in manufacture, or 45 to 55 cents per pound for clean wool. Manufacturers pay sometimes 20 or 22 cents for these imported wools, so that they do not come into competition at all with our Canadian wools. Now, there is one point I wish to be understood, and it is this, that, so far as I know, and I think I am well informed on this subject, we do not import English grown wools into this country for the purpose of manufacture, nor do we import American grown wools for this purpose, they all come from Australia, Africa, South America and New Zealand.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I wish to correct an impression which hon. gentlemen opposite are taking much pains to send abroad, and that is that the price of wool has gone down very materially during the last few years. Now, it is preposterous for them to talk of the low price of wool for this season as the ordinary price of wool, because everyone knows that it is only within the last year that the price has fallen. I can tell hon. gentlemen that I have sold South Down wool within the last two years for over 30 cents per pound, and it is only within the last two years that the price of wool has fallen.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman said the duties had benefited the industry. If so, they would prevent the prices falling.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I do not think either the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Customs will allow hon. gentlemen opposite to put statements in their mouths which no man of common sense ever would make. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been continually putting into our mouths the statement that we said the tariff would regulate the price of wheat. No man in his senses would state that the tariff would affect the ordinary prices of wheat. But what we do say and what we have always said is, that under certain conditions, such conditions as prevailed during last year, and prevail now, the tariff does cause higher prices for our wheat. I am certain that neither the Finance Minister nor any hon. member on this side of the House stated that the tariff was going to regulate the price of wheat. But hon. gentlemen know well that when it was proposed last year to take the duty off wheat in order to equalise the duty on flour, there was a great outcry, because the duty had been found to be a great benefit to our wheat growers. The same thing occurs with respect to the prices of wool. Speaking from my own knowledge, I find that the National Policy has had a very beneficial influence on the price of wool, as it has created a demand for certain classes, for which previously there was no demand. A few years ago there was no demand for South Down wool, or at least very little. The National Policy has promoted the woollen manufacture which has used that particular class, and during the last few years the prices of South Down wool, as compared with the coarse wools, has advanced, and it is relatively higher than in 1878. That is due to the National Policy, because it has led to the manufacture of cloths in which this class of wool is used. What I particularly want to say is this: That the Finance Minister and the Minister of Customs would do well to look into the regulations of the tariff on wool. I think the classification, as it now stands, is altogether an erroneous one. Wool should be divided into three qualities—fine, medium and coarse. We only produce the two latter, medium and coarse; and as we are never likely to grow the higher class, it might be admitted free of duty, as a raw material, because it would not come into competition with our wool. On the other hand, as regards coarse wool, as the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson) said, it would not matter if we put 10 or 20 per cent. duty on it, because we export it and do not import it, and so it would

make no difference what amount of duty was imposed on it. But there should be a duty imposed on medium wool, because that is a quality we produce and which to some extent we import. Therefore, the true principle in dealing with the wool duties on the principle of the National Policy is to admit the higher classes, which we do not grow, free of duty; to impose a duty on the medium class, because it is a class we grow for home consumption; and as to the coarse wool, it makes no difference what duty is imposed.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman omits a very important point in regard to the National Policy. He knows right well that in Michigan and Ohio, and the adjoining States, there is no coarse wool produced, and that all the sheep kept are Merinos. They can be kept as well in Canada as in Michigan and Ohio. Why are they not kept?

An hon. MEMBER. Because it will not pay.

Mr. MILLS. Yes; because it will not pay so long as we admit the fine Cape wools and the Australian wools free of duty. Let the Government impose a duty and they will produce precisely the same conditions as prevail in Michigan and Ohio, and they will produce exactly the change in sheep growing in Canada as has been produced in those States. I am not saying that that is the best course in the public interest; I do not say so. I believe that if the National Policy was in the public interest, it would be the best course to follow. But hon. gentlemen opposite are not dealing candidly with the people when they pretend to say that the Government do not impose a duty on fine wools because they are not produced in Canada. The very moment you impose a duty they will be produced, and if it is in the public interest you can produce the same change in sheep growing, by imposing a duty on fine wools, as has been produced in Michigan and Ohio. Besides, we manufactured a few years ago tweed goods in which the coarser class of wools were largely used. These are produced no longer. Why? Because fine wools are introduced; a handsomer article is manufactured, and our Canadian wools have ceased to be worked up to the same extent in our Canadian manufactures as formerly. The hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House says we should not impose any duty on fine wool, because they do not come into competition with our wools. I say they do, and that they have driven the coarser wools out of the establishments of the country and the finer classes have taken their place. From my point of view, I admit it is not in the public interest to impose a duty on wools; but I say if the National Policy was in the public interest and if hon. gentlemen opposite were as anxious to maintain the home market for Canadian farmers as they profess to be, they would impose a duty on fine wools, and the sheep on which fine wools are grown would be raised in Canada instead of coarse wool sheep, for whose product no market can be found in this country.

Mr. ALLEN. I would beg to say a word in reply to the hon. member for Welland, who said that no English-grown wool was imported into Canada. This, Sir, I know to be incorrect, and I know the trade of which I am speaking, and could mention the names of parties who have inspected hundred of thousands of pounds of this English wool.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman who spoke recently (Mr. McNeill) was good enough to say, if I understood him rightly, that the present National Policy had greatly increased woollen manufacture in Canada. Of all the false charges brought against the Mackenzie Administration there was none, perhaps, more false than the charge that they had injured the woollen manufactures of Canada, although that charge was repeated from husting to husting and from Province to Province. As good a test as we possess of the way in which the woollen manufactures grew, is found in the amount of wool imported into this country. I want to call the attention of those hon. gentlemen who boast that they have increased the woollen manufactures of Canada, and that the policy of the Mackenzie Administration injured it, to these simple facts. In 1874 the woollen manufacturers of Canada imported 3,756,000 lbs. of wool. In 1878, the last year of the Mackenzie Administration, they imported 6,230,000 lbs. In 1884 they imported 5,182,000 lbs. of wool—50,000 lbs. less than they imported in 1878, whereas in 1878 they imported 2,500,000 lbs. more than they imported in 1874.

Mr. WIGLE. I notice, Sir, that two or three years ago hon. gentlemen were the champions of the manufacturers, but to-day they are the champions of the farmers. I am surprised to hear hon. gentlemen speaking about the farmers not getting what their wool is worth. I know that between 1873 and 1878 I bought wool for less than 25 cents a pound, and at that time the farmers were paying from 75 to 85 cents for the same kind of cloth which they now get for 50 to 60 cents a yard; so that in reality the farmers are getting their cloth cheaper in proportion now than they were when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), when he spoke a few minutes ago, referred to Michigan and Ohio, and he said why do not we grow short wool as they do? The reason is that the carcases of these Merino sheep are no good, and that is one reason why sheep are scarce in Ontario to-day, and the farmers are taking sheep from this country into the United States. Take the case of the Ontario Agricultural College. We find that the people of this country are finding fault because they are selling sheep to people in the United States instead of keeping these finely bred sheep in the country. I was surprised to hear these hon. gentlemen speak about the difference between shoddy now and shoddy a few years ago. I have statistics here about the shoddy made in one institution in this country, and there are many others of the same kind. I refer to the Weston Woollen Mills, about seven miles west of Toronto. This institution commenced in 1879; it employs in the neighborhood of 300 hands, and manufactures tweeds, blankets, linings, etc., all the products of rags. In 1879 they did import rags from other countries, but since that time they have not imported them; and they are not importing a single pound to day. More than that, they are doing more than $300,000 worth of business yearly, from rags which they buy from poor people at from 2 to 8 cents per pound. In addition, I find that there are peddlers going through the country buying rags and cast-off clothing; and this same factory, in addition to the 300 hands I mentioned, employ 70 or 80 women and girls in Toronto—girls who, when the hon. gentlemen were in power, were to be found in the soup kitchens instead of earning regular wages. They use from eight to ten car loads of wool oil in this country; 600 to 700 barrels, manufactured in London and Petrolia. This work was formerly done in England, and shipped to this country. The shoddy of England is not better than the shoddy of this country, because the rags are not picked so close here. More than that; outside of the oil which is used, they use from six to seven thousand dollars worth of soap yearly, manufactured in this country. I would like to know where all these hands which I have mentioned are boarding, if not on the farmers of this country. Before the National Policy this money was collected from the farmers of this country and sent to other countries to pay the board of laborers among the farmers of other countries, so that I say that it is an advantage to the farmers of this country, and the hon. gentlemen cannot get over it. The hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), was making a comparison the other day between the condition of things under the National Policy and under the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite. He said on account of the National Policy this was a dear

country to live in, and he said he was reading about a poor little child whose mother had covered it over, and then put a door or a board upon it to keep it warm. I have reason to believe that that case occurred when the Grit Government was in power, and not since this National Policy came into effect, because we now find that these girls can earn blankets to keep themselves warm. Before 1879 42 cents per pound was the price of the blankets, but since that time, since these establishments were started at Weston, they are selling at 27 cents per pound, or little more than half the price they were when hon. gentlemen were in power. Still, because farmers are only getting 2 cents per pound less for their wool, and are getting their cloth 25 cents a yard cheaper, they are finding fault. Why are they getting their cloth cheaper? Because there are more manufacturers, and the competition of the manufacturers brings the price down. When I hear hon. gentlemen making statements like these in this House, I look upon their statements with suspicion. The other night one hon. gentleman was hunting in London for an oil cloth factory which was in Kingston, and because he did not find it in London, when it was in Kingston, he found fault with the policy and said that the Blue Book could not be depended upon. I have no doubt he gets most of his facts 300 or 400 miles from where they are. That is all I have to say on this question.

Mr. CHARLTON. I judge that the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Wigle) is somewhat at variance with hon. gentlemen opposite, sitting on the front benches, with reference to placing rags on the free list. I infer that he considers a shoddy blanket at 27 cents a pound better value than a good all-wool blanket at 45 cents a pound, and that he considers that the country will suffer a serious loss if the policy of admitting rags free of duty is not persevered in. I rose, however, to say a few words with regard to the remarks which were made by the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). He gravely informed us, and in doing so he took a position directly at issue with the position of his leaders some years ago—he informed us that common sense taught us that Governments could do nothing to affect the price of grain, or produce, or the condition of trade in the country. Now, we have an explicit declaration on the part of the leaders of the party now in power, in the elections of 1878, that the Government could affect the prosperity of the country, that the Government could affect prices. The farmers were assured that the duty on grain would result in enhancing the price of grain; the Government assured them that they would have a home market as the result of this policy; they assured them that the prices they were receiving for the various productions of the soil were to be largely increased, in consequence of the adoption of this policy. Sir Charles Tupper, in 1878, stated:

"Hon. gentlemen ought to know that if Governments are good for anything they are good to increase the prosperity of the country by Acts of Parliament, and to meet the difficulties in which the country may be placed by legislative interference."

That was a declaration made in 1878, and the same gentleman declared that it was possible that the taxation of the country could be so arranged as to increase the prosperity of the country to an extent sufficient to give the people the funds necessary to pay the taxation, by arranging the taxation drawn from their pockets.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to correct him. I was not speaking of the prices of grain generally, or the prices of agricultural products generally, but of the price of wheat alone, and the price of wool alone —two very different things.

Mr. CHARLTON. He asserted that the tariff had been instrumental in increasing the price of wheat, and I infer from his remarks that he considers that at the present moment wheat is higher in Canada in consequence of the duty than it would be without it. I turn to the market reports of yesterday, and I venture to say the story they tell will be told by the market reports of any day since 1879, when the tariff went into operation. What do the market reports show with regard to wheat? They show that yesterday No. 1 spring wheat was worth 92 cents in Buffalo, the corresponding market to Toronto, while it was worth 83 cents in Toronto, 9 cents less than in Buffalo; and they show that No. 2 spring wheat was worth 84 cents upon call in Chicago, 1 cent higher than in Toronto, although Chicago is hundreds of miles farther west. That is the story the market quotations to day tell with regard to the price of wheat, and that is the story they will tell for any day in the last four or five years—that the National Policy has had no effect whatever on the price of wheat, which has been relatively lower in Canada than in the corresponding markets of the United States, during the time that policy has been in operation. We find that yesterday oats sold for 36 cents for 34 pounds in Toronto, and for 35 cents for 32 pounds in Buffalo, or 1 cent a bushel higher in Buffalo than in Toronto. No. 2 barley was 67 cents in Toronto and 87 cents in Oswego, or 20 cents higher immediately across the lake. Yet the hon. gentleman promised that the duty of 15 cents a bushel on barley would make it 15 cents a bushel dearer in Canada than in the United States. If the duty was not imposed in order that the price the Canadian farmer was to receive for his barley should be increased by the extent of the duty, why was it imposed? If the duty is useless and absurd, as every one of the grain duties is, except that on corn, why put it there, as a false promise, a delusive light to the farmer, to persuade him that he is to receive some advantage from this policy of humbug?

Mr. WALLACE (York). The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has just repeated the statement to-night that he made some time before. The hon. gentleman states that to-day in Chicago No. 1 spring wheat is quoted at 84 cents. Well, I hold in my hand the *Mail* of to-day, which has the following:—

"Chicago, March 26.—Wheat opened at 76¾, closed at 77⅞; the highest price, 77⅞.

And yet the hon. gentleman has the effrontery to get up in this House and quote the price at 84 cents. What does he do? He takes the quotation of wheat in Chicago for next June, and he tells us that is the price in Chicago, and then compares the June price in Chicago with the Toronto price to-day in order to mislead this House. If that is not a specimen of political dishonesty I do not know what is. He tells us, further, that this policy is a fraud and a delusion to the farmers, and that the farmers have never received any benefit from the duty. Well, Sir, we know that large quantities of flour have been brought into this country during the last year, a larger quantity than I would like to say; but what does that prove? It proves that American flour has been selling at a lower figure in the Lower Provinces. When Ontario millers want to sell flour to the dealers in the Province of Quebec they tell us: We can buy American flour cheaper than yours. If that duty was not on flour, we would have to sell our flour 50 cents per barrel cheaper, which amounts to 11 cents a bushel on wheat; so that the farmers received at least an advantage of 11 cents a bushel from this policy. Now, the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Allen) told us, that, from his experience, the price of wool was lower to day than it was during the time the Mackenzie Government was in power. There is a difference, but very little. South Down wool will sell to-day at from 27 to 28 cents a pound; Cotswold wool and other coarser wools are somewhat cheaper. These hon. gentlemen tell us that during the time the Mackenzie Government was in power these wools were very much higher in price, but they do not tell the reason they have gone down in price. The

hon. gentleman for North Grey could have told you if he had chosen to do so that long wools are made into black lustres and goods of that description, and he could also tell you that in 1874 he sold 100 pieces of lustre to one piece that he sells to-day. The reason is that people have ceased to wear that class of goods; they have gone out of fashion; and consequently long wool has largely gone out of use. However, but for the fact that they have gone into the manufacture of blankets and other articles, long wools would be much lower in price than they are to-day; so that the farmers are indebted to the National Policy for keeping up the price of long wools to-day.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wigle) began with a perfectly correct statement of facts, and wound up with a very inconclusive deduction from them. It is quite true that the reduction in the price of long wools is due to the fact that they have gone out of fashion; but when he says the National Policy has prevented them from going still lower in Canada, I cannot agree with him. When we consider that long wool is not imported, his conclusion from the facts he stated appear absurd. He says that South Down wool is from 27 to 30 cents a pound. Well, it has been up to that price during the last year, but it is quoted in to-day's *Mail* at 22 cents. But if it was 30 cents to-day, and we did not grow enough short wool to supply the home market, whatever duty the Government put on it would raise the price so much per pound, and the farmer would gain so much benefit from it. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that we have become converted to their views, because we are urging that the farmer should have as much protection as everybody else. That is absurd. All that we ask is that they should carry out the scheme they promised in 1878, and make this protection fair all round. We know that if they did all prices would be raised equally and nobody would be better off, and that would only show the absurdity of the policy they have embarked in. They have entered on the absurd task of helping everybody by increasing the price of what everybody has to sell but they stop short with increasing the price of goods to some classes to the disadvantage of the rest. The hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Wigle) has a crushing proof of the correctness of our views. He has told us that the Weston Mills near Toronto had formerly to import shoddy from England. There was not any shoddy to be had in Canada in the days of the revenue tariff; rags were not plentiful enough; but now, he says, we use home made rags. They keep thirty or forty girls and a countless number of men employed collecting these rags throughout the country. The hon. gentleman has proved that the most flourishing industry in Canada to-day is the rag and shoddy industry. That is just the conclusion to which we thought this policy would come, and I am glad to hear a frank admission of it from the hon. and humorous gentleman. If this great increase in the production and consumption of Canadian rags has taken place in the absence of any duty on the imported article, what will be the result when these rags are placed on the duty list? My heart swells with pride when I think of the tremendous shoddy industry that will grow up in Canada in a year or two, through the operation of this duty! My hon. friend showed that the people were not fairly dealt with in the price of rags; that they are only paid 2 cents per pound, while, according to the Trade Returns, the average price of imported rags is something like 12 cents, so that the woollen manufacturer gives the Canadian only a sixth of the price for his rags that he gives the outsider.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). These are unsorted rags.

Mr. CASEY. I do not understand anything about assorted rags; that is a part of the National Policy I have not gone into. The hon. gentleman told us he bought wool under the *régime* of my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) for 25 cents per pound. I do not remember, in my own neighborhood, any year when we could get wool as low as that—that is washed wool—which is the standard we ought to take; but I remember several years when we got 40, 50 and 60 cents a pound for it. The hon. gentleman says that although wool is much cheaper; cloth is also much cheaper. Yes; shoddy cloth. The importation of shoddy has increased the production of Canadian shoddy, and very cheap clothing can now be produced and sold to the farmers; but the farmer is sold as well as the cloth. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) told us how shoddy cloth is made—tied together with a little Canadian wool. In concluding, I want to call attention to the fact that the price of wool was thought to be a grievance as long ago as 1878. On the 2nd of July of that year, during the elections, the *Mail* took the following extract from the Sarnia *Canadian*:—

"The price of wool this year is one of the farmers' tribulations. For the very best wool he only gets 22 cents, while across the river the price is 32 cents. Our wool growers are entirely at the mercy of the Yankees, and our Government does not protect our farmers, and wool is allowed to come into Canada free of duty. A Government that would submit to such injustice does not deserve the confidence of the people."

Well, to-day, with the price of wool ranging from 15 to 18 cents a pound, I can echo the words, that "the farmers are at the mercy of the Yankees and the Government that would submit to such injustice does not deserve the confidence of the people."

Mr. CHARLTON. The quotations I gave were called in question by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). Well, the following appears in the Chicago report of the *Globe* to-day:

"Forbes & Co. received the following dispatch to-day from Chicago over their private wires; there is no perceptible change in the freight rates although it is reported that they are firmer, because of a scarcity of cars. Wheat—puts 80¾; calls 84¼ cents.

Mr. DUNDAS. What term of delivery?

Mr. CHARLTON. I am not familiar with the terms of the stock market to say, but when I gave quotations I stated that wheat on call was 84¼. If the statement of the hon. gentleman was correct, and wheat was worth 77 cents in Chicago and 83 in Toronto, the difference would not pay half the freight; consequently, even at that price wheat was higher in Chicago than in Toronto.

Mr. WALLACE (York). In the same paragraph that the hon. member read from the report of Forbes & Co., received by private wire, he will see that wheat, on March the 26th, was 77⅜; lowest, 76¼. When the hon. gentleman stated the prices in the papers to-day, he gave this House most distinctly to understand that they were the prices selling in Chicago to-day. If not, what point was there in his comparison of Toronto and Chicago prices, the one of March and the other in June. The hon. gentleman would ask us to believe he does not know the meaning of puts and calls; but if not, he should not have quoted the paragraph. Calls may give the selling price months hence; we all know the quotations in Chicago are given months in advance, and that wheat delivered next May is higher than to-day's delivery; that June is higher still, and July still higher. The hon. gentleman, when he quoted, should have given quotations for to-day's sales.

Mr. CHARLTON. Whether I understand the meaning of puts and calls or not, I stated, when I made the quotations, that the price was 84¼ cents in Chicago on call. If I did not understand that, the hon. member for York did. I repeat the price of 77 cents in Chicago is relatively higher than 77 cents in Toronto.

Mr. WALLACE. I do not agree that the price in Chicago of 77 cents is as high as the price in Toronto at 83 cents. It has been repeatedly stated that the freight

rates from Chicago to the seaboard to-day are less than from Toronto to the seaboard; and if the Liverpool prices rule the market, the Chicago prices should be higher than the Toronto prices. You will find that Toronto prices are higher by 6 cents; and we find, further, that Chicago No. 1 wheat is different from Toronto No. 1. Chicago hard spring wheat is not grown in the vicinity of Toronto, and not quoted. What is quoted in Toronto is Ontario spring wheat, and that is not worth as much in Toronto by 6 cents as the Chicago wheat; so that there is 13 cents of difference in the comparative value at the two places.

Mr. DUNDAS. The hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace) answered so effectively the comparisons of the hon. member for North Norfolk, as to the prices of wheat in Chicago and Toronto, that I need only refer to the comparison of the hon. member for North Norfolk, of the prices of wheat in Toronto and Buffalo. I find the price of wheat quoted in the *Globe*—the hon. gentleman stated it at 92 cents—at 91 cents and a fraction in Buffalo for No. 1 hard wheat. The hon. gentleman should know that No. 1 hard wheat is worth from 5 to 7 cents—yes, up to 10 cents—more than ordinary spring wheat in the same market at the same time, and it is very unfair for the hon. gentleman to quote one class of wheat in one market and compare it with another class of wheat in another market, when the value of one is fully from 5 to 7 cents greater than the other. Hon. gentlemen on the opposite side say the price of wheat is regulated by the value in Liverpool. If that were the case, the price in Toronto and the price in Chicago ought to be about the same, provided the freight is about the same. I think it is known in the trade that freight from Chicago to Liverpool to-day is not 1 cent more than it is from Toronto; in fact, I believe it is known that freight from Chicago can be had for less than from Toronto. There is then a clear difference of 6 cents and a fraction in favor of Toronto to-day as against the price in Chicago for the same kind of wheat. The hon. gentlemen on the other side are continually saying that we on this side prophesied that the price of wheat would be increased and that we would always get high prices for wheat, for wool, and for every article. I would just like to ask those gentlemen once for all to point out where members of the Government and prominent members of the party promised that, under all circumstances, the price of wheat under the National Policy would be high. What we said then and what we say now is that the National Policy, by placing our home market in the hands of our own farmers, has increased the value of a large portion of wheat for home use. That is what we said it would do, and that is what we contend it has done; and I say that the hon. gentleman should once for all either cease making false assertions as to what we said before, or else prove them to be what they say they are.

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. gentleman from Elgin seemed to be very much annoyed at the National Policy, because he said that during the time of the National Policy we did not import rags to Canada.

Mr. CASEY. No.

Mr. McNEILL. That, during the time there was the National Policy, there was no trade in the importation of rags.

Mr. CASEY. That is not what I said.

Mr. McNEILL. I mean that prior to the National Policy there was no trade in the importation of rags.

Mr. CASEY. No; I was quoting from the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Wigle), who said that prior to the introduction of the National Policy there was no trade in the manufacture of rags into shoddy at the Weston Mills. I did not say there was no importation.

Mr. WALLACE.

Mr. McNEILL. I understood the hon. gentleman to say distinctly that there was no importation of rags, and I think we can readily understand why that should be, because probably we had plenty of rags at home. Since the National Policy has been introduced, however, I think we find that we are able to clothe our own people comfortably, and we require to get our rags from abroad. I rose to refer to the price of oats. The hon. member from Norfolk, on a previous occasion, in speaking of the prices of grain, quoted certain prices, and stated that it was impossible for any one to assert truthfully or correctly that the National Policy had benefited the farmers of the country. While he was making his quotation I called his attention to the price of oats at Chicago.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Rags.

Mr. McNEILL. I would not refer to a prior debate, but this matter has come up at this moment, and I suppose you will allow me to refer to it. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the price of oats in Chicago to-day. I find that to-day the price of oats at Chicago is, for March, 28¼ cents and 28 cents. The price of oats in Toronto is quoted thus:

"Oats quiet. Sold one at 37 cents on the track, but held steady and offered slowly."

So that 37 cents on the track represents the price of oats to the Canadian farmer to-day, whereas in Chicago they are worth only 28¼ cents.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will the hon. gentleman state the difference in the standard bushel?

Mr. McNEILL. The difference in the weight is, I believe, 2 pounds to the bushel, which is a mere fraction of the weight, and would be a very small fraction indeed of the price. It is clear that there is an enormous difference in the price of oats in Toronto and in Chicago to-day.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will the difference pay the freight between the two points?

Mr. McNEILL. The fact is, that prior to the introduction of the National Policy the price of oats in Toronto was ruled very much by the price in Chicago, and was very seldom higher.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman evades my question. I ask whether the difference will pay the freight?

Mr. BOWELL. It has nothing to do with it.

Mr. McNEILL. The cost of the freight from Chicago to Toronto has surely nothing to do with the price that oats may be in other parts of Canada for the farmer. The price of oats in Toronto has been, prior to the National Policy, very much the same as the price of oats in Chicago. Since the National Policy was introduced, except in one year, when there was a failure in the crop of oats in the United States, we have had a very large advantage in Canada over the American producer.

Mr. CHARLTON. No; you have not. This is the first year.

Mr. McNEILL. It is so to-day, at all events. When he referred to it before, the hon. gentleman did not refer to the Chicago market, but to the Oswego or the Buffalo market. I spoke to a grain dealer on the subject, and he simply laughed at the idea of a comparison between the Oswego or Buffalo market and the Toronto market. He said it was the Chicago market alone which they considered, as far as American markets were concerned, as to the price of oats and the price of wheat. In establishing the prices at which they purchased, they considered the market in Chicago and the market in Liverpool, and not at all the market in Buffalo, to which the hon. gentleman referred. The fact is, that, so far from the National Policy having been no benefit

to the farmer, so far as I, as a farmer, can at all judge and am capable of forming an opinion, it has been of enormous benefit to the farmer. We have been told to-night, in the course of this debate, that there was no protection to the farmer. There is a protection to the farmer on his wheat, as the hon. member for West York has just proved; there is a protection to the farmer on his oats, as I have just shown, and there is a protection on his peas also; because I know myself that I have got a much higher price for peas ever since the introduction of the National Policy. There is a protection to the farmer for his pork, and incidentally for his eggs, his butter and his cheese—I say incidentally, because there has been a much greater demand for these commodities in our own markets, and the consequence is that we have higher prices.

Mr. IRVINE. Do we not export more cheese than we did?

Mr. McNEILL. I dare say we do, but that is no reason why we do not get a higher price for cheese at our own doors. The hon. gentlemen go upon theory. They say we export so and so, and therefore it must be so and so. But we refer them to the facts. The whole of their contention proceeds upon theory, from beginning to end, and they refuse to look facts in the face. They assume a certain theory, and, like the school men of old, they twist the facts into conformity with this theory. If they would look abroad, and see what the facts were, they would know that this free trade, as they call it, is a dead issue almost everywhere. They would know that there is no great country in the world which follows that policy, with the exception of England, and in England there is an enormous reaction against it. They would know that there is no country in the world, as I have stated before, which has ever succeeded in building up its industries without having recourse to protection. Notwithstanding that hon. gentlemen know, or ought to know, that to be a fact, they ask us to turn round and introduce into this country a policy directly the reverse of that which has proved to be successful all over the world. Not only so, but they ask us to adopt a policy which is now pursued by England as the only great country that adopts it. England is the one country which to-day pursues that policy at all. Formerly she was a protective country, just as much as Canada; and, therefore, it is impossible to deny that every great country, England being no exception, has succeeded in building up its industries under a policy of protection. It is also a fact that the greatest thinker on their own side of the question that has been produced during this generation, John Stuart Mill, admits, though he was a great free trader, that in such circumstances as ours we would probably be justified in adopting a policy of protection. Yet in spite of all these facts, hon. gentlemen would do just the opposite for Canada to that which has been successful everywhere else, they say; pursue the very opposite of the successful policy and then you will be all right.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The policy is remarkably successful this year, is it not?

Mr. McNEILL. I think it is; I think that so far as Canada is concerned, this year we have every reason to believe that the policy has been successful. If we compare Canada this year, with other countries, we have every reason to be proud of the National Policy. And if the hon. gentleman will tell me any country which has adopted the policy he advocates, which is more prosperous than Canada, I will be much obliged.

Mr. MILLS. New South Wales.

Mr. McNEILL. Where are the great manufacturing industries that have been built up in New South Wales. Does the hon. gentleman not know that there is a tariff imposed in New South Wales in the form of great freight rates, that we have not got here at all, and if that country is an exception, it is an exception which proves the rule. I would like the hon. gentleman who first interrupted me, to mention a country that has adopted the policy of free trade that is in a more prosperous condition than Canada. Not only is there no such country, but the one country which has pursued a policy of free trade—of course it is not free trade. But they call it so; it is a policy of free imports, because free trade means free selling as well as free buying—but the country that has pursued the policy of free imports is the one great country which did not benefit to any considerable extent by the great wave of prosperity of hon. gentlemen were so fond of talking about a short time ago. Not only do they ask us to adopt a policy the reverse of that which has been successful in France, in Austria, in Germany, in Italy, in Russia and in the United States, but they ask us to pursue a policy which has resulted, in the case of England, in placing her at a disadvantage during the last few years, as compared with every other country in the world. I make that statement upon the authority of Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Childers, the Chancellors of the Exchequer of England. At the time when the Finance Minister of Canada was able to declare enormous surpluses, these gentlemen who had charge of the finances in England were obliged to admit that the finances of that country were in a very unfortunate condition, and that its trade and industries were depressed. Now, with regard to this matter of wool, I have understood, from the observations of the Minister of Customs, that he intended to protect the Canadian farmer on his wool. I have understood that it was the belief of the Finance Minister himself that the tariff had been so framed. There is some ambiguity with regard to the wording of that clause in the tariff, and I am sure the hon. gentleman will take care that that ambiguity is removed in future and that the farmers shall have the protection they require. I may remark also that I do not think any Government can be supposed to be omniscient, and if these matters are not pointed out to them by the farmers in the House, like myself, for example, and others, why I think that upon us should be the blame. I confess that if there has been a mistake of that kind in this tariff for some time past, and if we, the farmers in this House, had not called the attention of the hon. gentleman to it, I think upon us should be the blame. I am glad attention has been called to the matter, and that this discussion has arisen, because, although at the time this tariff was first framed it would have been absurd to place a protective duty upon fine wools, when they were not being produced in the country, now that we have had time to make a start in raising fine wools, I think there ought certainly to be some protection upon them. As regards the question of shoddy, I must say that it seems to me a very difficult question; but, on the whole, I should much prefer to see the tariff altered in that respect, and the farmers protected. I think the question just resolves itself into this: Whether it is better that we should supply a cheap blanket with the shoddy, or make the consumer pay for a dearer blanket without the shoddy. I think there are certain classes of consumers who should be regarded in this matter, and if it were possible to supply them with very cheap blankets, without doing the others injury, it would be very desirable that it should be done. But the difficulty with respect to that is, that if you allow shoddy to be used in one class of goods and to be imported into the country, it will be very likely to be used for other classes, and it will be very difficult to prevent fraud to consumers. So that, so far as shoddy is concerned, I should like, speaking as a farmer, if the Finance Minister could see his way to make an alteration in the tariff in regard to it. So far as the question of benefit of the National Policy is concerned, I am satisfied, from all I have seen and know, that

it has been of incalculable benefit to the farmers of this country.

Mr. FOSTER. Since we have got back to the question of wool, there is one point to which I wish to call the attention of the House and also of the member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright). It is a peculiar method of reasoning that he seems to indulge in, and it is not altogether conclusive. The hon. member for South Huron said: What has your policy done for wool? And he proved to his own satisfaction, no doubt, that it had done nothing for wool; and this was his method of proof: In 1874 there were imported 3,756,556 lbs. of wool; in 1878 there were imported 6,230,084 lbs.—that was at a time when there was no National Policy. See the great increase! But in 1884 there were imported only 6,182,000 lbs., against 6,230,084 in 1878. See the decrease! That is what your policy has done. Now if we are to take that as a conclusive method of reasoning, which selects two single years and compares them, and from that deduces what we must adopt as a truth, we shall be landed in difficulty almost every time. Suppose, for instance, I should adopt the same course of reasoning as that of my hon. friend. Suppose I had been in this House in 1877, I would have said to my friend: See what your policy has done for wool? In 1875 there were imported 7,947,879 lbs. of wool; but in 1877 there were imported only 4,608,825 lbs., a decrease of pretty nearly 3,500,000 of lbs. See what your policy is doing for the wool business. Now what I wish to call the attention of the House to is this: If the hon. gentleman had wished to give a fair statement for the House to make a deduction from, he would have said this: That the average imports of wool, from 1874 to 1878, inclusive, were 5,232,928 lbs., and that the average imports from 1879 to 1884 were 7,753,211 lbs., that is 2,520,283 lbs. on an average per year greater in the latter than in the former period. I am not saying whether we are to draw the conclusion from this that the policy has been successful or not; I am simply pointing out that such reasoning is very inconclusive; and as the hon. member is not correct in regard to his quotations, I think we may well be excused, if we are asked, from the figures given, to arrive at the conclusion that the policy has not been successful.

Mr. BOWELL. I desire to refer to one or two remarks made by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Irvine). I should be very sorry to misrepresent the hon. gentleman. As to whether his remarks are worthy or unworthy of being quoted, I leave that to himself as the best judge. What I did state was, that he had called the attention of the House on a previous occasion to the fact that a large proportion of certain goods imported into his county was smuggled from the United States. I have no desire to misrepresent him, and in order that there may be no mistake in regard to the hon. gentleman's utterances, I will read a short paragraph from his speech, delivered in 1882, when he enlightened the House with a very long speech, on the grievances of his own particular county and Province. The hon. gentleman discussed the question of cotton and other goods that were imported into his county, and in replying to the Finance Minister, he said:

"Why, I live within four miles of the American boundary, and I have as good a right to know what the retail prices of goods are as any other man in Canada. We are told that our cottons are as cheap as those of the United States markets; but I say, Sir, there is more Yankee cotton used, a large part of it smuggled into Carleton county, than there is of Canadian, and I am willing to let the statement go back to my constituents."

I do not desire to add one single word to that statement. The hon. gentleman having called the attention of the Government to that fact, I, administering one of the Departments whose duty it is to look after these matters, accepted the hon. gentleman's statement, that the largest proportion of the cottons consumed in Carleton was smuggled from the United States.

Mr. McNEIL.

Mr. BLAKE. A large proportion.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, a large part of what is consumed is smuggled into the county. I am always glad to receive information, particularly in a public manner, from hon. gentlemen opposite, that smuggling to any extent is going on in any portion of the country; and when hon. gentlemen give me such information I deem it my duty to use it, just the same as I use any information given, either privately or in any other way, by instructing collectors of Customs and those whose duty it is to look after and protect the revenue, to see that the practice of smuggling a large portion of any particular fabric or article is not continued. If a large quantity of goods imported by the hon. gentleman's constituents has been seized, I have to thank him for the information he gave me; and I can assure him that so long as I occupy my present position I shall be very glad to receive any information on that point, either privately, or publicly in this House, and I can assure the hon. gentleman I will act upon that information immediately. The hon. gentleman is quite right in his statement that the return moved for by the leader of the Opposition does not convey a correct idea of the number of seizures made, either in his county or anywhere else. The return gave the information asked for by that hon. gentleman; and I will add here, parenthetically, that I would be very glad, on any future occasion, when motions are made in regard to smuggling, that such motion should be so worded as to cover all the cases and penalties, whether by confiscation of goods or fines imposed, or enclosures, or undervaluation, or anything else, and I will bring the return down. I throw out this hint because I hope that any member who moves for such a return in future will ask for the causes of the imposition of any fines, more particularly if names are to be given. For this reason. A merchant may have enclosures of which he is altogether ignorant and for which no possible blame can attach to him; and yet, if a return is brought down to the House, simply setting forth that a certain merchant had his goods seized, without giving reasons why they were seized, it might mislead those who read the statement, and it would appear that an honest man had been guilty of wrong, when such was not really the fact. I have made this explanation, and will be more cautious, if the hon. gentleman thinks it necessary, in future, to quote his exact words. I desire briefly to reply to the hon. member for Bothwell, who asked me the question as to what position woollen rags would be in when the items were struck out of the list. They will be placed then among the unenumerated articles, and consequently will bear 20 per cent., unless we should specially place them in another class. There is another question, however. The question has been raised, as to whether an article having been placed on the free list by an Order in Council, the Governor in Council has power to repeal it, and in conversation with my colleagues on that question, I said it was my intention to introduce a short Bill in reference to the Customs Act, in which I should take power to remove any doubt upon that point. I remember that my hon. friend, the ex-Finance Minister, called our attention to that point.

Mr. IRVINE. The Minister of Customs is well aware that the smuggling of cotton goods is but a small proportion of the smuggling that is going on in the various parts of Canada. I say there is a portion of the community who make a living by smuggling, and that does not apply to the inhabitants of my own county more than to the inhabitants of other counties in Canada. I am glad to find that for once the Minister of Customs pays so much attention to my remonstrances and advice. I have remonstrated with him on another matter, when he did not pay so much attention to me. A few years ago I asked information from the Department as to the appointment of a seizing officer in my

own county, and informed the Department that he was a merchant, and asked who recommended him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. IRVINE. And the hon. gentleman expressed surprise——

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman must confine himself to the subject before the committee.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Rags.

Mr. IRVINE——and stated: I can assure the hon. gentlemen that the matter will have my serious consideration; but the hon. gentleman knows very well, because I told him, and I stand by my declaration, that he appointed one of the most prominent merchants in the county a seizing officer, at $200 a year; and to-day that merchant is in the employment of the Government, and he is selling dutiable goods.

Mr. BOWELL. Is he smuggling?

Mr. IRVINE. You would not have me give you the proofs. It is you who ought to know; and I ask you if he is smuggling?

Mr. BOWELL. I say that if I knew he was smuggling I would dismiss him.

Mr. IRVINE. I say that he is selling dutiable goods; and when you appointed him you acknowledged that you did not know he was a merchant.

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman cannot go on in this manner. He must confine himself to the question now before the committee. He is discussing a different question altogether; the question is woollen rags.

Mr. IRVINE. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I deserve as much courtesy as any other member.

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman must confine himself to the question of woollen rags.

Mr. IRVINE. To rags?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. In discussing the National Policy, I think it is appropriate that we should confine ourselves to rags.

Mr. McCALLUM. The hon. gentleman says we should confine ourselves to rags, and I shall try to confine myself to that question. I notice that hon. gentlemen opposite are coming over to our policy; they are urging that we should put a duty on rags. Why, Sir, during the time hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, from 1874 to 1878, there were no rags to be manufactured; the people had to wear them. I would say to the Minister of Customs that as this question is closely connected with wool, in my opinion—and I am a farmer—the farmers of this country do not get the price for wool that they think they should have for it. I believe that if the Government were to put a duty on fine wool coming into the country, as well as coarse wool, it would be an advantage. At the time of the organisation of this policy it was necessary that fine wool should come into the country free, as it was the raw material for the manufacturers. Well, Sir, I contend that if there is a duty put on fine wool coming into this country there will be more coarse wool used. Then, of course, the manufacturers would say, these Scotch tweeds and fine tweeds come into the country, and that would not be fair to the manufacturers. I would say to the Minister of Customs and the Finance Minister, that if they put a duty on fine wool, and also increase the duty on fine tweeds coming into this country in competition with our manufacturers, then I think the farmers would get a better price for their wools, as the coarse wools would be mixed with the fine and make cloth, suitable for use by the majority of the people of this country; and if the people want to wear finer qualities of cloth let those do so who can afford to pay for them. An hon. member smiled when it was mentioned in the House that no country in the world had free trade except England, and England itself has not got free trade if you have. Where are you going to get the revenue——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Rags.

Mr. McCALLUM. We want a revenue to carry on improvements——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Rags, rags.

Mr. McCALLUM. I am talking close to rags. If those articles come into the country I understand they are to pay 20 per cent. duty, and if the hon. gentleman puts a duty on fine wool and increases the duty on fine tweeds, there will be more coarse wool used, and the farmers will get a better price for wool than they do to-day. By doing this they will assist the manufacturers and help the wool growers as well.

Mr. FARROW. I want to say two or three words on behalf of the farmers.

Mr. MILLS. On behalf of the hens.

Mr. FARROW. I want to say a few words, but I see that even a philosopher does not know how to behave himself.

An hon. MEMBER. He is not so wise as he looks.

Mr. FARROW. No; and he is not so wise as he thinks himself to be. If he had a little more knowledge it would help him a great deal. I wish, Mr. Chairman, to say, as a farmer, that the farmers would like very much to have the price of wool increased. I have paid a great deal of attention to the raising of wool. I have tried the coarse wool sheep and I have tried the finer kinds—not the finest—and I think we are probably raising sufficient of the fine wool now, in the shape of the Downs and the South Downs especially, that it would be wise for the Government to put a duty on fine wools. But I have come to this conclusion, along with the farmers in my neighborhood, that there is just one way by which the price of wool can be increased to the farmers; and I wish the Finance Minister would pay particular attention to this. My hon. friend from Monck (Mr. McCallum) has, no doubt, touched the sore spot. If you examine the returns, you will find that a vast amount of shoddy cloth and shoddy blankets come into this country from the old country. Now, what the Minister ought to do is to double the duty on these goods—to make it a prohibitive duty. We do not want shoddy cloth or shoddy blankets in this country; and by keeping them out, our own wool, especially as our farmers are growing it now, will become quite serviceable for these very purposes. That, I believe, would run up the price to the farmers.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I desire to say a few words on this subject. I did not intend to say anything, only from some matters which have dropped in the discussion I thought probably it was right I should. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) has tried to give us an idea that this country is in a very flourishing condition, that the farmers and everybody else are prosperous, and that everything is going on in a very happy way. Now, I am reminded of a little circumstance that occurred at my place before I came down here.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order—rags, rags.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am coming to rags, and if this policy lasts much longer you will all come to rags. The hon. member for North Bruce tells us that he is a farmer, but when I look at him he does not look like a farmer; he really has not got the airs of a farmer; he appears to be

altogether different from me, who was born and brought up on a farm.

Mr. McNEILL. Well, I will tell the hon. gentleman that I was born and brought up on a farm, too.

Mr. LANDERKIN. He does not look like a farmer. He appears to be one of these white kid-glove farmers. But when he talks of the prosperous times, I am reminded of a little event that occurred at my place just before I came down. A young man who was a sawyer in a mill in the riding the hon. gentleman represents—I think it is owned by Mr. McVicker—came to my house, and he said: "Can I get a job of cutting wood from you?" I asked him: "Why do you want a job of cutting wood?" He said: "I have been working in the mill at Wiarton, and it has been closed down, and I have nothing to do." Now, we have the statement made by a politician that things are prosperous; and he ought to know that his riding is coming to rags, for the mills there are closed. Now, I am going to read to you what a farmer writes to me from the county of Bruce, also. He has been trying to get a situation, and in his letter he says:

"I have had no offers yet for my farm, but I must find something to work at, as stopping here on my farm is not going to put bread and butter in my mouth. At present, the outlook seems rather blue; still, people seem to live in hopes of better times, myself among the number. I have been to Collingwood searching for employment, and I saw the manager of Mr. Dodge's mill—I was book-keeper there at one time—and found that times were bad with them, and very little hope of improvement."

Now, there is the testimony of one who is not a politician but a farmer, and he is a gentleman whose word I would rely upon. It is most extraordinary that gentlemen will get up here and try to paint the condition of this country differently from what it really is. It is very much to be regretted that it becomes necessary, in the interest of any party in this country, for gentlemen to get up and misrepresent the actual condition of the country. There is not a member of this House who does not know that wheat was never so low in this country as it is now, as well as all other grains that the farmer produces. Now, the subject of wheat is quite pertinent to the question under discussion, because if wheat continues as low as it is, the country will soon go to rags. The hon. member for North Bruce cannot have been farming long. The more I look at the hon. member, the more I am impressed with the idea that he is not a farmer. He is living on a farm; perhaps he has a mansion or a palace; but he does not go down, like the rest of us, into the fields, and work and dig and cultivate his farm; but perhaps he goes around with a whip or cane, or something of that kind, and looks after his men, and then he comes and tells us that he does not know that in his own riding the mills are closed up, and the farmers are getting less for their wheat than they have got at any time during the last twenty or thirty years. A number of friends called on me before I came away from home, and they wanted me to speak to Sir John. They were supporters of his, although friends of mine. Many supporters of his are friends of mine, and I am glad they are, and I hope they will continue to be friends of mine. They said to me: "Will you go, doctor, and ask Sir John if he cannot do something to raise the price of wheat for us. Wheat has never been so low since we have lived in the Queen's bush, as it is now, and we want you to go Sir John and tell him that we want him to carry out his promise and raise the price of wheat." Well, I did not go to see him—our relations are somewhat strained—and I thought I would take this opportunity to ask him, for the sake of these men who trusted and supported him, if he cannot get them a higher price for their wheat. Will not the hon. member for North Bruce and the hon. Minister of Customs ask him to do so? The Minister of Customs sits there as happy as a clam since he has got into office. We remember when he was not so happy—when he was on this side of the House. We remember the deputation that he got to come down and press Sir John to take him into the Cabinet if there should be a change. We remember how cross and savage he used to be. I wonder how he gets along now? I think he must be happier now, because he smiles oftener now than he did then; the uncertainties as to his position have been removed. You know I am a practical farmer; I was brought up on a farm, and know all about it. The hon. member for North Bruce (McNeill), is a theoretical farmer; he does not believe in theory, but he farms on theory, and I want him to see the Government and not delay about it. I want him to see that the farmers get a better price for their grain and for their wool. You know that wool was never so low since you have been in the country; I do not know how long you have been here, but I do know you have not been here very long. You had only to show yourself and you were elected.

The CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is out of order when he addresses an hon. member across the floor, and not the Chair; also when he wanders from the subject which is brought before the committee. On these two points that hon. gentleman is out of order, and I must ask him to confined himself to the question in future.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Will you kindly tell me what the question is?

The CHAIRMAN. Woollen rags.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Just what I thought; and my observations were all tending to show that the policy of the Government is going to bring us all to rags, and this House has now come to woolen rags. And about rags: I remember the time when the Minister of Customs used to come into the House and speak of the Government, which then administered affairs, as a starvationist Government. He said they were starving the people; and how did they do it? At that time the farmer used to get $1.50 a bushel for his wheat; at present, I know lots of people who have sold their wheat at 70 cents, but the Minister of Customs is happy to-night; he has come out all right, and he has not a word to say about the bad times. He used to have trouble getting through the corridors of the House from the great crowd of officials; but how does he get through now with so many more in it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to know who has been speaking to-night, who was in order. Was all this discussion about wheat in order? If other hon. gentlemen have a certain amount of liberty, I do not see why I should be restricted in my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. I am giving you a great deal of liberty.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am much obliged to you, Sir, but I will not take any undue liberty. Hon. gentlemen were very much astonished to hear the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) talk in the manner he did, because that hon. gentleman knows that in his own riding the mills are closed and the people seeking employment all over, without being able to get it. I hope the Government will give serious consideration to this matter. If discontent has arisen, it is owing to their policy all over the country. I hope the Government will look into the interests of the country, and see that peace, prosperity, order and harmony are restored.

Mr. McNEILL. If my hon. friend opposite had addressed one solitary argument in reply to what I advanced, I should have been most happy to have replied to him. He has only argued as to whether I look like a farmer or not. If I do not look like a farmer I am very sorry, for I like to look like a farmer; but I will not pronounce an opinion as

to whether my hon. friend looks like a medical man or not I would only say this: that I do sincerely hope, for the benefit of his patients, that he knows a little more about medicine than he knows about farming.

Steel, imported in the use of the manufacture of skates.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will state if he knows how many houses import steel for the manufacture of skates.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think there are a great many. The article was placed on the free list, because it was not manufactured in this country, in order that the skate manufacturers might not only continue their work, but be able to export, as they were and are still doing, to other parts of the world.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have you any idea of the quantity?

Mr. BOWELL. No; I frankly confess that these articles, being on the free list so long, and being now placed here at my own suggestion, I did not look into the question, supposing that any one who had paid any attention to the politics of the country was aware that these things had been on the free list.

Mr. BLAKE. I happened to be aware that by Order in Council these had been put on the free list, but this is the first opportunity we have had in Parliament of ascertaining the reasons. Does the hon. gentleman know if there is more than one manufactory of skates?

Mr. BOWELL. There is one in St. John and one at Dartmouth.

Mr. BLAKE. Was it necessary, for the purpose of the export trade that this steel should come in free? I thought the drawback system answers our export trade.

Mr. BOWELL. It is in order to promote the industry and enable it to be continued. It has been the policy of the Government, in articles of the kind, that do not come into competition with anything manufactured here, to place them, as far as possible, when the revenue allows it, on the free list. As this article had been on the free list for many years, and the trade had grown up with it on the free list, the manufacturers represented the injury it would do them if we collected the high rate of duty, unless we increased the duty on skates very largely; and we thought it advisable to place this article on the free list. It has been on the free list since 1880.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Customs returns do not enable us to ascertain how much is imported for this particular purpose, and it is necessary we should have some idea of the quantity. Very considerable advantage is taken of provisions like this, and cases have occurred in which, under such a provision, a very large quantity of an article has been imported, far more than the wants of the particular manufacture, for which it was ostensibly imported, required. You do not allow this steel to be imported for any other purpose?

Mr. BOWELL. No; not now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose the hon. gentleman can easily find out, when this comes up in the usual course, how much was imported last year for the purpose. I take it that the principle the hon. gentleman adopts is this, that it is all entered through the Customs, and he requires proof of some sort from the manufacturer that this goes actually into the manufacture of skates.

Mr. BOWELL. It would be impossible to obtain the information the hon. gentleman asked for unless I wrote to the different ports at which it is imported, that is, Halifax and St. John, for the reason that the returns kept in the Department here are, as he knows, aggregated at the different outports, except in special line articles. I will endeavor to ascertain the information he has asked for, and if possible I will give it to him. The manner in which we enforce the law is, by compelling importers to take an affidavit that it is imported for a particular purpose and will not be used for any other; but, notwithstanding that fact, he knew during his time in office, even that was evaded, and is still, as the hon. gentleman no doubt has seen from the public press, and as the leader of the Opposition knows, for I am informed that cases have been laid before him where we have seized the articles and punished the parties who have entered them under special provisions and have used them for other purposes than those for which they were imported. I may be in error as to the hon. gentleman's having the facts, but it was stated to me that they were sent to him, and that is why I said, on a former occasion, that no doubt he had many complaints, which would turn out on investigation to be without foundation.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not remember whether any such papers have been laid before me, but from some source I have been aware, and former discussions in the committee made it plain, that there is great difficulty and inconvenience in charging a tariff on an article for certain purposes, and admitting it free for others. There is a temptation, and it is human nature, if an article is required, to say it is wanted for that purpose and then to use it for another. Of course, proper precautions should be taken in all such cases, and that is why I have been of the opinion that there should be as few of these deviations as possible, consistently with the policy of the Government. The hon. gentleman stated as the reason why this was placed and proposed to be continued on the free list, that there were many manufacturers of skates who manufactured not only for home consuption but also for the export trade, and I said I had understood him to say, on former occasions, to the House, that the drawback system answered admirably for that, so far as the export was concerned, so that I did not see that that portion of his remark held water. But, of course, we know that the general policy of the Government is, when it is compatible with certain other portions of their policy with which it sometimes conflicts, to admit the raw material free; and there is a sense in which I entirely agree with that policy. With reference to the application of it to the article of steel, we know that there is one steel manufacturing company in the country already. I do not know whether they have ever proposed to manufacture steel of the particular quality required for skates; probably not, as there is no duty upon it. I refer to the Londonderry steel works. More than that; steel works were one of the very things which it was told to us, in May and June, 1882, would be developed in this country if only the electors would signify their confidence in the National Policy by their verdict at the polls. At a meeting held in the city of Toronto, in order that the First Minister might address the electors, the chairman stated in his presence that the Steel Association of Ontario were willing to expend three million dollars, and asked the people:

"Was it not of importance to the people that such an industry should be started, and he might say that he was only one out of two hundred companies ready to be floated by American capitalists if the Government was returned and the National Policy upheld."

And the First Minister ratified that by his statement, a few days afterwards, speaking at Yorkville, when he said:

"The Government had appealed to the country before their time had expired, in order that all uncertainty about the continuance of the National Policy might be removed. The industries that policy had inaugurated, though important, were small to what would be established if capitalists were certain that the tariff would not be repealed or brought by slow degrees to a free trade standard by Mr. Blake and his party. As an instance of this, he mentioned that a company was prepared to invest two millions in starting steel mills at Niagara as soon as the people declared in favor of protection. The Government had good

evidence that millions of capital were waiting on the decision of the people at the polls."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Who said that?

Mr. BLAKE. The First Minister, in the town of Yorkville, now part of the city of Toronto, referring to the meeting at which the chairman had stated a few days before that three millions were to be invested in the town of Niagara, if only the Government obtained a verdict. Of course I have no doubt—I have not heard of it, I have not seen it in the newspapers, I have not visited Niagara since, but I have no doubt, of course—that, after those positive assurances, the steel mills are in full blast at Niagara, and that they are producing a superfine quality of steel, eminently suitable for the manufacture of skates, and I want to know why the hon. gentleman is proposing to continue the free importation of this steel, when he told the people he would have a fresh manufactory of steel, if only they would give him a verdict at the polls. Why is it not protected; why does he not propose that they should be left without a rag of protection?

Mr. STAIRS. I think I can answer one or two points raised by the hon. gentleman. He fell into a certain error as to the manufacture of steel at Londonderry. There has been no steel manufactured at the Londonderry steel works for many years, but steel is made at New Glasgow. I do not wonder at his falling into that error. The Londonderry steel works, when they were started many years ago, manufactured charcoal pig iron principally. Afterwards it was intended to enlarge them and to manufacture steel. They intended to adopt the Siemens-Martin process, which was a very complicated and, at that time, a new process. They expended a great deal of money in the outlay, and I am sorry to say it failed. When it failed they gave up the manufacture of steel altogether and went into the manufacture of pig iron, by the ordinary blast furnace and the puddling principle, which is as old as the manufacture of iron, but they never changed the name of the Londonderry steel works. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that many should fall into this error. There are steel works at New Glasgow which are manufacturing a large quantity of steel, but they are not yet manufacturing steel of a class suitable for the manufacture of skates.

Mr. BLAKE. Why should they, when they are not protected?

Mr. STAIRS. The reason is, I think, that they are manufacturing by the open earth process and have not yet arrived at the manufacture of crucible steel, which is the steel largely used for skates. I have no doubt they will reach it sometime, but it takes a good while to inaugurate and carry on works of this kind. The manufacture of steel is a complicated manufacture, and they have not arrived at this point yet, though I have no doubt they will in time. I think I can relieve the hon. gentleman's mind as to this skate steel being entered for other purposes. That is not likely to occur. Most of the steel is imported in a bevelled section, suitable to cut into runners, and can be used for nothing else. More than that, a large portion of this runner steel is a compound article, and that is why it is not made in the Dominion. It is a combination of steel and iron. It is steel manufactured for the runners of skates, with a steel front and an iron back; it is welded by some peculiar process, and then rolled into shape; and it is a singular thing that the finest quality of skates are made from a combination of iron and steel together. The cheapest skates are made from an entirely steel runner, the iron and steel runner together being very much better. Steel of this peculiar section, and of this peculiar combination of iron and steel together, can be used for nothing else but for skate runners. So that the largest proportion of steel imported for the manufacture of skates is not likely to be diverted to any other use. Now, with reference to the question of drawback, I think that one of the reasons why it was important, in the interest of the skate manufacturer, that steel should be free and not subject to drawback, was that it is a very difficult matter to ascertain exactly how much is waste. A great deal of the waste metal, of course, is cut into different shapes. I presume the percentage of waste is, in many cases, over 50 per cent., perhaps larger.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would tell us whether he knows if any of the skate companies have made any proposals to the Steel Associations of Niagara, to supply them with steel.

Mr. STAIRS. I do not speak about what I do not know. As I am not so well acquainted with the manufacturing industries of the western part of Canada as the hon. gentleman, I am not going to talk about them.

Mr. BLAKE. Or anybody else.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the Minister of Customs is bound to give some answer to the statements that have been read. The country were appealed to, under a direct promise that these works should be here. The direct promise of a Minister must be of some consequence, and I think they are bound to explain whether these factories have come into existence as they promised.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not propose to enter into the discussion of that question now, although the leader of Opposition and the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) desire to lead me into such discussion. I have been anxious, so far as I can, to explain the reason why this article has been put upon the free list. I commenced my observations by stating that one of the reasons was that this quality of steel was not manufactured in Canada, and if that statement were correct, then the question put by the leader of the Opposition to the member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) was altogether irrelevant and unnecessary. The question has been so well answered as to the reason why this article was put upon the free list instead of giving a drawback, by my hon. friend from Halifax, that I do not think it necessary to enter any further into that discussion. I am convinced that the explanations of the hon. member for Halifax were quite satisfactory to the leader of the Opposition, and all I could do, if I were to enter into further discussion, would be to repeat what he said. Anyone who has paid any attention to the question of drawbacks—and no man in the House, I think, has done so, except those who are charged with carrying out the law—knows very well the difficulties that present themselves in arriving at a correct and honest conclusion as to what should be paid to the persons asking the drawback. As this steel, I repeat again, did not come into competition with any article manufactured in Canada, and in order to relieve the Department from entering into an abstruse calculation as to how much steel was waste when it was cut to fit it to the wood or iron to which it was attached, it was deemed advisable to put the manufacturers in the best possible position they could be in, and if there was any advantage in giving them free steel, that they should have it. Now, in coming to the conclusion as to the amount that should be paid to manufacturer as a drawback, and what articles should be included in the list so manufactured, we must consider that there are many things brought into this country, small in themselves, but amounting to a good deal in the aggregate. There are other articles which are perfect in themselves that come to the country and go into the completion of an article exported from the country. Under the revised system that we have adopted we allow them, providing the article is not manufactured in the country, to receive a drawback of duty paid upon such articles. It may be a small screw, a tack, or some other small article, that do not amount to more than a very few cents—all these have to be taken into the calculation. But in case

of an article like steel, which is not manufacured in the country, but is used exclusively by the manufacturer, it is deemed advisable to put it on the free list. I am quite sure that the leader of the Opposition and the House will justify that policy and will further admit that it should be carried out to the fullest possible extent where it does not interfere with the industries of the country.

Mr. PLATT. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us if he despairs of securing the manufacture of steel from the iron ore of his own county. In 1882 we were almost made to believe that the smoke of the blast furnaces was already visible; that a further product of iron in his own county, which was calculated for the manufacture of steel, would take place.

Mr. BOWELL. Knowing the progress of human nature and the genius of the human race, I do not despair of anything. I think the time will come when steel will be manufactured in Canada, and I hope profitably. We know that our market is not large enough for that particular quality of steel, but I can inform the hon. gentleman that crucible steel was manufactured in London for some short time, but the works are not going on now. I hope the time is not far distant when we shall not only have steel works, but other works in North Hastings, where, as the hon. gentleman well knows, there are large deposits of iron. I think there are more profitable enterprises into which the owners of that ore can enter than to manufacture the finer qualities of steel at the present moment.

Mr. PLATT. We were told, however, that the placing of a duty upon steel and iron would likely hurry on the happy period to which the hon. gentleman alludes. I suppose that if the doctrine which was then preached be correct to-day, the placing of a duty upon steel might still hasten that happy consumation.

Mr. BOWELL. If we followed the footsteps of our neighbors across the border, and put about $7 a ton on pig iron and $28 on steel, perhaps the hon. gentleman's happy dream might be realised.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suggest, for the promotion of business, that the Minister of Customs should undertake to let us know, on Concurrence, what were the works specified with so much minuteness of detail by the First Minister.

Mr. BOWELL. No; I thank you.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not holding him responsible for the First Minister's statements, except in a perfunctory way. I think my proposition is a reasonable one. These things were given with great minuteness of detail; we were told the amount of capital ready to be invested in this work. We have had proof recently of the worth of the First Minister's utterances on other important matters, and we cannot doubt for a moment that when the First Minister made these statements he had in his pocket full and perfect proof of all these things whereof he spoke. I think that really on Concurrence we ought to have the details ourselves.

Mr. BOWELL. I will call the Premier's attention to the question of the hon. gentleman. No doubt he will satisfy him.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member for Lennox is very hard to satisfy. The Steel Association of Ontario has not been opened, and we are told this evening that the Steel Association of Nova Scotia has desisted from the manufacture of steel.

Mr. BOWELL. Oh, no.

Mr. BLAKE. I am speaking of Londonderry.

Mr. BOWELL. They never manufactured it.

Mr. BLAKE. They did it for a while.

Mr. STAIRS. They never really got into operation.

Mr. BLAKE. Londonderry never got into operation, and the Crucible Steel Works of Ontario are closed. So the hon. gentleman cannot expect much when these disasters have attended the attempts to manufacture steel. The closing of the Crucible Steel Works of Ontario is one of the happy events which have occurred within a short time under the National Policy.

Mr. McLELAN. There is a mistake as to the date at which the Londonderry company attempted to make steel. It was in 1875 or 1876 that they attempted to make steel, and they ceased operations in 1876 or 1877.

Mr. McDOUGALD. I cannot understand why hon. gentlemen opposite should oppose the placing of steel for skates on the free list, for it is within the distinct recollection of members of this House that when the Administration submitted a proposal to place a duty on steel, for the purpose of protecting that industry, it was strongly opposed by the Opposition of that day. This change is not required for protective purposes. Steel for skates is not made in this country, and is not likely to be made for a good many years to come. It has been stated that under the operation of the National Policy very little result has been obtained in the way of promoting the steel industry. Reading the statistical reports with respect to the manufacturing industries of the country, I find that one industry, the New Glasgow steel works, which was brought into existence under the National Policy, at the present time employs 100 hands and has a weekly wage-bill of $750. That is a manufacture that has been brought into existence, I repeat, entirely by the operation of the National Policy. The Steel Company of Londonderry was a company that carried on business entirely in iron. It has been a failure in regard to producing steel; and it certainly was a failure under the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, as the company went out of business, as regards making steel, before the National Policy came into existence. In relation to the steel works at New Glasgow, I will read a short extract from the *Eastern Chronicle*, published in Pictou county, a paper which hon. gentlemen will not repudiate, and the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) who visited the constituency, last year, will corroborate the statements published. On March 12th, the *Eastern Chronicle* says:

"We note that Messrs. Jas. D. McGregor and Andrew Walker, the respective presidents of the Nova Scotia Steel and Glass Companies, have recently returned from the Upper Provinces, which they visited in the interests of their companies. We understand that Mr. McGregor made contracts for some 1,500 tons of steel nail plate in Montreal, and that orders for some 500 tons of other qualities have been secured by the company. This insures constant work for the company for the next six or eight months. Mr. McGregor says that the prices at which the large contracts have been made are exceedingly low, and were only possible because of the excellence of the steel made by the Nova Scotia Company and of the fact that steel nails are evidently forcing iron nails out of competition. Over 1,000 tons of these same goods were sold last year to one Montreal firm, who showed their satisfaction with their quality by duplicating the contract for this year. Probably a good portion of these heavy goods will be shipped by schooner to Montreal direct from the company's wharf, as the freight is somewhat cheaper by that method of carriage than by rail. Mr. Walker's visit, we understand, was rather to see the customers of the company than to sell goods. He found that in all cases the goods gave excellent satisfaction. He reports business very dull in the Upper Provinces, but the Nova Scotia Glass Company are able to hold their own in the western market, and are receiving orders about sufficient to keep them running without accumulating much stock. Their table glass is to be found on the tables of almost all the hotels and restaurants between here and Ottawa. The prospects of both these works are very encouraging, under their present excellent management, and with their unsurpassed facilities, both for obtaining coal and for making shipment by water or rail."

Mr. BOWELL. I was in error in regard to the quantity of steel imported for skates. I find, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns, that in 1883 there were imported 180 cwt., of the value of $1,495. This year the quantity was 2,418 cwt., of the value of $12,732.

Mr. BLAKE. I am very glad to know of the progress which those two industries have been making, and I am sorry the hon. gentleman did not add, what I am sure would have completed the picture, information that the companies are paying good dividends and that there are brilliant prospects in that regard.

Mr. McDOUGALD. I am not a stockbroker.

Musk, in pods or in grains.

Mr. BOWELL. This is used by perfumers; it is a raw material, and they manufacture perfume from it.

Mr. BLAKE. How much is used? This is for the perfumers, you say. It is a necessary of life, I suppose, and therefore free.

Mr. BOWELL. Whether it is a necessary of life or not, it is used. We do not produce it here.

White shellac, for manufacturing purposes.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman give some statement with regard to this item.

Mr. BOWELL. It is used in the manufacture of varnish, and it has been on the free list since 1881.

Mr. BLAKE. How much is imported under the free provision?

Mr. BOWELL. These articles have been on the free list so long that I did not look into the question of importations. I promise that I will endeavor to obtain the quantities imported for all the articles on the free list, and give a list to the House on Concurrence, if the hon. gentleman desires it. I cannot answer the question at the moment.

Mr. BLAKE. I have no objection to a statement being brought down, showing the quantities and values of these articles. In some cases somewhat important questions may arise, which it is impossible to determine without this information.

Mr. BOWELL. I will make a note of it, and produce it if possible.

Jute cloth, when imported to be manufactured into bags only.

M. BOWELL. This was placed on the free list on 22nd December, 1881, and for the express purpose of encouraging the manufacture of this particular kind of bag in this country. I have the satisfaction of stating that they are manufactured now within a fraction as cheaply as they can be purchased in Glasgow. And, at a rate, that was given as a reason why we repealed the Order in Council, allowing bags to be imported free, for the purposes of export, when filled with grain or flour. The Department found, on enquiry, that these articles could be manufactured just about as cheaply in Canada as in Scotland, or the difference was so small that the millers themselves said there was no objection if the privilege they had enjoyed should be repealed. I am speaking of the largest millers—those who did the largest export trade.

Mr. BLAKE. Is this same article used for other manufactures?

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. BLAKE. I observe that you allow jute cloth to be imported free for a particular purpose. Is their a considerable importation for other purposes?

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman will see that it comes in in as raw a state as it possibly can come, and that it has to be callendered, pressed and finished here, by machinery, before it is made into bags. I am not aware of its being imported in that state for any purpose.

Salt cake, being sulphate of soda, when imported by manufacturers of glass and soap for their own use in their works.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give an explanation about this item.

Mr. BOWELL. The explanation I have already given about the last item applies to this. The salt cake is the residue of soda, which, as the hon. gentleman knows, is free, and the question arose whether the article imported, called salt cake, which is in fact a sulphate of soda, which is not dutiable, should be allowed free or not. Difficulties have arisen at different ports, some declaring it free and others imposing a duty; and as it was not intended, when the tariff was framed, that it should be dutiable, it was placed on the free list.

Mr. PLATT. Why should it not come in free when used for other purposes?

Mr. BOWELL. It says that.

Mr. BLAKE. No; it says "when imported by manufacturers of glass and soap," plainly indicating that when imported for other purposes it is dutiable, and the hon. gentleman says it was not the intention to make it dutiable at all, in that case.

Mr. BOWELL. This question was brought to the notice of the Government by these manufacturers, and it was represented that it was used by soap manufacturers and glass makers, and as soda, sal soda, silicate of soda, and other preparations of the same salt, were all free, it was deemed advisable to give the manufacturers the advantage of this article free, when imported for that special purpose; but what other purposes it is put to I am not able to tell the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend from Prince Edward says it was used by other persons—as in making seidlitz powders.

Mr. BOWELL. I am sorry, as I would like to protect the doctors if possible, or rather protect the patients against the doctors.

Mr. BLAKE. It is the apothecaries who suffer.

Mr. BOWELL. Both, perhaps.

Foot grease, the refuse of the cotton seed after the oil is pressed out.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For whose benefit is this imported free?

Mr. BOWELL. This is another article used by the soap makers. Foot grease is the residue of the mills where cotton seed is pressed and the oil taken from it. It is also obtained from flax seed and is, in that case, called by the same name. There are two or three articles of this kind placed on the free list which are used by soap makers.

Tagging metal, plain, japanned, or coated, in coils not over 1½ inches in width, when imported by manufacturers of shoe and corset laces for use in their factories.

Mr. BLAKE. Is this article imported for any other purpose?

Mr. BOWELL. No, for no other purpose; and not being made in the country it was in order to encourage these industries.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it used in the country for any other purpose than this particular purpose.

Mr. BOWELL. I presume it must be, although I am not prepared to say what it is.

Mr. BLAKE. I presume so, too, and following out that presumption, I was desirous of knowing why persons using it in their manufactures should not have the same benefit as those using it in the manufacture of shoe and corset laces.

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman that.

Hoop iron, not exceeding three eights (⅜) of an inch in width, and being No. 25 gauge or thinner, used for the manufacture of tubular rivets.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see there are quite a number of these concessions in the matter of iron. I should imagine it would make it somewhat difficult to distinguish, in the several classes I see below, between what was really and *bonâ fide* imported for these special purposes, and those imported for other purposes.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman will see that we take the precaution, as far as possible in all these articles which are put on the free list, for the encouragement of any particular industry, of confining it to the importation of the manufacturers themselves, although it is not so worded.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would just say, with respect to a good many of these things—I make the remark as to the whole of these various articles, in the way of iron and steel—that it appears to me that there are a considerable number of other manufacturers who use articles closely similar to those. Take, for example, the case of manufacturers of agricultural implements in general—not confined to shovels and spades, and those kinds of things—it seems to me they have at least an equal claim with the others to whom the hon. gentleman is making these reductions.

Mr. GLEN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman why the men who make scythes, rakes, hoes and forks should not have free steel as well as the man who makes spades and shovels. Why should not the steel used by agricultural implement makers be allowed to come in free as well as that used by other manufactures? I do not think we should make fish of one and flesh of the other. I do not object to making the raw material free, but I think all should be served alike.

Mr. PLATT. The line of discrimination seems to be drawn between those who ask and those who do not.

Mr. BLAKE. I think that is it. Those who come to this paternal Government and ask their good masters and pastors to do it get it done.

Mr. BOWELL. No; that does not follow. There are many things asked for that are not given. We are not in the habit of making concessions of this kind if the article be made in the country, and in no case are they made when the article can be procured in the country. The general principle referred to by the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Glen) opens up a wide door, and it is perhaps as well that we should not discuss it at this hour of the night, though I have no objection to the hon. gentleman discussing it at any time or at any length. The rule we follow is this: When we find that an industry can be aided, by allowing articles to be imported free which are not made in the country, and cannot by any possibility come into competition with articles made in Canada, we do so, thus carrying out the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite of admitting raw material free of duty.

Mr. GLEN. There is no sheet steel made in Canada at all. It is used for making reaper knives; and why should it come in duty free, when used for spade and shovels, and taxed when used for reaper knives?

Mr. BOWELL. The question is a very proper one, and I may inform the hon. gentleman that that very point, relating to reaper knives, is under the consideration of the Government. Although I cannot promise that a change will be made, I am inclined to agree with him that there is no reason why the same kind of steel that is used for shovels and spades should not also be admitted free when used for the manufacture of reaper knives.

Mr. GLEN. There is no steel fit for tools made in this country at all.

Mr. BLAKE. I think these observations indicate the propriety of the Government considering, as far as practicable, the adoption of some general principle regulating the placing of articles on the free list. The hon. gentleman lays down one rule, which, of course, is a sound one, having regard to the fiscal policy he is endeavoring to carry out, namely, that the article is admitted free when it cannot be manufactured in the country, and when it is the raw material of something that is. Now, I maintain that if you find an article is not manufactured in the country and is the raw material of various manufactures, you ought to admit it for all the various manufactures in the country without limitation, or prescribe the classes of manufactures in which it is to be used.

Mr. BOWELL. I think there is a great deal of force in what the hon. gentleman says, and although this question has been discussed very often by the Minister of Finance and myself, and by the other members of the Government, I shall not forget, when the question next comes up, to bring the point raised by the hon. gentleman before my colleagues for consideration.

Buckram, for the manufacture of hat and bonnet shapes.

Mr. BLAKE. Is buckram used for any other manufacture?

Mr. BOWELL. It is not made in this country. I fancy it is used for a number of things. It comes, I think, in a half finished state, and is then completed by the hat and bonnet makers.

Mr. BLAKE. But there are other articles applied to another part of the person for which buckram is used, and it seems to me that the hon. gentleman ought to be more generous, that he ought to take a more comprehensive view of this question, that he ought to look at it all around, behind and before, above and below, everywhere; and if he did so, he would permit buckram, when used for the manufacture of any article, to be admitted free.

Mr. BOWELL. Well, we will consider it.

Re-covered rubber and rubber substitute.

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. gentleman explain what re-covered rubber is?

Mr. BOWELL. It is the rubber from the old shoes that are thrown away. They are gathered up and imported to a large extent; and as rubber, in its raw state, is admitted free, at the representation of the rubber manufacturers who gather up these shoes from all over the country, as well as import them, it was thought that it should be placed on the free list also. They separate the cotton, or whatever may be attached to the rubber, from it, and it is re-manufactured again into shoes. By some it is called the re-covered rubber, and by others rubber substitute.

Mr. BLAKE. They are, in fact, rubber rags.

Mr. BOWELL. I think you may fairly call them rubber rags.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman found that the use of these rags has improved the manufactured article, and that under his policy we are getting a better article? Because that is not my experience. I really fear that we are wearing rubbers made out of the discarded rubbers, because the truth is, that they wear out in a very few days. One may be very unpatriotic, but I am glad to have the opportunity sometimes to buy rubbers made in other countries. There is no doubt we have a very inferior class of rubbers.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). And much more expensive than they used to be some years ago.

Mr. BOWELL. No, no.

Mr. CAMERON. I beg your pardon. The price has advanced something like 30 per cent. since 1878.

Mr. McLELAN. That is, the advance in rubber.

Mr. CAMERON. The advance in rubber has not been more than 20 per cent. At the same time, the product has very materially deteriorated.

Silver and German silver, in sheets, for manufacturing purposes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What particular manufactures are affected by this?

Mr. BOWELL. It is used largely by the plated-ware manufacturers. It has been on the free list since 1883.

Steel, of No. 20 gauge and thinner, but not thinner than No. 30 gauge, to be used in the manufacture of corset steels, clock springs and shoe shanks, when imported by the manufacturers of such articles for use in their manufactories.

Mr. BOWELL. The same observations apply to this as to the others.

Mr. GLEN. Why not let thinner steel than 30 gauge in free?

Cotton yarns, thinner than No. 40, unbleached, bleached or dyed, and not finer than No. 60, for the manufacture of Italian cloths or fabrics.

Mr. BOWELL. The same remarks apply to this. That is not made by any of our manufacturers; it was necessary they they should have this quality and fineness for the manufacture of this kind of goods, which are now manufactured in different parts of the country.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it a fact that they make no finer cotton yarn than No. 40?

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. BLAKE. What sense is there in putting in a second limitation, unless it be, although we do not make them 40 or 60, we do make them finer than 60, which is hardly likely?

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman says it is not finer than 40. There are coarser qualities made, and then it goes as fine as 60. If you go beyond 60, you come down to the ordinary sewing thread. The finer qualities of sewing thread will be brought under this clause, if it were not confined to these particular numbers.

Steel, in sheets, of not less than 112 or over 18 wire gauge, and costing not less than $75 per ton of 2,240 lbs., when imported by manufacturers of shovels and spades for use exclusively in such manufacture in their own factories.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It appears to me there are a considerable number of other manufacturers engaged in the manufacture of agricultural implements besides shovels and spades, who, on every reasonable principle, should have the benefit of this clause. Why grant a premium to the manufacturer of shovels and spades that is not given to the manufacturer of other implements?

Mr. BOWELL. Making the value at $75 per ton was to confine the importation of that article to that particular kind of steel which is made in this country at the present time, and to encourage these special industries. The hon. gentleman will recollect that a year or two ago we had no duty on steel of any kind. On the Government being assured that these steel works were going into operation, a duty was placed upon this article; but the better class of steel not being made in the country, we have, so far as that is concerned, placed it on the free list, in order to encourage industries.

Red liquor, a crude acetate of alumina, prepared from pyroligneous acid, for dyeing and calico printing.

Mr. BOWELL. The acetate of alumina, a solution of iron, is used exclusively in the dyeing works, particularly to calico printing, and, as the hon. gentleman knows, the policy of the Government has been to place as many dyes as possible upon the free list. These were placed on the free list on 2nd November, 1884. Precious stones have been made free when not imported in the manufactured state, and they have been specially designated, in order that there may be no misunderstanding at the different ports. Bichromate of soda, another article used for manufacturing purposes; indigo auxilliary, is largely used in the different manufactures of the country; fancy grasses were dutiable in the past, when imported in the manufactured or in unmanufactured state, and in order that the manufacturers might have them free, we have put them on the free list. Oil cake is free for feeding purposes, but meal is not, and in many ports there was difficulty in determining whether meal should be admitted under this particular clause or not. To avoid mistake, we included meal. Canadian productions of Canadian artists in oil or water colors. This has been inserted in order that Canadian artists who go abroad to pursue their studies may bring in free the results of their labor in a foreign country. This is the law in the United States, and we have adopted precisely the language of the American tariff.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Although I have no particular objection to the admission of these things, these precious stones and paintings, free of duty, into the country, it seems to me that when the Government taxes flour and coal, this looks very much like giving the people a stone when they ask for bread.

Mr. BOWELL. All these precious stones have been, in the past, on the free list, and are only named now in order that there may be no clashing in the rulings at the different ports. I propose to strike out the first item of bolting cloths, of silk worsted, not made up The bolting cloths are now free, and it was thought advisable to confine it to silk or worsted; but we find, on investigation, that a very fine bolting cloth, of a very fine wire, is made for the use of mills, and it is deemed advisable to allow the item to remain, as it now is, on the free list.

Borax, not ground or otherwise manufactured.

Mr. BOWELL. That I propose to strike out also. Borax is free now and is imported largely by the packers of meat.

Duck, for belting and hose.

Mr. BOWELL. That is now upon the free list. We propose to add the words "when imported by manufacturers of rubber goods for use in their factories." It is now confined to a great extent to that class of manufactures, but it was deemed proper to restrict it to that.

Mineral waters, natural, not in bottle.

Mr. BOWELL. Great difficulties are found to ascertain whether the waters are from the spring or are manufactured or ærated, and it is thought better to confine the free importation to mineral waters when in their natural state. We have now, when they are imported, to calculate the duty upon the bottles, and it is thought better to take the *ad valorem* value of the waters when in bottle.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I rather think that duck for belting and hose is used by others than manufacturers of rubber goods. Is not the hon. gentleman discriminating rather unreasonably against some existing manufactories, by adding the words "when imported by manufacturers of rubber goods?"

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me there is some belting or hose, other than rubber, in which duck is used, and it is giving the preference to those who make that particular kind of belting or hose over others.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; he is quite right. It was on the free list without any restrictions whatever, but it was

deemed advisable to confine it exclusively to this particular industry.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think it is used in threshing machines.

Mr. GLEN. Yes; the grain belt.

Mr. BOWELL. That is after it is manufactured as belting. But it is not used for belting purposes until it has gone through some other process.

Mr. BLAKE. Is not duck manufactured in the country?

Mr. BOWELL. Not this kind of duck, that I am aware of.

Mr. BLAKE. In the various multiplicity of our cotton manufactures they have not gone into this kind of duck?

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. GUNN. Is it not made at Yarmouth?

Mr. BOWELL. No; that is for sail purposes only.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not object to adding restrictions to the free importation, to make more plain the purpose for which the importation free is admitted, but I think we ought to be very careful, if it be the case that belting or hose is manufactured in the country, in which there is not the constituent of rubber, that we do not give the manufacturers of rubber belting or hose an advantage over the other manufacturers of belting or hose.

Mr. GLEN. There is a cotton hose made.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; I have seen it. This is practically discriminating. If there is a cotton hose made and a rubber hose made, and in both cotton duck is the raw material, and you say to one: You shall have your raw material free, and to the other: You shall pay a duty; you are making the law an instrument of injustice.

Mr. BOWELL. But the hose is never used without some other manufacture than that of the cotton itself. There must be some substitute, and there must be the rubber added to it, but this is intended exclusively for use in this particular manufacture, and I do not know that it discriminates against any other class of manufactures, though cotton duck is used for a variety of purposes.

Mr. BLAKE. I have seen hose which appeared to be made of cotton duck, but not to have any rubber in it at all, and it seemed to be a very good kind of hose.

Mr. STAIRS. Is not the hose which the hon. gentleman has seen a woven hose?

Mr. BLAKE. I could not say.

Mr. STAIRS. I think it is a woven hose. I think a pure cotton hose is not made from cotton duck, but is woven into the hose at once.

Mr. PAINT. The hose is made of cotton and fastened with copper nails. It is not woven always—very seldom. The best quality is made with copper nails, clinched.

Mr. BLAKE. I judge there must be something in this, because I suspect it is the manufacturers of rubber goods who have been talking about it a little, perhaps. I know there has been some approach to the hon. gentleman by the manufacturers of rubber goods.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; to a much greater extent than this.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; he has been invited to give them further protection. You can protect them in two ways. You can protect them by higher duties against imports, or you can protect them against the domestic manufacture of another article, by discriminating between them. I do not know that this cotton hose is manufactured here, but I have seen it here, and if it is the case that it is being manufactured here, it is obvious that there would be an unjust discrimination created by the hon. gentleman's proposed addition; and, if not, I fail to see the use of the addition. If the only use of this duck is made by the manufacturers of rubber hose, there can be no harm in leaving the law as it is.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman will see that, from the number of officers and the number of ports in the country, the number of men who have to carry out the law in this particular, they have, in the past, very often admitted duck which was for other purposes than for the manufacture of belting and hose. The law, as it stands now, is "duck for belting and for hose," and we simply confine it to the manufacture of that particular article, when it is used in their factories.

Mr. BLAKE. The whole difficulty will be obviated by making it read "when imported by manufacturers of belting and hose for use in their factories," instead of "manufacturers of rubbers goods."

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will let that pass, I will make a note of it and let him know, on Concurrence, what can be done with it.

Mr. BLAKE. Would it not be possible to allow moulding ploughs to be manufactured to be admitted free?

Mr. BOWELL. They are free. The free list now reads as follows: "Bolting cloths." When that was put upon the free list it was intended to cover only silk or worsted, and after it was upon the free list the question arose as to whether bolting cloth made from this finer wire was free or not. Some of the ports insisted upon collecting a duty, from the fact that it was a manufacture of steel, and when I looked at the law I ruled that it must be admitted free. Then it was deemed advisable to explain it by putting in the words "of silk or worsted," which would have excluded the quality of bolting cloths to which the hon. gentleman refers. I have suggested striking out the item altogether, which would leave all bolting cloths free in the future.

Mr. WATSON. It is not made up for the purpose of making bolting cloths of silk or worsted. I think it would be well that these cloths made up should be admitted free.

Mr. BOWELL. It is imported, not made up, in rolls, and it is largely made into bolting cloths by a factory in the county of Essex, which employs twenty or thirty men. The hon. gentleman's policy would be to allow the article to come in from a foreign country already made up.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. gentleman must be aware that there are many changes made in milling now. Minneapolis is looked upon as the headquarters of improvements in milling, and it often happens that a miller requires to have certain bolting cloths for certain purposes and for a short time. He can have these cloths made up there more suitable than at other places, because they are accustomed to make cloths by a certain process, and it would be much more convenient for the milling people to have them made up there. The making up does not cost a great deal; it will not deprive many people of employment, and it would be much more convenient for the people who use these cloths.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not prepared to go that far.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). The hon. Minister has admitted the impropriety of not discriminating against any manufactures at present in existence in the country, and I would like to ask him whether, in considering the propriety of admitting duck for belting and hose, he has considered the present condition of the belting and hose industries in the country. We are aware that hose of rubber is being largely substituted for hose of leather, but it is not, to the same extent, the case with leather belting. We know

that leather belting is largely manufactured from native hides, the South American hides not being proper for the purpose, and the consequence of giving this discrimination in favor of duck manufactured elsewhere will be, to a certain extent, to substitute in the manufacture the hides imported from elsewhere instead of our own hides, which the farmers now complain are cheap enough.

Mr. BOWELL. I promised the leader of the Opposition that I would look into this matter, and give him, upon Concurrence, the reasons why it was confined to this particular industry; and if there are no good reasons for restricting it, I have no doubt my colleagues will consent to its amendment. Hides are free, for all purposes, and this duck, in the state in which it is brought into the country to be manufactured into belting and hose, is a raw material just as much as hides.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I understood from the Minister of Custom that he was deferring the consideration of some parts of this question until Concurrence, but I did not know that the particular phase of it I have just suggested had been raised. I am well aware that the importation of hides is free, but the Minister of Customs must be aware that the imported hide is not used for the purpose of manufacturing belting; that the Canadian hide is the only one adapted for that purpose, and if these materials are allowed to be admitted free, they must necessarily displace the Canadian leather to a considerable extent and restrict the market for it, and consequently restrict the demand for Canadian hides.

Mr. BOWELL. I am glad the hon. gentleman is carrying his protective principles so far. But if it can be shown that it really interferes with the manufacture of leather belting, there may possibly be a reason for adopting his suggestion. I am not aware that it does come into contact with the article to which he refers.

Mr. BLAKE. With reference to mineral waters not in bottle, I think that some further reason ought to be given than the hon. gentleman has given in this difficulty of valuing the bottle.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say there was a difficulty in valuing the bottle, we know what they cost; but the difficulty is to know whether the water is in its natural state, or whether it has gone through some process of manufacture by being ærated, or acids being injected into it. If it comes in that state it is not natural. Consequently, difficulties have arisen in almost every port; and it was thought just as well that when it comes in bottles it should pay an *ad valorem* duty.

Mr. BLAKE. I fancy there is a large consumption of the natural mineral waters which are consumed, not only for pleasure, but frequently for health; and to increase the price of them, as they do not come into competition with any Canadian industry——

Mr. BOWELL. Oh yes, they do.

Mr. BLAKE. Not natural mineral waters.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; there are natural mineral waters in Canada used in the same way as Apollinaris water.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know whether they are as nice or not; but I am afraid the increased price will cause some inconvenience.

Mr. BOWELL. Not to any appreciable extent, because they now have a duty upon the bottle just in proportion to its value.

Mr. BLAKE. The effect of their paying a duty upon the bottle will be, probably, that the price of the bottle will cost more, and if the natural mineral water is imported in the cask, and then is to be bottled at the consumer's cost, the result is that the price is increased. At present mineral water comes in free and you get the bottle at the foreign price, plus the duty. And so it may be with many of these waters. I presume that with regard to all the sparkling waters it will be impossible to import them at all, except in bottles, and they will have to pay duty because you cannot import them in cask, I fancy, without some degree of loss of their effervescent qualities.

Mr. BOWELL. There are some waters imported in cask which keep well; but with respect to others, I think the hon. gentleman is quite correct.

Mr. BLAKE. What duty will be paid.

Mr. BOWELL. The duty will be 20 per cent.

Pitch pine, packages of not less than 15 gallons.

Mr. BOWELL. Pitch pine comes in in a variety of forms and a variety of shapes—some medicinal, or medicated, and otherwise. It was thought better that these explanations should be added to it, in order to prevent the difficulties which have arisen.

Pumice and pumice stone, ground or unground.

That is another small and apparently insignificant matter, but a great deal of trouble has arisen, because some collectors have decided that when it came in ground it was manufactured, and therefore dutiable, while others decided that it should be admitted free. Thus some of those who imported it were paying duty while others were not. The ruling of the Department has been that pumice and pumice stone in any shape may be brought into the country free. For that reason we have added the words "ground or unground."

Quercitron or oak bark, for tanning.

That is brought in in a variety of ways, and is used for medicinal purposes in some quantity, while the intention was that it should only be imported for tanning purposes. The same remark applies to resin.

Steel railway bars or rails, not including tram or street railway rails.

It has been contended by those who have imported this particular kind of rails for the purpose of constructing street railways that that class was included in the free list of steel rails when imported for railway purposes proper. That has given a great deal of difficulty, although the Department has always ruled that it did not include tram or street rails.

Tar (pine), in packages of not less than 15 gallons.

The same remark applies to this as to resin and pitch, and other articles of that character.

Mr. DAWSON. I suggest, as steel bars have been mentioned, that it would be very desirable that mining machinery, to a certain extent, should also be placed on the free list. It would encourage mining in a new country, and mining machinery such as is now required cannot be obtained in the Dominion: such, for example, as diamond drills.

Mr. BOWELL. They are free now.

Mr. GLEN. Diamond drills are made in Montreal.

Mr. DAWSON. I refer to machinery for dressing and crushing ore, and if that were placed on the free list it would encourage the mining industry.

Mr. BOWELL. Diamond drills are free, when used for prospecting for minerals.

Mr. BLAKE. They were used afterwards in working a mine.

Mr. BOWELL. They are used for boring to ascertain whether the deposits are of sufficient extent to justify working.

Mr. WATSON. They are also used for drilling to blast.

Mr. BOWELL. They were put on the free list two years ago, after the hon. gentleman from Algoma called the attention of the Department to it. It was shown that they were very extensively used in the mining districts of Lake Superior, and they have also been used in my own county for the testing of iron deposits. But they were not used for any other purpose, and they were placed on the free list in order to encourage that industry.

Mr. DAWSON. I do not refer to drills so much as to other machinery, the admission of which, duty free, would encourage a new industry, struggling at present under very great difficulties.

Mr. BOWELL. There is much difficulty in determining what is mining machinery. The question has come very frequently before my Department, and scarcely a month passes that we do not get applications of this kind. The applicants state that stamp mills, for example, cannot be made here. Yet they have been made in my own town. Then they say that a rolling mill and an engine cannot be made here; in fact, everything they desire to import, they state cannot be made in the country. I have not been able to learn what machinery there is, that is used for mining purposes that cannot be made in the country.

Mr. DAWSON. I will mention one class: No suitable machinery for cleansing crushed ores is made in this country.

Mr. BLAKE. No doubt the hon. gentleman's applications are not confined to mining machinery, for everyone wants to get the article where it can be obtained cheapest.

Mr. DAWSON. I think this is in the interest of the country. If such machines were once introduced and mining began to grow, there would be a demand for them in the country, and they would be produced here. They would be manufactured in the country if once the enterprise was placed in operation. It is not in the way of begging anything that I speak, but simply to encourage the mining industry.

Mr. BAKER. I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), that machinery for mining purposes should be admitted free. Coming, as I do, from a mining district, I think it would be very desirable, in the interest of my district, that machinery which is not made in the country should be admitted duty free, so as to encourage the mining interest. As regards diamond drills, they are supposed to be admitted free for prospecting purposes, but it is exceedingly difficult to discriminate exactly between prospecting and actual mining. Another peculiarity that has struck me is, that a diamond drill, with all appurtenances belonging, is admitted free for prospecting purposes; but if some little piece of machinery connected with the drill gives way, you have to pay duty on that article to replace it, and in British Columbia the people are at a considerable disadvantage in that regard.

Committee rose and reported progress.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. I have received a message, to the effect that further intelligence has been received from the North-West since the statement made by the First Minister at 8 o'clock, and I think it would be well, as we are not going to meet until Monday, if there is any further intelligence, that it should be communicated.

Mr. CARON. The information which has been conveyed to the House by the leader of the Government is all the information which has been received, except telegrams stating that the instructions which had been sent to the various corps to be ready have been carried out and that they are now moving; and the instructions with regard to the conveyance of troops have been carried out.

Mr. BLAKE. There is no more information from the North-West? May I ask whether we may have an intimation now as to all the forces which are in motion, or are likely soon to be put in motion. We had a statement from the First Minister yesterday of the forces, and to-day we have a statement with reference to batteries "A" and "B." Are there any additional forces ordered to be moved?

Mr. CARON. Under the instructions so far given 100 men from "A" Battery, now stationed in Quebec, and 100 men from "B" Battery, stationed in Kingston, have been ordered to move immediately, and will be conveyed over the Canadian Pacific Railway north of Lake Superior to Winnipeg, where the troops will be under the immediate command of Major Middleton, who is now at Winnipeg. Since the telegram which has been communicated to the House was received, orders have been given for 500 men, composed of 250 from the Queen's Own, in Toronto, and 250 belonging to the 10th Royals, to be in immediate readiness for active service; also 85 men out of the "C" School of Infantry, under the command of Colonel Otter, to be also ready for immediate service. This will be 585 men who are to be placed under the command of Colonel Otter and to be in immediate readiness for transport to Winnipeg *en route* for Qu'Appelle and Fort Carlton. These are the only troops so far ordered to be in readiness for active service.

Mr. BLAKE. Has anything been done with reference to the despatching of additional troops of the volunteers within Manitoba?

Mr. CARON. Orders were given two days ago for the 90th Battalion, and a half battery stationed at Winnipeg, to proceed to Qu'Appelle, and the orders have been carried out, in so far as that yesterday 100 men belonging to the 90th Battalion left Winnipeg for Qu'Appelle, and the balance, about 200 men more, left this morning for Qu'Appelle.

Mr. BLAKE. And the batteries?

Mr. CARON. The 200 men will be composed of the half battery and the balance of the 90th Battalion.

Mr. BLAKE. That will be 300 men, comprising the half battery from Winnipeg.

Mr. CARON. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Is there any proposal to obtain any further military assistance from the volunteer force in the North-West than that?

Mr. CARON. It is the intention to organise a mounted corps, composed of men who furnish their own horses, saddlery and arms—men who are thoroughly accustomed to that country, who are accustomed to riding, and who have about the best arms that can be furnished in the country.

Mr. BLAKE. From various parts of the Province?

Mr. CARON. Yes. The corps which it is intended to organise is to be organised under the command of Captain Stewart, who was in command of the Princess Louise troop of cavalry. He is a very good officer and he is thoroughly accustomed to the country, having lived there for two or three years. He has submitted to the Government a scheme which I will be happy to bring down, and which, to my mind, proposes the very best corps that could be organised under the circumstances.

Mr. BLAKE. About what size.

Mr. CARON. It will be composed of between 150 and 200 mounted men; and of course the hon. gentleman will understand the great difficulty in that country, owing to the great distance, is the question of transport, and a

mounted corps naturally would be more likely than any other to render the service which is required of an armed force.

Mr. BLAKE. I might suggest, Sir, as we are separating for a considerable time, that I think it would be satisfactory if such authentic information as the Government may receive, and as they think may be communicated without injury to the public interest, should be made accessible to us here to-morrow, and at an early period on succeeding days, until we meet again. I need hardly say that we are in great anxiety, and desire to know, as soon as we can, what the actual state of things is.

Mr. CARON. I have no doubt, from what the leader of the Government has stated, that he will be happy to communicate to the leader of the Opposition any telegrams he may receive——

Mr. BLAKE. I do not ask for myself, particularly.

Mr. CARON. They may be communicated to the leader, of the Opposition, and thus to all members on that side, and means will be taken to communicate the same information to our friends who sit behind us.

Mr. BOWELL. I may add that I have been informed since the House rose, that the distance between the two ends of the road which the men have to traverse is only some 40 or 45 miles, which is much more satisfactory than that the distance was 60 or 70 miles, as was intimated before.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask the Minister of Militia if he has made any arrangements to furnish arms and accoutrements for companies that are got up in the North-West. As he is well aware, applications have been made in years past for accoutrements for companies formed in that Province, and he has stated that these applications would receive consideration. Now that trouble has arisen in that country, I hope he will see the necessity of making some arrangement of this kind, for companies that may be formed.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman will understand that the discretion of the Government must be exercised so far as giving arms to any troop that might be organised, but I can tell the hon. gentleman that the Government are perfectly alive to the necessities of the moment and that arms have been forwarded. We had already a large number of stands of arms at Winnipeg and we have supplemented them by forwarding a larger supply still; and any troop—any organisation approved by the Government, will be provided with arms and accoutrements.

Mr. WATSON. I understand that was the promise made to any of those wishing guns; but the arms have been kept stored in Winnipeg. I did not wish for a moment to convey the idea that anyone who applied for arms would receive them. I have been informed that, last summer, this same Louis Riel, who is now raising a disturbance in the North-West, sent an order for a stand of arms to a Winnipeg firm, to be shipped to Qu'Appelle, and that the Government intercepted them. If that was the case, they must have known at that time that there was danger to be apprehended from this man. If Portage la Prairie, and Brandon, and the other places that have repeatedly petitioned to have companies formed, had been granted their request, they would be of great service at present, instead of our having to withdraw volunteers from Toronto and Montreal.

Mr. CARON. I am not aware of any interception of arms having been made by the Government last summer, in the way the hon. gentleman states.

Mr. BLAKE. I trust that on Monday, without fail, we shall have on the Table of the House all the papers that can be laid on the Table with reference to past events, in connection with this matter, and any reports made in the course of last year by any of the officials of the Government bearing on the matter—Mr. Dewdney's report, the report of Colonel Houghton, who was charged, I believe, with the duty of picking up arms in the neighborhood of this disturbance, and the report of Mr. Stephenson, with reference to the settlers on the lands of colonisation companies. Now, I am not giving a list; I am only mentioning three or four reports which have been probably received; but I have no doubt that in the discharge of their duty in the North-West, the officers of the Government, and in the discharge of their duty at Ottawa, the Government, have had numerous communications of what was going on, and I think these papers should come before us without any delay.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12:45 a. m., Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 30th March, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST—INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I am about to submit a motion which I am sure will meet with the concurrence of the House, and will be accepted without the ordinary notice. I beg to move:

That the accountant be authorised to pay, on their departure from Ottawa, the full sessional indemnity to such members of the House as have volunteered for service in the North-West, and whose services have been accepted.

Mr. BLAKE. I have no doubt this motion would be unanimously adopted by the House, but I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that we cannot legally authorise the accountant to do this. We have for some time past adopted the proper course of inserting the amounts required in such cases in the estimates, and no doubt the Finance Minister will in the supplementary estimates bring down a sum sufficient to answer this amount.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The amount will be put in the estimates.

Mr. BLAKE. The sum is not voted. It is a statutory payment.

Mr. SPEAKER. Shall this motion be adopted?

Mr. BLAKE. I have already pointed out that we have no authority under the law to give this authority to the accountant. The sum paid is paid under a Statute passed by Parliament, and that Statute cannot be altered by a resolution. The result is that it must be by the estimates that this additional sum will be paid. For the last three years, I think, such sums have been put in the supplementary estimates. If the hon. gentleman inserts a recommendation it would be another thing. I have no doubt, as I said, that the principle of the motion will be unanimously accepted by the House, and that the House will invite the Finance Minister to insert the necessary sum.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would suggest to my hon. friend, in order to meet the technical objection which has been raised, that his motion should run in this way:

That, in the opinion of this House, the full amount of indemnity to such members of the House as have volunteered for service in the North-West, and whose services have been accepted, should be paid upon their departure from Ottawa.

Mr. WHITE. I will suggest that it should read "who have or may."

Motion agreed to in the following form:

That, in the opinion of this House, the full sessional indemnity of such members of this House as have volunteered or may volunteer for service in the North-West, and whose services have been or may be accepted, should be paid upon their departure from Ottawa.

INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS.

Mr. FARROW moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 116) to amend the Members' Indemnity Act. He said: This Bill is not to increase the indemnity, but to regulate it. The law is such now that if a member falls sick in Ottawa and abides there, he is paid his sessional allowance, but if he chooses to go home and have his own doctor, and be attended to by his own people, he loses so much per day—$8 per day. Now I am convinced that both sides of the House, so far as I have ascertained, are against that arrangement. The idea is that if a member is in Ottawa or out of Ottawa he should receive his indemnity. My Bill further provides that if a member is sick himself, or his family is sick—his family to be interpreted as meaning his wife or his children—if he is called away to attend to these, and makes a declaration at the end of the Session that he was lawfully detained, in such cases he is to be paid. This amendment is not to apply to this Parliament.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST—PRIVILEGE.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire for the first time since I have been in Parliament, to refer to a newspaper article. I read an article from the Daily *Spectator* of Hamilton, of March 27th, 1885:

"The trouble in the North-West is not so serious as the Grits, the people of St. Paul and other enemies of Canada wish people to think. It has, however, one very serious aspect. The half-breeds of the North-West are not the promoters or the originators of this little rebellion. They are an easy going, contented people; they have no desire to shoot anybody; and they have not the means to shoot anybody unless provided with the means. There were not a dozen rifles among them all, and they had not the money to buy rifles. Especially there were no *Remington* rifles in the country. Now where came these arms? The seriousness of the affair centres in that question. The great majority of the half-breeds were in Manitoba in 1870. They had their share of the half-breed lands there, sold out, and moved farther inland. Somebody has been moving them to ask for more land; somebody has been inciting them to discontent; somebody has got Riel over to further excite them; somebody has supplied them with rifles—Remington rifles—from the United States. The Grits of Ontario sympathise with the half-breeds. They try to make the most of the little outbreak. They think they can make political capital out of it. They were informed of the affair before anybody else knew anything about it. It is not unreasonable to suppose that those who sympathise with the half-breeds, those who have encouraged the half-breeds, those who are trying to turn the rising of the half-breeds to political use are the persons who have incited the rising and supplied the arms. The police will have no difficulty in suppressing the outbreak. We trust the simple, misguided half-breeds will be lightly punished. But it will be the duty of the Government to probe this affair to the bottom. The conspirators who have organised and inspired the movement and supplied the arms must be ferreted out. They deserve very serious punishment."

Sir, if this paper referred to myself alone I should have followed my invariable custom of not bringing a newspaper article before Parliament and the country. But it refers to the whole Reform party of the Province of Ontario; it refers to a party of as loyal men, as devoted Canadians as any set of men that are to be found in wide Canada, and I say that this article is a gross, and atrocious, a malignant insult. I say that no man ever perpetrated a fouler calumny against fellow countrymen than those who perpetrated this monstrous slander—false to their own knowledge. For my own individual part, my cousin's blood already stains the snows of the North-West, and my nephew is on the train to-day on his way to the front. Six men have been taken out of our own office for service in the North-West, and my own son and my brother's son have offered their services. I cannot control myself when I think that a newspaper, reported to be decent and an organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, should dare to say such things as I have just now read.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All I can say is that the newspaper is responsible for its own statement. I can only say that I totally disagree with the spirit of the article, and that I quite sympathise with the hon. gentleman in the indignation with which he has repudiated the charge.

DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST—INFORMATION.

Mr. BLAKE. I call upon the hon. gentleman for any further statements he has to make with reference to that unhappy affair.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no further intelligence of any kind since the last explanations were made in the House. The militia and military men are moving on from Ontario westward. Of course, the House can well understand that a great deal of uneasiness exists in the North-West in the partially settled districts as to what will be the result in their own immediate vicinity. A great deal of apprehension exists in the vicinity of Calgary from their having no force there. There is fear that they may be involved in trouble with the Indians in their vicinity, who are in an excited state and may be troublesome; but that is all. There has not been any additional rising in any portions of the country since Friday. There is one exception, however, which I nearly forgot. A telegram has arrived that an Indian well known as troublesome, Poundmaker, and Little Pine, also a troublesome Indian, have donned their war paint not far from Battleford and have some men with them.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has not given any information with reference to the alleged evacuation of Fort Carlton, nor a statement of the circumstances under which the disastrous collision took place there.

Mr. CARON. I communicated to the hon. gentleman the last telegram——

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, quite so.

Mr. CARON—which was received on that subject. Nothing has been received since, throwing any further light upon the event which has taken place, in addition to what I communicated to the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. BLAKE. I consider it my duty to invite the hon. gentleman to state to Parliament such facts with respect to the North-West disturbances as he may have in his possession.

Mr. CARON. The telegram which was received last evening or late yesterday afternoon conveyed the intelligence that Fort Carlton had been abandoned, and that Col. Irvine, who was in command, had moved from Fort Carlton to Prince Albert. The telegram also stated that the fort had been burnt down. That fort I believe, so far as defensive purposes are concerned, was not very valuable, and it was considered advisable by Col. Irvine to move his force from that Fort to Prince Albert, after the abandonment and after the fort was burnt down. The information does not say whether by accident or intentionally, or by whom.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hastings). I take occasion to ask the hon. gentleman whether the mounted police and "A" and "B" Batteries have been provided with gatling guns. Those guns have been found very valuable in the Egyptian war; and as they will fire 100 shots in a few minutes, they would be found, I think, very valuable in the North-West.

Mr. CARON. In answer to the hon. gentleman, I may say that gatling guns have been ordered. I think every

possible precaution has been taken so far as regards arming the troops and forwarding them as rapidly as possible to where they are required. I do not consider it advisable to indicate more explicitly the movements of the troops and what measures have been taken to provide them with arms and ammunition.

Mr. BLAKE. I was about to make some enquiries of the hon. gentleman as to the movements of the troops and as to arms and ammunition, because we have statements made in the newspapers upon that subject; and it seems to be somewhat difficult to understand how it would be inexpedient, when such reports are published, that we should know what the facts are. But I entirely recognise the measure of the responsibility of the Administration in an emergency of this kind, and at all events to-day I shall not press, after what the hon gentleman has said, for any answer, although my own judgment does not permit me to see where difficulty would arise in answering some of the questions which the hon. gentleman has excluded from consideration by his reply. But there is certainly a statement which I think ought to be made by the Minister, and which should have been made without its being asked for. Between 12 and 1 o'clock on Saturday morning announcements were made by the Government as to the number of the troops and the quarters from which the troops were ordered for service. Since that time it is everybody's news that more troops have been ordered out. Surely there can be no inconvenience in stating at all events what more troops have been ordered out.

Mr. CARON. I may state, in answer to the hon. gentleman's enquires, that a detachment of 100 men belonging to "B" Battery and a detachment of 100 men belonging to "A" Battery have been ordered. Also 85 men belonging to the "C" Infantry School stationed at Toronto; also 250 men belonging to the second battalion of the "Queen's Own," and 250 men belonging to the "10th Royals" of Toronto. The formation of a provisional battalion has been authorised, to be commanded by Lieut.-Col. Williams, one of our colleagues in this House.

Mr. BLAKE. Of what strength?

Mr. CARON. About 340 men. The 35th Battalion has also been called out for service, under the command of Lieut.-Col. O'Brien, another member of this House, and Lieut.-Col. Tyrwhitt, another member of this House, goes as Major in the same battalion.

Mr. BLAKE. Of what strength?

Mr. CARON. A total strength of 360 men. Capt. Todd has been authorised to organise a company, composed of crack shots, sharpshooters, to move forward immediately. The company will comprise 43 men. This makes the total force, including officers, of 1,514 men. These are the orders which have been given in so far as troops coming from the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec are concerned. It has also been deemed advisable to authorise the formation of the following corps in the North-West and Manitoba: Lieut.-Col. Scott is authorised to organise a company at Regina, 40 men. Col. Wood, is authorised to organise a company at Birtle. Lieut.-Col. Osborne Smith is authorised to organise 8 companies, 336 men. Capt. Stewart, as I have had occasion to state to the House, has been authorised to organise a corps of mounted rangers in the North-West; one company at Calgary, about 42 men; Lieut.-Col. Boulton, one mounted corps, 60 men; Lieut.-Col. Gisbourne, one company at Battleford, 40 men; and Lieut.-Col. Horton has been authorised to organise a body of twelve cavalry scouts who have been much needed and who will no doubt prove very useful in that country. Lieut.-Col. Scott, who is also a member of this House, is organising a battalion composed of six companies, which will give about 253 men. Major General Strange is authorised to organise a mounted corps, the strength of which I have not yet heard. In giving the battalions ordered for actual service I omitted to state that the 65th Battalion, commanded by my friend and colleague, Lieut.-Col. Ouimet, has been ordered to keep itself in readiness.

Mr. BLAKE. What strength?

Mr. CARON. I cannot exactly say, as the return is not in; but I should fancy between 300 and 350 men. The last muster of the battalion in Montreal showed about 350 men as efficient. I should fancy that would be about the number that would go to the front.

Mr. GAULT. What kind of arms will our men have who go to the front? I understand that the rebels are supplied with the best Winchester and Remington repeating rifles, whereas our men are going up there with the old Sniders. I was at the drill hall in Montreal on Satnrday night, and I may say that you can get 2,000 men there prepared to go to the North-West whenever they are ordered. I hope that the Militia Department here will see that our men are armed with proper rifles—rifles that will earry eleven or twelve hundred yards, and none of these short range guns, because all will depend on the use of long range arms.

Mr. CARON. In answer to the hon. gentleman I may say that we have furnished very good arms to the force we are now sending up, and we will continue to serve out to them the very best arms that can be procured, considering the short notice at which we were called upon.

Mr. BLAKE. I may say that though I may differ in judgment from hon. gentlemen I shall not to-day make any remark or draw any inference from the public documents which I have beside me as to the character of the arms. I shall only say that I hold hon. gentlemen personally as well as politically responsible, if, at whatever expense it may cost, the force that may go to the North-West are not supplied with the very best arms that it is possible to procure. I maintain that no matter what the condition of things, no matter what it may cost, no matter what express trains you may require to take them, no matter through what territory they may require to go, it would be nothing less than murder to send them up with anything but the best arms.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I wish to remark for the information of hon. gentlemen who may not be practically acquainted with the subject, that I do not believe that there is practically a better rifle than the Snider-Enfield. I am perfectly satisfied in my own mind that that is the case, and to-day many military men think that for all practical purposes, for all general purposes, it is equal to the Martini. It is an unsettled point whether there is a better rifle than it, but I am perfectly satisfied that it is as good an arm as we could put in the hands of our men.

Mr. GAULT. There is a gentleman at Medicine Hat whom I know very well—Thomas Tweed—who has gathered a company of 100 men. He was on the Red River expedition, and is a smart, active man, and I hope and trust the Government will give him sufficient arms to arm the people around him with the best arms they have.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman opposite did not exercise a wise discretion in making the personal attack on the Government which he has just made—saying that he would hold them personally and politically responsible. What right has he to hold us personally and politically responsible? It is mere impudence on the part of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAKE. What I said was that if the Government did not at whatever expense and cost provide the volunteers that are going to the North-West with arms of the very best quality I would hold them politically and personally respon-

sible, and as one who has relatives and near friends who are going there I will hold them personally and politically responsible, whether the hon. gentleman regards it as impudence or not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mine ancient pistol spoke very brave words at the bridge, and the hon. gentleman opposite speaks very brave words at the bridge. Let him volunteer himself and go to the front; let him take his rifle.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to enquire, Sir, whether proper steps have been taken to supply those in the North-West who are going forward, and those who are going up to the North-West, with specially warm clothing and proper footing to carry them through their marches?

Mr. CARON. I have already stated that every possible measure has been taken by the Department to give every possible comfort, and to provide the troops that are going up with everything necessary to enable them to go through a long voyage and to withstand the climate of that country.

Mr. CASEY. If I am correctly informed, and I think the information came from the hon. gentleman himself a year or two ago in the course of a debate, a considerable number of Martini-Henry's are in store in this country, brought over for the purpose of rifle shooting. I remember urging on him several times to have these arms brought out, and I understood that they procured some.

Mr. CARON. We have, and we have issued some to the men and will issue them.

Mr. BLAKE. I see it is stated that the Military Secretary of the Governor General has proceeded to the North-West. I desire to enquire whether he is under the instructions of the Government, and in what capacity he goes?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Lord Melgund has volunteered to go up and put himself under the orders of the Major General. He will take his orders from the Major General, and will be employed as the Major General thinks most useful.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to enquire whether the commission which was spoken of the other day, has issued?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot say it has, but I think it has.

Mr. BLAKE. When are the commissioners expected to start on their journey?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Next Thursday.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to enquire whether the hon. gentleman proposes, in conformity with the understanding arrived at on Friday, to lay any papers or information upon the Table with reference to the points which were involved in the subject of a formal discussion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To what points does the hon. gentleman refer.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry these things passed from the hon. gentleman's memory so early. I pointed out on Thursday that there had been long standing questions with reference to the half-breed claims in connection with the lands upon which they have settled, and also claims to be placed in the same position as the Manitoba half-breeds. I asked that we should have information, all reports, all papers, all dates, showing what the action of the Government has been since they had taken office with reference to these claims. I do not speak of each one in detail, but the general results. The hon. gentleman stated that these claims had now been adjusted—I refer to the settlement claims—except somewhere about fifty, which fifty were to be the subject of investigation by the commission; but we had no dates as to the period of adjustment and their communication to the population; no material at all as to the process of adjustment. So it was pointed out with reference to the surveys, that there had been surveys on the rectangular plan. But there were no papers with reference to that brought down. So with reference to the question as to their being placed on the same footing as the Manitoba half-breeds, and the decision of the Government, which was alluded to in the one report, as a subject involving consideration, and other information and dates upon that point. I also mentioned the published report that Riel had been invited into the country last summer, that he had answered the invitation and had come there; and I assumed that reports had been sent to the Government on that subject. As to the state of the country I assumed also that the Government, having public means of information had requested information, and that they obtained it. Papers on that point would be interesting too. The Government also gave certain orders that Fort Carlton was to be occupied, they withdrew arms from the forces at Duck Lake and that they obtained—as appears from the annual report of Col. Houghton—information from him with reference to their division in the country. These reports as to matters taking place during the course of last summer would be important in order that we might see what the condition of things has been in the country for the past few months. There have been, if I am rightly informed, reports from others, among them from Mr. Stephenson. I presume there is also a report from Mr. Burgess, after his return from the North-West, as I perceive that he was interviewed, as is the modern phrase, and gave some information on that country. I dare say that Mr. Schmidt, the Government employé who was chairman of one of the first meetings attended by Riel, may have supplied reports. I have no doubt there are also some reports from Mr. Dewdney, the Lieutenant-Governor, and I should think there would be some from the late Dominion Lands Commissioner, and from Mr. Pearce. I have been told that there was a letter from Colonel Strange, giving his opinion of the condition of things last fall; I received a communication to that effect a moment ago. Then the North-West corps and companies, I think, were disbanded by order of the 13th of September last, or thereabouts. The reports and orders upon which these North-West corps and companies were disbanded would also be interesting.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The papers connected with the half-breeds, and their claims in relation to the surveys, which I had forgotten that the hon. gentleman had particularly referred to, are now in course of preparation.

Mr. IVES. It strikes me that it is barely possible for us to give this matter just a little too much prominence. Of course, I would not for a moment belittle the gravity or the importance of the situation in the North-West. But it seems to me that if the people of this country should spend as large a proportion of their time in discussing this matter as we are in this House, it would be a very serious thing for the Dominion. Now, we should not forget that with our neighbors in the United States, a difficulty on the frontier and the loss of ten or a dozen lives is, I won't say of daily, but certainly of monthly occurrence, and it does not create as much excitement there as it does here. It does seem to me that while the Government should take every means to quell the uprising, Parliament, by devoting so much of its time and giving so much prominence to the matter, may impress the world, and intending immigrants particularly, with a false idea of the position of matters in the North-West. I know, as a matter of fact,

that the state of things in the North-West is now being used in St. Paul and by the landed interests of the Northern Pacific Railway as a reason to persuade people that they should not go further than St. Paul, and that immigrants intending to go to Manitoba and the North-West should stop on their side of the boundary. Reports are circulated that the whole country is in a condition of war, and that life and property are in danger north of the boundary line. We are certainly giving some countenance to that by our discussions. I think we should leave the matter in the hands of those who are responsible to the country, and should go on with our business as if it was not a matter of life and death to the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. BLAKE. It is a matter of life and death to a good many people.

Mr. CARON. With reference to what the hon. gentleman has said about the companies which were disbanded in the North-West, I wish to state that they were disbanded in consequence of the disorganised state in which they were. Colonel Houghton was sent up as usual to hold his inspection of the various companies, whose names appeared on this paper, and he found that these companies were completely disorganised. We did not treat them differently from any other companies in any other district. When any companies become disorganised, the invariable practice of the Department is to call in the arms and put them in a place of safety.

Mr. WATSON. I believe those companies were organised and drilled for years; and they disorganised themselves simply because they could get no uniforms. All that they were furnished with was a common saddle, I believe, and a carbine rifle; and they could not get uniforms or places to drill in with their horses. This was the reason they were disorganised. I am surprised to hear any member of this House get up and make such remarks as those which have fallen from the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives). He evidently looks at the matter like a speculator in that country, as some other members of this House are.

Mr. IVES. I am not as much a speculator in that country as you are.

Mr. WATSON. There are people in the country surrounded by thousands of Indians, as the hon. gentleman knows—Indians that I believe the Government is preparing to guard the people against now. I believe the Government is perfectly right in sending a large force of men into the country. It is better to discuss the matter in this House than to have more bloodshed, and I am surprised at any hon. member getting up and speaking in the way the hon. gentleman has done.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the Alberta and Athabaska Railway Company.—(Mr. Williams.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 114) to comprise in one Act a limitation of the share and loan capital of the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. Kilvert.)

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—CONSTRUCTION TO INDIAN TOWN.

Mr. WELDON asked, What amount has been paid on account of the construction of the Intercolonial Railway to Indian Town? What was the cost of survey, and does such cost include costs of surveys prior to 1884.

Mr. IVES.

Mr. POPE. The amount paid on account of construction is $33,981.65. Cost of surveys prior to 1884, $1,884. No expenditure made on surveys in 1884.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—COST OF EQUIPMENT.

Mr. BLAKE asked, What is the cost of the existing equipment of the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. POPE. $5,627,719.

POST OFFICE AT "LES FONDS."

Mr. RINFRET asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to establish a post office at a place called "Les Fonds," in the Parish of St. Antoine, county of Lotbinière?

Mr. CARLING. It has been decided to establish a post office at the place mentioned.

PORT MOODY DOCK, BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. CASEY asked, Have tenders been called for or received, or has a contract been let for the renewal or repair of dock at Port Moody, British Columbia, reported by engineer to be gravely injured by borers in 1883? If so, at what date? What precautions is it intended to take to prevent fresh injury by borers? What material is to be used in renewals or repairs?

Mr. POPE. Tenders have been called for, but no tenders have been received and consequently no contract has been let. About a month ago they were called for, as near as I can remember. As to the precautions taken, it is designed to have iron and concrete below high water.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—EASTERN DIVISION—EARNINGS AND EXPENSES.

Mr. BLAKE asked, What were the earnings and working expenses of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Eastern Division, for the year 1884?

Mr. POPE. I have not the information. If the hon. gentleman moves for it in the ordinary way, I will send to the Railway Department for it.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—WESTERN DIVISION—EARNINGS AND EXPENSES.

Mr. BLAKE asked, What were the earnings and working expenses of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Western Division, for the year 1884?

Mr. POPE. Same answer.

QU'APPELLE VALLEY FARMING COMPANY.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the Qu'Appelle Valley Farming Company has applied for a change in their agreement with the Government and whether any change has been made therein?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, they have applied for a change in their agreement, and a change has been made. I will bring down the particulars.

MAIL TRAINS—GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex) moved:

For a return showing the date of departure from Toronto and arrival at Brockville of all trains on the Grand Trunk Railway carrying Her Majesty's mails from the 1st February to the 30th of April, in the years 1881, 1882, 1883, 1884, and in the present year up to the date of the return; also, the date of departure from Brockville and arrival at Ottawa of all similar trains on that portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway between the two points last named during the same periods of time.

He said: My purpose in submitting this motion is to draw the attention of hon. members to the very serious delay that

has occurred recently or during the Session of the House in delivering the mails over that section of the Grand Trunk Railway west of Toronto and the intermediate points east of Toronto on the same line of railway. What the reason for that delay may be other than the severity of the season I am not prepared to say, but one fact is known to all the members of the House, and that is that the section of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Brockville to Ottawa has lengthened materially the time during which trains travel over it, from what it was in previous years. I am not in any way disposed to censure any railroad for delays over which it can have no control, and necessarily these must be very serious in the winter season, but I think this House owes it to itself and owes it to the country that the valuable franchises that have been conferred by it on the different railway systems of the country should secure to the people in return all reasonable mail facilities. If the recent opening of the Ontario and Quebec section of the Canadian Pacific Railway has led to these delays or has been a material factor in producing the delays in the mails, I think this House should know it. My motive is to bring to the attention of the House and the country the fact that these delays are occurring. I am sure hon. gentlemen must have found it a matter of serious inconvenience to maintain that correspondence with their own localities which is a necessity with many of them, at all events, who have to leave their business for such a length of time as they are compelled to leave it; and, if their convenience could be aided in any way by an intimation to any of these companies which are responsible that the House looks to them to facilitate the carrying of the mails as much as possible, my object will have been accomplished.

Mr. CASEY. I hope the hon. gentleman will add to his resolution an enquiry into the date of departure of trains from Ottawa and their arrival at Brockville, as I think that is quite as important as the other. I move that those words be added. I think the delay of mails coming eastward has certainly been scandalous on this section of the road. I think also that the alteration of the date at which the mail train leaves Ottawa to connect with the Grand Trunk is a very serious and totally unnecessary inconvenience to those who have to send mails by this road. We all remember that the mail train for Brockville used to leave at about 11 o'clock at night, and you could mail letters for it up to 10 o'clock. That train now leaves here at about 8.30, losing thereby at least two and a half hours, during which you might write letters to go by that train. It makes comparatively little difference to those of us who live west of Toronto, because we can send our letters at the later hour by the Canadian Pacific Railway itself, but to those who wish to correspond with Toronto or points east along the Grand Trunk, it must be a serious inconvenince. I urge as strongly as possible upon the Postmaster-General that his Department has some responsibility in regard to this matter. The Department should have the power, if it has not—I believe it has under existing laws, but, if not, it should be given the power—to see that mail trains are not wantonly changed in their hours and that the hours of the departure of mails are not wantonly made inconvenient to the public, especially that the public are not inconvenienced in the interests of the railway company itself. It is clear in this case that the train is not necessarily changed to the earlier hour, because it has up to this year made connections with the Grand Trunk, starting at a later hour, and there is no doubt that it could do so still. It is therefore for some other reason, for the convenience of the company itself only, that the hour for the departure of the mail has been changed. I understand that the mail and passenger cars are attached to a local way train, which stops and shunts at all the stations between Ottawa and Brockville. The reason is not far to seek. It is easy to see that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company wish to divert traffic from the Grand Trunk route to their own route between here and Toronto, and it is quite natural that they should wish to take any means at their disposal, the means in this case being to make it inconvenient for the public either to go or to send letters by the Brockville route. I contend that, in this case, where the railway company in question is practically a Government institution, when it has received all the cost of all its lines almost from the Government, at all events the vast majority of the price, as some think a good deal more, it should be compelled, as far as the laws put it in the power of the Government to compel it to yield to the convenience of the public even at some inconvenience to itself. I have pointed out that there is nothing impracticable in keeping that train at the old hour, nothing impracticable in acting for the public convenience in this matter, and probably no loss to the company would be involved in coming back to the old hours, except that they would have to give up this means of annoying the Grand Trunk and preventing traffic going by that road. I think they should be forced to give that up if the law allows it to be done. Whether the law empowers the Government to do this or not, the influence of the Government over this company ought to be such that they should be able to secure this beneficial change. I hope the Government will carry this out, and that the Postmaster General and his colleagues will see that the matter is remedied.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I would suggest to my hon. friend who has moved this resolution that he should ask for the date and the hour, because it is evident that the date only means the day of the month, and what we want to ascertain is the hour as well as the day of the month. In reference to the remarks of my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey), I am informed—I don't know if I am correctly informed or not—that the mails for the west are still sent by the Grand Trunk line and not by the Ontario and Quebec. If that is not so, I shall be glad to hear from the Postmaster General. It is clear that the new and shorter line, the Ontario and Quebec, should be used for the conveyance of mails. It is used almost exclusively for the conveyance of passengers, and I think the mails ought certainly to go by the shortest, the most direct, and the most reliable road, which it certainly is. In my experience, the Ontario and Quebec train is almost invariably sharp on time in arriving at Toronto and in arriving here, and the Grand Trunk is almost invariably from one to four or five hours late.

Mr. CASEY. I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member that mails for points west of Toronto should be sent by the Ontario and Quebec, which is the shortest route. I wished to call the attention of the Department to that matter and will do so officially by letter. I think that the through mails should go by the Ontario and Quebec since that route is the shortest. It would also be a great convenience to our part of the country, if a mail clerk were put upon that train. I do not like to suggest anything that involves extra expense, but I am informed that there is no mail clerk on the Canadian Pacific coming down by the night train, so that letters have to go to the Toronto post office to be sorted, and therefore they lose connection westward by the Credit Valley to St. Thomas, and all other places for which that is the distributing point.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to notice a remark made by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) in which he assumed that the fault lies with the Canadian Pacific, he takes that for granted. He forgets that there are some people in this House who know a little about that as well as himself. If he watched the arrivals and departures of the Grand Trunk, as I have, he would find that nine times out of ten they are behind time; indeed, so general is their delay that nobody expects them to arrive at the advertised hour. With regard to what he said as to the Canadian Pacific

making some changes for their own purposes, I am not going to say whether they did or did not; I know nothing about it; but if the hon. gentleman makes that statement on information I would like to ask him where he got his information. Did he get it from the Canadian Pacific or the Grand Trunk? Perhaps he got it from the Grand Trunk. Now, Sir, there are two sides to that question. The fact of the matter is the delays on the Grand Trunk have a great deal to do with the delay of the mails. With regard to the time that is taken to go from here to Brockville, it is quite clear the Canadian Pacific, with the great through connection they have established to the satisfaction and comfort of the whole travelling community of this country, have a right to make such arrangements as will best suit their own convenience. True it is that the Postmaster General should endeavor to utilise the speediest, the best and safest line, and I think if he has not employed the Canadian Pacific to carry the mails to Toronto and intermediate points upon that road, it is time that he did, for I know that the universal feeling of the passenger traffic that comes and goes, is that they would very largely prefer to travel by the route which they find to be the quickest and most comfortable, and that is the Canadian Pacific. Before my hon. friend makes a statement to the House assuming that the Canadian Pacific have made a change solely for the purpose of discommoding the Grand Trunk, he had better make enquiry from the Canadian Pacific Company, and ascertain what the reasons are for the change. I have heard the reasons stated and, although I have not paid much attention to the matter, I understand it is for the purpose of suiting the convenience of their own road, for the purpose of enabling their trains to run in the way that would best suit the convenience of the company, both as to time and as to the employés, and as to the distribution of the trains.

Mr. CASEY. Just what I said.

Mr. DUNDAS. My experience is confirmatory of the supposition of the hon. member for West Elgin. This is certainly a matter of great inconvenience to the public. Not only are the trains two hours and a-half longer reaching Brockville from here in the evening, but the authorities on the Canadian Pacific refuse to check baggage through from the point of shipment here to any point on the Grand Trunk——

Mr. MITCHELL. The Grand Trunk can do the same.

Mr. DUNDAS. I am not aware of that, but while this question is before the House it is well to ventilate the matter. I do not mean to say that the Canadian Pacific are not doing as other roads would do under the same circumstances; I merely point out this fact as an additional evidence that the supposition of the hon. member for West Elgin is correct.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I think there cannot be any doubt but that the Postmaster General ought to take some steps to have the mail from Toronto carried by the Ontario and Quebec. I know that frequently trains leaving here at 4.55 for Pembroke are obliged to remain at Carleton Place three or four hours waiting for the train from Brockville in consequence of delays upon the Grand Trunk; and as the Grand Trunk carries the mail for all points westward and northward the Canadian Pacific deems it in the public interest, and for the public convenience, to hold their trains at Carleton Place to await the arrivals of the trains from Brockville. I have known many instances in which the train has had to wait for the Grand Trunk, and I think the Postmaster General would be consulting the public convenience if he would have the mails carried by the Ontario and Quebec, especially for all points northward.

Mr. CARLING. There is no objection to giving any information in the possession of the Government with regard to the arrival and departure of mails from Ottawa. With regard to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken and of other hon. gentlemen, I may say that ever since the Session commenced two mails a day have been carried both ways by the Canadian Pacific between Toronto and Ottawa. A mail is brought in the morning train and another in the evening train; a mail leaves here every morning at 12 o'clock, and every evening at 11.05; so that two mails have regularly been carried by the Canadian Pacific between Toronto and Ottawa since the commencement of the Session. With regard to the connection at Brockville, the Department have done everything in their power to have the mails carried by the swiftest train, but it is not in the power of the Government, I think, to compel railways to make connections. Of course, we are most anxious that they should make connections, and the difficulty is that the Canadian Pacific starts here at half past 8 in the evening instead of 11 as it used to do. Of course they are slow in getting to Brockville; still the connection is made with the Grand Trunk on the up train from Montreal to Brockville and from Montreal to Toronto; also the train coming down from Toronto in the morning connects with the Brockville train from Ottawa. I believe the mail that leaves Toronto in the evening is delivered in Ottawa by nine o'clock in the morning. Everything has been done by the Department to expedite the mails, both while Parliament is in session and during the recess.

Mr. BLAKE. Those of us who live in Toronto find that a good portion of our mail from the west comes by the one company, and a portion by the other. As a general rule I get my newspapers by the Canadian Pacific train, and I get my letters almost invariably by the Grand Trunk some hours later. Now if there is a mail sent down by both roads how does it happen that the letters almost always come by the slower road? There must be a defect in the arrangements by which the bulk of the mail matter, I presume, comes by the slower of the routes. Of course it is obvious that there is no long and efficient passenger connection between this place and the front, and we have got to put up with it as best we can under the present state of the law. But what we have a right to demand is that particularly if, as the Minister says, he uses both roads, the letters should come by the fastest route.

Mr. CARLING. I am glad the hon. gentleman has called my attention to this matter. It must be that the Toronto post office send the bulk of the mails by the Grand Trunk instead of the Canadian Pacific. I will look into the matter and see that a remedy is applied.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). My experience is similar to that of the hon. member for West Durham. I get my newspapers the first thing in the morning, but I have to wait till late in the afternoon for my letters. The letters come by the Grand Trunk, and the newspapers by the Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I have no objection to the motion being amended by inserting the words "and the hours of departure from Brockville to Ottawa," showing the date and hour of departure. I think a reference to the hour should be embodied in the motion. But I just want to direct attention to one other consideration in connection with the question that is being dealt with. There are a great many points between Toronto and Ottawa along the line of the Grand Trunk that must necessarily depend on that road for their mail accommodation. So it has become an important, if not an imperative, matter that the connection at Brockville should be an ordinarily expeditious one. We know as a fact that the time on the Brockville and Ottawa section of the Canadian Pacific Railway has been lengthened something like one hour over what it was last Session. That is undoubtedly a just cause for complaint by those whose communications come from the

neighborhoods affected; and I think as regards the arrangements made with the Post Office Department, all mail matter west of Toronto comes by the same route, the consequence being that the mail matter from Toronto reaches by the Canadian Pacific Railway—and I must say that during this Session it has reached us fairly near the time advertised—and that from the west comes by the Grand Trunk, and it has been notoriously irregular. The complaint consequently is not a local one; it is sufficiently general to induce the Postmaster General, I trust, to give some attention to it and make some representation that will provide a remedy. I am not by any means disposed to advertise any railway; I am quite indifferent so far as the mails are concerned over what railway they are carried. I am not like the hon. member for Northumberland (*Mr. Mitchell*), who controls a newspaper; it is some time since I took any share in newspaper management; and I am quite prepared to accept any road, whatever its interests, so long as it carries the mails as expeditiously as possible. It lies with this House to imperatively insist on any railway company to whom is given a public franchise so valuable as that possessed by the roads from Brockville to Ottawa and between Toronto and Brockville, to see that the train service, both passenger and mail, is performed with reasonable expedition.

Motion agreed to.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS.

Mr. FAIRBANK moved for:

Return showing the number of persons who on the 30th June, 1884, had deposits in the Post Office Savings Bank of the following amounts:—

Number having	sums not	exceeding	$100
"	"	between	100 and $300
"	"	"	300 " 500
"	"	"	500 " 1,000
" (if any)	"	exceeding	1,000 and

the amount, if any, of the several sums exceeding $1,000, and in each class giving the number of males and females depositing, also the Province in which the deposit was made and the same information in all respects regarding depositors in the Government Savings Bank.

He said: At a time when public attention is so intensely directed to events in the North-West, at a time when we are watching the fitting out and departure of our citizen soldiery to restore law and order in that country, at a time when crape is being placed upon many homes in Canada, and when the deepest possible anxiety is being felt in thousands of homes over those who are going forward, an anxiety which can only be appreciated by those who have experienced it or closely observed it, I hesitate to call the attention of the House to so dry a subject as that of savings banks, and I realise that I can hardly expect to attract the ear of hon. members on this subject. Yet I feel that, in asking for a return involving a considerable amount of labor in two departments, not such an amount however as would at first appear, I am called upon to give some reason for asking for such return. I believe that the House and the country desire fuller information as to whether the Post Office Savings Bank and Government Savings Banks are in their working, carrying out the objects for which savings banks were instituted. In defining what I understand to be those principles I may be pardoned for referring very briefly and imperfectly to their origin. In doing so I cannot do better than to quote from Emerson W. Keyes. He said:

"Savings banks were conceived and instituted as a means to an end. Their ultimate purpose in the social economy was to abate the evils of extreme poverty. Devices to this end, in the form of measures for the care and maintenance of the poor, had served little more than to aggravate the evils they were ordained to mitigate. Appropriations for the support of the destitute showed in the result as bounties offered to idleness and improvidence. Statesmen were baffled by this ever-recurring problem of human want, whose magnitude increased and whose difficulties multiplied with every attempt at its solution. They could not stop, they dare not go on; to stop was to decree starvation to thousands, to go on was to invite the idle and dissolute to unite with the destitute in crying for bread. In this strait to the aid of statesmanship came philanthropy, with the suggestion, novel at the time, that incentives to industry might be more effective than gratuities to idleness in diminishing the evils and burdens of pauperism. These incentives philanthropy proposed to supply by offering to the small savings of frugal industry what they had never before enjoyed—a place of secure deposit, where in time of need they could be withdrawn, together with such moderate interest as they had earned. In contrast with the vast monetary interests controlled, and nearly or remotely affected by savings banks in our day, their humble origin in the abodes of poverty and toil, which it was their mission to brighten with the hope of gain, is difficult to realise yet under circumstances such as we have outlined, and with the single purpose which we have designated, did savings banks, both in Europe and America, have their inception."

Allowing all due credit to the establishment of somewhat similar institutions a little earlier in Hamburg and Berne, I think England is fairly entitled to be considered the cradle of savings banks. The agitation in their favor commenced about the close of the last century, but it was not until the beginning of the present century that the exertions received assistance from legislation. That which was accomplished was by individual exertion down to 1817, at which time there were 74 savings banks in England and Wales. An Act was then introduced for the encouragement of the establishment of banks of savings. It did encourage. It so far encouraged that within ten years from their recognition by law, namely in 1827, 392,000 depositors had £14,000,000 sterling in those banks. In 1837 there were 636,000 depositors, and they had £19,000,000 deposited; in 1847, 1,096,000, with £30,000,000; and in 1861, 1,609,000, with £41,000,000 in 638 savings banks. In this year, 1861, a Bill, suggested as early as 1807 by Samuel Whitebread, advocated by George Sykes and drafted by George Chetwind and H. Scudamore, with the assistance of Sir Rowland Hill, was passed by Gladstone. It is entitled: "An Act to grant additional facilities for depositing small savings at interest, with the security of the Government for the due repayment thereof." Up to this period the Government did not give its security to these depositors. They aided them so far as the interest was concerned, but the Government were not responsible. Losses occurred, resulting from defalcation, and it became desirable to make the Government responsible for these deposits. An Act of Parliament was the result, and it seems to have been prepared and its details carried out with the greatest possible care. Deposits in any one year were limited to thirty pounds sterling, and the total deposit, including interest, limited to two hundred pounds, and the interest to two and a half per cent. So successful has this post office savings bank in England been, that by the close of the year 1883 there were 7,369 post office savings banks in Great Britain and Ireland having over three millions of depositors, the exact number being 3,105,642, having deposits to the immense sum of £41,768,808, sterling. The increase for the year which closed on the 31st December, 1883, the latest for which we have returns, was £2,730,987 or in round numbers 13¼ million dollars. While many are rejoicing in the evidences which the deposits in our own savings banks, of 1¼ million dollars in last year, give of the prosperity of the country it must afford us pleasure to find so large an increase in the old country, indicating that the honored mother of our system shows no sign of decline. The average deposit at the time I mentioned—the close of the last year, in England and Wales was £13 10s. 6d. or about $66. The largest draft for the year was in the latter part of December, no doubt the result of a requisition made by His Royal Highness Prince Santa Claus, God bless him. Who shall estimate the benefits of these savings banks? They are beyond our power to estimate. I think, Sir, if the authors of that system, who by their thought and exertions established it, could see the result of their labors they would consider it an ample reward—such as Jeremy Bentham, whose idea towards the close of last century, took the form of "Frugality Banks;" Mrs. Priscilla Wakefield, with her "Friendly Society;" John Murkersy, with his "Friendly Bank for the savings of the poor;" Lady Isabella Douglas; Rev. Henry Duncan, J. H. Forbes, and

last but not least, Patrick Colquhoun, and many others. These, Sir, are names, that when the record is made up of those who loved their fellow men and worked for their benefit will stand high in the list. Such is the honored mother of our Canadian savings bank which, established in 1877 has progressed so rapidly and so well, that on the 30th June, 1884, it had in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec 343 offices with 66,682 depositors; their accounts amounted to $13,215,552, or an average of $198.63 each, an increase in the year of $1,269,315. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot too highly estimate the influence and effect of the post office savings banks. I cannot do better in this connection than read a brief extract from Mr. Gilbart's work on banking. He makes the following quotation from the Edinburgh reports:—

"It secures independence without inducing pride—it removes those painful misgivings which render the approaches of poverty so appalling and often paralyse the exertions that might ward off the blow. It leads to temperance and the restraint of all disorderly passions. It produces that sobriety of mind and steadiness of conduct which afford the best foundation for domestic virtues in humble life. The effects of such an institution as this upon the character of the people, were it to become universal would be almost inappreciable."

Again he says:

"The deposit system of banking is universally considered to be one cause of the prudence and frugality by which the people of Scotland are distinguished. In every point of view the savings banks appear calculated to produce unmingled good. They extend to persons of small means all the benefits of banking. The industrious have thus a place where their small savings may be lodged with perfect security from loss, and with the certainty of increase. They tend to foster that disposition to accumulate which is usually associated with temperance and prudence in all the transactions of life. Upon the mercantile interests of society they have the same effect as commercial banking. The various small sums which were lying unproductive in the hands of many individuals are collected into one sum and lodged in the public funds."

The savings of the individual, I think, partake of the nature of a reserve to an army—they give it confidence and strength. The question has been asked, are they adapted to the country? I believe they are particularly so. Fortunately, Sir, in this happy new country we have not such masses as are to be found in less favored lands, upon whom the demand for daily bread is so pressing upon their capacity to earn bread as to leave scarcely a hope for improvement. It is true, Sir, that we have not poverty to the same extent, and massed in the same manner, as it is in less favored lands. Still, we should not deceive ourselves on this point. It is as true to-day as it was 1,800 years ago, that "the poor ye have always with you;" and with all the blessings that surround our people, to-night, Sir, in this happy country, many a woman and many a child will retire to their scanty cot cold and hungry. If we investigate the causes of poverty, we shall find that many times it is not from lack of physical ability to earn a sufficient amount to preserve them from the miseries of want, but rather from inability properly to apply those earnings. In speaking of poverty, I do not desire to do so in any offensive manner. I do not desire to cast any stigma on persons who are very poor. Poverty is a somewhat indefinite term. The man who lives within his means and has a small saving escapes many of the serious ills of poverty, while he who lives beyond his means, I care not how large they are, will experience many of the keenest pangs of poverty. I use the term as applied to persons of small means. With regard to the question of the rate of interest that should be paid in the savings banks, I do not look upon the existing rate as a sacred one, which is debarred from discussion. I think it is one which may properly be discussed. My own opinion upon that matter is that the rate should not often be changed. The number of depositors are much too great to be dealt with frequently. In England the rate of interest paid is 2½ per cent.; but we all know that interest is higher in a new country than in an old country; money is worth more in Canada than it is in England. In dealing with the question of interest, I think so long as the deposits are confined to the class for whom they were originally intended, we should be at all times ready and willing to pay quite as high a rate of interest to the depositors in the savings banks as we do when borrowing money elsewhere; and I think we should give every doubt in favor of small savings. We cannot at present borrow money in other countries for less than about four per cent.; and I believe the rate of interest we allow on deposits in savings banks is not too high at present; and I think there is no prospect that it will require to be reduced for a considerable period of time. Upon this point we may gain a little knowledge, perhaps, from the experience of Belgium. She recently reduced the rate of interest on deposits, to the injury of her savings banks. And I believe that every man who gives careful attention to the question will be anxious to deal liberally with these depositors. I did regret, Sir, that the Minister of Finance thought that there were insurmountable difficulties in the way of extending the benefits of the savings banks by adopting the card system, by which postage stamps are saved, which has proved very successful in England. He raised as an objection to it the expense in the commission upon stamps sold. It is true, there might be some small loss there; but as these deposits would not draw interest until they amounted to a certain sum, there would always be a considerable sum that would not draw interest, and that would to a large extent compensate for the expenses of the commission on the stamps; and I believe on fuller examination it will be found that the benefits which would result from encouraging children to make these savings would more than pay for the loss which would be incurred. While the post office savings banks have succeeded exceeding well in Canada, certainly the mother land holds the lead. I believe that there they strictly limit the yearly deposit to £30; our yearly deposit allowed is $300, but I believe that upon application to the Postmaster General permission is given to increase that deposit to $1,000. However, the test I would apply, in comparing the success of the post office savings banks in England and in Canada, would not be the amount of the deposit, but the number of persons availing themselves of the system. In England and Wales—and we must remember that these post office savings banks have been in existence only five years longer than in Canada—one-ninth of the population are depositers in the post office savings banks, in addition to which there are 1,500,000 depositors in the old savings banks, while in Ontario the depositors are one to thirty-four. This comparison shows largely in favor of England. The average amount of deposit in Great Britain is $66, while in Ontario and Quebec it is $198. Thus we find that the number of depositors in England in proportion to the population is nearly four times as great as it is in Ontario. In Quebec, the number is very much less. But I do not think it is fair to compare England with Quebec, owing to the habits the people of Quebec have fallen into previous to the establishment of post office savings banks of depositing in certain savings banks which now hold large deposits. The depositors in Quebec are in the proportion of one to 136. The average amount of deposits in Ontario is nearly three times as great as in England. The test to which I wish to call attention is this: I look upon the savings banks as, to some extent, in the nature of a school, and would consider it more with a view to the number of pupils that attend it than to the book the pupils are in. In his very excellent paper on the Government savings banks, Mr. Cunningham Stewart remarks that the Savings Bank Department has not sought to attract depositors by means of pamphlets, nor attempted in other ways a paternal treatment of the people which would hardly find favor in this

country. I do not agree with Mr. Stewart that such a treatment would not find favor here; I believe it would, and is well worthy the consideration of the Government. There is one more feature of contrast between the Canadian savings banks and the English, in which I do not know that we have made any improvement by varying from the English system. All methods that differ from English methods are not improvements; England is by no means always wrong; and upon a subject of this kind, to which she has given so much attention, we would be pretty safe in following rather closely in her footsteps. The deposits in the savings banks in England are not a floating liability of the Government, but are invested in the funds. This system existed in Canada up to a certain period, and why it was changed I do not know. In the Government savings banks of Canada, which are quite distinct from the post office savings banks, and which exist only in the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. At Toronto, Winnipeg and British Columbia, I find the following amounts on deposit on the 30th June, 1884. In Nova Scotia, where there are 29 offices, there were $6,493,000 on deposit; in New Brunswick, with 14 offices, there were $4,306,000; in Prince Edward Island, where there are two offices, the amount was $1,412,000; in Toronto, one office, $758,000; in Winnipeg, one office, $653,000; in British Columbia, three offices, $2,374,000, making a total of 50 offices having a total deposit of $15,971,000. Of the total deposits in Nova Scotia, $2,689,000, or 41 per cent. of the whole, was deposited in the city of Halifax; of the total in New Brunswick, $2,325,000, or 54 per cent. of the whole, was deposited in the city of St. John. For a time deposits in the saving banks seem to have been unlimited; now they are limited to $3,000. I am informed upon good authority that large sums find their way into the Government savings banks in the eastern Provinces. I have heard of sums of over $3,000, of over $5,000, of $15,000 and $20,000, being deposited in those banks; and under the present arrangements, the restrictions are frequently evaded by the deposits being frequently made in the names of different members of one family. If this be the case, these offices cease to be exclusively places or reservoirs for the receipt of the savings of the poor, but become places into which the accumulations of the rich find their way; and they cannot be defended in this regard, upon the old line. I may be asked if I propose to abolish them. By no means; I would propose that if they have sailed out of their course their reckoning be corrected and that they be placed upon their right course. I think it is quite likely, Mr. Speaker, that in your boyhood you may have, in the meadows of Frontenac, become acquainted with the habits of the little ground bird, the gray sparrow. If you have noticed particularly the habits of the bird and watched its nests, you may at times have found in the nest a much larger egg than usual. Had you continued to watch, you would find that it did not hatch out a ground bird but a bird of much larger size, the blackbird or cow-bunting. The blackbird, seeming to copy some features of modern society, wishing to be relieved of domestic duties, deposits her egg in the ground bird's nest, and allows the ground bird to raise her young. Having the largest body and the longest neck the blackbird gets the most of the worms brought by the mother bird for the supply of the nest to the ultimate injury, I think, of the legitimate inhabitants of the nest. I have no objection to the blackbird; he is a sleek, smooth fellow, nearly always dressed in black, and he is sociable and musical; but I do not want him in the ground bird's nest; he is not adapted to the nest nor is the nest adapted to him. I would propose taking him very quietly out of the nest and putting him into a proper one. The Finance Minister may ask, what nest? I would not debar any person from investing in Government securities if he preferred to do so on the same terms as other people. Whatever expert financiers may think of the necessity of borrowing money in distant lands, if our own people are disposed to invest in our securities on the same terms as others, I have no objection to their doing so; but there is a very material difference between obtaining money on call, money as to which the depositor dictates the time when he shall take it out, and money as to which the borrower fixes the time when the lender shall be paid. This matter is very well provided for in the post office savings banks in England, where the depositor is limited to £200, but facilities are afforded for the making of investments in the English funds to the extent of £300 more. For a small consideration these stocks are bought for them, the account is kept in the savings banks, and the sales are made free. I cannot see any reason why, if people want to invest in Canadian securities, a facility of this kind may not be afforded them, but I think it is unwise that these deposits should be made on call in the savings bank. I intended to show by my few remarks that I was by no means hostile to the savings banks. If I have not made myself so understood, it is contrary to my intention, for I take a very deep interest in them. I believe you have improved a man, I believe you have improved a society immensely when you have caused it to save a portion of its earnings, and it is for the purpose of ascertaining to what extent the existing condition of these post office savings banks and Government savings banks are meeting this view that I ask for this return. Within their original bounds, in keeping with their foundation principles, in harmony with the thoughts that gave them birth, I would bid the post office savings banks God speed, and hope that they may be speedily established at all possible points from Cape Breton to Vancouver, teaching their lessons of industry, frugality and sobriety, lessening the sum of human misery and thus building one stone higher the walls that defend our freedom.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I must compliment the mover of this resolution on the very able address that he has made in moving it. It shows that he has considered the subject, and has made a careful study of it, and I am sure the House has been interested on both sides by the statements he has made. With many of the views he has expressed I entirely agree. From some of them, perhaps, I should dissent. As I stated on a former occasion, I have doubts as to the propriety of extending it to the penny deposits on the stamp principle which prevails in England. The information asked for in the latter part of the hon. gentleman's motion, as far as the Government savings bank is concerned, has been asked for already by the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), but his motion does not extend, I think, to the post office savings bank. There will be no practical difficulty in the matter, however, as the hon. member will of course accept that return as a return to his motion. I could not quite understand the analogy between the blackbirds and the other birds, the blackbird that had the longer neck and got the worm while the other birds with the shorter necks missed it. I did not see how it was applicable to the present system of deposits, because we do not shut out any of them, except, of course, the penny depositors, and if the hon. member referred to them, of course I can quite understand it, but any person can deposit in the post office savings bank to the extent of a dollar. If those who deposit from a dollar to one hundred dollars or three hundred dollars are the blackbirds, I can understand the analogy my hon. friend has made. Still, while he has endorsed so thoroughly and completely the savings bank principle, I do not understand how it is that he takes such strong exception to receiving the deposits on demand, because if every depositor placed his money there for a specific time or time which would render it inconvenient for him, it would

destroy to a great extent the advantages he enjoys under the present arrangement. Therefore I cannot understand his views in that matter, but on the whole I go very largely with the hon. member who has moved this resolution in many of the statements he has made with reference to the advantages of savings banks.

Mr. CARLING. I am very glad indeed to know that the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Fairbank) approves generally of the management of the post office savings banks. I must say that, so far as I am concerned as the head of that Department, everything is being done that can be done to extend the system in all the different Provinces of this Dominion. Up to this time, it has only been in operation in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, but arrangements are now being made to have the post office savings banks established in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, also in the North-West and in British Columbia, and the number in Quebec and Ontario is being increased as rapidly as possible. I am sure that, so far as the Department is concerned, everything is being done that can be done to facilitate the movement and bring the post office savings banks within the reach of everyone in the Dominion. I think the resolution moved by Sir Richard Cartwright and carried by the House covers the whole or nearly the whole ground of the present motion, for I see that it refers to the post office savings bank as well as to the Government savings bank. Sir Richard Cartwright moved for a return showing the total number of depositors in the savings banks (post office or other) holding deposits of $1,000 or upwards; also the total amount so held; the total number of depositors having deposits of less than $1,000 and more than $500 each; also the total amount so held, and the total number of said depositors holding less than $500 each; also total amount so held. There can be no objection to bringing down this information, but it is hardly necessary to have two resolutions of a similar kind carried. I have made enquiry in the Department, and Mr. Stewart, the head of the Savings Bank Branch states that this information cannot be brought down in less than five or six months, as there are 67,000 depositors accounts which have to be critically examined and attested. The information will be brought down as rapidly as possible. Mr. Stewart, the head of that branch, assures me that it cannot be brought down in less than four or five months.

Mr. BLAKE. I am very glad to hear the hon. gentleman state that the post office savings banks are being extended throughout the country. There are many localities where there is no facility for depositing savings but that which is given by these banks; and I am sure the House and the country will receive with gratification the announcement that the Government propose to extend the operation of an institution that has been on the whole extremely beneficial.

Mr. VAIL. I would like to ask the Postmaster General if he proposes to allow interest on deposits from the date they are made, or to adopt the same rule as governs the savings banks in Nova Scotia, which allows interest to commence on the first of the month after the deposit is made. If so, depositors in the post office savings banks will have a great advantage over those depositors in the ordinary savings banks. It seems to me that on the smaller sums under $300 or $500, the poorer classes of people ought to be entitled to interest from the date of deposit, both in the ordinary savings banks and post office savings banks. I can easily understand that it would be very proper in the case of a larger depositor that interest should commence only from the first of the following month, or, if he drew out the money between the first and last of the month, he should only be allowed the interest to the end of the previous month.

Mr. CARLING. Interest is allowed on a deposit as soon as it is made. As soon as a dollar is deposited the depositor receives interest. That is much better than it is in England. $300 is the highest for one year. In England they are not allowed interest until they have accumulated to 20 shillings. Although the depositor may deposit up to a shilling there is no deposit received less than a shilling and when it gets to 20 shillings the deposit commences to pay interest.

Mr. VAIL. I would call the attention of the hon. Finance Minister to this fact. Now that post office savings banks are being established in Nova Scotia the depositors in that branch will have an advantage over those who deposit in the old savings bank.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I am sorry the Department has not sooner seen its way clear to extend the privileges of post office savings banks to Prince Edward Island, but from the announcement which has been made by the Postmaster General, I am pleased to learn that they propose doing so hereafter. I may say that we have a Dominion savings bank established in Charlottetown and Summerside, but our people have been looking for the establishment of post office savings banks in some of the outlying places where, I believe, they would tend to cultivate habits of saving among the people. If they had places of that kind in which they could deposit their little savings, it would cultivate among them economy and thrift. There are central places in my own county, like Souris, Murray Harbor, Georgetown, Montague and others, where there are numbers of prosperous and well-to-do fishermen and farmers, and they are all favorable, I believe, to the system being extended to those centres of population in the belief that they would afford great advantage to the people. I trust the Postmaster General will see his way clear to extend the system as much as possible.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before the House rose the hon. Postmaster General had stated that depositors were allowed interest on the sum that they deposited from the date of deposit until the time of withdrawal.

Mr. CARLING. If the hon. gentleman would allow me, I find, upon reflection, that I was in error, and that we do not pay interest on any part of the month.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was pleased to learn that the Government had altered their rules, allowing interest from the date of deposit, because I consider that parties depositing small sums ought to receive interest from the date of deposit to the date of withdrawal. We are all aware that mechanics and others who are engaged by the month do not, as a rule, get paid until the first or, in many cases, the fifteenth of the following month; they have to retain their money until the end of the month or deposit it at the time they receive it, without interest. It is desirable, in the interest of small depositors, that they should have all reasonable inducements offered them to make deposits, by allowing interest from the date of deposit to the date of withdrawal. On a previous occasion when the question of giving better facilities to farmers in the way of borrowing money, was before the House, I took occasion to remark that I was opposed to the continuation of a high rate of interest to depositors. My remarks on that occasion applied to large depositors, those who deposit sums of from $1,000 to $8,000. I think it is desirable that the poorer classes should be offered every inducement to made deposits, while parties who control large amounts should be asked to find some other investments for their money rather than that of the Government savings bank. I believe that such an arrangement would cause a larger amount of money to flow into the chartered banks. In that way the rate of

interest would be reduced; and interest would also be reduced if these parties were to seek investments by taking mortgage on real estate. I think it is desirable that such change should take place. Perhaps additional facilities might be afforded to parties drawing out money. In some cases considerable inconvenience is suffered by depositors from having to give written notice, which has to be sent to the head office here, acknowledged and a cheque sent to the party making a deposit before the money can be withdrawn. It would be well if depositors who require to withdraw amounts immediately should have the privilege of transmitting their books to the Department and in that way obtain immediate payment of the amount. My reason also for mentioning this matter in connection with large deposits is because the Finance Minister, in making his Budget Speech, stated that the increase in connection with the Post Office was largely owing to increased business in connection with the post office savings bank. It is quite evident we are paying very high interest for money borrowed from large depositors. If we count the amount we have to pay in allowances to clerks, and add that to the interest allowed, it will be found that the country is paying to large depositors a higher rate of interest than that at which money could be borrowed elsewhere, and it is therefore not desirable that such a system should continue. At the same time I am perfectly willing that the greatest facilities and inducements should be held out to small depositors to invest their savings in the savings bank in order to accumulate a little money from month to month.

Mr. HALL. I desire to call attention to the advisability of establishing an annuity branch of the Savings Branch of the Post Office. There are a class in the community receiving small incomes who are very anxious to make provision against old age by means of an annuity or to make provision in this way for others dependent upon them. This plan has been worked with successful results in Great Britain; and I am told by Mr. Stewart, of the Savings Branch Department, that very little trouble would be experienced in introducing it here. It would be an arrangement mutually advantageous. It would retain funds in the country that are now sent abroad; it would give the Government the benefit of the money at a low rate; and it would confer great good on a class in the community thoroughly deserving of this kind of protection.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I understood the Postmaster General to say that the work involved in preparing these returns would occupy several months. I refer now to the return I have asked for. Of course, if anything I have asked for is contained in other returns, I certainly do not want it a second time; but the return I have asked for would involve no such amount of work as has been suggested. If the Postmaster General had given his attention to it he would have seen that the motion is divided under four heads: those having deposits under $100, those between $100 and $300, those between $300 and $500, and those between $500 and $1,000. I have asked for the statements by Provinces, which would not add to the work at all; and I have asked them to be divided between male and female. I purposely selected the close of the year. Hence in taking off what I require it can be done nearly as rapidly as the ledger pages can be turned over. In this connection I wish to refer to an authority from whom I previously quoted. Mr. Cunningham Stewart, in speaking of the manner in which the accounts are kept, says:

"So rapidly can accounts in this form be treated at the close of the year, that, in respect to the fiscal year just closed, 30th June 1884, it may be said that the labor of balancing all the ledger accounts, 66,861 in number was completed on the third day after—that is on the 3rd July—necessarily during extra hours, but without interruption to the daily work. On the 18th July the labor of extracting from the ledgers the year's balances and transactions in 87,621 accounts, or adding them, and of bringing the year's operations to a final proof was concluded."

I only ask for the number not the sums, and I venture the assertion that an accountant would take off 4,000 a day. So I am afraid my motion has not been correctly read by the Postmaster General. The Finance Minister is not in his place. He could not understand my allusion to the blackbird. The allusion is this: I stated that the blackbird in the ground bird's nest interfered with the interests of the ground bird. The comparison was perfectly true in regard to savings banks. The large deposits being made in the savings banks, for which they were not intended, exposes the bank to adverse criticism which may be unjust to those for whom it was designed. I think the Finance Minister was disposed to rally me on that point. I do not want to introduce anything of a political character on this occasion, but I might point out another respect in which there is an analogy. I do not know the language of the birds, but it is quite possible that the ground bird finding a large bird in her nest, may have pointed to it as a result of her policy, while it was not the result of her policy but of the blackbird's policy.

Motion agreed to.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. BLAKE moved for:

Copies of all advertisements, tenders, contracts, specifications, Orders in Council, correspondence and other papers in connection with George Goodwin's contracts in respect to the Trent Valley Canal or navigation; including all accounts and letters with reference to claims for extras on such contracts.

He said: The information which has reached me and which has induced me to make this motion goes to show that one lock only is completed, and a claim for extras is made. At another lock the contractor found the material very hard and flinty, and he made up his mind to stop work unless the Government paid $50,000 extra. At another lock the work has been suspended, and efforts are being made to obtain a large sum of money in excess of the contract, and the parties refuse to go on unless a sum is obtained, because some sticks of timber were lost. The finished lock is of no use without the other three locks, and it is alleged that these matters have been going on in the Department, in order to obtain advantageous changes in favor of the contractors. Under the circumstances I hope the Minister will not approve the proposal.

Motion agreed to.

BRITISH COLUMBIA PENITENTIARY RULES.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE moved for:

Copies of all correspondence between the Department of Justice and the Inspectors or the Warden of the penitentiary in British Columbia in regard to the suspension in whole or in part of any of the rules of said institution.

He said: I desire to occupy the attention of the House for only a few moments. I have been informed that one of the rules of this institution has been suspended in reference to a portion of the prisoners in the penitentiary. One of the rules of the institution is that every man's hair shall be cut short when he enters the prison, but I have been informed on very good authority that the Department of Justice has issued an order that that rule shall not apply to the Chinese prisoners. Now, Sir, I fail to see the justice of such an order. I believe the reason why the rule was made was on the ground of cleanliness, and in an interview which I had with one of our gaolers a short time ago with reference to this matter I was informed by him that it is essentially necessary that every man's hair shall be cut short, and more especially the Chinese prisoners, because he says their heads are dirtier than those of white men or Indians. I was informed by that officer that he had two Chinese prisoners who were sent to that goal, and when

they came in their heads were literally alive with lice. I want to state the facts to the House, and see whether it is right that a rule which is considered essential to cleanliness in the case of the white man should not be applied to every prisoner coming within the walls of the penitentiary. Whilst white men's hair is cut short on the ground of cleanliness, we ought to know why Chinamen, who come into the institution in a filthy condition, and are allowed to mingle with the other prisoners, should not be subject to the same rule. Now, I think it is very unfair, and to my mind it appears useless, to apply the rule to one portion of the prisoners and not to apply it to the whole, seeing that they all mingle together. My object in moving for these papers is to find out the real reasons assigned by the Department for the suspension of this rule. I am informed that this same class of people, when they violate the laws of their own country and are sent to gaol, have to submit to this rule, and why they should not in a strange country, when they violate our laws and are imprisoned, be subjected to the same rule, I fail to comprehend. I trust that the papers will be brought down, so that we may ascertain the reason why such a rule has been suspended.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). In seconding this motion, I may say that I concur with my hon. friend in believing that whatever regulations there are—though I do not know these regulations particularly—should apply equally to the Chinese and to the white men. My hon. friend and colleague has had a much more intimate acquaintance with the Chinese than I have, I confess, and his knowledge of the interior of a prison may also be greater than mine; but apart from that, I think what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. If John Chinaman is gander enough to get himself inside our prison walls, I think the same rule should be applied to him that applies to the white man who gets himself into that predicament. It strikes me that the rule is one which is particularly hard in the case of men from vessels of Her Majesty's navy, who are sentenced to periods of from six weeks to three months for misconduct on board ship. The only place available is the city or county gaol, where Chinamen, Indians and all other prisoners are confined. Now I know these men complain bitterly that they should be compelled to have their hair cut while John Chinaman should go free; and therefore I hope the Minister of Justice, or such other member of the Government in this House having that particular matter in charge, will see whether there has been a digression from the ordinary regulations or not, and will enquire if instructions have been given to vary the customary regulations. I hope that the correspondence will be brought down.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. In relation to the question put by the mover of this resolution, I think it is but due that I should render testimony to the exceedingly well kept condition of the institution in question. It is a pleasure for me to say that I have seldom seen a penitentiary so well kept in every part and in every detail as that of New Westminister, which I had occassion to examine. My hon. friend, the mover of the resolution, has decidedly gone into more details than I had time to go into when I visited the penitentiary; but let me tell him that I think his informant was badly informed. I was much surprised to hear that it was one of the officers of the penitentiary who complained of the breaking of the rule, or the exemption from the rule, which was alluded to. I am still more surprised that an officer of that establishment would have complained of the special uncleanliness of the Chinese as compared with the other prisoners. I am disposed to disbelieve the statement. I made special enquiry from the warden as to the conduct, the health, and the cleanliness of the different prisoners, mentioning the different classes of prisoners, and particularising the Chinese, whose condition we were then enquiring into. The answer of the warden was that the Chinese prisoners were generally very orderly, and rather more so than the generality of prisoners; and he added, it is a calculation with them, because good behavior gives them a little less time, and they are so accustomed to calculate small profits that they behave well in order to shorten their imprisonment by a few days. Mention was also made of their keeping their pigtails, and the answer which was given is, I suppose, what has prompted the authorities in not enforcing the rule to the extent my hon. friend desires. When he says that no exemption should be given to Chinamen, with regard to the rule that criminals must have their heads shorn, I agree with him that those whose term of sentence for grave crimes would subject them to that punishment would be punished like others. It is one of the ordinary rules of the penitentiary that the prisoners shall have their hair cut certain dimensions and at certain times, and I understand that the Chinese are not subjected to that rule as the ordinary prisoners, on account of the infamy and the humiliation which they are supposed to be subjected to by having their hair cut short. The Chinaman is punished like the other prisoners, only he is not subjected to something which is considered to be a humiliation, and some say a kind of breach of religious custom. That would be unfair, in ordinary cases, to inflict on them what would be considered an additional punishment to that imposed by law. With regard to the state of cleanliness of the Chinese prisoners and their pigtails, I have enquired into that, and the information I have from the warden is, that, as a rule, they are known and distinguished for their cleanliness in the penitentiary and for their orderly conduct and submission.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I desire to say a word in explanation. The hon. Secretary of State referred to the remark I made as to what the warden had said with regard to the condition of the Chinese. What I said was, that I had seen one of our gaolers. That was not one of the gaolers of the penitentiary, but the gaoler of the Victoria gaol, who told me just exactly what I have stated. Now, it appears to me that it is equally degrading to a white man to have his hair cut short. There are numbers of white men who wear their hair very long, who have nice curly hair. Unfortunately they sometimes get into the penitentiary, and if they do, they have, without exception, to have their hair cut short. Now, I fail to see why a distinction should be made. I think it is no business of ours whether it is a degradation or not to a Chinaman to have his hair cut. If it is a rule of the penitentiary that every prisoner's hair shall be cut short, I think no exception should be made whatever. The Chinese are subjected to the same rule in their own country; and on coming into our country and violating the laws of the land, and being convicted and sent to the penitentiary, why they should not be subjected to the same rule as the white man—I fail to see the consistency or justice of it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There can be no objection to the motion being carried and the papers being brought down, showing the regulations which obtain in the penitentiary at New Westminster. I quite agree with my hon. friend that the same punishment should be meted out to the Chinaman, to the Indian, and to the white man, for the same crime, and that is the intention of the law. But I fancy, from the explanation made by my hon. friend the Secretary of State, that the cutting off of the pigtail appendage is to the Chinese an additional punishment, not shared either by the white man or the Indian. We all get our hair cut; some wear it a little longer than others. But the hair grows quickly, and when a man comes out of prison, in a short time, if he had a good head of hair when he went in, he will soon have a good head of hair again. But the Chinaman, with his long pigtail, if he is marked and humiliated

among his fellows by its removal, is subjected to an additional pang with the punishment of his imprisonment. That is my understanding, though I may be wrong. It may be that he is superstitious—that he may think that by the pigtail being cut off he is deprived of the chance of being drawn up to heaven. If it is a greater punishment to the Chinaman than to the white man to have his hair removed, I do not think he should receive greater punishment than the white man. Then, the hon. gentleman says that the pigtail is uncleanly in itself, and ought to be cut off. Well, I suppose my hon. friend, in the stress of necessity, has had a Chinaman or woman in his household.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. No; never.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, they are employed very much in Victoria, much against the people's will, because hitherto they have not been able to obtain a sufficient quantity of white labor; and I do not think it is a pre-requisite to the employment of a cook that he must have his pigtail cut off. I think most of the cooks in Victoria are Chinamen, and they have their pigtails, notwithstanding the uncleanly nature of the appendage. What I have stated I am quite sure must have induced the authorities to draw the distinction in that regard between the Chinese and the white convicts. However, the papers will be brought down, and I will endeavor to get the reasons for the distinction as well.

Motion agreed to.

COMMERCIAL RELATIONS BETWEEN FRANCE AND CANADA.

Mr. AMYOT (Translation) moved for:

Copies of all correspondence between the High Commissioner of Canada in London and the French Government, in reference to the commercial relations between France and Canada, and to a proposed commercial treaty between the two countries; of all correspondence between the said High Commissioner and the Government of Canada on the same subject, and of all documents relating thereto emanating from the Imperial Government, the French Government, or the Government of Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the National Policy inaugurated in 1879, in accordance with the will of the people, was inaugurated for the purpose of promoting the financial interests of the Dominion of Canada, through a wise protection at home against a ruinous competition from abroad, and through the development of our foreign trade. As soon as they came to power the present Government introduced this protective tariff which had been asked for by the Conservative party. The hon. Minister of Finance, aided by the whole Executive, had wisely elaborated it, and the people seeing its good effects, solemnly ratified it in 1882. Already it had put an end to the growing deficits of the old system, and even produced large surpluses, it had given a new impulse to agriculture and trade, caused powerful and numerous industries to crop out, brought back prosperity everywhere, and put everything in a settled shape. And today it enables us to go, without being fatally affected by it, without any sensible delay in our march towards progress, through the great financial and commercial crisis which bears down heavily on almost every civilized country. While preparing that tariff, the Government were dealing with the no less important question of our foreign trade. They endeavored to create business relations with nations which were in the best condition to supply our market and to buy our produce. The object of the motion I now make is to inform this hon. House and the country of what has been done in that respect with regard to France, a country having a population of 40,000,000 souls, a nation whose commercial activity is wonderful, and whose collective and individual wealth is immense. As early as 1878, Sir Alexander Galt, our delegate in London, was instructed by the Finance Minister of Canada to secure whatever commercial facilities which might be granted to us by the French Government. I will not take up the time of the House by giving the particulars of the negotiations which took place, of the authorizations and of the aid which had to be obtained from the Colonial Office in London, and of all the preliminary steps which were necessitated by the diplomatic exigencies. In his letter containing the instructions to our delegate, Sir Leonard Tilley advised Sir Alexander Galt to endeavor to obtain from France certain facilities for the sale of our ships, a rebate on the entrance duties levied on our agricultural implements, tools, cutlery and fish. As an equivalent, it was offered to lower the entrance duties on certain French wines imported into Canada. The negotiations, conducted with a great deal of courtesy on either side, were not finally successful. Canada was still very little known in that great republic, and the French Chambers refused to accede to our wishes. This was in February, 1879. The report of Sir Alexander Galt, printed in the 104th Sessional Paper of 1880, gives the particulars of the correspondence which then took place. But the hope having been expressed on either side that the negotiations might soon be resumed, the Canadian Government soon returned to the charge. As early as the 25th of March, 1879, an Order in Council was passed declaring that it was expedient to appoint a Commissioner specially charged with the duty of conducting new negotiations with France. The Colonial Office, did not see fit to authorize that appointment, but they invited Canada to select a person of trust, who would be connected with the English commission, for the purpose of representing our interest, and Sir Alexander Galt was accordingly appointed. At that date, Mr. Leon Say, the celebrated French economist, Ambassador at London, was appointed President of the French Senate, and he promised to favor our demands. Canada found in him a powerful and devoted auxiliary. A number of others were soon to join him. The parleys were entered upon in 1881, and lasted a pretty long time. They were still continuing, when France, by a law passed in the month of April, 1881, reduced from 40 francs to 2 francs per ton the entrance fee of our ships in her ports. That law is still in force. The question of the Franco-Canadian Treaty was then complicated by that of the Anglo-French Treaty, but in January, 1882, it was disengaged to be treated independently and on its intrinsic merits. France was then asked to grant to Canada the privileges of the most favored nation as regards trade, navigation and consular agencies. On the 15th of March 1882, an official conference was held in Paris. With the kind permission of the House, I will read it in order to show the progressive march of ideas on that question which, I hope, is on the eve of a happy solution:

"CONFERENCES:—For the negotiation of an agreement regulating the the trade relations between France and Canada.

"*First Conference, March 15th*, 1882.

"Mr. de Freycinet, President of the Council, Minister of Foreign Affairs, occupies the chair.

"The conferences for the adoption of an agreement regulating the trade relations between France and Canada have been opened at Paris in the *Hotel du Quai d'Orsay*, on Wednesday, the 15th day of March, 1882, at ten o'clock in the forenoon, under the presidency of Mr. de Freycinet, President of the Council and Minister of Foreign Affairs.

"Mr. Tirard, Minister of Commerce, attended the meeting.

"His Excellency Lord Lyons, Ambassador of Her Britannic Majesty at Paris, introduced Sir Alexander Galt, High Commissioner of Canada at London, as special Commissioner at the conference.

"Mr. President introduced as Commissioners for the French Government:

"Mr. Ambaud, Councillor of State, Director General of Customs.

"Mr. Marie, Director of Foreign Trade in the Department of Commerce.

"Mr. Clavery, Director of Commercial and Consular Affairs in the Department of Foreign Affairs.

"Mr. Ramond, Manager of Customs.

"Mr. René Lavallée, Consul-General of France, is appointed to fulfil the duties of Secretary.

"Mr. President having opened the meeting and bid a hearty welcome to His Excellency Lord Lyons, and to Sir A. T. Galt, expressed to them

the great pleasure he felt in opening with them negotiations with a view to the adoption of an arrangement regulating the commercial relations between France and Canada. He added that these negotiations will be carried on, on his part, in the most conciliating and friendly spirit. His Excellency, the Ambassador of Great Britain, thanked him for the sentiments he had just expressed. and was glad to give him the assurance that those sentiments were fully reciprocated by Great Britain and Canada.

"The hon. Commissioner for Canada then took the floor to explain what were, in his opinion, the basis on which the negotiations might be engaged.

"Sir Alexander Galt read the following note, a copy of which was remitted to the French Commissioners:

"'Pursuant to an agreement between Canada and the Government of Her Britannic Majesty, and under reserve of their approbation, the Government of Canada desires to come to an understanding with the French Republic, with respect to an agreement regulating the commercial affairs between the two countries. But, before dealing with the question of the basis on which this agreement might stand, it would seem necessary to recall the circumstances under which, at the present time, the Canadian products are at a disadvantage on the French market

"'In 1859-60, an informal arrangement gave to Canadian products certain advantages for importation in France, on condition that, as regarded several French articles for importation in Canada, the Canadian duties should be assimilated to similar articles of English manufacture, on the further condition that the duties on wines, excepting however sparkling wines, be reduced to a shilling per gallon, that is to say at the rate settled upon for the import duty of French wines in England.

"'Canada had not been mentioned in the treaty between France and England in 1860; nevertheless, it had the benefit, under the above mentioned arrangement, of being treated as the most favored nation, until 1873.

"'But, from that time the French Government adopted another system; and, placing Canada under the general tariff, caused a material damage to that country.

"'In 1874, Canada increased the duties on wines without, however, infringing upon the principle which had been sanctioned by its Customs Legislation, under which French produce, including wines, were subject to the same duties as were paid by all other nations, England included.

"'In 1879, fiscal requirements necessitated an increase in the Customs duties of Canada. No alteration was made with regard to France, which now enjoys as heretofore, the privileges of the most favored nation; but, as to wines (sparkling wines excepted), the English duties were re-imposed, besides an overtax of 30 per cent., which the Canadian Government is authorised to repeal in favor of France or Spain, according to whatever agreement may be made with respect to trade relations between the two countries.

"'Therefore, it may be remarked that until now Canada has not varied; neither has it abandoned its engagements of 1859-60, as to the treatment of French produce; and, as regards wines, its Legislation enables it to immediately re-establish the old duties.

"'The Canadian Government were in hopes that the constant regard which they have had for the French commercial interests, might, at the proper time, induce the Government of the Republic to re-establish a state of things which has only proved beneficial on either side.

"'The trade between France and Canada, which, until 1873, had taken a great impulse, has decreased since, under the old general tariff, and there is no doubt that under the new system it will decline entirely. But it is for that reason that the Canadian Government would heartily wish to find a remedy to such a disastrous situation.

"'In the first place they would desire the abolition of the over-tax on goods in bonds, which bears down heavily on Canadian products when imported in France. The competitors of Canada on the French market are chiefly the United States and the Northern States of Europe. As regards the first, the competition covers, among other articles, canned fish, canned fruits, mineral oils, sewing machines, agricultural implements, plain furniture, lumber in deals, cutlery.

"'All these products, directly imported from the United States into France are exempt from the over-tax, while similar Canadian products, coming into France by way of England, are liable to it.

"'From Northern Europe, the competition with Canada applies chiefly to lumber. It is to be remarked that European lumber imported from a country other than the country of production is exempted from the overtax, while non-European lumber is not. The consequence is that Canadian lumber bought in England would be liable to a prohibitive overtax, while that of Norway, for instance, would be exempt.

"'So with the fish from Northern Europe, bought in England or elsewhere, it seems to be exempt, while Canadian fish is subject to the overtax of goods in bond. The Canadian Government naturally desire to see this over-tax taken off from their produce. Besides they would desire that the French Government would be pleased to make the following reductions on certain duties of the French tariff:—

Curried leather, to	20 francs.
Tanned leather, to	10 "
Common cutlery, to	50 "
Common razors, to	80 "
Other cutlery, to	120 "
Fine cutlery, to	300 "
Cows. oxen, &c	Exempt.

"'And lastly they would ask that France would be pleased to place Canada on the same footing as the most favored nation as long as Canada will be in a position to continue to admit French produce at the same rate as that of other nations.

"'On the part of Canada, the only reduction which would seem possible, would be that of the duty on wines; for on all other articles France enjoys all the benefits which Canada can concede to other nations with due regard to its policy and its financial necessities.

"'As to the duration of the proposed agreement, it is thought that in view of a future commercial treaty, probably at a not very distant date, between England and France, in which Canada might hope to be included, it might be well to conclude only a temporary arrangement, which might be broken on one year's notice.'

"The Minister of Commerce said that, before discussing the conclusions of this note with regard to which he would, besides, have more than one reserve to make, he would wish to examine it leisurely and to confer officially with the Canadian delegate. Therefore, he thinks, that it would be proper to postpone the official negotiations until a date which would ultimatly be fixed upon.

"This proposition having received the unanimous assent, the commission adjourned to an undefined date

(Signed) C. DEFREYCINET,
T. TIRARD,
AMBAUD,
E. MARIE,
CLAVERY,
RAMOND,
LYONS,
A. GALT.

The Secretary,

(Signed) RENÉ LAVALLÉE."

That official note from our delegate having been submitted to the French Parliament that Parliament answered on the 20th of March, 1882, through an official note from Mr. Tirard, which note was remitted to our delegate and was couched in the following terms:

"PARIS, 26th March, 1882.

"The Canadian Government has expressed in a memorandum the desire to agree with the Government of the French Republic on the basis of an arrangement for the purpose of settling the commercial relations between the two countries. In the present state of things, the colonies and possessions of Her Britannic Majesty having been kept out of the stipulations, treaties and agreements intervened between France and Great Britain, and no particular arrangement existing between France and Canada, it follows that the Canadian products on entering France have had to be submitted to the application of the general Customs Tariff. During the period of 1860 to 1878, that tariff has undergone liberal changes of which Canada has benefited. But, at the same time, that country has had to suffer from the consequences of the law of the 30th of January, 1872, which establishes an over-tax of 3 francs 60 centimes on all products of extra European origin imported from the European warehouses, and which has substituted to the one and singular tax of 2 francs per ton register on wooden or iron sea going vessels, duties of 30 and 40 francs on the hulls of wooden and iron sea-going vessels.

"On his part, by way of retort, the Canadian Government had increased by 30 per cent. the entrance fees on wines (sparkling or non-sparkling), that is to say, on one of the chief articles of French importation in Canada.

"In the course of conversations which took place in 1878, with a view to the improvement of that situation, it was pointed out that in case that France would consent to re-establish the duty of 2 francs per ton register on sea-going vessels, Canada would blot out from its tariff the overtax of 30 per cent. on wines. Since that time, the law of the 7th of May, 1881 has given full satisfaction to the wish expressed by Canada as regards the duty of two francs on sea-going vessels; but in Canada the wines are still liable to the supplementary tax of 30 per cent. Besides, in their new propositions, the Canadian Government do not content themselves with asking for the taking off of the overtax on goods in bond, and the benefit of being treated as the most favoured nation; but they also ask for new reductions of the duties on tanned or curried leather, on common and fine cutlery, on oxen, cows, &c. But in exchange for these concessions, they limit their offers to a reduction of the duties on wine. In other words, they enlarge considerably their demands, without conceding anything anything over and above what they offered in exchange for the rebate of the duties which they have obtained on one sole article of their imports in France.

"After having declared that, on the part of Canada, the only reduction which would seem possible would be that of the duty on wines, the note adds that on all the other articles France was enjoying all the benefits which Canada could concede to other nations having regard to its policy and its financial necessities. Now, these favours, as regards the chief articles of French importation to Canada, are illustrated by a duty of 170 francs 74 centimes per hectolitre on our brandies; of 233 francs 72 centimes on liquors; of 88 francs per hundred kilos and 20 per cent. besides on our all-wool cloths and flannels; of 118 francs and 25 per cent. besides on woollen ready-made clothing; of 20 per cent. on printing and writing paper; of 30 per cent. on wall paper; 29 francs 44 centimes per hectolitre, and 30 per cent. on non-sparkling wines; of 16 francs 05 centimes per dozen bottles, and 30 per cent. on sparkling wines; of 25 per cent. on prepared ornamental feathers; of 25 per cent. on gloves, boots and shoes; of 30 per cent. on clothing and ready-made linen goods; of 25 per cent. on haberdashery and buttons; of 30 per cent. on woven silk and silk ribbons; of 45 francs per 100 kilogrammes on salt butter, and of 20 per cent. on olive oil. In France on the contrary, under the conditions of the general tariff, the chief articles of Canadian importation are either admitted on the free list or liable to very moderate duties, consequently

the importations from Canada into France have reached 2,145,432 francs in 1865; 6,069,722 francs in 1878 and 11,199,407 francs in 1881, while the exportations from France to Canada which were 1,709,182 in 1865, have reached 9,848,503 francs in 1874 to fall back to 3,579,444 francs in 1879, and to 3,671,801 francs in 1880. In their proposals the Canadian Government insist a great deal on the taking off of the overtax on goods in bond which bears down with particular weight on Canadian products as they are entered in France; but it is to be remarked that this overtax whose only purpose is to favour direct importation by sea of goods having an extra European origin, does not at all bear a discriminating character; it is levied indiscriminately on Canadian products from the United States or elsewhere outside of Europe, coming to France in bond through another county, so that its effects are mostly felt in the country through which the goods come in bond, but that it is rather beneficial than injurious to the shipping trade of the country of production.

"To summarize, with the most sincere wish to cement the friendly relations which have for a long time united France to Canada, and to develop as largely as possible their commercial relations, the Government of the French Republic can not foresee the possibility of an arrangement which could be ratified by the Chambers, unless they obtain from the Canadian Government material reductions not only on the wines, but as a whole on the articles above enumerated, and on which the present tariff of the Dominion imposes duties so high that they amount almost to prohibition.

"(Signed) P. TIRARD."

Such was, Mr. Speaker, the result of the first conference. It will be seen that France had already given proof of her good will; she had reduced from 40 francs to 2 francs the entrance fees on our ships. But we did not do our part; we had promised to reduce the duties on the wines and we have not done it. Not satisfied with having obtained the taking off of the duty on ships, and with not having taken off the duties on wines, we asked, besides, the taking off of the overtax on goods in bond, the advantage of being treated as the most favored nations, and various other important concessions which I have pointed out. We offered very little to obtain a great deal. About that time, the question of a direct line of steam packets between France and Canada was being agitated, and occupied the minds of public men in both countries. The official note from the French Government having been transmitted to the Canadian Government on the 26th of October, 1882, an Order-in-Council was passed in answer to Mr. Tirard. The Government declared that they were unable to reduce the duties as had been asked, because that would have involved a like reduction on similar produce from England, Germany and Belgium, and would have too materially reduced our revenue; the Government declared themselves ready to reduce the duties on French wines in a proportion corresponding to that which would be made on various Canadian articles; they pointed out to the annual grant of $50,000 already offered by Canada for a line of steamers, and lastly they argued that the French articles had always been admitted here on an equal footing with that of similar products from England. Acting on this Order in Council, Sir Alexander Galt addressed to the Government a note, the contents of which it will be interesting to know, and which reads as follows:

"Paris, 30th November, 1882.

"The undersigned has been instructed by the Government of Canada to inform the French Republic that their Government have studied with great care the memorandum which His Excellency the Minister of Commerce has been pleased to communicate to them under date of the 20th of March last, on the question of the proposed arrangements to give a proper basis to the commercial relations between the French Republic and the Canadian Dominion. The Canadian Government has also considered the letter, bearing the same date, in which His Excellency has dealt with the question of subsidies to be granted to a line of steamers to be established between the two countries.

"The Government of Canada have received, with a most sincere pleasure, the assurance of the desire expressed by the French Government to cement the friendly relations which have for a long time united France to Canada, and to develop, as largely as possible, their commercial relations.

"The Canadian Government are animated with the same feeling towards France, and it is in that spirit that they undertake to examine the points brought out in relief by the memorandum.

"As to the duties on wines, the undersigned is instructed to submit that the Canadian Government being desirous of complying with the wishes of France, intend to recommend to the Canadian Parliament during the Session of February next, to reduce immediately to 15 per cent. the duty of 30 per cent., and that they put as the only condition of the total abolition of the duty, the adoption of a commercial agreement between the two countries.

"As regards the representations which His Excellency has been pleased to make on the question of the duties on silks, woollen goods and other articles of French manufacture, the Government have given their whole attention to the matter, with the firm desire of making a few material reductions in the tariff; and the undersigned has been instructed to explain that the increase of duties which are complained of in the memorandum, are not increases which have ever been directed particularly against France. In the Budgets for the years which have preceded 1879, large deficits have occurred which had necessarily to be met, while a pressure of public opinion claimed a certain measure of protection to Canadian industry. The Canadian Government being under the necessity of increasing all the duties of the tariff, raised especially those duties which were imposed on the articles used mostly by the classes which are in easy circumstances.

"The English products have suffered as much from it as the French products, and the protection which was established has mostly affected the ordinary manufactures of the United Kingdom. But the purpose which was aimed at has been obtained. The equilibrium of the Budget has been re-established, and the protection which was created has been the more effective, inasmuch as it has added to the general prosperity, and enabled the country to consume a larger quantity of articles which are not produced in Canada.

"The policy of the Canadian Government in this matter has received the approbation of the country at the elections of the month of May last. Therefore it would be very difficult to reduce the duties on the articles of luxury, it would be even impossible, unless the duties affecting the importations from Great Britain be reduced in a corresponding manner.

"But it would seem impossible to enter into that course, first because the financial wants created by the great public works now under construction in order to develop the resources of the North-West Territories, constitute an insuperable obstacle, and again, because public opinion is decidedly in favor of the protection of Canadian industry.

"The undersigned is compelled, under these circumstances, to express to the French Government, the deep regret which the Canadian Government feel at not being able at the present moment to reduce the duties dealt with in the memorandum, and this question will necessarily remain in abeyance until the pressure on the Canadian revenue shall have materially subsided, and until Canadian industry will be fairly established. Meanwhile it is proper to remark that the articles mentioned in the memorandum are precisely those which are not produced in Canada, at least in any appreciable quantity, so that the duties are paid by the consumers only, and only affect French trade as far as the increase of prices tend to limit the consumption.

"Owing to the impossibility of satisfying the desire of a reduction of duties in favor of France, the Canadian Government find that they are no more in a position to insist on the demands of rebates on duties which they have thought proper to make in the memorandum presented by the undersigned at the first conference. Therefore their propositions are now merged into one, and that is to place the commercial relations between France and Canada mutually on the same standing as the most favored nation, Canada, for her part, agreeing to abolish the *ad valorem* duties on wines. If this proposal was approved of by the Government of the French Republic the question of overtax on goods in bond would only remain to be settled.

"But as the Canadian people desire to enjoy communications, more complete and more direct than those which exist to-day, with a country to which they owe a great part of their population, the undersigned has been instructed, with regard to what was contained in the letter from His Excellency, dated the 20th day of March, in connection with the establishment of a direct line of steamers, to inform the Government of the Republic that the Canadian Government have already voted an annual subsidy of $50,000 or £10,000 on condition that an equal subsidy be granted by France. The Canadian Government would agree that the bounty given to French sea-going vessels would be considered as being paid on account of the subsidy, provided always, that should these bounties be reduced or abolished, the subsidy would be re-established at the same rate as the Canadian subsidy. In order to facilitate this arrangement the Canadian Government would make no observations as to the nationality of the subsidised steamers.

"The undersigned cannot conclude without expressing the hope that the Government of the Republic will be convinced that, within the limits prescribed by the circumstances, the Canadian Government are animated with the same sentiments of sympathy which France has been pleased to express towards Canada, and that they earnestly desire to arrive at a complete identity of interests on both sides.

"(Signed) A. GALT."

The parleys continued, and on the 10th of May, 1883, a new conference took place. The following is the report thereof:—

"*Second Conference, 10th May*, 1883.

"Presidency of Mr. Challemel-Lacour, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

"Were present: Mr. Hérisson, Minister of Commerce; His Excellency, Lord Lyons, Ambassador of Her Britannic Majesty at Paris; and the French and Canadian Commissioners who had attended the previous meeting.

"The meeting was opened at half-past one.

"The Minutes of Proceedings of the first conference were adopted.

"Mr. President recalls that at the conference held in Paris on the 15th of March, 1882, M. C. Hunt, Canadian Commissioner, had read a note pointing out the *desiderata* of his Government. Mr. Tirard, then Minister of Commerce, had expressed the opinion, that before discussing the

conclusions of that note it was necessary for him to examine it and to confer officially with the Canadian delegate. He had thought it proper in consequence to postpone the official negotiations until a date which was to be ultimately fixed upon.

"Since that time there has been no meeting of the Commission; but both Governments have continued to communicate their views to each other, by the exchange of notes emanating from Messrs. Tirard and Hérisson on the one part "and from Sir Alexander Gault on the other part" (see in schedules A., B. and C. of the Minutes of Proceedings the text of the three notes, from Mr. Tirard, on the 20th of March, 1882; from Sir Alexander T. Galt, of the 30th of November, 1882; and from Mr. Hérisson, of the 1st of May, 1883), Mr. President asks whether the High Commissioner for Canada desires to offer a few remarks on the last of these notes.

"Sir Alexander Galt read in answer the following note, of which the original text in English is annexed to the present Minutes of Proceedings (see schedule B)—[Re-translation.]

"The High Commissioner from Canada has the honor to acknowledge receipt of the note of His Excellency, the Minister of Commerce, with regard to a commercial agreement to be concluded between France and Canada.

"He sees with regret that His Excellency has not found in the Canadian proposals sufficient reasons to grant to Canada the treatment of the most favored nations, and that he did not deem it possible neither to abolish the over-tax on goods in bond nor even to make it less injurious by consenting to a common subsidy to steamers for direct service between the two countries.

"The High Commissioner, following the instructions of his Government, is not in a position to extend or modify the proposals which he has already made in behalf of Canada; but he still entertains the hope that a more careful study may perhaps induce the Government of the Republic to think that the position of Canada, contrarily to that of France, compared to that which has been done to other nations, with whom treaties have been concluded, would perhaps ultimately justify the adoption of more liberal measures.

"For over twenty years, and particularly since 1873, Canada, even under the pressure of the general tariff, has not ceased to concede to France the treatment of the most favored nations nor to maintain her products on the same footing as those of Great Britain. Its tariff has been draughted not in view of the negotiation of treaties, but only in view of its own wants. It is therefore impossible to consider that a rebate of duties on the part of France (which has already been made in other cases) could justify a demand for a reduction of Canadian duties—a reduction which would result in diminishing the revenue, while it would at the same time prove detrimental to the interests and the National Policy of Canada—while, on the other hand, the duties in question do not impose any exceptional impediment on French trade.

"Canada, owing to the treaties of Great Britain, in which it is included, is now enjoying the benefit of the treatment of the most favored nations in Belgium, Germany and other European countries; and the Canadian Government is loath to believe that a different treatmeut should be held in store for them by the French Republic. They have made all their efforts for the last four years to remove the difficulties which impede their trade with France and other nations which have practically excluded the Canadian products from their markets. They deeply regret that their efforts have not met with success.

"The High Commissioner has been instructed by his Government to inform the French Government that it would seem impossible to resist for a long time to public opinion, according to which, in justice to the Mother Country and to the Powers who have admitted Canada to the treatment of the most favored nation, it will be necessary in a near future, to impose an overtax on the entrance of the produce of every country who refuses to grant such treatment to Canada, overtax which would naturally cease as soon as relations of reciprocal agreement would have been re-established

"In view of this state of things, the Canadian Government have thought it their duty to forego their intention of reducing the 30 per cent. duty on French wines to 15 per cent., and to maintain the first of these two figures.

"The High Commissioner regrets to find that His Excellency the Minister of Commerce has not found in his proposal to establish a line of steamers, sufficient motives to adopt it. He does not see in the note of His Excellency any suggestion which might give hopes of obtaining the same results in another manner; and as it would be difficult for Canada to show more generosity than is shown by the offer of a subsidy to a thoroughly French line, and by accepting as an equivalent the legal bonus, which, in any case, such a line must receive from the Government of the Republic, the High Commissioner comes to the conclusion that His Excellency is no more of the opinion of the Canadian Government, that the line in question would be the means of improving, between the two countries, the relations which have always been a source of deep satisfaction for the Canadian people.

"Mr. President answers that he has no intention to discuss the considerations developed by Sir Alexander Galt. He cannot, however, dispense with making a few remarks, for it would seem to follow, from the note of the High Commissioner and especially from the allusion which it contains with respect to the emergency of an increase of Customs duties, that France has been very unliberal towards Canada. Now, such is not the position.

"On the question of the Customs tariff, it will be sufficient to refer to the note from Mr. Tirard of the 20th of March, 1882. This note compares the high duties which are imposed in Canada on French manufactures, with the free list system or the light duties which are, as far as Canadian products are concerned, the result of the application of the French general tariff. As to the overtax on goods in bond, it constitutes one of the basis of French Customs legislation, and the favor asked for by Canada has had to be constantly refused to all powers with which France has been dealing recently.

"Lastly, as concerns the establishment of direct maritime relations, the Government of the Republic would highly appreciate it, contrary to what the High Commissioner from Canada seems to have supposed; but it is in opposition with the principles adopted in France to subsidise any private undertaking except when charged with a public service, such as the carrying of mails. 'His Excellency, Lord Lyons, expresses in his own name and on behalf of the High Commissioner for Canada, the opinion that a new discussion on these various questions would now be devoid of expediency.'

"Mr. President answers that it is also his opinion.

"The representatives of the Government of the Republic regret that it should be impossible to arrive, immediately, at the conclusion of a commercial treaty between the two countries, but they at least retain the desire and hope of such a treaty being ultimately concluded. Besides, they will remember, with the greatest of pleasure, the excellent relations which they have been happy to entertain with the High Commissioner for Canada.

"His Excellency, Lord Lyons, in behalf of Sir Alexander Galt and on his own behalf, thanks the Minister of Foreign Affairs for the sentiments which he has expressed, and for the kind reception with which the representative of Canada has been received by that gentleman and by the French Commissioners. He heartily and sincerely wishes, besides, that a new conference may ultimately succeed to conclude the agreement which is considered to-day as unpracticable.

"The meeting is adjourned at a quarter past two.

(Signed), J. CHALLEMEL-LACOUR, C. H. HÉRISSON, AMBAUD, E. MARIE, CLAVERY, RAMOND, (Signed), LYONS. A. GALT.

The Secretary, (Signed), RENÉ LAVALLÉE."

The next day, 11th of May, the French Government, through the agency of Mr. Hérisson, draughted the official note closing the parleys, in the following terms:

"PARIS, May 11th, 1883.

"As had been agreed in the Conference of the 15th of March, 1884, Mr. Tirard, then Minister of Commerce, has conferred with Sir Alexander Galt, High Commissioner of the Dominion, with regard to the proposals of the Canadian Government concering a certain proposed commercial agreement with France, and has remitted to him officially a note which Sir Alexander Galt has submitted to his Government.

"It appears from this memorandum that the reductions on silks, woollen and other articles, which were asked for by Mr. Tirard, cannot be granted by Canada; which country, therefore, gives up, on its part, the reductions which it claimed on the duties applicable in France to curried and tanned leather, to plain and fine cutlery, and to cows and oxen.

"Consequently, the Canadian Government are simply offering to-day, an immediate reduction of the 30 per cent. duty on wines, to 15 per cent. of the value, and the total abolition of that duty immediately after the conclusion of the proposed treaty.

"They demand in exchange the treatment of the most favored nation, the exemption from the overtax on goods in bonds, in favor of Canadian goods imported in France indirectly; and, besides, the establishment of a line of steamers between France and Canada, which line of steamers would be subsidized by both countries.

"The Canadian Parliament has already voted to this effect, a subsidy of £10,000 sterling (250,000 francs).

"According to the desiderates of the Dominion Government, France should grant an equal amount of subsidy to that line, from which amount the bonuses granted to French vessels, would be deducted, on condition that the amount of the French subsidy would be brought back to the figure of the Canadian subsidy, in case that the aforesaid bonuses would be reduced or abolished.

"Thus, in exchange for the conventional tariff granted to nations with which France has established treaties, and which involves reductions of duties on a considerable number of our French conventional tariff, they also comprise the exemption of the overtax on goods in bond. Now, this overtax, whose only purpose is to favor the direct importation of goods of extra-European origin, has no discriminating character whatever. It is levied indiscriminately on Canadian products, and the similar products from the United States, or from any other country outside of Europe, coming into France in bond through another county, so that its effects are mostly felt in the country through which they pass, but that it is rather beneficial than injurious to the shipping trade of the country; and, so far as it goes, to the establishment of direct commercial relations between France and Canada.

"The French Government have never consented to inscribe in any of the treaties which they have concluded until now, the exemption of this overtax. This rule, which has never been laid aside, precludes the possibility of making any concession on this point.

"As regards the establishment of a regular service of steamers between Canada and France, Mr. Tirard has recognised its usefulness in a letter addressed to Sir Alexander Galt, on the 20th of March, 1882. On this point, Mr. Hérisson holds exactly the same views as his predecessor. Nevertheless, it does not seem to him that that line may become the subject of a conventional stipulation. Moreover, the French Government have never granted any subsidy to steam navigation compan-

ies, except for postal service made by them. By laying aside this principle, they would be granting a favor to a private undertaking, to the detriment of rival undertakings, which would be contrary to the principle of fairness which the Government are bound to observe.

(Signed,) "HÉRISSON."

Things were in this state whem Sir Charles Tupper was appointed High Commissioner to London. If the rumor is to be credited, and the papers asked for will show whether it is to be credited or not, Sir Charles has attempted new negotiations. On the 5th of November, 1883, if I am well informed, he submitted a memorandum by which he proposed :

1. That France should grant to Canada the benefit of the tariff granted to the most favored nation, and should abolish the over tax on goods in bond imported from Canada into France by way of England or any of the sea ports of Europe.

2. That Canada should grant to France the privileges of the most favoured nation and abolish the duty of 30 per cent. which are now imposed on wines, while maintaining the specific duties now imposed.

Such would be the proposal made on the part of Canada. Lord Lyons, Ambassador in France, has, it seems, assented to it, and the Colonial Office, on his recommendation, and at the request of Sir Charles, has also, it seems, assented to it. I am even told that France is ready to sign a treaty to that effect, but I do not know how far the negotiations have gone. Let us now consider if it would be in our interest to have such a treaty, what it would bring us and what it would cost us. Every country in Europe, with the exception of Holland, Denmark and Greece, have a conventional tariff with France. The rest of the commercial world, including Canada and the United States, are subject to a general tariff in France. I may say in the first place that this conventional tariff, which constitutes the treatment of the most favored nation, applies to every thing which concerns transit, goods in bond, working, re-exportations, local duties, brokerage, Customs formalities, samples, manufacturing designs, in short, to any thing appertaining to the exercise of trade and industry. Here are a few of the items of this conventional tariff as compared with the general tariff :

	General Tariff.	Conventional Tariff.
Game, poultry and tortoise	20 fr. per 100 kilog.	5 francs.
Feathers for beds (down and others	20 " "	15 "
Brown, yellow and white beeswax (crude)	10 " "	exempt.
Eggs (from wild and domestic birds)	10 " "	exempt.
Condensed milk	8 & 15 "	exempt.
Soft cheese	6 " "	3 francs.
Hard "	8 " "	4 "
Fresh and melted butter	13 " "	exempt.
Salt butter	15 " "	2 francs.
Honey	10 " "	exempt.
Fresh fish from rivers and lakes	5 " "	exempt.
Stock fish	48 " "	10 francs.
Coal oil (special note page 24)	48 " "	10 "
Starch and fecula	6 " "	4 "
Pasteboard in sheets, moulded (papier maché)	11 " "	8 "
Hides, prepared, varnished and dressed in morocco	74 " "	60 "
Sheepskins, dyed	56 " "	45 "
Other dyed skins	74 " "	60 "
Other skins	50 " "	20 "
Boots	2 fr. per paire.	1 fr. 60
Men's and women's bootees	1.25 "	1 fr. 60
Shoes	75 "	0 fr. 50
Stocks for hand-planes	62 per 100 kilog.	50 francs.
Articles of saddlery (other than saddles)	200 per 100 kilog.	150 "
Saddles for men	10 per piece	6 "
Saddles for women	12 "	8 "
Articles for harness-making	50 per 100 kilog.	40 "
Belting and leather hose	62 "	50 "
Soft Morocco leather	200 "	160 "
Hard "	150 "	120 "
Other "	100 "	80 "
Agricultural machinery	6 "	5 "
Iron tools lined with steel	15 "	13 50
Empty casks, new put up or not put up	15 "	13.50
Empty casks, new, put up or not put up, wooden hoops	15 per 100 kilog.	13·50 francs.
Empty casks, new, put up or not put up, iron hoops	2 "	exempt.
Boards and mouldings, or pieces for inlaid floors, planed, grooved and (or) grooved and tongued	2.50 "	1 franc.
Oaken or hardwood	2 "	1 fr. 50
Fir or softwood	1 "	0.50
Basket-work, platted straw, or bark or mat-weed, and platted basswood, rough	10 "	5 francs.
Basket-work, platted straw, or bark or mat-weed, and platted basswood, fine	20 "	5 "
Rubber goods, woven elastics	200 "	150 "
Rubber combs	190 "	100 "
Common brushes set up on wood, furnished with vegetable fibre or whalebone	37.50 "	30 "
Common brushes set up on wood, furnished with hair or bristles	75 fr. "	60 "
Horn, wooden and buffalo-hoof buttons	150 " "	40 "

The conventional tariff contains also reductions of duties on a series of articles, iron, steel, woven goods, chemicals, &c., &c., which are only of secondary interest to us.

Several of the articles of that tariff are of material importance and may establish for us a very important and very remunerative trade. The table of Trade and Navigation for 1884 may give us valuable information on that point. Last year we have exported $1,960,000 worth of eggs. This article would be exempt from duty in France. On poultry there would be a reduction of 75 per cent. of the duty and our exportations of that article have already reached nearly half a million. The exportations of our fisheries and their products, this inexhaustible resource, which is capable of such great developments, have amounted to $8,609,341. What great proportions this trade would reach if we had France as an additional market. The prepared hides, boots and shoes, articles of saddlery and harness making, which are favored by that tariff, already represent a trade of one million; and so with the agricultural machinery and wooden articles, which represent another million in round numbers. Our cheese, which is exported to England, to the amount of $9,777,675, is in great part re-sold in France and sold as English cheese by the English traders. To allow us to introduce it directly into France with a reduction of 5 per cent. duty, would be to open for us a very profitable market; and so with fresh butter, which would be exempt from duty; with salt butter, the duty on which would be reduced from 15 to 2 francs per hundred kilos, and which we are exporting at the rate of a million and a half yearly. Not only would our present industries be highly benefited, but new industries would be created. I may mention among others the prices for inlaid floors, plained, grooved, and grooved and tongued, which are of frequent use in France; pulp, under the various forms in which it is now prepared for wainscoting, paper, books, &c., and of which we can supply the whole world. We have the raw material in abundance; what we want is an outlet, a paying market for the sale of our products. In fact we may become the rivals of our neighbors, which come fourth in the order of nations trading with France. In 1882 they have exported to France goods to the amount of $755,300,000, which are classed as follows:

Natural products or raw materials	208,800,000 francs.
Articles of food	166,900,000 "
Manufactured goods	6,500,000 "
Goods not enumerated	8,100,000 "

IMPORTATIONS FROM FRANCE TO THE UNITED STATES.

Natural products or raw materials	41,600,000 francs.
Articles of food	21,500,000 "
Manufactured goods	284,600,000 "
Goods not enumerated	17,300,000 "

On how many articles could we not compete with them? Take the coal oils among other things. In 1882, the United States exported to France the worth of 19,600,000 francs of

that article. It is true that the conventional tariff does not provide for that article. Here is what is said in the general tariff about that item:

Crude oil, petroleum, &c.:		
Of European origin, imported from the countries of production	18 frs.	per 100 kilog.
Of European origin, imported from elsewhere	30 "	" " "
Of extra-European origin	25 "	" " "
Refined oils and essences, &c.:		
Of European origin, imported from the countries of production	25 "	" " "
Of European origin, imported from elsewhere	30 "	" " "
Of extra European origin	25 "	" " "

With duties equal to those imposed on American goods, we might compete with them; we might compete still better if we could be put on the same footing as the European countries. We might also demand, and very probably obtain reductions of duties on our sewing machines, furniture and other wooden articles, canned fish and canned meat, fresh meat, &c., all of which articles we may produce in immense quantities, and the consumption of which in France is such as to create a very large demand. And this competition which we would make to our neighbours, who would be liable to the general tariff, would not only result in opening a new field to our trade and industry, but it would necessarily become a great means of persuasion to induce our neighbors to conclude a treaty of reciprocity with Canada. The great proportions which our trade would take may be foreseen from the outset, and so with the beneficial results of the opening of the French market to our goods. Our geographical situation, our great system of canals, our fine river, our great system of railways, the abundant variety of raw material in Canada, the wants of France, all tend wonderfully to the success of these new business relations; everything urges us to make a last effort in order to ensure these advantages to our country. To multiply our international exchanges would be to add to the strength and wealth of our land and water routes; it would be preparing the way to turn aside in our favor and for our benefit the tide of the great western trade; it would be to foresee the emergencies of war or other contingencies which might occur abroad. Let war be declared at a given moment between England and other countries, and our ships might have great difficulties in entering the English ports, and we might avoid a terrible crisis if we should secure beforehand another market accessible to our products. Another advantage of the proposed treaty would be that we would be benefited by every reduction made in favor of European countries. In watching over their own interests, in using their influence for that purpose, Germany, Belgium, Italy, Austria, almost the whole of Europe would be working for us. In exchange for these advantages what should we give? 1st. the privileges of the most favored nation, which are already existing, and which are a result of our tariff. 2nd. A reduction on French wines directly imported, either the abolition of the duty of 30 per cent *ad valorem* now imposed, non-sparkling wines not included. That reduction, if we take as a basis the present direct importations, would represent for the treasury an annual loss of about $30,000. This small loss is, however, only apparent, as will be seen, and it would have a double effect. In the first place, by diminishing the cost of light wines, it would add to their consumption, and would diminish the use of strong liquors; the cause of temperance would be the gainer, and it would be a panacea against drunkenness. This consumption of light wines being increased, the Government would collect more from the unabolished duties, and would more than repay themselves. On the one hand they would lose $30,000; on the other they would, perhaps, gain $100,000. Large sales would give large profits, according to the popular saying. Therefore we have a very great deal to gain and nothing to lose by this proposed treaty, which would be to the advantage of the two contracting parties. France desires to establish commercial relations with us, and she has proved it by subsidizing a direct line of steamers to Canada. I congratulate and thank the Government for having seconded the establishment of that line of steam packets, which will do so much towards tightening the bonds of friendship and trade which unite the two countries, towards opening a new era for Canada, and towards securing for us such immense advantages, both directly and indirectly. Numerous consequences will naturally follow. Take, for instance, our trade with St. Pierre de Miquelon. The goods from all countries which are transported there on French ships are admitted free. Out of an amount of 6,407,000 francs worth of goods coming from Canada and the United States, Canada only figures for an amount of 953,020 francs. It will readily be seen to what extent we might add to the sale of our goods in that island. Very probably we might even obtain the abolition of the taxes which are now imposed at St. Pierre de Miquelon on goods transported on Canadian ships. It would be easy to offer in return to French vessels the right of coasting along our Canadian shores. They are the only ships which are now excluded, and that without any benefit for anybody whatever. This line of steam packets will also virtually remove the French overtax on goods in bond. It has already been reduced on various items, but trade will entirely remove its effects as far as we are concerned. Besides it is only meant to encourage and promote direct trade with the countries of production. France, if we are to judge hy the speeches of her public men, by the writings of her publicists, by the favorable reports of prominent Frenchmen, who have come here, and who are coming every day to Canada, to seek information, by the hearty reception made to our delegates and to our visitors, France, I say, is perfectly disposed towards us. The efforts of our Government, the pamphlets distributed, the *Paris-Canada*, the admirable lectures given by the Hon. Mr. Fabre, lectures which should not be given at his own cost, but at the cost of the State, the Franco-Canadian monetary undertakings, which have resisted to various financial cataclysms, the visits of the French frigates and vessels, the clever and intelligent work performed by Sir A. T. Galt, and above all, the work done by Sir Charles Tupper, the connections of our leading statesmen—I could even name some of them who are in this House—with the leading men of France, all tend to add to the powerful interest of business, the stimulating influence of a strong sympathy, which is very natural after all, and which it would be wrong for us not to take advantage of. I do not speak from the point of view of French immigration. This is not the proper time to discuss that question. I will limit myself to commercial relations, to business interests which have neither nationality nor color, which have only honesty and legitimate profits for a basis. I say that the well understood interests of the Dominion require that we should lose no time in securing that market, so rich in men, in capital and in products; that we should increase our internal wealth by the development of our external trade; that we should foresee all the emergencies of foreign politics; that we should add a population of 40,000,000 souls to the not sufficiently long list of consumers of our agricultural, lumbering, mining, industrial and maritime produce; that we should increase the number and the wealth of our industries by procuring so favorable an outlet for their products; that we should favor the morality and welfare of the Canadian people by giving them an easy access to the pure and beneficial wines of France. All this can be done without interfering with the general tariff, while extending the application of the principles of the protective tariff and National Policy, these elements of strength and greatness through which the present Administration have justly deserved the confidence

of the country. I ask the Government to crown their work by an act of high policy and of wise foresight, which will ensure to them the gratefulness and hearty support of the people of the whole Dominion of Canada, which they will thus continue to make happier, greater and more prosperous.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I congratulate the hon. gentleman on the able speech he has made. He is very favorable, as we all are, to opening commercial relations with France. Of course, as the hon. gentleman has shown, negotiations had been carried on between this country, through the ambassador at Paris and the High Commissioner at London, and France. These negotiations lasted for several years. I hope with the hon. gentleman that the time will come very soon when these negotiations will be resumed, and that they will come to such a result as will be a benefit to Canada as well as France. No doubt also the result can be obtained without too great sacrifice on our part; but if we have to make a sacrifice, we must expect that this country, with which we will have to deal, will make a corresponding sacrifice. That is the only way in which we can obtain a reciprocity between the two countries. I have no objection to the papers being produced, and they will be brought down as soon as possible.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) If the hon member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) will allow me I will offer him my most sincere congratulations for the speech he has just made. With the exception of his peroration in which I think he has been rather exaggerated in his praise of the National Policy, I would be ready to endorse all that he has said. I must congratulate him especially on the progress which I think I have remarked in his ideas. If I remember rightly, three years ago, when the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) made his motion in favor of commercial treaties, my hon. friend from Bellechase voted against that proposition. I do not know if I am right in stating that such were the views he held at that time, but I am under the impression that he then voted against the proposition of the hon. member for West Durham. If such a proposition was made now, I presume, from what he has said to-night, that he would give a vote different from the vote he has given at that time. He has so well demonstrated the importance for the country to have direct commercial relations with France that he must admit that it would be equally important to negotiate our commercial treaties ourselves. He has shown, in an unquestionable manner, to what an extent it would be advantageous to us to export our produce directly to France and to have commercial relations with that country. Well, is it not evident, Mr. Speaker, that it would be equally advantageous to Canada, if we could negotiate our commercial treaties ourselves? And the hon. member would more rapidly attain the object he has in view if we could send our delegate directly to France without obliging him to pass through the medium of London officials. Again I congratulate my hon. friend on the progress of his ideas. "Paris was not built in one day" according to the old French proverb; but I hope that when the proposition is made again—if it is ever made—my hon. friend will see fit to favor it, for it could have no other result than to enable him to obtain that which he desires to obtain.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) In answer to what has just been said by my hon. friend, the member for East Quebec (Mr. Laurier), I must say that when the question of the importance for the Canadian Government to negotiate their treaties themselves was discussed, I was obliged to oppose it because it was untimely, and appeared to me to be incompatible with our position as a colony. If we wish to have the protection of the British flag, if we wish to cross the seas with safety under the British flag, if we wish to enjoy the advantages of English diplomacy, we must remain a colony. As long as we will not have our independence, we will be unable of making, ourselves, our treaties with other countries. But I think England gives us all the possible latitude and facilities. She makes us virtually independent, and allows us to treat with other countries, through the medium of her agents and of our delegates. We are really cumulating the advantages of an independent state with those of a colony. When the hon. member for West Durham made the motion to which my hon. friend has just referred, the Government were making efforts to have their delegate accredited at London with regard to other countries. To vote for his motion would have been to unjustly vote non-confidence in the Government on a measure which they favored and which they were preparing through constitutional means. It would also have been voting non-confidence in the colonial office. It would have been committing an unjustifiable and uncolonial act. Canada must congratulate the Government for having obtained from England, permission to treat almost directly. I can only desire that England may continue to give us as much freedom as she now gives us with regard to our commercial relations. All of this agrees with the speech I have just made, and nothing could induce me to regret the vote I have given on the occasion to which my hon. friend has just referred, nor to give a different vote should the question be raised anew.

Motion agreed to.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND FISHERMEN—REFUND OF DUTIES.

Mr. MILLS for (Mr. DAVIES) moved:

For a copy of the report of the commissioner appointed to enquire into the claims of the merchants and fishermen of Prince Edward Island for a refund of duties paid by them in the years 1871 and 1872, on fish exported to the United States. Also a copy of the evidence taken by such commissioner, together with all instructions furnished to said commissioner, and all correspondence between the commissioner and the Government, or any of the Departments, relating to said refund, or to the evidence or report of the said commissioner.

He said: I desire to have the words: "also a copy of the evidence taken by such commissioner" struck out, as this would take some time, and Mr. Davies is anxious to get the information as soon as possible.

Motion agreed to.

STEAMER *SIR JAMES DOUGLAS*' REPAIRS.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria) moved:

For copies of all correspondence of a date subsequent to 1st January, 1883, upon the subject of repairs to, hauling out, and launching of the steamer *Sir James Douglas* in the early part of said year, between the Department of Marine and Fisheries and their agent at Victoria, B.C., and between the Department and any other person or persons in the Province of British Columbia upon said subject; also copies of reports sent in to the Department by the agent in British Columbia and the master of the steamer referred to, in connection with the serious and unpleasant difference of opinion which arose between them, reflecting discreditably upon themselves and the Department; also all correspondence upon that or any other subject between the Department and any British Columbia member or other person, in any way reflecting upon the agent of the Department in British Columbia, to date.

He said: I notice that the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is out of his seat, and therefore I presume it would be a little out of place for me to make any very lengthy remarks on this subject, reflecting on the Department of which he is the distinguished head. I may state, for the information of members, however, that the main reason for my calling for this correspondence is, that last year I asked for the same correspondence, but unhappily did not get it. I therefore consider it incumbent on me to call for it this year, more particularly in reference to the repairs to the steamer *Sir James Douglas*. In connection with this subject, I may say that the expenditure on that vessel was considerably enhanced by the conduct of the agent of the Marine and Fisheries Department towards the artisans employed on the vessel. Reports have also been sent in to the Department,

reflecting upon the conduct of the agent. I am happy to state, however, that I have the assurance of the Minister that the obstacle of which I have so long complained is likely to be removed in the near future, and on that assurance I rest content.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Carried.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says "carried." I was thinking what a good thing it was to be a supporter of the Government. If a member of the Opposition had moved a motion of this kind, asking for papers and reports which reflected discredit upon one of the Departments of the Government, the Minister would not have said "carried," but would have cried out indignantly and said, it was a gross and improper act to ask the House to affirm unanimously that there were reports which reflected upon a Department. He would have said: It is impossible that the Department can err, it is impossible that the Department can have done anything discreditable or that it can be discredited; but my hon. friend can say these things and can have those motions carried, whereas, if we made any attempt of the kind, we should be met with a torrent of abuse.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is mutual confidence between my hon. friend and myself, and we had every confidence that the motion would be all right, even without reading it. Certainly, I did not.

Mr. BAKER. In this world there can none of us see ourselves as others see us, and I am pleased to know that the leader of the Government has confidence in one of the poorest and possibly the meanest of his loyal supporters. At the same time, I have had very good reason for calling for this correspondence, not as particularly reflecting upon the Department as a whole, but on a part of the Department in British Columbia, in which, of course, I have a right to take a decided interest.

Motion agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 31st March, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ENQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask the hon. Finance Minister when he will bring down the savings banks returns.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They are not ready.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I understood the hon. gentleman to say he would be able to bring down the returns for the Government savings banks.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They are in course of preparation and will be brought down as soon as possible. I could not speak about the others.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not necessary to get the whole at once; I will be very glad to get the half as soon as he can get it ready.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may inform the House that there is no fresh news from the North-West, except two satisfactory ones. One is that the movement on Battleford will, in all probability, have a peaceable and satisfactory solution; and we have the strongest assurance from Crowfoot, chief of the great Blackfeet tribe, that he and his tribe will be loyal under all circumstances.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 117) respecting the Commercial Bank of Nova Scotia.—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient further to amend the Acts respecting weights and measures by providing that a barrel shall no longer be a measure of capacity under section sixteen of "The Weights and Measures Act, 1879;" by defining further the weights which shall be deemed equivalent to a bushel; by making provision as to the size of barrels in which apples shall be packed and offered for sale, and by modifying the provisions of the said Act relating to goods packed in hermetically sealed cans.

Mr. BLAKE. Explain.

Mr. COSTIGAN. At present there is no standard size for a barrel of apples; and the provision that I propose is submitted at the request of persons interested in growing and exporting apples. There is also a change providing for the selling of coal by weight, a matter which has been urged upon the attention of the Department for some time past. It is also intended to amend a section or rather propose a substitute for a section, that was passed last year relating to canned goods, a section which from the information gathered from the business community, I think will be more acceptable and more easily worked. These are the main points dealt with in the Bill. Fuller and more detailed information will be given at a subsequent stage.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has mentioned something with respect to coal, which I do not find at all referred to in his resolution or indicated in the slightest degree. As to apple barrels: The hon. gentleman says a barrel of apples is a variable quantity, that there is no standard for the barrel just now; but may I ask whether it is intended that the new standard barrel shall be smaller or larger than the usual barrel at the present time? I also think we should have a little more detailed information even now as to what the nature of the provision is with respect to hermetically sealed cans. Is it the Act of last Session which the hon. gentleman is about to modify? We know that there have been considerable complaints as to the provisions with respect to stamping, and that the hon. gentleman, or some of his officers, indicated, some time during recess, that the Act would not be enforced; and he exercised a dispensing power with respect to laws on the same ground as the Minister of Marine had exercised it, that the people were ignorant of the results that would flow from the action of those laws. Besides making provision as to the weight of coal, which the hon. gentleman proposes to do, I would make a friendly suggestion as to another omission which should be supplied. I quite acknowledge that Ministers have acted upon the spirit in regard to the matter to which I am about to refer for some time past, but it would be well to obtain parliamentary sanction for it. The Bill provides "that a barrel shall no longer be a measure of capacity." I propose to add, that a position in the Cabinet no longer be regarded as a measure of capacity.

Mr. SCRIVER. I should like the hon. Minister to inform the House as to how the capacity of the proposed standard barrel of apples compares with that of a flour barrel. People generally, both for the home and export trade have, within my knowledge, packed apples in flour barrels, either

barrels formerly used for flour and emptied, or new barrels of that capacity. Perhaps the Minister will tell me the number of capacity in cubic inches of the proposed barrel, as compared with the barrel generally used heretofore. I trust it is not his intention to propose to increase the size of the barrel. I am satisfied if that is done, it will operate to the prejudice of fruit growers generally in the Dominion. They will not obtain any more for barrels of apples if the capacity is increased than they would get if it remained as at present. I am prepared to approve of legislation which will secure uniformity in respect to this matter. I think it is required in the interests of the trade generally and is in the real interest of apple growers in this country.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think it will be convenient if I reply to the enquiries made by the leader of the Opposition, and also allude to the friendly suggestion he threw out, which was the gist of his whole speech. It is not the first time I have experienced the friendliness of that hon. gentleman. Why it is that he makes a point of wounding my feelings on every occasion, I do not know. Is it because I am known to be of a quiet and peaceable disposition, and that I prefer to put up with the sneers of the hon. gentleman rather than to resent them? If that be the case, it would be wrong to allow the hon. gentleman to labor under that misunderstanding any longer; it would be better that we should understand one another, and though, according to his ideas of what the capacity of a Cabinet Minister should be, I may not come up to his standard, let me tell him that there is another standard by which I may be judged, and that I will not allow the hon. gentleman to treat me with sneers and contempt. I stand here by the rights of my position as a member, as a representative of the people—rights which are as constitutional and as well founded as the rights by which the hon. gentleman stands in his position. My rights to a seat in the Cabinet, I tell the honorable gentleman, are as well founded as were those of the hon. gentleman when he had a seat in the Cabinet. As to my qualifications, my capacity, the hon. gentleman need not be too severe. We all cannot be of such calibre as the hon. gentleman is, but the hon. gentleman, who sat in a former Cabinet, might perhaps measure the members of this Administration by the capacity of those with whom he sat while he was in that Cabinet. The hon. gentleman should look back to the colleagues with whom he was associated, and with whom I never heard that he found fault, and I am sure he will not consider that the humblest member of this Cabinet is at all inferior in capacity to many of those who were his colleagues in the then Cabinet. Then again I would remind the hon. gentleman that I shall know in future when he throws out friendly hints to me, what we may expect, from what one of his friends who was formerly leader of that party experienced, of the hon. gentleman's friendliness. I have not got the capacity of the hon. gentleman, but at least I am true to my party, and I have sometimes independence enough to express my views just as well as the hon. gentleman, not in such eloquent language, not in such a finished or polished way, but with just as much honesty of purpose as the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman cannot charge, at any rate, that whatever might occur, I would turn and betray my leader, and perhaps he may not be able to look his former leader in the face and say as much for himself; so I think that it is just as well that we should understand one another at the start, and that I should let the hon. gentleman understand that I will not allow his sneers to go unnoticed. I consider that I have a right to stand in my place here and in my humble way explain any measure which I propose for the consideration of Parliament, and if it is not acceptable I know what the result will be. These measures may not be pleasing to the hon. gentleman—they cannot all come up to his expectations, but I may say this that I think the hon. gentleman often goes out of his way in questions like this, where no politics or anything like that is concerned, where we are dealing with the trade and commerce of the country—I say I think the hon. gentleman would show more good sense if he would assist in perfecting such measures instead of trying to pick little technical objections upon every point that is raised. That is the course which the hon. gentleman has pursued all through—ever since I have occupied the position I now hold. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that I defy him—little as he appears to think my capacity, and although I have a great opinion of his ability, I have also my opinion about other characteristics he possesses. I have within my memory some of the characteristics of that hon. gentleman, and as reference has already been made to the troubles we have now in the North-West, I have a recollection of that hon. gentleman using that power of eloquence that we all know he possesses as an orator, to excite the feelings of one portion of the community against another portion of the community. I remember it well, and I charge the hon. gentleman with it. I charge him with trying to raise a cry against Riel and his followers in the North-West, and afterwards when these people were coming here pleading for an amnesty he excluded the only Irishman who was among them; the hon. gentleman in the most inconsistent, cool, and ungenerous way as an Irishman standing here—when I stood on that side of the House defending or trying to ask that equal justice might be meted to the late Professor O'Donohue, what did the hon. gentleman say? He called on his followers on this side—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I think this is exceedingly out of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not want to take up the time unnecessarily, but I think this is as necessary as the remarks the hon. gentleman made, and that his remarks were just as foreign to the subject under discussion. I just wish to complete the statement I was making. When I was on that side, moving a resolution that Professor O'Donohue should be treated in at least the same way as others who were exiled for five years, while he was banished for all time, the hon. gentleman rose on this side and he appealed to his supporters to vote my resolution down, picturing Professor O'Donohue as a red-handed murderer, guilty of all the crimes of the calendar, that he was worse than all the others, because he went out of the country and brought in an armed force, and therefore that an amnesty should not be granted to him. And what did he do afterwards? An hon. gentleman alongside of him had gone back to Quebec for re-election, when politics were to be turned to account, what public opinion demanded in the name of justice and fair play should be meted out to this man—what the hon. gentleman refused on that occasion to the representatives of the people in this House—what he made his voters on this side of the House vote down, he turned and granted on the eve of the election in Quebec. I tell the hon. gentleman that if he has great power and eloquence, if he enjoys the position in this House of being able to castigate those whom he chooses——

Mr. MITCHELL. Not all of them.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No, not all of them. I tell the hon. gentleman there are members in this House who will not be castigated by him, and I for one shall not submit to it. Now with regard to the size of the barrel I wish to state, in answer to the question raised by the hon. gentleman, that it is proposed to fix the standard the same as is known for the flour barrel. The reason of that is that small growers are often supplied with empty flour barrels to pack apples in, and it will not prevent larger growers having them manufactured for their own purposes, and having them manufactured the same size. That is the reason that the

Bill will provide that the standard of the barrel will be the same as the present flour barrel.

Mr. BLAKE. In reply to the hon. gentleman I would venture to say in the first place that my observations were not at all confined to him. I would say in the second place that he has made some observations with reference to myself; he has compared myself with him. I do not feel myself worthy of the comparison, I am sure, in any respect in which I think we are proper to be compared. The hon. gentleman says he has always been true to his party. He need not have told us that; our memories are not so short that we cannot remember the incidents which took place last Session quite well, when the hon. gentleman retired from the position in which he now sits—retired from his seat and took a desk in the rear. We remember quite well that concurrently with that, when the hon. gentleman in his occupation of his seat in the Chamber, thought that in his public duty he had some observations to make before the Canadian Pacific Railway resolutions were disposed of. We remember that he called for an adjournment, in order that that might be done, when—not his colleague of the moment, nor perhaps his leader at the moment, but the First Minister, invited him to desist and make his observations at a subsequent stage. We remember that the hon. gentleman persisted and that the First Minister was obliged to yield to the hon. gentleman's persistence, and consent to the adjournment which he thought inconvenient a moment before. We remember that for some few hours the hon. gentleman was in that position, and that the measure came before the House a day later; and when that adjourned debate, which had been adjourned for his convenience, and in order that he might make the observations which he felt his public duty required him to make before the measure proceeded to another stage—when I say that debate was resumed, the hon. gentleman complained that his throat was sore, and that he could not speak with convenience just then.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No message had been sent over to speak now.

Mr. BLAKE. I am glad that he acknowledges that no message had been sent over to speak now. Perhaps if it had, the hon. gentleman's throat would not have been so bad. But the hon. gentleman said that his throat was sore, and he could not speak then, but would reserve his observations until concurrence. In the meantime before concurrence came, there was another kind of concurrence, and the hon. gentleman, although his throat was restored, harmony being also restored, spake not at all; so that we never heard, perhaps we shall hear now, what the hon. gentleman's grave objections to that measure were; we never heard, perhaps we shall hear now, how his objections were cured. But so it was, that resignation took place, resistance took place, reconciliation took place, and readmission to the Cabinet took place; and the hon. gentleman resumed his loyalty and fidelity to his party. Now, the hon. gentleman says with reference to me that I have been false to my leader. Well, I do not mind that. I acquit myself of that. Those who sit around me and support and follow me acquit me of it also; and it is not upon the hon. gentleman's statement that a contrary verdict will be returned. I have heretofore denied that statement when it has been made by other hon. gentlemen; I have nothing to do on this occasion except to repeat that denial. Then, the hon. gentleman says that there was an occasion on which I excited one portion of the community against another, by moving in reference to Louis Riel, who I thought ought to be punished for what he had done in the North-West, as I think still. He says I excited, or sought to excite, one portion of the community against another. I ask the hon. gentleman to refer to the speeches I delivered on that occasion; I ask any hon. gentleman who will take the trouble, to search the records of the grounds on which I acted and spoke—which are the grounds upon which I act and speak still—and he will find that, so far from my views having been based on any effort to excite one section of the community against another, I stated in the speech I made in the Assembly, and to which the hon. gentleman refers, expressly my views as to what were the moving causes of that difficulty. I expressly disclaimed the notion that that denomination, to which the hon. gentleman himself belongs, and to which I suppose he alludes as one of the parties against whom he alleges another was to be excited, had any responsibility for the difficulty. So far from my efforts having been such as to excite one class in the community against another, it is my proud boast to-day that my views were confirmed by the population of my Province, Protestant and Roman Catholic, Orange and non-Orange, Tory and Reformer, by a unanimous vote in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, with the exception of one single man, the present Mr. Justice Cameron, who alone recorded his nay vote—every member of the Assembly, Tory and Reformer, Roman Catholic and Protestant, Orange and Green, uniting, Sir, in the resolution that the reward ought to be offered. Now, that was the result.

Mr. McCALLUM. You soon forgot it afterwards.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, we will see about that Let us do one thing at a time; my plan of operations is to attend to one point at a time. I am attending to this charge of exciting one section against another, and I am pointing to what is the best evidence against it, that the representatives of the Province, after a general election, the election of 1871, when we were returned to Parliament, were unanimous, of whatever creed, whatever denomination, whatever class, with the single exception to which I refer, in affirming my policy. I had a united Province at my back, and that is not a sign of exciting one sect or denomination against another. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) says I forgot it afterwards. I never forgot it. I found in the interval, we all found, that certain transactions occurred of which we had no conception, to which reference was made the other evening, and to which upon a convenient occasion I shall be delighted to refer at greater length—some transaction occurred which rendered a particular course advisable, statesmanlike, and the only course which could with justice and equity be pursued. We found that we had been committed by the acts of those in power; and I took that view and acted upon it, and in accordance with that view the question was adjusted. I was only a private member of Parliament at that time, but I take all the responsibility of having heartily concurred in the action taken by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie), and of having supported it by my vote and voice, because I believed it was the only course which honor and good faith permitted, after what had taken place, and which was developed in the very resolution on which the amnesty was founded. The hon. gentleman who has attacked me says that I forgot all that shortly afterwards, and that I declined to agree to a proposal for an immediate amnesty to the late W. B. O'Donohue. He is quite right; I did so; but he says I declined upon the ground that he was a red-handed murderer—he said that I painted him as a murderer. Now, Sir, I would like hon. gentlemen who may have forgotten that debate, again to recur to it, and they will find the distinct grounds, on which I thought a difference existed between the case of the others and the case of O'Donohue at that time, to be stated plainly. It was plainly made to appear that W. B. O'Donohue had been inciting a Fenian rising; he had been inciting Fenians from the United States to come into Canada. That was his position, that was his end, that was his object in this matter; and it was the circumstance that he was so inciting them, which had induced Governor Archibald and other authorities to make certain promises and to take certain action with

reference to Louis Riel and others, which formed important ingredients in the way they were treated. I said then, that I thought the time had not now come—speaking from a somewhat remote memory—for dealing with the case of O'Donohue. I did not say that he should not be relieved from some portion of his sentence, but I said the time had not come for dealing with his case. Subsequently the Government—I believe I was then a member of it—at all events I accept the responsibility just as if I had been, for I fully concur in the view they took—came to the conclusion that the time had come. The hon. gentleman says it was because my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier) was then standing for the city of Quebec, I deny it. I say we were open to take that action at such a time, as we thought a sufficient period had elapsed. My hon. friend tells me, what I did not know, that there are not 50 Irish votes in Quebec East. That was the statement. The hon. gentleman can of course impute to us improper motives for having done what we did do. I remember very well at the time that the hon. gentleman called upon me to make my promise beforehand. I declined to do that, because I stated that I thought the Government ought to be unfettered to deal with the question when that time had arrived. My hon. friend Mr. Laflamme was the Minister of Justice who prepared the report and proposed the measure. He did it because he thought the time had fairly arrived; the hon. gentleman thinks it arrived some time before but he did not delay too long. But when we acted the hon. gentleman thinks we acted from base motives; it is a question of motives. I deny the imputation of base motives. It is all the hon. gentleman can make, and I hope now I have answered the statements of the hon. gentleman so far as they affect me personally or politically.

Mr. CASEY. Is there to be a penalty for selling apples in a barrel smaller than a flour barrel?

Mr. COSTIGAN. That will be discussed later.

Mr. CASEY. It is not always possible for the small farmer to get apple barrels. He may put what small quantity of apples he has into any sized barrel or box he can find and bring them to market and sell them in a lump quantity without defining the measure. The purchaser sees what he buys and takes his chances. If a penalty be imposed for selling in such barrels or cases, it will be hard upon the small farmer who cannot afford to go to the expense of getting a barrel specially.

Mr. GAULT. Large quantities of selected apples are shipped from Montreal to England in barrels smaller than flour barrels, and the question is whether any alteration should be made in the law to prevent that. As a rule, apples are sold in the market in flour barrels, but the selected ones are shipped in smaller barrels.

Mr. MILLS. This question as to the size of the barrel was before Parliament some years ago. It was then pointed out that in Nova Scotia a smaller barrel was used in selling apples than the flour barrel. I can see great convenience in the suggestion of the hon. gentleman to adopt the flour barrel as the standard. Is the standard to be made imperative? If not the law will be useless, but if it be made imperative how does the hon. gentleman propose to enforce his provision? Does he propose to make it penal? Or does he propose to allow the Nova Scotia barrels to be used, which, I presume, are the ones to which the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Gault) refers.

Mr. COSTIGAN. When the demand was first made for standard barrels for apples the gentlemen in that business who made the proposition were in favor of a larger barrel than the flour barrel being adopted. They said that from the fact that they shipped to the English market apples in barrels larger than the American barrel, they established a character for the fruit advantageous to them. I felt the force of the remarks of the member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) with regard to small growers who might not be able to go to the expense of getting manufactured barrels, and thought it advisable, for convenience sake, to adopt the flour barrel, because the small farmers would be in a position to use their empty flour barrels. As to providing penalties that can be arranged in the Bill. It is intended to provide a penalty for selling otherwise than in such barrels, but that will be discussed better when we come to take up the Bill, I think.

Mr. WOODWORTH. As has already been referred to by the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), the Revised Statutes of Nova Scotia, fourth series, provide, at page 76, for the measurement of apple barrels. I remember when Mr. Longley, who was then the member for Annapolis, introduced this Bill. We have found it to work very well, and I do not understand exactly what kind of a Bill is going to be introduced here after this resolution passes, but I would ask my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue to look at this Act. I suppose it has escaped his notice.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman had any communication with the fruit growers of western Ontario, where there are very large and extensive orchards, on this subject.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The petitions came principally from the fruit growers of Ontario.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But I mean from western Ontario. My county and that of my hon. friend are very large apple growing counties, and several of those who are largely engaged in that trade have represented to me on several occasions that they were in favor of much smaller packages and barrels, and that for the English market they thought it would be better to have not the barrel but a much smaller unit of capacity, in order to encourage trade in the English markets. How that may be I cannot say, but I merely state the opinion expressed to me by some of them, and so I would like to know what particular quarter of Ontario the hon. gentleman's information was received from.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Some suggestion might be made when we come to discuss the section. We might make the barrel the same as the flour barrel. This is not a measure I have introduced from any notion I have myself, but from representations from the fruit growers that this legislation is required.

Mr. BLAKE. But the hon. gentleman did not appear to be aware that there was a law regulating the size of the apple barrel in Nova Scotia. I do not know whether he had any representations from the apple growers of Nova Scotia, who grow a large quantity of apples for export?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No.

Mr. BLAKE. The difficulty is this, if we are to prepare legislation in respect to a matter on which very few of us are informed, it seems almost a necessary preliminary to understand what the general view of the growers in the different parts of the country is, if the hon. gentleman bases his opinion upon that. It does not do to legislate because the fruit growers of Huron or of other parts of Ontario require it, without arriving at a reasonable thing for all.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The legislation now intended will make the barrels uniform. The size laid down by legislation in Nova Scotia is the same as that proposed in this Bill.

Mr. HESSON. For the last few years I have had correspondence with fruit growers in Ontario in reference to this matter, and I am sure this measure will be accepted by the fruit growers throughout that Province as a step in the right direction. It would appear to me that the utilisation

of the flour barrel, which can be always purchased cheaper after it has been used, would be a very important consideration. To take any size that would not conform to that would probably create a loss, as a flour barrel is very easily obtainable by the smaller producer or packer of fruit, and it is desirable that they should be able to utilise it. I think a smaller package, provided it is not smaller than any ordinary flour barrel, would be the best to ship fruit in. I quite agree with what my hon. friend from Huron seemed to indicate, but I do not think it would be desirable to get below a flour barrel. A uniform size is found necessary, as some of these barrels have contained two and a half bushels, some three, and some three and a quarter bushels, and in many cases it was unfair, as a market price was to be attached to a barrel, whereas the difference in the contents might be very material. I have had letters on this subject within the last three years. I have not found it necessary to bring it before the House, but I find that pressure has been brought to bear on the Minister himself, and I merely desire to sustain the view that there is a necessity for uniform legislation.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has not explained under which limb of this resolution he proposes to deal with the question of coal.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If the hon. gentleman objects, I shall not be able to avoid his objection, because it does not seem to be mentioned in the resolution.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the change about the cans?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The second sub-section of section 26, passed last Session, is as follows:—

"2. Every hermetically sealed package of canned goods, such as vegetables, fish and the like, shall have the weight of the contents of the tin, can or package containing the same, legibly marked on it; and any packer or other person found guilty of selling or exposing for sale such goods in any such tin, can or package, on which the weight of the contents is not so marked, or on which such weight is misrepresented, shall, for the first offence, incur a penalty of two dollars for each such tin, can or package, and for each subsequent offence a penalty of not less than three nor more than twenty dollars for each such tin, can or package."

At the time of the passing of this Act strong objections were taken to this section by the packers on the ground that they could not put the exact quantity in the packages that this measure required. It was represented, also, that they had large stocks on hand, and that large quantities of tins had been ordered for packing purposes, and that to enforce the law would inflict a heavy loss on these parties. The hon. gentleman states that my Department has suspended the operation of the Act. Well, my Department has no power to suspend the operation of the Act; and to-day, under that Act, every person in the trade is just as much liable as under any other Act of Parliament. The hon. gentleman may be correct if he supposes that under all the circumstances our officers did not enforce that Act with the same strictness that they would if the circumstances had been other than I have mentioned. Now the change at present does not give up the principle involved in the first section. I still hold to the propriety of securing for the consumer the quantity that he purchases. We go further in this Act and provide at the same time, not only for the marking of the packages, but also that it shall contain the name of the packer, and further that it shall show the year in which such goods are packed. That provision, I think, is in the interest of the consumer, so that he may know whether the article he is buying is fresh or not. Another reason that I think the House will admit is with reference to the poison in the cans. We see references made in the newspapers to accidents of poisoning occurring from the use of canned goods, and we find it is a general belief that these poisons accumulate by some means in the older classes of goods, and that the poison is more likely to be found in stocks that have been held over for a number of years. It is believed that in all cases where poison has been found in these goods the cans had been packed for several years, while there is no danger to be apprehended from fresh packed goods. Therefore we think it is in the interest of the public, when they buy an article they shall know, at least, in what year it was packed, because if the can is hermetically sealed they cannot otherwise ascertain whether the contents are fresh or old. Among the packers of fruit one of the strong arguments used is that in different seasons the fruit differs in density or weight, and that a can manufactured to hold two pounds of prepared tomatoes, for instance, this year, might not contain the same weight next year on account of the different density of the fruit. While there may be something in that, I confess that I am not able to decide the point, but in order that no injustice may be done to the packers, or to any one else who may be affected by this Bill, I propose to take powers under the Bill by Order in Council that where any class of these goods is known to be liable to variation, a percentage may be allowed as a margin to meet the variation to which packers claim that certain fruits are liable. It is proposed, also, to exempt from the operation of the section to which I am alluding, all such goods as may be imported from foreign countries into Canada, and such as are not prepared and put up here. It is also proposed to exempt from the operation of the Act goods that are put up in this country for exportation. My opinion last Session was that the exemption was not necessary; I believed then that if this principle were adopted the packers exporting such goods would find that it would establish their character in foreign markets, and would give the goods increased value. But, on the other hand, I have been informed by packers that it would prove a great inconvenience to them, especially in the English markets, where the present law does not insist upon any weights being marked upon the can, but imposes a penalty if the weight is marked upon a can, and the contents are not in accordance with the weight so marked. They claim that if they were to export their goods marked, as I say, to contain two, three or four pounds, in small packages, and in case any of these cans fell short in the actual weight, they would be liable to a penalty under the English Act. Then I thought, perhaps, it would be as well to yield that point for the goods which are to be packed for exportation. I think that is all the explanations I have to offer at present on that section of the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. Then I understand the operations of the measure are, first of all, that the hon. gentleman demands some further marks upon the can; secondly, he omits from the operations of the law, goods imported into the country of a character which we do not put up ourselves, and goods exported; and thirdly, he takes a general power to permit some variations in classes of goods which are found not to be certain in their natural weight from one year to the other. Of course, as to goods for exportation, it was pointed out last year when the measure was under discussion, that having found himself in a position in which he was obliged to dispense—not in form—of course he could not, nor could the whole Government dispense with an Act of Parliament—but practically to dispense with it by telling his officers not to carry out the law with the same strictness as they carry out other laws, or telling them not to do anything. I think the hon. gentleman had better pass a law which will deal with these questions effectually. The law at present is one which is subject to variations from year to year by Order in Council. So there is no stability in the law as to certain classes I think it would have been better if enquiry had taken place, and the hon. gentleman had been able to say that such and such are the limits of variation in the different classes of goods. The hon. gentleman has pointed out that the marking will indicate the year in which

the goods were really canned, and I hope the hon. gentleman will be able to assure consumers that those marks will represent accurately the years in which the goods were put up.

Mr. JACKSON. I did not hear the Minister distinctly. Does the hon. gentleman intend to have the weight marked on the can?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. JACKSON. Then do you intend to allow foreign goods to be imported here without the weight being marked and yet oblige home producers to have the weight marked?

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend behind me was under the impression that the Minister had been speaking generally as to foreign goods imported here. I understood the Minister to say that the exception as to weight is to apply only to such foreign goods imported as are not of the same character as we put up in this country.

Mr. DAVIES. With respect to the packing of lobsters, I suppose the Minister intends that those who pack lobsters for export do not need to stamp the cans, while any cans of lobsters attempted to be sold here must be stamped. I would impress on the hon. gentleman the supreme importance of obtaining accurate information before he legislates. Last year we passed what was nothing more than a tentative measure, and it turned out that it was not capable of being enforced. A good many packers went to a large expense in providing dies and casts for stamping cans, and afterwards they received notice from the Department that the Act would not be enforced. The hon. Minister shakes his head; but I can give him one case from my own personal knowledge. Packers, I say, went to the expense of providing dies and were then informed by the Department that the Act would not be enforced. The Minister admits that such was the case; it was not enforced as a matter of fact last year. If new regulations are made this year it is very desirable that they should be contained in the Statute itself, because if they are to be made by Order in Council they will be changed from time to time, and the trade will be interfered with. Nothing annoys any trade so much as constant changes of regulations. I submit that the hon. gentleman should satisfy himself on every point before he introduces legislation, and regulations should not be made by Order in Council.

Mr. MILLS. Looking at the Statutes of 1879—I was unable to obtain the Statutes for 1884—I find it is provided that 25 Imperial gallons shall be a barrel. That is made by law the capacity of a barrel without reference to the particular use to which the barrel is put. That provision would apply, of course, to apples as well as to anything else. Will the hon. gentleman state what is the capacity of the barrel which he now proposes to adopt; is it 25 Imperial gallons?

Mr. BLAKE. Will it be larger or smaller than 25 Imperial gallons? In fact, how many Imperial gallons will the new barrel hold?

Mr. COSTIGAN. A flour barrel, I suppose, will hold about three and a half bushels.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Nothing like it.

Mr. BLAKE. The Act provides 25 Imperial gallons shall be a barrel. How many Imperial gallons will the new barrel hold?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I can measure it if the hon. gentleman wishes. It is provided by this Bill that a barrel shall be of certain dimensions.

Mr. BLAKE. We should like to know how much it will hold. We know how much 25 Imperial gallons is.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It would be nearly 25 Imperial gallons.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman will see that the matter of weights and measures is getting each year into greater and greater confusion. We have adopted, as a measure of capacity, the Imperial gallon, and in addition we have said that 60 pounds of wheat shall be a bushel. A Winchester bushel will measure 60 pounds, but an Imperial bushel will measure 70 pounds. The weights of the various kinds of grain mentioned are based upon the Winchester bushel and not on the Imperial bushel, which is mentioned in the Act. We shall see when the Bill comes down what its provisions are; but there could not be a greater mass of confusion and inconsistency than the provisions of the Act relating to weights and measures.

Resolution considered in Committee, reported and concurred in.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 118) further to amend the Acts relating to Weights and Measures.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose there is no more coal in the Bill than in the resolution.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is coal in the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. Is that fair?

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INSPECTION OF GAS.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, That it is expedient further to amend the Acts respecting the inspection of gas and gas meters by providing that gas may be inspected without notice to the manufacturer.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman throw a little electric light on this subject?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I shall be most happy. The only change proposed is that in inspecting gas and gas meters, instead of giving notice to the owners or manufacturers, as at present, we may make the inspection of gas without any such notice.

Mr. BLAKE. We have lost the last part of the clause?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The hon. gentleman never had it.

Mr. BLAKE. We had notice of it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I hope the hon. gentleman does not insist on my moving it.

Mr. BLAKE. No, if the hon. gentleman does not wish to move it.

Resolution considered in Committee, reported and concurred in.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 119) further to amend the Acts respecting the inspection of Gas and Gas Meters.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the hon. gentleman does not intend to make any further provision respecting the presence of sulphuretted hydrogen in gas. This is I suppose a sort of compensation for the superfluity of the other Bill. The question as to the quantity of sulphuretted hydrogen was the subject of debate and of attempted legislation some time ago, and I thought the hon. gentleman was about to deal with it. Is this postponement on account of the difficulty of dealing with the subject, or the representation of the gas companies, or perhaps because the consumers do not like such a proposal?

Mr. COSTIGAN. We thought it advisable at first to require the number of meters in use to be entered in the registers of consumers, but we learned from the reports of

outside inspectors that the number would not be very great, and we considered that further legislation would not be required.

Mr. BLAKE. But as to the provisions with respect to the presence of sulphuretted hydrogen?

Mr. COSTIGAN. We do not propose to deal with it further than by the present Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ENQUIRY FOR A RETURN.

Mr. VAIL. I would remind the Minister of Marine that the Return with reference to the supplies on the Hudson Bay steamers has not been brought down. The Order was passed on the 28th of February; I amended it to suit the hon. gentleman's convenience, by including other papers, but we have waited for it a long time.

Mr. McLELAN. I enquired of the Deputy Minister this morning, and he said it would be ready shortly. There was some delay in getting the accounts from the Auditor's office, but they have been obtained and are now in the hands of the copying clerks. We have had a number of returns to prepare, and some which have been called for since that day were much more important and they were put in hand first.

Mr. VAIL. I think the hon. gentleman has been favored a good deal this year, as we have not asked for a great many returns from his Department.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders are called, I would invite hon. gentlemen opposite to give some further information with reference to the condition of affairs in the North-West, and also with reference to what further action they have taken with regard to troops, and so forth, since we last met.

Mr. CARON. I understood that the right hon. leader of the Government had given to the House at the beginning of the sitting the news which had been received so far. With regard to the troops, the 9th Battalion, Quebec, under the command of Lieut.-Col. Amyot, has been called out, and will proceed forthwith to the front. The telegrams received from along the line are most satisfactory, as indicating that the measures taken by the railway company are being carried out successfully, and that the troops are being conveyed as rapidly as possible over that portion of the line north of Lake Superior. The hon. gentleman will understand that I do not wish to point out the exact place which the troops have reached. The hon. gentleman may smile; but I think it is of the greatest possible importance that this information should not be given. However, it must be satisfactory to the House to know that the measures taken have been successfully carried out, and that the troops are proceeding as rapidly as possible to the scene of action.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has not stated what he expects to be the strength of the 9th, or whether the 65th has been ordered to leave.

Mr. CARON. I explained yesterday that they were ordered to be ready and to proceed to the front.

Mr. BLAKE. He did not state that they were to proceed to the front, but that they were to be ready.

Mr. CARON. I may not have gone that far; but they have received orders to proceed, and I expect that they will proceed to-morrow morning or afternoon. The 9th Battalion, under my hon. friend Col. Amyot, has just gone through its annual drill, and was inspected a few days ago, in consequence of which it will be possible to despatch it with almost no delay. Colonel Amyot told me that he expected to be able to leave by to-morrow night or the day after. He has left this afternoon by the four o'clock train for Quebec to take command of his regiment, and he expects to be able to leave immediately. The strength of his battalion is about 340, or possibly 350. The full strength of the 65th, I am informed, will be between 250 and 300.

Mr. BLAKE. There have been some statements in the newspapers with reference to the condition of the accoutrements of the 65th. Are those defects now repaired?

Mr. CARON. I do not know what the papers have said, but I can tell the hon. gentleman that the 65th, like every other battalion in ordinary times, is not provided with all the equipment which is necessary when moving. The requisition was sent in by Col. Ouimet to the Department, and the requisition was filled without any delay whatever. Whatever was required that we had not, I authorised Col. Ouimet to purchase in Montreal.

Mr. BLAKE. As the hon. gentleman has stated that it is of the highest consequence in the public interest that it should not be known where the troops north of Lake Superior are, of course I do not enquire further as to that. But we were told, when it was announced to us by the First Minister that this route was to be adopted, that there was a gap in the Canadian Pacific Railway of from seventy to seventy-five miles.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That was a mistake.

Mr. BLAKE. A little later in the evening the Minister of Customs said a mistake had been made in that, and that there was one gap in the road of 42 miles. The First Minister also stated to us that the troops would reach Winnipeg by that route more quickly than they would by any other route. Now, the information I have received is that there is not one gap, but three gaps, and that the sum of the mileage of those three gaps is about 87 miles, being more than twice as much as the Minister of Customs said; and as they are divided into three parts, the troops will require three transfers, not one. The information I have also received is that the officials of the Canadian Pacific Raiway say themselves that they expect the troops now on the railway to reach Winnipeg on Thursday, which would indicate that route to be not shorter, but much longer than any other route. As the statements the First Minister made when he informed the House of the adoption of this route appear not to be in accordance with this information either as to the mileage of the gaps, or the number of the gaps, or the length of time, I think, when the knowledge of these inaccuracies comes to him, he should give us the accurate information on the subject. In this connection, I would ask whether the hon. gentleman can say when he expects that the troops who started yesterday will reach Winnipeg. In the same connection I would refer to a statement made in the Montreal *Times* of to-day:

> "The Government had occasion to forward from Kingston and Toronto a quantity of ammunition for the North-West by the Grand Trunk Railway to Chicago. Mr. Cable, President of the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Company, on learning the facts, immediately placed, without charge, two cars, and made a special train for the speedy delivery at St. Paul of the war supplies. An act of kindness like this is not at all likely to be forgotten."

I would ask whether that statement is correct as to the transport of these munitions, and as to the kind action of the president of the company.

Mr. BOWELL. The statement that I made just before the House rose was made upon the authority of the president of the company. I made special enquiry as to the length our volunteers would have to travel to connect with the western section of the Canadian Pacific Railway and gave the information as I received it.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope neither the hon. gentleman or anybody else thinks that I intimated the hon. gentleman said anything else than what he believed to be true. I stated that as soon as the Government became aware of the inaccuracy of their statement they should have given us the accurate facts.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think I said there was only one gap, because I know there are several small gaps besides the chief one. I believe I said, or at any rate I intended to say the gap or gaps were 70 miles. If the hon. gentleman has seen the plan exhibited by the Canadian Pacific Railway, he must have seen whore these gaps are. I find that the larger gap estimated to be 42 to 47 miles. I think 47 miles is the accurate distance—and then there are two other smaller gaps. Sleighs are in readiness at the gaps, and the men without difficulty are transferred from railway to sleigh and from sleigh to railway, and I think that is the safest and shortest route in Canada by which to send troops to the North-West.

Mr. CARON. In so far as the paragraph which the hon. gentleman read from the *Times* of Montreal with reference to the action of the American railway companies is concerned, I may say it is perfectly true. The American railway companies have been extremely kind, expediting with all possible promptness the ammunition we have sent over their lines, and I took occasion to telegraph Mr. Cable the thanks of the Government for his promptness.

Mr. BLAKE. It is stated the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) has left for the North-West. Has he gone under instructions from the Government or on a Government mission?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. BLAKE. At what time did Gen. Middleton leave Ottawa? When did he reach Winnipeg?

Mr. GAULT. The House and the country will recognise the great efficiency and promptness which the Government has displayed in sending forward troops. I need only say that there is still in Montreal a battalion ready to go to the front as well prepared to go as any battalion in this country.

Mr. CARON. General Middleton left, I think, on Monday night and must have reached Winnipeg on Friday morning. To be absolutely certain I will get the accurate information and give it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BLAKE. I have been informed that the Government has taken control of the telegraph lines west of Winnipeg. Is that so? And I would also ask what is the present condition of telegraphic communication in the North-West, in the disturbed region, and what are the present facilities for obtaining news, and what the date is of the latest news received from Prince Albert, Carlton and Battleford?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman is perhaps not aware that the lines which are under the control of the Government are from Qu'Appelle to Fort Qu'Appelle, from Fort Qu'Appelle to Humboldt, with two or three stations on the way, from Humboldt to Clark's Crossing; then from Clark's Crossing it divides, one line goes to Prince Albert, the other goes to Battleford; from Battleford to Edmonton, and from Edmonton to St. Albert. St. Albert must not be confounded with Prince Albert. St. Albert is far in the west while Prince Albert is more in the east, about 20 miles from Carlton, but Carlton is not on the line of the telegraph. The line was cut Saturday last between Humboldt and Clark's Crossing, but was re-established during the night on orders from here, and the next news we heard was that the half-breeds had taken possession of our station at Stobart, about 17 or 18 miles from Prince Albert. It is also called Batoche. Near there is Duck Lake. Stobart is about 16 miles from Carlton. The line has been cut between Clark's Crossing on the main line and Prince Albert, and has not been reestablished. The line was cut two days ago between Battleford and Edmonton in the west; that was reestablished once or twice but it has been cut again, and we have had no direct news by telegraph from Edmonton for the last two days.

Mr. CARON. Arrangements have been made to establish a service for the troops so that we will not be without information.

Mr. BLAKE. Is there any reliable information with reference to the fate of the Indian instructor on the File Hills reserve?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, there are only rumors of which we have no means of knowing the truth or falsity.

Mr. BLAKE. Are we to have to-day any of the papers which have been asked for, some of which the hon. gentleman stated were in preparation? Since that time it has been indicated to me, with reference to some of the papers which I have suggested as likely to be in the possession of the Government, that there was a letter from the Bishop of Saskatchewan to the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Territories, which probably the latter officer may have transmitted to the Government, as it was certainly his duty to have done; also there were several applications from Bishop Grandin in regard to the half-breed claims, and also that there was probably some response on the part of the Government to the memorial or representation or Minute in Council of the North-West Council which was passed in the year 1883. I mention these as other papers amongst those which I think it is important the House should have.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will bring down such papers as are not confidential.

Mr. MILLS. When the hon. gentleman brings down these papers, he might also bring down the report which was made by Major Walsh in the autumn of 1878. Before the late Government retired from office, Major Walsh, who was connected with the police force in the North-West Territories, received leave of absence through the Secretary of State, and was in the service of the Department of the Interior. He was appointed to visit the half-breeds south of the Saskatchewan and north of the American border to ascertain their numbers, to ascertain their wishes and aspirations, to know where they would like to be located, and in fact to obtain for the Government all the information that could be had in regard to them, and which at that time was not in the possession of the Government. I understood in the Session of 1879 that that commission of Major Walsh was cancelled and he was ordered back to join the force. The Government, no doubt, had some reason for changing the policy of their predecessors in this particular. Major Walsh, I know, was engaged in those duties at the time that the policy was reversed, and he was ordered again to join the police force. I have no doubt that the Government have some papers upon the subject, the communication of the Government to Major Walsh and any statement he may have made to the Government in regard to it, and I hope the hon. gentleman will, with the other papers he may bring down, bring down those papers, and we shall then be in a better position to see what is the position of the half breed population, known as the half-breeds of the plains, than we would be without that information.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman desires to have speedy returns, he cannot get returns of all the papers and correspondence in regard to the North-West from the time we got the country.

Mr. MILLS. I am not asking that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, nothing has been heard, or, at all events, nothing was suggested this Session in reference to this real or supposed report of Mr. Walsh.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman will see that he was in charge of the Department at the time Major Walsh was ordered to desist from the work in which he was engaged and to return to his post on the police force. It must therefore have been done by the hon. gentleman.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, but in 1879.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Winceys.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I propose a substitution. The original proposition was that costume cloths, serges and similar fabrics under 25 inches wide should be charged 25 per cent. *ad valorem*, and winceys of all kinds 25 per cent. *ad valorem*. I propose to strike out those two items and substitute the following:—

Checked, striped or fancy cotton winceys over twenty-five inches wide a specific duty of two cents per square yard and fifteen per cent. *ad valorem*.

This alteration is, I think, not a change from the Act as it now stands. At present all these goods not over a quarter wool are subject to precisely the same duty. Great difficulties have arisen in many of the ports and in the entry in the Custom house to ascertain whether the goods were over a fourth wool or under. This is intended to remove that difficulty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why do you introduce the word "cotton?" Will not that add to the difficulty? It might be considered to refer to all cotton.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They do make winceys all cotton as well as of wool.

Mr. BLAKE. As you now have it, is it intended to embrace only those which are cotton, and to omit those which have any admixture of wool at all?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. As it stands at present, any wincey that is cotton or not over one-fourth wool pays this duty. This is to remove the words, "not over one-fourth wool."

Mr. BLAKE. It will simply apply to plain cotton?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. To plain cotton winceys. Then

All fabrics composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the Alpaca goat or other like animals, not otherwise provided for, twenty-two and a half per cent. *ad valorem*.

Winceys of all kinds, not otherwise provided for, twenty-two and a half per cent. *ad valorem*.

At present all fabrics composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, etc., pay 20 per cent. It is proposed to make that 22½ per cent. Those not otherwise provided for it is proposed to make 22½ per cent., instead of 2 cents a square yard and 15 per cent., as at present, and then there are some that are under the class of woollen goods. The ground for changing the proposition as before stated is that, in communication with representatives of the trade in some of the larger ports, it was suggested that the difficulties they had had in the past would be entirely removed if we would adopt a uniform rate under these three items, for instance the difficulties as to custom goods as compared with winceys. After hearing their arguments and the reasons they submitted, the Government decided to ask the House to amend the original proposition in this respect.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the range of value in these cotton winceys?

Mr. MILLS.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That I do not know. It is a cheap range of value.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is a matter of some moment as the hon. gentleman will see. A specific duty per square yard may amount to 10 or 20 or 30 per cent.—I merely use that as an illustration—according to the value of the cotton wincey on which it is imposed. In all the other cases he has an *ad valorem* duty which, I am inclined to think, the trade to the contrary notwithstanding would have been fairer to the consumer. There are several distinct interests in this matter—the trade, the consumer, the manufacturer, and the revenue. The hon. gentleman will see that two cents per square yard necessarily may vary very much according to the range and value of these winceys. That is the reason I wanted to know what the range was.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Still, the new proposition does not change that materially; it simply strikes out the words "not over a fourth." Therefore, the value was not materially changed. But the hon. gentleman will see the difficulty that would arise in ascertaining whether it was over a fourth. The fact is winceys of that kind have but a small quantity of wool in them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know that wincey, properly speaking, consists of a mixture of cotton and wool, and the cotton wincey is a much less valuable article—if I am correctly informed, as I am not an expert myself—than a wincey composed of cotton and wool together; so that there is a more material change in this than would appear at first sight. I cannot speak with any certainty, but I have been given to understand that in many cases this might range to a duty of 35 per cent. as against a duty of 22½ per cent. in other cases, and as against a duty of 25 per cent. which the hon. gentleman first intended to propose. I must say that, without minute information, I rather like his first proposal better than his second one.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is no proposition to change the duty at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The proposition he made originally was that winceys of all kinds should be 25 per cent. *ad valorem*; now the proposition is that winceys of one particular kind shall pay 22½ per cent. If winceys come under No. 2 they would also pay 22½ per cent.—perhaps they do not. It appears now that in cases between No. 1 and 3 there is room for considerable discrimination against cotton winceys as compared with his original proposition of 25 per cent. I am inclined to think that in a good many cases a duty of 2 cents per square yard will bring this up pracically to 35 per cent., perhaps more. Has the hon. gentleman any definite information on that point?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No, I have not at this moment. I would state that there is no doubt that winceys proper, such as have been imported, are not like the winceys in the olden times, which were a mixture of wool and cotton. That is the only proper wincey. Still, an article made entirely of cotton has been for a number of years imported and entered as winceys. But the hon. gentleman will notice that there is no change whatever in the duty upon winceys proper, that is, containing over one-quarter wool, subject at present to the wool duty. There is no proposition to change that at all; the only change is in the direction of ascertaining with more certainty the quantity of wool.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know, as a matter of fact, but it is very likely, judging from the way in which the trade usually avail themselves of these details, that in future you will find a lot of goods which in old times might have been called cotton winceys now coming in under

some other name. There is a great variety of names in the list of cotton goods; and is cotton wincey so well established a term that it cannot be brought in under any other head? Has the First Minister considered that point? I know that in former times all kinds of differences used to be made. When we put on the tariff an article which, up to that time, had been a tolerably clearly well defined article of commerce, it was suddenly discovered that it was not so clearly defined, and all sorts of irregularities arose.

Mr. BLAKE. It would be well to understand what the effect will be. The first item has this result, that whereas formerly winceys, whether of cotton or of wool, or a mixture, provided the wool did not exceed 25 per cent. paid this duty. Now, only that class of winceys that is composed of cotton will pay a specific and *ad valorem*. I understood the hon. Minister to say that it was the more expensive winceys that consisted of a mixture of cotton and wool, and that therefore it is the less expensive wincey now, with a run of two ranges, that will be paying duty. Has the hon. gentleman any idea what this duty amounts to, *ad valorem*, as a rule—this specific and *ad valorem* or checked, striped, or plain cotton winceys?

Mr. BOWELL. As to the effect which the leaving out the wool will have, in the question proposed by the leader of the Opposition, and also by the hon. member for South Huron, I am not prepared to say. In conversation with a deputation from the merchants of Quebec, Montreal, and Toronto, in which we discussed this question fully, we came to the conclusion that this would put them in a better position, and that to adopt the system that has been proposed would be equally favorable to the Government from a revenue standpoint. But I have not really investigated the question as to what amount the *ad valorem* would be upon the winceys or cotton alone. I can tell the hon. gentleman how many winceys altogether were imported last year, and the duty collected on them, and the probable result of the adoption of the present policy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But our returns only give pounds weight; they do not give the yards. If they gave the yards the question would be more easily answered.

Mr. BOWELL. No, pounds only refer to woollen goods; it is only the woollen goods that have the specific duty of 10 cents per pound and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*. It is true that these winceys pay two cents per square yard and 15 per cent. *ad valorem*, but whether they are kept separately in the Trade and Navigation Returns I do not at present know.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They are put down as checked, striped and fancy winceys, of material partly wool.

Mr. BOWELL. That is another item. The checked, striped, or fancy winceys were only 20 per cent. before. The old tariff regulating the duty upon winceys, reads as follows:—

"Winceys, plain, of all widths, when the material is over one-fourth wool, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*. Checked, striped, or fancy, not over 25 inches wide, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*. Checked, striped, or fancy dress winceys over 25 inches wide, and not under 30 inches, when the material is not more than one-fourth wool, two cents per square yard and 15 per cent. *ad valorem*."

The latter paragraph is retained with the exception of the qualification of one-fourth wool. The other two clauses are struck out, and the item which is numbered 265 in the tariff, is also repealed. The present proposition is to retain that item which proposes a duty of 20 per cent. on all other classes that are entered as winceys or dress goods, or of any other character not otherwise provided for. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman as to the difficulty he has suggested in adopting any particular name for any particular class of goods. Experience has taught him no doubt, as it has taught others, that the moment you put in particular words a way is opened to introduce all kinds of goods under that head. For instance, in one small port our attention was called to the fact that large quantities of winceys were being imported. A closer investigation brought to light the facts that light Scotch tweeds were being brought in, which could not properly come under that head. Wincey to-day is not the fabric it was in Scotland when the article was first brought into notice. At present almost everything in the shape of common goods is introduced as wincey, although it may have no particle of wool in it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is cotton wincey entered under? Is it under the head of cotton manufactures as in former years?

Mr. BOWELL. No; it is under the head of winceys.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Although it is simply cotton?

Mr. BOWELL. A large quantity of winceys are nothing but cotton. To the inexperienced observer they appear to be made partly of wool; but when they are submitted to a chemical test it is proven there is no wool in them. During the process of manufacture, in some cases, the material is sprinkled with woollen particles which give the fabric a woollen surface.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The paragraph you have here would certainly not include winceys made of cotton only.

Mr. BOWELL. The item in the tariff under the head of wincey goods is as follows: checked, striped or fancy winceys.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hardly see if they are partly cotton why winceys should pay that amount.

Mr. BOWELL. The reason this class was placed in the tariff last year, or some previous year, was that this particular width of goods came into direct competition with a class of goods that was being made in this country; and it was in order that it should not come into competition with the shirting made in our own factories that it was placed at 2 cents per square yard and 15 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. BLAKE. But the tariff says checked, striped or fancy cotton dress winceys; and it also mentioned over 25 and not over 30 inches. So that there are two other changes besides those which have been adverted to.

Mr. BOWELL. There are only two classes of winceys covered by the proposed changes. We came to the conclusion to put all winceys composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted and alapaca at 22½ per cent.; but upon looking into the matter more closely we found that there was a class of winceys composed partly of wool and partly of cotton in addition to all cotton winceys, so we added a third class, not provided in the classes already referred to, and placed them in the 22½ per cent. *ad valorem* list. So there are only two questions for appraisers or collectors to decide. First, whether the article was a wincey. If it was of a certain width and all cotton, the duty would be 2 cents per square yard and 15 per cent. *ad valorem*. All other kinds of fabrics not elsewhere specified, such as winceys, partly cotton, and dry goods, such as costume cloths, etc., will come in under the one head.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So I understand, but I am informed by a gentleman who is more acquainted with the matter than I am, that there are cotton winceys actually sold in Canada that only cost 4 pence and 5 pence sterling per yard, that is 8 or 10 cents. If that be the case the duty on such winceys amount to 40 per cent. That is very high, it is in fact a prohibitory duty, and I should think objection-

able from a revenue and also from a consumer's point of view.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not in a position to speak as to the correctness of that statement. I have not yet learned that cotton winceys are as cheap as that. I know, in communicating with a manufacturer of winceys in Bradford, England, Mr. Slater, who is now manufacturing a very good class of cotton winceys, gave me no such price as that. He claimed that 20 per cent. was not a sufficient protection; of course he spoke from a manufacturer's point of view.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman, before concurrence, will give the House some information as to what the real incidence of this duty will be. He has not answered the point I put to him. If they are winceys of the class stated in the first paragraph, that is to say, all cotton, checked, striped or fancy, and over thirty inches wide, there is a practical increase of duty, because the present tariff limits the class on which a duty is charged of 2 cents per yard and 15 per cent. *ad valorem* to cloths over twenty-five and under thirty inches; and those in excess of thirty inches are now being brought under a higher rate of duty. Why is this?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I spoke of the prices of cotton winceys in England, not laid down here. There are, of course, very great reductions made from time to time.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). With respect to those cotton winceys, the Minister has explained to the gentleman whom he named that the duty would be placed at 22½ per cent., while 27½ is imposed as a protection to a print mill. Why should hon. gentlemen opposite, under a policy that is not having an eye to revenue but to the protection of manufacturers, give to one manufacturer of a similar line of goods in some respect 27½ per cent. duty, and to another, which is also a pioneer industry, 22½ per cent. It appears they first placed the rate at 25, but reduced it to 22½. I desire an explanation from the standpoint of hon. gentlemen opposite as to why manufacturers are treated on different lines.

Mr. BOWELL. It is difficult to answer that question, because I had no conversation with the gentleman referred to as to the policy of imposing 22½ per cent. or any other figure. He, like other manufacturers, asked for a larger measure of protection to his industry. In considering the question, it was at first decided to place winceys made in this country at 25 per cent. *ad valorem*. Upon further consideration and after consultation with those in the trade, we came to the conclusion to place the tariff at 22½ for these classes of goods, by which we would not only give the manufacturer of that article a better protection than he had before, but it would also relieve the merchant and those who have the responsibility of collecting the duty from all difficulty, comparatively speaking, that has presented itself in the different districts as to distinctions between cloths and winceys and alapacas and other classes of goods brought into the country. To-day you have what is called the condola cloth. Next year that fabric may have entirely gone out and you may have "Khartoums," or something else. Those are the difficulties that presented themselves, and after full consideration we came to the conclusion that it was much better to lower the duty on this particular class of winceys and to make it 22½ per cent. for all this class of fabrics brought into the country. This article, as the hon. gentleman knows, does not come into competition with any other in the Dominion. I am not aware—although the hon. member for Wellington told me so the other night—that winceys are manufactured in some other place in Canada than Brantford. From all my enquiries I have failed to find that they are. When I asked Mr. Slater, when he first came into the country with his machinery, why he did not enter into this industry, as there was no competition, he gave me the answer which I suppose he thought sufficient, considering the question from his own standpoint, that there was greater protection on cotton, and he decided to go into that which he deemed would pay him best. As there is but one mill and as we thought 22½ per cent. would be a protection to him, we acceded to his requests so far as we thought it advisable in the interest of the trade, the revenue, and the manufacturer.

Mr. McMULLEN. I feel that the statement of the ex-Finance Minister as to the value per yard will not exceed the figure he said, when you add two cents per square yard and 15 per cent. you virtually make it 35 per cent. which is an excessive duty for that particular article. I have no doubt that it comes in competition with the article of winceys manufactured in this country, but at the same time I look upon it as very excessive to put on such an enormous duty.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman knows that all cotton manufactures are two cents and 15 per cent. I have however made a note of the question by the leader of the Opposition, as to the effect from the *ad valorem* duty, and will endeavor to ascertain it.

Mr. BLAKE. Also the question as to the reason why he omits specifically the width in winceys. The hon. gentleman will see that winceys over 30 inches are taxed *ad valorem* only, and that now he is proposing by omitting that specification of 30 inches, to tax all those in excess of 30 inches two cents and 15 per cent., so that he is making that change adversely to those over 30 inches, if such there be. I was about to say that I think the hon. gentleman is perfectly correct in stating that his present proposals are more advantageous to the general conduct of the importing business of the country than those which were in the first instance brought down, and they are to that extent an advantage and a relief indirectly to the consumer, because those things which involve difficulties and complications to the informer have ultimately, I am afraid, to be borne by the consumer, so that anything which the hon. gentleman can do in the way of giving certainty and simplicity to the importer is also important to the consumer. The hon. gentleman says these proposals are better than his last, and so far I agree with him. But he will remember that the tender mercies of the wicked are cruel.

Mr. BOWELL. Not always.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, the good book says so, though I do not say that the hon. gentleman is of that class whose tender mercies are cruel. I say I have received many complaints of the difficulties that the importers labor under in respect to this present tariff as it was, and many more as to the proposed changes, which seemed to aggravate the difficulties that existed, owing to the want of uniformity of judgment.

Mr. BOWELL. I hope the hon. gentleman does not refer to the amendment.

Mr. BLAKE. No, I say I think it is an improvement and I am glad to see it so far. Still I say that the trade complain seriously as to the consequences of constant changes. It really is most embarrassing to those who have to buy, for we know that the present custom of the trade is that goods are bought and sold in advance by samples, and that these constant changes of the tariff are extremely embarrassing to the importer, and that the consumer must ultimately pay for them. Although the importer suffers to some extent by reason of the diminution of his trade when excessive duties are laid upon him, and because that the higher the cost of the article the less the people will buy it if they can avoid it, still his main interest is simplicity and uniformity. But the consuming public has another interest, namely the rate of taxation actually paid, and upon that point the hon. gentleman has agreed to

furnish information—at least as to that which is the most difficult of calculation, the first item. The second and third —because I do not wish to trouble the hon. gentleman with a separate discussion upon them all—are increased from 20 to 22½ per cent., at any rate the second and part of the third. All these fabrics, of which many have been paying 20 per cent., are increased to 22½ per cent., and I was anxious to know what increase of revenue the hon. gentleman expects to derive from the change.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is estimated that the Customs will give $7,000 more of revenue. There will be no increase on winceys because there is no doubt that under the operation of this there will be an increased manufacture. The other woollen goods there will be an increase of $40,000 —that is $47,000 in all. The dry goods I will explain when we come to them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is $47,000 for the three items?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

The Committee rose; and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to draw the Finance Minister's attention to the fact that in his Budget Speech he stated that winceys were now being manufactured, and probably would be manufactured under a 25 per cent. tariff. Seeing that the duty has been reduced to 22½ per cent., I want to know whether he expects that winceys will continue to be manufactured in Canada.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, they are manufactured at 20 per cent., but this will be so much better.

Mr. McMULLEN. There was a proposition to take the duty off woollen rags. The duty being continued, will that interfere with the manufacture of winceys.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No because winceys are cotton.

Pickles and sauces, 25 per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. gentleman explain.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I stated, when I laid the resolutions on the Table, that the parties engaged in this industry of bottling pickles have complained, and we thought after considering the matter with some justice, that the duty on vinegar is higher than the 20 per cent. which they had on pickles. Under these circumstances, they thought an additional protection should be given to them. While there is a duty of 30 per cent. on the bottles, I think it does not increase the price to that extent, though it does perhaps increase the price slightly. Under these circumstances, it was thought proper to impose a duty of 25 per cent. We think that this change will in the first year realise an additional revenue of $6,000, or, if we take into account the additional 5 per cent. on the imports of last year, it will be something more; but we should make some allowance for the increased production in Canada.

Mr. BLAKE. More vinegar and bottles in the country?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Yet the manufacturers complain that they would not get the vinegar as cheap as they would if there was not a duty?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; they complain that the Excise duty we impose on vinegar made in the country out of alcohol is at a rate that places them in an unfavorable position.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the Excise duty amounts to anything approaching 20 per cent. on the vinegar.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They thought that on the vinegar made from alcohol we might find that it was more. But we do not take the duty in that way; we charge, I think, three cents a gallon, and the vinegar varies in price. Imported vinegar can be got at from 10 cents up to perhaps 20 or 25 cents a gallon, according to the strength and kind.

Mr. BLAKE. Then the duty of 20 per cent. on the bottles raises the price to some extent.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Not very materially, but to some extent.

Mr. BLAKE. 10 or 15 per cent?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No, probably it may be from 2½ to 5 per cent. The price varies according to the competition.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the hon. gentleman speaking of the general principle or of its actual application to the case of bottles?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Its actual application to the case of bottles. In many cases it does not increase the price at all. For vinegar bottles it is alleged they do pay something more.

Mr. BLAKE. And they are not satisfied with 20 per cent?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They are not satisfied with 20 per cent., because if they import the bottles they would have to pay what the importer pays on pickles ready for market, and they would have no advantage then.

Mr. BLAKE. But, as I understand, the bottle is sold sometimes at from 2½ to 5 per cent. in advance of the imported article, duty free.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No, not duty free. That is over the 20 per cent. duty.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, the bottles manufactured in the country are being sold at from 22½ to 25 per cent. more than the price of the imported article, free of duty.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, and sometimes less.

Barrels containing petroleum or its products, 40 cents each.

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. gentleman explain the reason of this change?

Mr. BOWELL. This is to avoid the many difficulties that arise as to the value of the barrels. The fixed value of barrels containing petroleum has been $2 for the last few years. Some complain that that is too much; the manufacturers of petroleum complain that it is too little; and we thought it better, in order to prevent any dispute in the future, to make the specific duty equal to what the *ad valorem* duty is at present; so that this is really not an increase in the duty.

Mr. SCRIVER. No, but the Department have been in the habit some time past of arbitrarily adding 50 cents to the actual cost of the barrel. These barrels are valued at $1.50, and the Customs valuators have been in the habit of fixing them, no doubt under instructions from the Department, at $2 each. If that practice is to be continued in the future, I agree with the Minister of Customs that it is better to put it in the statute. At the same time it is none the less an improper exaction, considering the amount of duty imposed on petroleum. It is only an indirect way of adding to the duty on petroleum.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is correct as to the ruling of the Department. The matter has cost a great deal of time and investigation. The importers of barrels, particularly those along the frontier, contend that they are

worth as low as $1, some say $1.25, others $1.50 and $1.75, while we have the very best evidence that can be furnished to show that a first class barrel is worth when new $2, but it has to be tarred and painted, and go through other operations before it is made sufficiently tight. The dispute which has arisen is precisely that which the hon. gentleman has pointed out, and it is much better we should have a fixed rate so that everbody may know what it is.

Cutlery not otherwise provided for, 25 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. When we introduced the resolution in 1879, we did not propose to change the duty on cutlery, but left it at a revenue tariff rate, because it was not manufactured in Canada, and on the dire declaration of the Government in 1870, frequently repeated since then, that any new industry started in Canada under the new revenue tariff would receive consideration, we now ask Parliament to increase the duty on this article 25 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In that case the hon. gentleman ought to be able to inform us how much the revenue will lose by this change and what and how much cutlery is manufactured, and generally what will be the effect of this increased duty. The brief declaration he has made gives no sort of information as to the practical bearing of this new measure on the consumer. All that we know is that we will have to pay 25 per cent. more for our cutlery, which is an article of general consumption, than ever before, and we know well besides that the cutlery we will get manufactured here is apt to be of an inferior description.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The effect of this on the revenue will be to increase it five or six thousand dollars. The application of 25 per cent. on the imports of last year would increase the revenue $53,272, but it is estimated from the number of hands employed and the quantity of cutlery which will be turned out that the actual increase of revenue will not exceed five or six thousand dollars. There is an establishment for the munufacture of knives and forks in Montreal on an extensive scale. I visited it a month or two ago and was told that under the circumstances they found it exceedingly difficult to make both ends meet. In fact, with the 20 per cent. duty imposed, they thought they were not in a fair position, and they were prepared, if they could get the control of a larger part of the market, to double the quantity of their manufacture. They manufacture forks and knives, and some of them are of a very superior character, I can speak from experience, having purchased six or nine dozen.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They were no doubt a much better sample than their ordinary goods.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. And as far as I could judge, they were a very superior article. Under these circumstances the Government think that it is in the interests of the country that this additional protection should be given.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman does not expect me to agree with him in that, but we will not begin another discussion on free trade and protection. I can tell him that the cutlery that I have been compelled to purchase of Canadian manufacture is of an inferior description, but no doubt the Finance Minister obtained a sample of much better cutlery.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Not at all because they were not made for me.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All I can say is that my experience was not so fortunate. I would be glad to see the article manufactured under a reasonable tariff, but I do not consider 25 per cent. to be a reasonable tariff for this Dominion. The hon gentleman must have some basis for his estimate. What is the total amount of capital now employed in this manufactory? And what is the total number of hands employed and likely to be employed? And what was the output last year?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. At the time I visited the establishment there was a large number of men employed, between 60 and 70 I was told, and they will increase the number largely if they obtain greater control of the market.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman know what the present output is?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not.

Mr. BLAKE. It is the only factory?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The only one I know of.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman does not know the output for the last year? The more limited it was, the easier to ascertain it—the shorter the row of figures.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I did not ask the number of hands; I know they said it was 60 or 70.

Mr. BLAKE. It is table cutlery?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Principally.

Mr. BLAKE. Is there anything other than table cutlery?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. What I saw was table cutlery.

Mr. BLAKE. Is there anything else, do you know?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The information I have is only table cutlery; that is all I saw.

Mr. BLAKE. "For cutlery not otherwise provided for" is the proposal before us. What will this include? Because there is some cutlery that has to be dealt with under other clauses?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not know, but my hon. colleague (Mr. Bowell) is asking for the information.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This, I understand, is simply table cutlery.

Mr. BOWELL. Plated cutlery and that is 30 per cent. under the old tariff.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where does that come in? Under iron and steel manufactures? The point I want to know is this: Last year the hon. gentleman allowed the different parts of cutlery in an unfinished state to be brought in. Was that for the benefit of this factory?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; what they call cast-iron forks in the rough.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Practically these people are not making cutlery but putting together pieces of cutlery.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; the commonest description of cast-iron forks that cannot be made there at all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman's motion last year allowed them to bring in the different parts, it does not necessarily follow that they were inferior goods; they may choose inferior goods, but they may bring in any other provided they are not finished. If that be the case they are not making cutlery, but are importing certain portions in an unfinished state and are finishing them.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They are making them all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For whose benefit was the resolution last year?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It was for them that time, because they were not making cutlery.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have they ceased to import.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; because there is not much demand for that description of forks.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it was the handles they were importing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, it was both parts.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They are cutting handles out of the bone, which they buy largely in Montreal.

Mr. BLAKE. Not out of the bone and sinew of the country, I hope?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The men who work there are the bone and sinew of the country, but these bones that were comparatively valueless for other purposes, certain portions of the shank bone, are cut up and used for the handle.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But what about the iron part of it—the blade?

Mr. McLELAN. I saw them forging the blades, and stamping them, and then grinding them down and cutting handles and finishing the whole knife and fork.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then has the provision that was carried last year become practically a dead letter, that is to say, as these people are not availing themselves of it, are any other factories?

Mr. McLELAN. They did avail themselves of it at first, to get started, but they had added the forging of the knife blade to their other work, and were doing it successfully and profitably.

Mr. BLAKE. Does this include—I should judge it did include—what is known in the trade as spring cutlery—penknives and pocket knives?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. They are not making penknives?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is true that they are not, but they intend to extend their operations and manufacture other kinds of cutlery.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it is represented to the Minister that they are about to make penknives and pocket knives, and that is why the duty is increased?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They make a common description of jack-knife, and if they are successful they will extend their operations; but it is proposed to extend this to all cutlery so that there will be no difficulty about it.

Mr. BLAKE. Does that include scissors?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I believe it does.

Mr. BLAKE. I should judge that it did. That is the information which I had from a man in the trade, that that would be the proper interpretation. Are they proposing to make scissors?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I did not ask them about scissors.

Mr. BLAKE. I think I ought to give the hon. gentleman scissors, because it is clearly his duty to be able to give us an intelligent and a definite statement of the benefit we are to derive from the increase of the taxes; and why our scissors are to be taxed if we are not going to have the advantage of home-made scissors, I do not see. Let the hon. gentleman ask the to-be enfranchised woman if it is fair to tax her scissors, if she is not going to get a Canadian pair of scissors.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What did the hon. gentleman say would be the probable effect on the revenue?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It will increase the revenue $5,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is, assuming how much to be manufactured? If you give us definite statements you must be able to tell us what they are based on. If the hon. member has got it down to $5,000, he must have made the calculation.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The value of the import last year was $307,501, the duty was $61,503, at 25 per cent. instead of 20 it will yield $76,875, which will be an increase of $15,372. It is not supposed that they will manufacture during the next year sufficient in Canada to reduce the duty, but it will probably yield about $5,000. It is an estimate, and it depends upon the quantity they may consume; but, making an estimate, and, as every estimate made under the circumstance must be, a somewhat rough one, that is what we think will probably be the result.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman, to reach an estimate of that kind, must of course have some notion of what the output of the factory is and is to be, because it is just based upon that. He says: They are affecting the consumption of the country to such an extent, I expect they will affect it to such an extent that, instead of this producing $15,000, it will only produce $5,000. Therefore he has formed an idea of what their output is. Will he tell us what it is?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. About $60,000 a year is their output.

Mr. BLAKE. I asked the hon. gentleman at first if he had any idea of what their output was, and he said no. Now he says it is $60,000.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We can spend a great deal of time in hair splitting, and getting down to questions as to matters which it is utterly impossible for any member of the Government to state, as to the exact number of knives and forks manufactured, and so on. I stated the number of hands employed, and the estimate we make of the output. I can come no nearer to it than that, but perhaps it would suit the hon. gentleman better if I were to make the statements more definite than I am making them at present, because he would point out how impossible it would be for me to arrive at such a result. I can quite understand that it might suit the hon. gentleman better if I were to make the statement more definite than it is possible for me to make it.

Mr. BLAKE. I stated that I thought the hon. gentleman ought to obtain such data as were available. Among those are, what is the factory doing now, and what is its output now? The hon. gentleman has not obtained that data. He makes a definite statement but he has not obtained any information on that point.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I gave you the number of persons employed.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, but he did not say whether they were all adults——

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Nearly all adults.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know what their output would be from that number. The hon. gentleman may be able, being intimately acquainted with the cutlery trade, to say exactly what the output would be. I am not, and I do not think any other hon. gentleman in the House probably is. He said himself he did not know. Then he takes the manufacturers' statements, and they tell him they will be able to get along if he gives them more protection, they will increase the business and the output. What is their statement? What do they intend to do? What is their representation as to their intentions and expectations? As he has given us a part of those intentions and expectations, he can give us the rest, and then we can compare the statements of the manufacturers to him, and through him to the House, with the results. But he deprives himself of the advantage of pointing out with clearness the great gains the

country is going to receive from the adoption of his proposals.

Red prussiate of potash, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is an article used in the various manufactories for dyeing, and is now included amongst the unenumerated articles at 20 per cent. We are reducing it to 10.

Mr. BLAKE. Is that in connection with the print factory?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is used for dyeing various things.

Mouldings of wood, plain, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*
Mouldings of wood, gilded, or otherwise further manufactured than plain, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.
Picture frames, as furniture, 35 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the present tax on this?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is no alteration as far as the first item is concerned from the present tariff. Mouldings of wood, plain, are 25 per cent. now, but we propose that mouldings of wood, gilded, or otherwise further manufactured, shall pay 30 per cent. Picture frames now pay 35 per cent. as furniture. There is no difference proposed in the first and last of these three items, as that is the duty collected at the present time. It has been decided by the Customs Department that picture frames are furniture and pay 35 per cent. It is thought better to declare that specifically in the tariff, so that no question shall arise about it, as disputes have taken place at different ports. As to mouldings gilded or otherwise further manufactured, these are manufactured in the Dominion of Canada. They manufacture in the first place the plain moulding, they then use a putty or gilding which makes a very handsome and at the same time substantial moulding. That is now brought in from outside at 25 per cent., and it is proposed to give the manufacturers in Canada this additional 5 per cent. for the increased labor that is spent in bringing this article up to what is practically a finished picture frame or nearly so. All they have to do is to take these mouldings when they are imported and saw them into the proper form and size, and convert them into picture frames. There is a large establishment in Toronto at the present time employing a large number of persons, and others are being started in various parts of the Dominion. It is proposed to change the duty with reference to No. 8 and make it 30 per cent. instead of 25, as it stands at present, the other two remaining.

Mr. McCRANEY. I would ask the hon. gentleman if it is the intention to take the duty off California redwood. The majority of the fancy woods that are imported into this country come in free, but California redwood is made an exception. It is becoming now quite a common article of commerce, and is taking the place of some other fancy woods that come in free, I am told that it is not grown in the Dominion of Canada. Some of our Toronto men are now beginning to import it; they have to pay $30 or $40 per thousand for it, and the 20 per cent. duty brings it up to about $60 or $70 per car load; and when in addition they have to pay $15 to $20 freight on it, the price puts it beyond the reach of many persons who would otherwise use it for house finishing, furniture, and various other purposes. As I said before, it is not a wood that is grown at all in the Dominion of Canada, so far as I have been able to learn. I think it would be in the interests of the people of this country if the duty were removed from California redwood and that article were placed on the free list, the same as other fancy woods.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. gentleman has already called the attention of the Government to this matter, as well as one or two other gentlemen who are indirectly interested in it; but I believe he called the attention of the Government to the matter in the interest of a manufacturer who is using this wood. After giving the matter consideration the Government felt that it was better to let the matter stand for the present Session, at all events. There is some question about whether this redwood would not take the place of a wood that we have in this country, and that is used for the purpose of manufacturing furniture and for trimmings for houses. For this and other reasons which influenced the Government, we thought it better not to place it on the free list at present.

Mr. McCRANEY. I observe that red cedar is on the free list, and this redwood is nothing more than a species of red cedar. It is a timber of much larger growth than red cedar, and a little softer, but it has the same color, the same appearance, and the same grain as red cedar, and I think it ought just as well to be on the free list.

Mr. BOWELL. Redwood has somewhat the color of red cedar, but certainly it does not partake of its qualities. It is a much harder wood than even our ordinary pine, and quite as hard as what we term Norway red pine in this country, although of a deeper color. It is the ordinary material used in southern California for building and other purposes, and is used in the same manner and for the same purposes that we use the ordinary white pine in this country, although, I admit, it is a little closer grain and a little harder.

Imitation precious stones, not exceeding 10 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. These are not enumerated, and are 20 per cent. Though they are imitation precious stones you can put hundreds of dollars worth in your pocket, and I am afraid that 20 per cent. would be an inducement for smuggling the article. Parties who are engaged in the manufacture of jewellery in Canada appear to have acted honestly in it, and object to being compelled to pay 20 per cent. duty. Jewellery now is 20 per cent., and there have been various propositions to the Government to increase it; but, in accordance with the policy of the Government, it being altogether a luxury, and rather tempting, we thought the difficulty would be that if we increased the duty it would afford a temptation for the smuggling of an article that is so easily concealed, and that we would probably loose revenue by it. Under these circumstances it was considered desirable to reduce the duty.

Mr. BLAKE. Has the hon. gentleman any idea how much is imported?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No, it is not kept under a separate heading, but it will be now, because it is to be specified.

Mr. BLAKE. I have no doubt it is good policy to impose a low duty on articles which are so very portable as stones, imitation or genuine, and in that point of view, I dare say, the hon. gentleman is quite right. I fancy he is likely to make more revenue out of a 10 per cent. duty than out of a 20 per cent., for some persons' virtue will succumb to a 20 per cent. duty when they might be able to resist the temptation of a 10 per cent. duty. However, I really should have thought that there was no particular demand for shams in this country now, because the hon. gentlemen produce so many of them themselves that I should think they would supply the market.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. My colleague this afternoon called attention to the tone of the remarks of the hon. gentleman towards the members on this side of the House. He seems to take great pleasure in saying sarcastic things, in saying what he thinks is exceedingly clever. We on this side of the House, have noticed that when he thinks he has said a very clever thing he sits down and bounces up again, and turns around as if inviting the applause

of his followers. We have noticed that over and over again. All I can say is that the shams the hon. member refers to have not so far been recognised as shams by the people of this country. They have considered them substantial efforts on the part of the Government to improve the condition of the people. But with reference to this item there are a large number of men employed in the manufacture of jewellery in Canada; and there are a great many poor people who, although they cannot afford to buy diamonds or other precious stones, like to make a little show with something that resembles them. There is a large quantity of cheap jewellery manufactured in Canada at present, and we wish to enable these parties to compete with foreign manufacturers.

Manila hats 20 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is a bonnet or hat not finished, made of Manila, and it is brought into the country. It is paying to-day the same duty exactly that the finished hat or bonnet pays. Under those circumstances there are persons importing Manila hoods, finishing them at home and selling them to wholesale dealers, especially in the Province of Quebec. This will give them the small margin of 5 per cent. by importing Manila hoods in an unfinished state, whereas they now pay 25 per cent. The loss in revenue will be comparatively small.

Umbrellas, Parasols and sun shades, 30 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman give some explanation in regard to this item?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. At present umbrellas, parasols and sun-shades of all kinds and materials pay a duty of 25 per cent. The silk is charged 30 per cent. So that the parties who are engaged in the manufacture of umbrellas, parasols and sun-shades have to pay 30 per cent. on the silk they import, while the parties importing the whole article pay only 25 per cent. It is, therefore, proposed to increase the duty on umbrellas to 30 per cent., so that there will be no difficulty in making an entry and designating the kind of material with which the umbrella or parasol is covered.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much revenue does the hon. gentleman expect to obtain by this change?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This change, together with a proposition which follows shortly after, by which we allow ribs and portions of umbrellas to be admitted at 20 per cent. will increase the manufacture, and it is estimated there will be an increased revenue of $8,000.

China and porcelain ware, 30 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman give some explanation.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The coarser descriptions of earthenware have for three or four years paid 30 per cent. China and porcelain, which were not manufactured in this country, were left at 20 per cent. But it is proposed to make them uniform, because it will prevent difficulty in making entries, and also because it is thought that China ware can very well pay the additional duty. We are accordingly making all the ware 30 per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. What will be the increased revenue?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. China and porcelain, it is estimated, give an increase of revenue to the extent of $7,000.

Earthenware and stoneware, 30 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman give some explanation.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Earthenware and stoneware were charged 35 per cent. The "C. C." ware paid 30 per cent. The change with respect to earthenware, and stoneware especially, is made in order to enable our manufacturers to have the market, or, at all events, a considerable portion of it. They find they cannot under any tariff that could be imposed, unless it were a 100 per cent., keep out a certain class of goods. Take, for instance, stone jugs of 1, 2, or 3 gallons. It is found that malformed goods are sent in here by foreign manufacturers, and this cannot be avoided. But if our manufacturers cannot have the home market in that class without imposing such a heavy duty as I have referred to, they want to have the market as far as possible for the better description of ware. The manufacturers say they can furnish them, if they get the market, as cheaply as they can now be obtained; but the difficulty is in obtaining a larger market, and securing an increase of output, and they desire to have that advantage secured to them. I may frankly say that they asked more than 30 per cent., but the Government thought an increase of 5 per. cent would place them in a position, as regards the better descriptions of ware, to obtain an enlarged market without increasing the price to the consumer. No doubt this country will be furnished with common and unmarketable articles from the United States, and this cannot be avoided without imposing such duty as I have referred to; but for the better articles we propose to give our manufacturers a larger market so as to give them an increased output, which will enable them to supply the goods at present prices after deducting a larger profit than they obtain at present.

Mr. BLAKE. Are those particularly St. John factories?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No, they are entirely in the other direction. They are at Tilsonburg, Brantford and other places—mainly in Ontario. This does not touch the St. John industry at all, so far as I know.

Mr. BLAKE. How long have they been established?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Well, I know the one at Brantford has been established, I should think, 20 years; the others are of later date.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says that the price will not be increased by this operation?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman know how the price ranges with reference to the duty point?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes; give us the prices of these jugs.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I may say that gallon jugs are entered at 4½ cents, so the hon. gentleman can judge what kind of an article it is. So far as the prices are concerned, they can manufacture at the present prices, but by the imports coming in so largely at the present rate of duty, the quantity of the articles sold is limited, and therefore they cannot produce them as cheaply as if they had double the quantity to manufacture.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the hon. gentleman aware how the price of the Canadian article now ranges with reference to the cost of the imported article plus the duty? The qualities being equal, is the Canadian article about the same price as the imported article?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I judge that in this case as in many others they have to sell at less than the duty paid price, because the prejudices are so great with reference to our own manufactures, on the part of a good many people of this country, that they will pay a higher price for a foreign article. I recollect, I think in September last, I was in the city of St. John, and I met a gentleman there who had formerly been a supporter of mine, but who, when the National Policy was adopted, opposed that policy and said it was going to be ruinous to his business. He was engaged in the sale of musical instruments—organs and

pianos—and he called me into his establishment last summer and asked me up stairs. I saw that two or three flats were well filled with American and Canadian instruments. I said, "You appear to have a good stock; I hope you are doing a good business; you were much alarmed at the National Policy when it was introduced; it was going to ruin you, and you disapproved of the policy of the Government altogether." He said, "I will be frank with you; I am doing a better business now than I did before the National Policy was introduced;" and then he pointed out Canadian pianos and organs to me. Some of them built in Toronto, some in Bowmanville and other parts of the Dominion of Canada, and he said one of the manufacturers in the United States had visited him some two or three weeks before, and when he pointed out the prices of the instruments made in Canada, he said: "I cannot compete with them." "How do you sell them at all." I said: "Well." He said: "There are certain persons here who are interested in that factory, and they recommend this piano to those persons who are taking music lessons, and a great many people believe that the Canadian piano or organ does not compare with the American, and we sell them at a higher price, though the instrument is no better than the Canadian instrument. He pointed out some which were $50 less, and still people would buy the American article because it was American, and because the manufacturer had a reputation. That is the case with many other industries of the country. That prejudice is now being broken because our own people are seeing that we are producing an article equal to those manufactured in the United States or the old country, and after a time these prejudices will be removed; but hon. members on both sides will understand that a prejudice has existed, and that it exists, to a certain extent, at the present day. There may not be so much prejudice in the matter of stone jugs as in organs, but I give this as an illustration and I take it for granted, though I do not know, that the parties are selling them for less than the duty paid price in order to make sales at all.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman propose to put an Excise duty on home-made jugs?

Mr. BOWELL. When they are full of whiskey.

Mr. BLAKE. I was about to call attention to the fact that the interesting anecdote which the hon. gentleman told about the organs and pianos——

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It was a fact.

Mr. BLAKE. I dare say it was a fact as well as an anecdote, though the hon. gentleman told it, for all anecdotes are not untrue. The hon. gentleman thinks this is a word of opprobrium; I tell him that there are a great many true stories though the hon. gentleman may not be accustomed to——

An hon. MEMBER. Hearing them.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. gentleman should finish his sentence.

Mr. BLAKE. I thought I had better stop and allow the hon. gentleman to finish it for himself. I say that the interesting anecdote of the hon. gentleman, hardly had a fair application. Of course we know there are certainly predilections, and I dare say there are prejudices, in the matter of organs, pianos and other things which involve taste and sentiment as well as efficiency. But how far this applies to the common brown jug I cannot say; and if we go and take a brown jug and take a drink out of it I am still unable to observe that the hon. gentleman is able to satisfy himself that the result of this kind of thing has been to give the Canadian consumer the article at a lower price than the duty point of the imported article. I do not say it is not; I have not the information, but it seems to me that this is one of the things which the hon. gentleman should have enquired into before he proposed to increase the duty of an article of this kind. He has told us that one of the manufactories has been established for twenty years—a good long life. He has now increased the duty because they say they cannot get as large an output as they desire out of the present duty, and he has not enquired, as I think he was bound to enquire, and put himself in a position to inform the Committee, as I think he was bound to do, what the practical operation of the tariff has been with reference to the consumer. It will not do for the hon. gentleman to indulge in general statements—I will not say anecdotes, after the interpretation he gives to that word, but statements of facts, conversations, information as to what occurs in St. John with reference to organs and pianos. What we should have is facts as he has gathered them with reference to the particular industry which he proposes to favor.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to ask the Minister of Customs what rule he has applied to the invoices of the seconds of this class of goods that come into the country? I believe that the complaints of manufacturers are not that they cannot compete with the number one articles, but with the seconds, a somewhat damaged article, which is brought in at an exceedingly low rate. I would like to know the rule applied by his officers in different parts of the country with regard to the invoices of such articles.

Mr. BOWELL. We take the market value of the goods in the country in which they are purchased, and that fixes the value of the article for duty in Canada.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is there a fixed value for seconds?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, there is; because in placing these goods on the market they select for their own market the better quality, and those that are at all affected—those which have spots on them or other defects—are put aside as seconds or thirds, some of them almost as culls. Whatever the ruling price is, for that class of goods in the country in which they are purchased, has to be the price for duty when they are imported. In some cases in which it has been supposed that they were imported into this country at a lower price than they were sold for at home, the value has been changed. But the hon. gentleman will readily understand, particularly at a time like this, when the United States market is glutted, that in manufactured goods of this line particularly, they select the worst, put them out at a nominal price, and then export the balance.

House furnishing hardware, 30 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. BOWELL. The object in using this term is to avoid the difficulties that have arisen at different ports. Many articles included in this term now bear 20 per cent., others 25 per cent. and others 30 per cent., and many articles are imported at 20 per cent. which, at other ports, are charged 25 or 30 per cent. For instance, a coal scuttle is a manufacture of iron, and yet may properly be classed among house furnishings. In some ports it has been entered as hollow ware; other furnishings made of cast iron have been entered as castings, at 20 per cent.; so that after full and careful investigation, it was deemed advisable to make all these articles bear one uniform duty of 30 per cent. In connection with this, it may be necessary to issue an extended classified list to the different ports, and the hardware merchants in the larger cities of the Dominion have not only accepted this proposition, but advised that this course should be taken, which they said would relieve them of all trouble in making entries. Although on the average the duty will probably be higher than at present, still they prefer it to the many different rulings that exist at present.

Mr. BLAKE. Can the hon. gentleman say what the increased duty will realise? The change raises the duty on a great many articles.

Mr. BOWELL. So it does. Take flat irons, for instance. They are entered as ordinary castings at 20 per cent. I find in the list I have, that no increase is calculated in this branch.

Mr. BLAKE. Why?

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot tell you why. I asked my officers to give me that.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, the hon. gentleman's officers can hardly have obeyed his orders.

Mr. BOWELL. It may be for this reason, that many articles now imported may be manufactured in the country to a much greater extent than before. There is no reason why flat irons and hollow ware should not be manufactured to a greater extent.

Mr. MILLS. And stoves?

Mr. BOWELL. I think we supply our own market with them. But they are not included in this list; they are specially provided for in the tariff.

Mr. BLAKE. There are a number of articles mentioned in a memorandum which I have, of which the first is what the hon. gentleman has mentioned, sad irons or flat irons. There is another that the Finance Minister and myself would be equally agreeable to increase the duty upon, I refer to the imported article of corkscrews. Then there are traps for rats and mice, tinware, stamped ware, Britannia metal ware, such as spoons, dish covers, German silver spoons, tea and coffee pots, etc. All these, it seems to me, would form an important quantity in the annual consumption of the people of the country in hardware.

Mr. BOWELL. There are many of these articles specially mentioned in the tariff, and of course are not affected by this change. For instance, Britannia metal pays a duty of 25 per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. This item does not say house-furnishing hardware "not otherwise provided for," so I presume all these articles would be included. Then there is a vast quantity of articles in tin. It seems to me that confusion will be created between this duty and the duty that we have already discussed, that on cutlery. I have been informed by the gentleman who has communicated with me, and who has a great acquaintance with the terms and customs of the trade, that table cutlery would certainly be included, in the view of the trade, in house-furnishing hardware. So the hon. gentleman had better, I think, say house furnishing hardware not otherwise provided for, if he does not intend to create instead of to diminish confusion. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman should upon concurrence give us some further information with reference to the estimated addition to the revenue in this case.

Mr. BOWELL. As this is the first practical suggestion the hon. gentleman has made during this discussion, we readily accept it, and will add the words, "not otherwise provided for."

Mr. BLAKE. The truth of the matter is that I make a great many suggestions to the hon. gentlemen opposite, and if they do not see they are practical, it is because they are wedded to their idols.

Chains, iron or steel, over $\frac{9}{16}$ of an inch in diameter, 5 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Mr. BOWELL. The tariff reads, "chain cables." We propose to leave out the word "cables." It is now 5 per cent., and we propose to leave it at 5 per cent. with the word "cables" out, in order to prevent the difficulties that have arisen in different ports, some contending that the word "cables" applied exclusively for ship purposes. I am inclined to think that was the original intention. It is only imported at 5 per cent. and we thought it would be better to strike out the word "cables," and let it come in at 5 per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. In the practical working of the tariff, then, all chain over $\frac{9}{16}$ has come in at 5 per cent.

Mr. BOWELL. Practically it has.

Acid, acetic, a specific duty of 25 cents per Imperial gallon, and 20 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the former duty?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Twenty-five per cent. It was found that a very strong description of acetic acid, the strongest that can be made, was entered in some cases, no doubt, at undervaluation. One gallon of it would make 21 gallons of vinegar of ordinary strength. To prevent undervaluation, we propose this change.

Mr. BLAKE. What will be the effect of this?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It will probably diminish very largely the revenue to be received for that acid, but we will get it from vinegar in other shapes, so that it will not affect the revenue at all.

Tissue paper, white and colored, when imported by manufacturers of artificial flowers for use in their factories, 10 per cent. *ad valorem.*

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is paper of a fine and very delicate character, used in the manufacture of artificial flowers in Canada. There are a number of persons in Canada employed in this business; one man in Toronto has been trying it for two or three years, and he finds that the duty of 20 per cent. left him no margin for profit; and he asks that the paper he imports for the purpose of manufacturing artificial flowers be reduced, as regards duty, to 10 per cent.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Can it not be manufactured in the country?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No, it is too fine and the quantity required is too small.

Glucose syrup, a specific duty of 2 cents per pound.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the hon. gentleman consider the present duty on glucose syrup to be?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is now being entered at a very low price, as low as $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents. It ranges, as a rule, from 4 to 5 cents, and this duty of 2 cents per pound is equal to about 4 cents. At present the duty is $\frac{1}{2}$ cent and 35 per cent. *ad valorem.* If you calculate that you will find that at 4 cents, it will give you 1·90 cents, and when it ranges 5 cents per pound it is equal to 2·25; so that really taking the average price of glucose, as imported for some years past, there is no change in the tariff, the only difference being to make it specific instead of *ad valorem.*

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there any object either of revenue or protection for this?

Mr. BOWELL. No, the object is simply to prevent undervaluation, which is constantly taking place, and the difficulties which arise in dealing with the question when it comes before the Department. The syrup is being very largely imported from Buffalo at a price which was altogether below the price at Buffalo. We sent an officer to Buffalo to investigate their books. They placed them at our disposal when they found that the glucose was stopped in London and in Toronto; and upon examining their books carefully with one of their agents in this country, it was found that they were selling glucose in the United States

at 4 cents and 5 cents for home consumption, while they were selling for shipment in Canada at 3 cents and 3½ cents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is a pound of glucose, considered in sweetening power, equal to a pound of sugar?

Mr. BOWELL. The present tariff regulates it in that way. It would be about ½ cent per pound, 35 per cent. *ad valorem;* we have computed the specific duty on a basis of 4 cents and 5 cents per pound.

Mr. GUNN. The proposed duty on glucose is higher than that upon sugar.

Mr. BOWELL. No, it is about the same. The present duty upon glucose is about 2 cents, taking it at 4½ cents per lb.

Mr. GUNN. This measure proposes 2 cents duty on glucose. What do you estimate the duty on raw sugar to be?

Mr. BOWELL. One quality of sugar is at 1 cent. per lb., and 32½ per cent. *ad valorem.* Another ¾ of a cent., and 27 per cent; and below No. 9 Dutch Standard is ½ and 27½ per cent. Concentrated melado is ¾ cent. and 27½ per cent. Of course we cannot tell the rate of duty per lb., unless you give the price of the raw material. Take for instance beet-root sugar imported from Germany. That is sold at about 2 cents per lb. Then duty is very high. Take the sugar from the West Indies and particularly from Java, which is a higher grade even, although the color may not be so good as some of the others, and which may run up 3, 4 or 5 cents.

Mr. GUNN. What is the object of making a tax of 2 cents on glucose when the duty on the whole sugar entered last year only averaged 1½ cents per lb., taking them all high grades and low. There was 172,000,000 lbs. imported, and that paid 3 cents. Some other sugar which went into British Columbia paid 3 cents, but the whole averaged 1½ cents.

Mr. BOWELL. The questions the hon. gentleman has asked would apply with more force if asked in reference to sugar.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). He asks, why you place a higher duty on glucose than on other kinds of sugar.

Mr. BOWELL. If you leave the duty as it is, at the prices at which glucose is entered into the country, you will get about the same duty. If it is rated at 4 cents it will give $1.90; 4½ cents will give about 2, and if it is 5 cents it gives 2¼ cents. We have taken the average so as to make the proposed specific duty about the same as we would collect if it were left at the present *ad valorem*, or mixed *ad valorem* and specific duties.

Mr. GUNN. But then the duty on glucose is a third higher than the duty on other sugars.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is the case at present, clearly.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend says the average collected last year on all kinds of sugar was 1½ cents per pound. Now, you are stating that you will collect 2 cents per pound on glucose, which is one-third higher than the average duty collected last year.

Mr. BOWELL. We have collected the same duty on glucose during the past year which we are proposing to collect now. If it is too much, that is another question. This is to make the duty specific, instead of *ad valorem* and specific. If the gentlemen are arguing to reduce the duty on glucose, that is a different matter. We do not think it desirable. There are plenty of glucose factories in the country that can supply the market, and we are in hopes that, by preventing the gross undervaluation of glucose and throwing it into this market at a much less rate than they have been selling it to their own people at home, the factories in this country may be continued in the manufacture of this particular article.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It would seem that the same rule ought to be applied in the case of glucose as is applied to all sugars. If you alter the duty on sugars to a specific duty, well and good, but I do not see the utility of doing it in regard to this one article and not in regard to the others. This is very high on glucose. The chances are that glucose will continue to be cheap, at all events as long as sugar continues to be so cheap.

Mr. PAINT. I observe that in the United States, in the last few months, by the most careful scientific experiments, they have been able to manufacture glucose at a cost of from 7 to 12 cents a gallon.

Mr. GUNN. What amount of duty do you estimate for the coming year?

Mr. BOWELL. The duty being averaged, we do not calculate upon getting any extra revenue. The duty collected last year upon glucose was $12,876, and at the present rate, if you calculate at 2 cents, it would give you about $1,000 or $1,500 increase, but we anticipate that it will be manufactured in this country, and consequently that there will be no extra duty.

Mr. MILLS. From what?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the statement of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Paint). If my hon. friend's statement be correct, a question of considerable importance arises. If I am correctly informed, a gallon would contain about 12 lbs.—the hon. gentleman will correct me if I am seriously in error.

Mr. PAINT. About 9 lbs.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should think it would weigh a little more.

Mr. PAINT. The Imperial gallon would be a little more.

Mr. BLAKE. Was the hon. gentleman's price on the Imperial gallon?

Mr. PAINT. It was on the measure in the United States.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then we will suppose 9 lbs. I understood him to say they were manufacturing that at from 7 to 12 cents. If that be the case, the hon. gentleman will see that there would be 18 cents on a gallon, and the consequence is that the duty would be from 150 to 200 per cent. in round numbers. That certainly is putting the advantages of this business in a very striking light. Canadians, under the beneficent operation of the National Policy, are to pay three times as much for their glucose as the price for which the Americans would get the same article.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think the hon. member behind me (Mr. Paint) must be mistaken.

Mr. PAINT. I will bring the evidence to-morrow.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If it were selling in the United States for 7 cents a gallon, they never would undertake to enter it here for three times that, as they have been doing all along. The Americans have not been in the habit of entering an article at three times the price they purchased it for, and the statement of the Minister of Customs is that they have been entering at a lower price than they ought to enter at.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think the hon. member said they were selling at that rate, but were manufacturing at that rate.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If that be the case, the marvel to me is that, with the protection of 35 per cent. and ½ cent. per pound, putting it nearly in the position of refined sugar, the glucose establishment my hon. friend referred to in his remarks on the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne should have been standing idle and unoccupied. If such a large profit could be made out of it as that, they would have been in full force. That is another reason why I think it must be a mistake.

Mr. BLAKE. It may be that they make it from a material that is more productive, and the hon. member for Richmond added another thing, that now, by the use of the most careful scientific experiments and improvements in machinery and so forth, they were able to produce it at these lower rates.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They have not done it up to this time, because, if they had, they would have entered it at such a low rate, and no such entry has been proposed to the Department. But the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Gunn) states that we ask a higher duty on this article than on the average of sugar. We are treating this, and we have treated it in the past as we treat refined sugar. The article is used for the same purposes largely that refined sugar is used for. The confectioners use it, and it has been treated in the past as refined sugar, and therefore we are simply continuing nearly the same rate of duty that existed before and for the reasons for which that duty was first imposed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But what the hon. gentleman from Richmond stated is a very strong argument, if there is any possibility of reducing it to this price, for not fixing a specific instead of an *ad valorem* duty. The *ad valorem* duty adjusts itself, but, in case of a large reduction in price, the specific duty may be very heavy and oppressive.

Mr. GUNN. What amount of duty is estimated from all kinds of sugar to the end of the fiscal year?

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot tell you just now. I have not got it.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not know that we have made that estimate. Last year it was between $2,500,000 and $2,600,000.

Mr. GUNN. How much is estimated for the coming year?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We suppose the consumption will probably increase, but the price has receded somewhat, and so we shall not probably get as much as we did last year.

Mr. GUNN. You received $1,300,000 for the first six months. Have you made an estimate for the coming six months?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No, only we estimate that we shall lose by the cheap rate of sugar during the year—that it will not reach as much as last year.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Can the Minister tell us how many hands are employed in the glucose factory or factories?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They have not been doing a great deal. There are three of them. Two of them are preparing to get into operation. There is one in Toronto, and the one which has been in operation is at Prescott, I think, and there is one at Windsor that has not been doing much, but purposes, I understand, going on with it. In the Toronto one, I know they are going on; I do not know but that they have it in operation now.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Judging by the quantity that has been imported and entered, unless it is entered under some other head, it is difficult to see where the market is to be for several more factories. It may, perhaps, go into consumption under some other name. But has the Minister of Customs the total quantity of pounds entered for home consumption last year?

Mr. BOWELL. The quantity of grape sugar was only 5,885 lbs., and of glucose syrup the quantity was 719,600 lbs.

Mr. PATERSON. What is the value of the glucose syrup?

Mr. BOWELL. $26,491.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, Mr. Chairman, you will see from that what a very small amount the product is. What perplexes me is to know where you are going to get your market?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We will get a revenue out of it.

Mr. PATERSON. But what about your extra pro- product of the Toronto factory, that I understood was to be started on a large scale? If the total importation has only been $26,000 worth, you can readily see that it is a very small amount, and it cannot employ many hands to turn out that much. I am not thoroughly acquainted with the process, and do not know how many men are required in order to do it, but I fancy there cannot be a great many hands employed in it. To turn out $26,000 worth extra in Canada, cannot be giving employment to a great many men. You may have a large building, but after all you cannot have many hands. Then it becomes a question just how far it is in the interests of the country to increase the taxation in order that a comparatively few hands may be set to work. I am free to say that the figures of the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Paint) are figures I have not seen myself before. I do not know how it is; I think there is some mistake somewhere with reference to it. But I think glucose could be bought for about three cents on the other side now—I think the Minister's estimate of four cents is too high. I do not know that they ask for their best kind any more than 3½ now, and I fancy it could be bought for 3. The old tariff at 3 would be $1.55. Here is 45 cents per 100 pounds more placed upon the article, if you take it even at 3½, which, I think, is the highest price. I speak subject to correction; perhaps it is 3¾, as an hon. friend near me suggests. If it were 3½, it would be $1.72; it is adding 28 cents more; and the Minister says that is based on the same rate as refined sugar. It is used largely for the same purposes as refined sugar. He is right in that, but it is not based on the saccharine matter which it contains. For instance, in refined sugar you have your saccharine matter in a large proportion, but you have not saccharine matter to the same extent in your glucose.

Mr. BOWELL. Nor in the refined. We have had some raw sugars contain as much saccharine as the refined.

Mr. PATERSON. Suppose I admit that point; the Minister will not contend that there is as much saccharine matter in the glucose as in sugar, either raw or refined. Therefore it is equivalent to adding a duty equal to that on the saccharine matter in refined sugar—or raw, if he will insist on putting that in—and now it is being increased. I grant you that in case of corn going up largely, and the price of sugar advancing, the price of glucose, in the States, might advance, and there might come a time when 2 cents specific duty would not be more than the old duty of 1 cent per pound, and 35 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman would be right if he confined his statement to the value of the glucose imported into Canada from the United States. I think I

made that sufficiently clear when I spoke before. I know that agents in Toronto and London import from Buffalo glucose of a fine quality, and enter it at 3½ cents per pound, but it is not the price at which they sell the same article for home consumption. To test that when objection was taken to the action of the appraiser in Toronto in raising the article in value, our officer at Fort Erie, whom the hon. gentleman knows very well, Mr. McMichael, a man quite capable of judging, went through their factory, and examined their books, and reported it was not the price at which they sold it for home consumption. When the agent visited Ottawa, and had an interview with me, I told him if he could establish the fact that the price at which they were entered, were the prices at which they were sold for home consumption, we would permit it to be entered at 3½ cents per pound. He agreed to that proposition, and went to Buffalo himself with the Customs officer, and went fully into all the books, and their report was that the former report as to the value of the article, was correct, and I have heard nothing of it since. They submitted to pay the duty upon the enhanced value.

Mr. GUNN. I observe that the duty for the twelve months ending 30th June last, averaged $1.50 per 100 on all kinds of sugar. For the next six months it had fallen to $1.30, that is, 20 per cent. per 100. That, on an estimate of the quantity compared with the last six months, would involve a loss of $200,000 to the revenue, the largest sum we are discussing in the tariff.

Mr. BOWELL. I hope the hon. gentleman will excuse us if we do not enter into a general discussion upon the sugar duties—particularly as they are not under discussion just now.

Mr. PATERSON. We propose to bring that all up under this item.

Mr. BOWELL. I am aware you not only propose to do it, but you have done it. Now, about raw sugars, so far as I understood the hon. gentleman's point, they were much cheaper during the last six months than they have been for a long time past, and a very large proportion of the raw sugars which have been imported, are of a very cheap grade, particularly those sugars which have been brought from Germany, and that may account to a certain extent for the lowness of the price to which he refers.

Mr. BENSON. I think they forget that there is a duty of 7½ cents a bushel on corn; and if we succeed in establishing the glucose manufacture we will obtain a revenue from the corn consumed. I am quite satisfied that the price to the consumer in Canada has been much less than it would have been had there been no manufacture established in this country.

Mr. GUNN. I think the amount I have stated will be all lost to the revenue in the next six months, as the income from sugar duties will be at least $200,000 less than last year. I think we should obtain some information as to how this loss will be made up.

Mr. PATERSON. The point mentioned by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Gunn) is that, under the present sugar tariff the people are not only paying a great deal more for their sugar than they otherwise would do, but there is a considerably less sum going into the Treasury. Upon this point, as it bears upon the subject under consideration, I desire to lay before the Committee, a few facts with respect to the sugar tariff we have in operation at the present time. I do so with a view that the Finance Minister may take notice of them. I understood the hon. gentleman when he was speaking on an advance in the duty on agricultural implements, to state to the House that if the manufacturers took advantage of the increased duty given, in order to make consumers pay a higher price, he would reduce the duty to the point at which it stood previously. I understood the hon. gentleman to lay down as a rule, that if, under protective duties given to manufacturers, they took advantage of those duties to raise the price above the fair selling price, he would take that power out of their hands and reduce the duty. The hon. gentleman having taken that ground, I think this is an opportune time to point out to him, as shortly and clearly as possible, the advantage which is being taken by the refiners in Canada, in order that he may consider the matter.

Mr. BOWELL. I rise to a point of order. I ask whether on a proposition to change the duty on glucose the hon. member has a right to enter into a discussion of the whole sugar duty. Such would lead to an interminable discussion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I never knew a discussion so clearly germain. Not only is it particularly germain to the matter before the Committee, but I have never known any objection raised to a discussion under these circumstances.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman making a speech; but if we desire to get through with the resolution in any reasonable time, we had better confine ourselves as nearly as possible to the item under consideration. I differ altogether from the ex-Finance Minister as to whether it is germain. If it be germain to discuss the duties upon sugar while we are discussing an article that is, I admit, sweet and may be used for the same purpose, he might as well argue that it was germain to discuss the whole iron tariff as to steel and the manufactures of iron in all its phases if we have the question of pig-iron before the Committee.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The propriety of the question is this: The propriety of this specific duty on glucose, which enters into competition with sugar, largely depends on what the sugar duties are, and how the sugar duties are affected by it. The hon. gentleman's position is that he is able to show the Finance Minister that the present sugar duties very seriously injure us all, and that by consequence this suggestion is injurious, too. The connection is very clear.

Mr. PATERSON. If the hon. gentleman withdraws his point of order I will proceed.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not withdraw it.

Mr. PATERSON. I think the Minister is wrong, and that the remarks I propose to make are quite pertinent to a discussion on this item. There are sugars made from corn and from beet as well as from cane. The reason I want to offer some facts is, because I think I may be able to make an impression on the Finance Minister so that when he is dealing with the question of altering the sugar duties and making further propositions on the subject, as I fancy he intends to do, he will be prepared with the changes, if his views accord with mine. As to the question of taking up time; if I desire to make a speech there is no way of preventing my doing so on another occasion, when a motion is made that Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair, and the House again go into Committee of Ways and Means.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the hon. gentleman has shown himself out of order, as he has been making a speech and discussing the matter generally on the point of order. As regards this particular item, I think the hon. gentleman can go into the question of the sugar duties, as they affect this item and as they are affected by it, but not beyond that.

Mr. PATERSON. I bow to your decision, Mr. Chairman. I think, however, it is rather limiting discussion—and I agree with you that it may be desirable to do so—as compared with the discussion on woollen rags the other night, during which hon. members debated the ques-

tion of wheat and a great many other subjects. The duty upon glucose will be, if you take 3 cents. per lb. as the value, 66⅔ per cent. if reduced to an *ad valorem* basis. I want to point out that in other articles used in connection with the manufacture of sugar, there is a very much higher duty paid than even that. You take the article of granulated sugar. Our granulated sugar is brought in from the United States, although the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs), in his speech the other night, and when referring to my figures, said that our granulated sugars came from Britain.

Mr. STAIRS. I beg your pardon.

Mr. PATERSON. It comes from the United States; that is well known, and the duty on granulated sugar from the United States coming into Canada, based on its present value, is 86½ per cent. *ad valorem*. And when the hon. member for South Huron said that over 3 cents a pound was added to that quality of sugar by reason of the duty, he was inside the mark, because the duty amounts to $3.10 instead of $3. Now, how does the tariff affect the revenue and the consumers of this country? I have here quotations from the New York *Herald*, of March 25th, and the Canadian prices from Montreal *Gazette*, of March 26th, both of granulated sugar. It could be bought in New York at 6 cents per pound, less the drawback, or a net price of $3.21 per 100 lbs. If we had the old tariff in operation of 1 cent per pound specific, and 25 per cent. *ad valorem*, the duty on that sugar would be $1.80, which, added to the $3.21, would make it, duty paid, $5.01 per 100 lbs. I leave out the question of freight, because the freight from Montreal west and east is as great as the freight from New York, and therefore does not enter into the calculation. Now, the Montreal *Gazette* gives us the price of granulated sugar on March 26th, as $6.50 cents per 100 lbs., less 2½ per cent. cash discount, amounting to 17 cents, making $6.33 per 100 lbs. The price at New York was $5.01, or a difference of $1.32 per 100 lbs. more than sugar costs in Canada now, than it would cost if the Cartwright tariff were in force. Now, let us have a comparison as to the extra duty paid under the tariff of these hon. gentlemen; as I have stated already the article would cost $5.01 in New York, duty paid, if the Cartwright tariff were in force, the duty being $1.80; while the duty under the Tilley tariff amounts to $3.10, or there is $1.30 per 100 lbs. more paid on granulated sugar coming into this country from the United States under the Tilley tariff than under the Cartwright tariff.

An hon. MEMBER. And still sugar is cheaper.

Mr. PATERSON. And still sugar is cheaper.

An hon. MEMBER. And better.

Mr. PATERSON. No, it is not any better. Granulated sugar is a standard article; you will find it as good in the United States as it is here, and as good here as it is in the United States. No matter whether it was cheaper or not, there is the fact that under the old tariff you would get sugar for $1.32 per 100 lbs. less, which is more than 1¼ cents per pound of an advance, and that is proved by the fact that the extra duty under the Tilley tariff as compared with the Cartwright tariff was $1.30, and the duty reaches on granulated sugar from the United States on an *ad valorem* basis at the present quotations, 96½ per cent. Now, I have no desire to see the refineries stopped. I am glad to see them at work, but I bring this to the attention of the Finance Minister. I call him to verify his statement made in the House that if he found the manufacturers taking advantage of the high protection given them and unduly increasing the price of the article to the public, he would use the power in his hands by removing the extra amount of protection given to them. I have established it; no man can controvert the figures; I speak before the Finance Minister himself and the Minister of Customs; I have given the data upon which I have worked it out; any business man can work it out for himself, and there is the fact staring him in the face. Now, I think the case is one which calls for the investigation of the Finance Minister, and I think he is bound in order to carry out his statement with reference to this subject—to see that these duties are altered. But hon. gentlemen may say: That may be an excessive tax, but we want the revenue. There is where the iniquity comes in. The fact of the matter is this, that under the Cartwright tariff more money would have gone into the Treasury than goes into it now. You are not only paying $1.32 more for your sugar, but less money is absolutely going into the Treasury than would have gone into it under the Cartwright tariff. How do I establish that? Well, on the 171,732,978 lbs. of sugar of all kinds imported last year, the money that went into the Treasury was to the extent of $2,581,149. Now the equal in granulated sugar of that 171,000,000 lbs. would be about 150,000,000 lbs. We must take it in granulated sugar, because that is the only standard sugar you have; when you begin talking about yellows you are talking of nondescripts, but you can work it out when you have a standard and, allowing for waste, it would be equal to about what I have said—150,000,000 of lbs. of granulated sugar. That would give $2,703,750, or $122,601 more money coming into the Treasury, and your sugar costing less. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) stated that all the sugar we use is not granulated. I know it is not, but a large proportion is, and I say that granulated sugar is the only basis upon which you can argue this question, because it is a standard and outside of it you have no standard. This hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) was not quite fair when he was arguing this question and attempting to reply to my statement. He said I had accepted 3½ cents for granulated as reported in the *Mail* newspaper. I did not do that; and I said the writer of that article must have known that we do not get granulated sugar from Great Britain at all. He went on to argue that we could get sugar as good there and bring it in at 87 cents less. I ask if that was the case would not the importers bring that sugar in? It is not to be had there; it does not come from there; it comes from the United States; it is made there and to-day if the Cartwright tariff was in force you would have more money going into the Treasury, and sugar would be $1.32 of a less price per 100 pounds than it is. As I have said already I do not desire to see our refineries closed; I am glad and willing to see them working, but I ask if it is necessary to give them such an amount of protection as that to enable them to keep going. It may be said that they are not making money, but that does not prove that the protection is not excessive, That may arise from other circumstances; it may be that the market is too limited or other causes may be at work, but whatever the cause the fact remains that this extra price is charged, and I hold that it is unjust to the people of this country, that it is not beneficial to the Treasury that that state of things should exist. I have given the figures and I have only repeated now what I said before when I had the opportunity of addressing the House at a former stage, with the difference that there has been somewhat of a change in price since then both in Canada and the United States, although the difference in the cost to the consumer has been maintained by our refiners here all the time. It may be said, if you can bring in your sugar at 2 cents per 100 lbs. cheaper from the United States, even under the present excessive taxation, why not have some trial lots brought in? But the Finance Minister knows that if the merchants attempted to so so, the refiners would drop their prices for a little time in order to sicken them of that enterprise. It is well known that the merchants in

Montreal and elsewhere, when they have attempted to bring in sugar, have learned to their cost that these men lower the price for a time, and then it is advanced again. I have thought it proper to say this with reference to the excess of duties imposed not only on glucose, but on another article which is quite as important to the country, and of which a great deal more is consumed.

Mr. STAIRS. In reply to the hon. gentleman who has done me the honor to mention my name, I take issue with him in the statement that we must take granulated sugar as the basis of calculation, because, in charging the duty on granulated sugar he is charging the duty on an article coming from the United States, and calculated on the fair market value in that country, which is very much higher than the price at which it can be purchased for export. But if you go across to the old country to purchase, you find that you pay the duty on the general market price in that country, which is very much lower. The export price there is invariably about the same as the home price. Therefore, our *ad valorem* rate of duty upon the price in the old country is not so excessive as it is on the price of the article coming from the United States. But I wish to point out that if there be over protection to granulated sugars at present, hon. gentlemen opposite and their policy are just as much to blame as hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and for this reason: The protection the sugar refiners of Canada have at present on granulated sugar is due, not so much to the increase of 10 per cent. in the rate of duty, as to the enforcement of that principle in the tariff which was the law of Canada when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. Any hon. gentleman who takes the trouble to look into this matter, will find that what I say is true. According to the figures given the other night by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), the difference in the price of granulated sugar for export and for home consumption in the United States is somewhere in the neighborhood of from $2\frac{3}{4}$ to 3 cents a pound. Now, the enforcement of the *ad valorem* duty upon that difference is not due to anything in the tariff so much as to the enforcement of the general law in Canada, which was in operation before the present Government came into power in 1878, and hon. gentlemen opposite are just as much to blame for that law being on the Statute Book as hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. But it may be said that they did not enforce it. Well, that is true. If they choose to plead that they are quite welcome to the plea, because they only accuse themselves of having an Act on the Statute Book which they did not put in force. They can take either horn of the dilemma they choose. The hon. gentleman says I was unfair to him when I charged him with saying that granulated sugar could be purchased in Great Britain at $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents. I did not charge any such thing. I had no intention of doing so. I understood just as clearly as the hon. gentleman himself, that granulated sugars could not be purchased in Great Britain; I admit that he is correct, although I do not know much about the sugar trade. The hon. gentleman himself said that he was glad to see the *Mail* admit that sugars could be purchased at that price outside of Canada, and I accepted that as an admission that that was a fair price to work upon; but I had no more intention to imply to the House or the country that granulated sugar could be purchased at that price in Great Britain than he had himself. He may be correct when he argues here to-night that granulated sugar cannot be purchased in England; but I believe it to be the case that sugars of a very much higher quality than those mentioned the other night as having been purchased at 8s. 3d. per 112 lbs. can be purchased in England—sugars which practically, so far as the general trade of Canada is concerned, will come into competition with a very much larger protion of our output of sugar. Now, if you really look at the increase of the duties on sugars under the present tariff as compared with that of the ex-Minister of Finance, you can see, without very much consideration of the question that, taking into account the sugars which can come in under the present tariff from Great Britain, and which constitute about $\frac{4}{5}$ of the volume of sugar consumed in the Dominion, that the difference in the rate of duty between the two tariffs is not more than 5 per cent. at the most on sugars costing from 8s. 6d. to 10s. or 11s. per 112 lbs.; and therefore the additional duty cannot be much more than 9 to 15 cents per 100 lbs. as I argued the other night. Now, I do not wish to go into the question of sugar to-night; but I shall be very much pleased at any time, to enter into a discussion with the hon. gentleman or any other hon. member of this House on this question, which is a most important one to the country. I believe it is very much in the interest of the Dominion that the refineries should be in operation. I agree with the hon. gentleman in that; but I disagree with him entirely that we must take the market price of granulated sugars in the United States to calculate what the people of Canada are paying for sugars at present. It does not give this House and the people of Canada a fair impression, because, no matter if you do turn the theoretical consumption of sugar into granulated, you do not get a fair idea of the increase in the rate of duty. You get an idea probably five or six times as great as it really is on four-fifths of all the sugar consumed in Canada.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The drawback allowed to the exporter of sugars in the United States, as the hon. member for South Brant knows, is $2.85 on every 100 lbs., which would bring sugar in this country down to $3.15, while the consumer in the United States has to pay $6 per 100 lbs.; so that the people of the United States, with the view of crushing out Canadian industries, offer a bonus for every 100 lbs. of sugar sent to Canada of $2.85. That is an incontestable fact, and I ask the hon. gentleman, that being true, if he would advocate a return to the Cartwright tariff, so that the interests of Canada could be crushed out of existence by a policy like that of the United States?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman is utterly mistaken. The Americans do not give a bonus at all; they return the duty to all these sugar refiners according to a certain scale.

Mr. WOODWORTH. That is the same thing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not the same thing by any means. It is quite true, in certain European States, under the guise of export duty, substantial bonuses have been paid, and it may be true that a good many years ago, under the same guise, bonuses were paid by the Americans, but the Americans made a most careful and exhaustive examination into that question, and if the hon. gentleman chooses to examine the subject at leisure, he will find that the return which they make, barely equals the amount of duty which was paid. As to what the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) said, I take it that the way to ascertain what is the weight of taxation in this matter upon the people of Canada, is to ascertain this simple fact: Were we purchasing this sugar, which we consume, in England, where there is no duty at all, what would we have to give for it? The weight of evidence, as far as I have been able to ascertain from my own researches and from gentlemen conversant with the trade, is entirely this: that on the quantity of sugar which is now imported into Canada we are obliged substantially to pay 3 cents per pound, on an average, more than we would have to pay were there no tariff of any kind. That is the weight of taxation under this tariff. That amounts, supposing our 172,000,000 lbs. were reduced to any standard, say granulated, on an average to $4,500,000 which the people of Canada have to pay for the 170,000,000

lbs. or 150,000,000 lbs., whichever you like, more than they would require to pay if they were able to buy it in the Glasgow market or any other English market where there is no duty. That is the position I lay down, and it is, according to all the trade returns and circulars and evidence on the subject, a fair representation of the real state of the case. I state here to-day, and I think my hon. friend will find it to be the case, if he will go minutely into the question, that, as regards the grades which go into the consumption of the greater part of the people of Canada, you could buy them, without the tariff, at about 3 cents less per pound than are charged for them over the counter. That is the proper measure of the weight of the hon. gentleman's tariff. That represents on the 150,000,000 lbs. consumed, $4,500,000, and as the Treasury has received but $2,500,000 of this, the remainder, $2,000,000, has been paid to the refiners.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not propose to continue the discussion further than to say that I think the hon. gentleman is wrong, so far as his remarks apply to the principle upon which the Americans pay a drawback. My investigations have led me to the conclusion that they pay, instead of less, a little more than actual duty, and in arguing that question the American statesman—I forget his name—who, at the time, regulated the amount of drawback to be paid, claimed that though they paid to the manufacturers a higher sum than the actual duty upon the raw sugar, the country was more than compensated by the labor employed in the refining of the sugar. That is, according to my distinct recollection, the argument used, and though I think the hon. member for King's, Nova Scotia (Mr. Woodworth), is not quite correct as to the amount $2.85, my recollection being that it is $2.70.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). $2.79 now; it used to be $3.20.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, some time ago; so that the hon. member for King's is substantially correct in his statement that while the amount paid is ostensibly a drawback, yet as the importer receives more than he actually paid, it virtually amounts to a bonus. The difference between the amount he paid and the amount he received——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is that?

Mr. BOWELL. My recollection is 25 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. 25 cents per hundred pounds is, I suppose, what the hon. gentleman means.

Mr. BOWELL. That is correct. The American statesman I refer to, used the argument that the advantages received through giving employment to laborers in the country, more than compensated for the extra amount given over the duty paid.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt at that time the Americans did think so; but over and over again they have altered the amount they allowed as drawback; and, at present, it will be found they do not admit that they offer any bonus. I recollect distinctly the argument the hon. gentleman speaks of was used; and as far back as 1876 it was tolerably conclusive that at that time the Americans did allow the figure over the duty of which the hon. gentleman speaks, 25 cents per hundred pounds; but the hon. gentleman will find that since then the drawback has been very considerably reduced; and that whether it be the case or not, at this present moment, that there is a substantial advantage or not, the Americans do not admit that there is. I speak with some reserve upon that question, because I believe their duty is partly *ad valorem* and partly specific.

Mr. BOWELL. No; it is all specific.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The reason I ask the question was when the duty is specific and *ad valorem*, no doubt the drawback does afford considerable opportunity for evasion; but the Minister of Customs knows there is no question in the whole range of controversy which is more disputed, and as to which the refiners have told more fibs than the whole question of drawbacks. There is not one to be trusted in England or America or Canada on that question. I recollect well, the refiners utterly refused to give any statement as to how much refined sugar they could make out of an ordinary 100 pounds of imported sugar; and if the Finance Minister can find that out, he has found out what has bothered all the Finance Ministers of England and America for many a day.

Mr. BOWELL. I have tried to ascertain but have not succeeded so far; but I am not prepared to say that the sugar refiners in this country should be therefore designated as fibbers.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not designate them in particular.

Mr. BOWELL. I have found that the different refiners, both in Halifax and old Canada, have given us, as far as they could, the facts upon which to base a drawback, but I admit there is a variety of opinions, and that this is one of the most difficult questions to solve. For that reason I came to the conclusion that it was impossible to establish an exact figure which would cover the exact amount of duty paid upon any sugar after it had been refined. You will have to guess, to a certain extent, and come to as equitable a decision as you possibly could; and with the fluctuations in the markets in the different countries in which the raw material is produced, the drawback to-day might be too little next week and too much the week after. The Americans, on that account, gave a very liberal construction in the ruling of the Treasury Department, and for that reason they gave no more than they thought the refiners entitled to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I certainly did not mean to say that our refiners would fib any more than their neighbors—I do not believe they do—but the hon. gentleman knows very well that the refiners all over the country, when they were demanding advantages from us, refused us information. They made all kinds of demands and they would not answer questions, they would not tell us the facts about it, and I do not suppose they have told the hon. gentleman any more accurately than they would me.

Mr. BOWELL. They have told me what they said were facts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman knows also that Mr. Gladstone and many others have made statements very much stronger than I did as to the *modus operandi* pursued by the sugar refiners in their various controversies with the Government, which are without end.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I thought it likely that we should drift into a general discussion on the sugar question, and that is why I desired that the discussion should be confined to the subject before the Committee. I am not going to be dragged into a general discussion. The hon. gentleman made his speech following the statements I made in introducing the Budget, and could then have dealt with this matter, but it appears that he has supplemented that speech now. If I do not enter into it now, it is because I do not wish to call off the attention of the Committee from the matter under consideration, and do not desire to be drawn into this general discussion at this time further than to say, that the statements made by the hon. gentleman are not, in my judgment, borne out by facts. If we get into a general discussion on the tariff, a general declaration in reference to it, as we may on going into Supply or on some other question, I will then devote some attention to the statements

he has made. I think they are erroneous and cannot be sustained by facts, and I think we shall be prepared to show it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I will not go into the general discussion again, but I will make one remark. It is, of course, a very easy way of disposing of statements, by saying they are all wrong, but here are the quotations from the New York *Herald* and the Montreal *Gazette*. To work out 1 cent a pound and 25 per cent. *ad valorem* on the net price, and 1 cent a pound at 35 per cent. *ad valorem*, on the New York long price is a very simple thing, and there is the result of it. Let me give another test. The granulated sugar which is quoted by the New York *Herald* at 6 cents is quoted by the Montreal *Gazette* at 6½ cents. There is ½ cent on the face of it, and it is known to the hon. gentleman opposite that the American refiner pays ½ cent a pound more than the Canadian refiner on his raw material.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. But he gets his drawback.

Mr. PATERSON. The fact remains that at the present prices of sugar, as quoted on 25th March in New York and on 26th March in Canada, the Canadian could have imported granulated sugar from the United States, paid 96½ per cent. duty upon it, and laid it down here a shade cheaper than he could buy it in Canada.

Carpets, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I move an amendment to that, by adding the following words :—

Carpet mats and rugs of all kinds and printed felts and druggets and all other carpets and squares not otherwise provided for.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state the recent duty on these ?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is estimated that this will yield an increased revenue of $40,000.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the ground on which the change takes place ?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Both in order to uniformity and for revenue. It is to prevent any difficulty in the rates of duty and to get revenue also.

Mr. BLAKE. There was no difficulty about uniformity as to carpets before.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. These were all at the same rate, but under the original resolution, different rates were proposed.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not asking for the reason of the amendment, but of the whole proposal as amended. I can understand the desire to put in these other items which are now proposed to be introduced into the resolution for the sake of uniformity, but that does not apply to the original resolution as amended.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. In 1879 we imposed upon all wool carpets 10 cents a yard and 20 per cent. duty, and upon mixed wool and cotton, that is to cover the carpets manufactured in Canada, 5 cents a yard and 20 per cent. Now it is found that a cheap tapestry carpet, which is more taking, a more flashy and fancy carpet, entered at 20 per cent., comes in competition with our manufacturers, and they are deprived of the advantage intended to be given them by the tariff of 1879. That is one reason. In addition to that, to make up the deficiencies that will arise in the Excise duty, as is quite apparent from the general sentiment of the country on the temperance question at this moment in regard to the Scott Act, it was thought we could get 5 per cent. more duty out of this, and, at the same time, give increased protection to the manufacturer.

Mr. BLAKE. That description is a very small portion of the whole value of the imports that are covered by this resolution. You take all the Brussels and the expensive carpets, and it is only the cheapest kind that comes in competition with the Canadian article.

Mr. BOWELL. Brussels carpets were only 20 per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. I know they were, but I am discussing how much of the value of the imports is affected solely from the revenue consideration and how much from the protective consideration, and I was desirous of ascertaining as near as might be, the relative value of the imports of these cheaper tapestries in regard to the whole item on which the $40,000 is expected to be made.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We have not separate heads and we do not know what proportion that would be. We know that the imports are large and that the tapestry is used very largely, but all the carpets imported paying 20 per cent. are under one head, so we cannot form an opinion exactly as to the amount. We know that the amount under that head, collected last year, was $163,816, the value of the import being $818,001. By the addition of the 5 per cent. the duty collected would be about $204,500, or an increase of over $40,000.

Plate glass, in panes not over 30 square feet, 6c per square foot.

Mr. BOWELL. A great deal of difficulty has arisen over the whole Dominion as to the real value of plate glass, and it has been a constant source of trouble both to the importers and to the Department. We thought it better, as it was a standard article, to place a specific duty upon it, instead of allowing it to remain at the *ad valorem*, and the relative position of this present specific duty, as proposed now, to the *ad valorem* is just about the same. We calculate no addition to the revenue, as long as the *ad valorem* was continued at the present low prices. For the last twelve months plate glass has been imported at an extraordinarily low price, and we based this calculation upon the prices at which it has been entered, taking the average of the last twelve months. The different sizes have been approved. I may say, we have taken precisely the wording of the American tariff, only we have lowered the rates of duty to make it equal to about 20 per cent. upon plate glass.

Mr. BLAKE. Is theirs a specific or an *ad valorem* duty ?

Mr. BOWELL. Theirs is specific exclusively ; but where we charge 6 they charge 10, and where we charge 8 they charge about 12, and so on, in proportion to the different sizes of the glass.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman's calculation is that, on the average prices of the last six months, this would produce about 20 per cent. duty ?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you allow plate glass to be entered at as low a rate as 30 cents per square foot ?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not remember now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because it would have to be entered at 30 cents per square foot in order to make this equal to 20 per cent. I should imagine that very little would have been brought in at that rate.

Mr. BOWELL. I am told by the appraisers that it has been entered as low as at 1s. 6d. and 1s. 9d.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. 1s. 8d. is equal to 40 cents.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes. It has been a good deal lower, and it has been higher, but in coming to a conclusion we adopted as near as we could the average of the last twelve months' quotations.

Colored labels for fruit, vegetables, meat, fish, confectionary and other goods, also tickets, posters, advertising bills and folders, a specific duty of ten cents per pound and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. gentleman explain this?

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman has the tariff before him, he will see that item 5 reads as follows: "posters, advertising pictures, and show cards, six cents per pound and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*," the 11th item reads: "labels for fruit, vegetables, meat, confectionary, also tickets and advertising bills, ten cents per pound and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*." A difficulty has arisen in some of the ports as to what a poster is, and what an advertising bill is. As a printer, I should say they were the same thing. Under the present tariff, posters are placed at six cents and 20 per cent., while advertising bills are under the item of 10 cents and 20 per cent., and the whole change is to strike out posters in the 5th and add it to the 11th item, making them all posters and advertising bills, 10 cents and 20 per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. Just a little levelling up?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, it is levelling up.

Sheet iron hollow ware, and all manufactures of sheet iron not elsewhere specified, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Mr. BOWELL. The most of that ware is 20 per cent. and some of it is 25.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What amount of revenue is expected?

Mr. BOWELL. It is not expected that any increased revenue will be derived from that item. It is more for the purpose of placing it under one heading, and to have the duty as uniform as possible.

Mr. BLAKE. If the only object is uniformity, and this principle of levelling up is adopted, and no revenue is obtained from it, are we not buying that uniformity at rather a high price? I hope the hon. gentleman will be able to console us by saying more money will go into the Treasury in consequence of increasing the duty by one-fourth. It is distressing that we should charge so much more, and get nothing. It is now proposed to add to what the people had to pay upon these articles one-fourth of the present duty, 5 cents, and add it to 20 cents without producing any increase of revenue at all.

Mr. BOWELL. A very few articles in this item pay 25 per cent., and some would pay 30 per cent. For instance, if an article is made of brass it is 30 per cent.; if made of iron and unenumerated it is 20 per cent., and if it be a manufacture of iron it would be 25 per cent. I have no figures as to the increase of duty, but I am just informed that the only reason the Department had in recommending this change was that which I have given. In many of these articles there are different rates of duty, as I have already explained, some 20, some 25, and some 30. So that in the aggregate there is little difference in the revenue, and very little, if any, additional tax upon the people.

Mr. BLAKE. This does not include brass.

Mr. BOWELL. It says hollow ware, and there is plenty of hollow ware made of brass.

Mr. BLAKE. But this is sheet iron hollow ware. Brass must be somewhere else.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, plenty of it. You do not have to go far for it either. If the hon. gentleman desires any more specific information upon this point, I will furnish it or give it to him upon concurrence.

Mr. BLAKE. Very well, we will compromise in that way.

Asbestos in any form other than crude, and all manufacture thereof 25 per cent

Mr. BOWELL. The additional 5 per cent. is given to the manufacturers of asbestos in the different parts of the Dominion, purely from a protective standpoint. 20 per cent. was the duty paid before. We shall have no additional revenue if they do what they promised, namely, make it more largely in this country.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman take written engagements from these people?

Mr. BOWELL. As they fail to give us endorsers, it is not worth while doing so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I quite agree with you.

Axle grease and similar compounds, 1 cent per pound.

Mr. BOWELL. The duty has been 20 per cent., it being on the unenumerated list. A large quantity of axle grease has been imported free, as grease for soap manufacturing purposes, but it should not have been entered in that way; and it is, in order to prevent frauds of that kind, that it has been deemed advisable to make it a specific duty.

Mr. BLAKE. About what rate *ad valorem?*

Mr. BOWELL. About 20 per cent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Would that include such articles as plumbago, used for lubricating purposes?

Mr. BOWELL. It would not include that, I fancy.

Cotton bed quilts, not including woven quilts or counterpanes, 27½ per cent.

Mr. BOWELL. These articles are manufactured in Canada, and it has been deemed advisable to give them the same protection as we give to prints.

Mr. McMULLEN. Where are they manufactured?

Mr. BOWELL. In Hamilton, I think.

Extract of fluid beef, not medicated, 25 per cent.

Mr. BOWELL. The duty was formerly 20 per cent. We propose to make it 25 per cent. because it is largely made in this country.

Mr. BLAKE. Is there a good deal of it imported? It is extraordinary if foreign manufacturers are able to buy our beef and send it back to us in the shape of extract, paying 20 per cent., and then sell it to our own people.

Mr. BOWELL. I am informed by the member for Montreal West (Mr. Gault) that there is a very large factory in Montreal, employing sixty or seventy hands.

Mr. BLAKE. My point is that we export the raw material, and I presume it goes where this extract is made abroad; the manufactured article comes back, and our home manufacturers seem unable to compete against it with 20 per cent protection.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is in error. The principal portion of the fluid beef we receive from abroad comes from the western States, from Chicago particularly, where beef is cheaper than here.

Towels of every description, 25 per cent.

Mr. BOWELL. The same explanation as was given with respect to quilts applies here. I may have been in error in my statement to the member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) as to where bed quilts were manufactured. Towels of every description are now manufactured in Hamilton very largely, and are obtaining a very large sale throughout the country. This 5 per cent. increase is given to encourage this particular industry.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the manufactured article is selling well already, why should 5 per cent. be added?

Mr. HESSON. In order that they may be made cheaper.

Mr. BLAKE. It is very extraordinary. A little while ago on some items we were told that the articles we produced were very good and ought to be sold largely, but that an extensive sale could not be obtained, and therefore more protection was proposed in order that the sale might be made wider. Now, the hon. gentleman tells us that the articles are very good, that they are having a very wide sale, and therefore more protection must be applied. Whether the manufacturer fails in getting a wide sale or not the cry is the same; the condition of the manufacturer is such that more protection must be had.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is like most of the members of his profession, very apt to make the most of very little, and is very clever in dealing with even small questions of this kind. What I said was that these articles are made largely in this country, are coming into general use, and are obtaining a large sale throughout the country. But the manufacturers, as in all cases of this kind, have to meet a competition which is not so strong until they become firmly established. No doubt the remark made by the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Hesson) is strictly correct, that, in less than a year, although the 5 per cent. is added, the articles will be bought as cheaply as in the past, and no doubt a little cheaper.

Damask of cotton, linen or cotton, and linen bleached, unbleached or colored, 25 per cent.

Mr. BOWELL. The same remark applies to this, and these articles are being satisfactorily made in the country.

Mr. BLAKE. A gentleman who occupies a first class position in the trade is under the impression that this term is very extensive in its meaning. Does the hon. gentleman mean by this description damask of all those various elements, or damask of cotton, linen or cotton, and linen bleached, unbleached or colored.

Mr. BOWELL. Damasks of all those articles.

Mr. BLAKE. I would suggest that the phrase read damask of cotton, of linen or of cotton, and of linen bleached, unbleached or colored.

Mr. BOWELL. I accept the suggestion.

Umbrella and parasol steel, iron or brass ribs, runners, rings, caps, notches, tin caps and ferrules, when imported by and for the use of manufacturers of umbrellas, 20 per cent.

Mr. BLAKE. What we had before was umbrellas then?

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentlemen will remember that the Finance Minister explained, when the question of umbrellas was under consideration, and gave as a reason for raising the duty from 25 to 30 per cent., that a large proportion of material, particularly silk, which is a raw material, paid 30 per cent., and in order to compensate the manufacturers it was considered that these articles should be decreased. Under a clause now in the Customs Act, but which it is proposed to amend, all parts of an article pay duty at the same rate as the article itself—in proportion to its value.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose there are no manufacturers of any of these articles in the country?

Mr. BOWELL. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose some of these articles may be imported for some other purposes than the manufacture of umbrellas?

Mr. BOWELL. So the manufacturers inform us. What we propose to do is to send a sample of each of the articles to the ports, so that they may know exactly, when imported, that they are the articles specified in the tariff.

Mr. SCRIVER. What duty would they be liable to, if they were imported by other than the manufacturers of umbrellas?

Mr. BOWELL. The duty charged would vary according to what the articles were.

Mr. BLAKE. Are there many manufactories of umbrellas?

Mr. GAULT. I know there is a large one in Montreal, established within three or four weeks, and that it employs between 20 and 30 people. The proprietor is a friend of the honorable gentleman.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not ask how many there were in Montreal, but if there were many in the Dominion?

Mr. BOWELL. I cannot tell. I know there is a large one in Montreal, and I think there is one in the west, but I am not sure. The proposed amendment is as follows:—

When any manufactured article is imported into Canada in separate parts, each such part shall be charged with the same rate of duty as the finished article on a proportionate valuation; and when the duty chargeable thereon is specific, or specific and *ad valorem*, an average rate of *ad valorem* duty equal to the specific, or specific and *ad valorem* duty so chargeable, shall be ascertained and charged upon such parts of manufacture.

The law as it stands now, is as follows:—

"Parts of carriages or other manufactured articles, shall be charged with the same rate of duty on a proportionate valuation, as are chargeable on the finished article."

I have heard gentlemen of the legal profession argue that this applies only to parts of carriages, because it is bracketed under the head of carriages, buggies, railway cars, children's carriages, etc. Besides, the hon. gentleman will see that no provision is made in this paragraph for an article which bears a specific and an *ad valorem* duty; and in order to put an end to any controversy, it is changed, as I have read, and I presume there is no objection to it.

Mr. BLAKE. I should think there would be considerable complication in ascertaining the proportionate values at which these articles are to be taken. I am afraid it will be a grand opportunity for the diversity of judgment in the different ports which exist at the present time.

Mr. BOWELL. It is much worse as it is now.

Also, to add partridge, prairie fowl and woodcock to the articles the exportation of which is prohibited by section 9, chapter 13, 46 Victoria.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are now included in that section.

Mr. BOWELL. Deer, wild turkey and quail, in carcase or in part.

Mr. CASEY. Black squirrels are exported in large numbers.

Mr. BOWELL. Does the hon. gentleman desire to have them placed here?

Mr. BLAKE. I think this is a good thing, but of course the hon. gentleman will have much more difficulty in enforcing it than in the case of big game, because it will not be difficult to export considerable numbers of these small fowl, say in trunks in the winter season.

Mr. BOWELL. That is true, but it is not so much to prevent that as to prevent the slaughtering which is carried on by those coming from foreign countries and carrying these animals away by hundreds and thousands. In fact in years past they almost depleted our country of deer.

Mr. WELDON. So far as New Brunswick is concerned they have almost completely destroyed the partridges. They come from the State of Maine into our country.

Mr. BOWELL. Another reason is that the construction of the railway through the centre of New Brunswick enabled parties living in the interior a great many miles away, to pack them in the winter season and send them away by thousands. We had the Province of New Brunswick specially in view, and we decided to put a stop to the practice if possible.

On Resolution 4 (p. 333),

Mr. BOWELL. The rates of duty which this resolution imposes on the different kinds of fish are, with one or two exceptions, the same as those imposed by the United States on fish going from foreign countries into the United States. On oysters, however, we have, in the amended list, ranged the duties, which are less than 20 per cent. on the different classes of oysters; and when they are brought in in bulk, in tubs, the packages in which they are brought are charged 25 per cent., the duty now paid on tubs brought in alone. If the hon. gentleman has no objection, I would like this resolution to be passed, and any information he desires will be given on concurrence.

Mr. BLAKE. With that understanding, I am willing to let it pass.

Mr. BOWELL. With reference to the charges of inland transportations, I may possibly ask the House to permit me to amend the resolution. I do not say positively, but my impression is, that it would be better to amend it so as to give the Department power to declare by regulation what the charges should be per ton, more particularly upon heavy articles which are brought to the shipping point from the interior, especially in Great Britain. My reason for that is: While we have the railway rates from Birmingham, Warrington, and a number of other places to Liverpool, —they are advertised in the English papers—and as they have been obtained by gentlemen whom we have asked to obtain that information while in England, still, in a large number of invoices presented to the Department, the rates of freight mentioned vary so greatly as to lead one to suspect dishonest intentions. In one case, in which iron was purchased at a place in Scotland not more than 13 miles from Greenock and shipped from Greenock to Canada, one invoice gave 20 shillings per ton and another only 5 shillings per ton as the freight charges, when we knew that the actual freight rates at the time did not reach either one figure or the other; yet in the working of the Department, we allowed full latitude of 5s. In another case, one of the largest firms in the Dominion made a demand for a refund of duty upon freight which they claimed to have paid Canada upon inland freight in England. After a good deal of correspondence, not only with merchants in Canada, but with the Chambers of Commerce of Liverpool and of Manchester, and also with the Colonial Secretary, Lord Derby, we decided to accept affidavits of the actual freight paid, and allow the drawback on that. Perhaps the House will be surprised when I say that while most of the invoices showed 10s. per ton paid from a certain point to Liverpool, the affidavits, in almost every case, covered only 6s. The Department refused to give them the drawback unless they made an explanation. The matter remained in abeyance for several months; and when they tried to produce evidence to establish that they had paid the duty, one of the very invoices produced showed a freight rate of only about 4s. 10d. or 4s. 11d. for the same class of article. I explain this to the House now in order that the Committee may think over the proposition to strike out the exception made in favor of importers when they purchase their goods in England. The inland transportation is charged on all articles in all other countries, and it was the law in Canada prior to 1879.

Mr. BLAKE. But not acted on, I believe.

Mr. BOWELL. I think the hon. gentleman is correct. Like many other provisions of the Customs laws, it was more honored in the breach than in the observance; but while a law is on the Statute Book, it is the duty of every Government to enforce it. It has occurred to me that the better way to deal with this question is to establish the rate by regulation or Order in Council for the time being. That is a suggestion I throw out for the Committee to think over —either that, or strike it out altogether.

Mr. BLAKE. The question is one, the hon. gentleman will admit, of very considerable importance to the trade of the country. I would invite the hon. gentleman, if he is able to reach a conclusion on this subject, as I presume he is, before we go into Committee, to have his proposition, so that we may have the opportunity to consider it.

Committee rose and reported progress.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I wish to read two telegrams received since the announcement was made by the First Minister. They are from the Indian Agent at Battleford:

"BATTLEFORD, 31st March, 1885.

"The Stonies are up in arms on way in. It looks serious now.
"J. M. RAE."

"BATTLEFORD, 31st March, 1885.

"The Indians rising. Payne and Applegarth killed.
"J. M. RAE."

Those are the two instructors there.

Mr. BLAKE. We heard a few moments ago of this dreadful communication which fills us all with great sorrow. It is stated there is some additional information with reference to more forces, that the 7th Battalion and a portion of the Halifax forces have been ordered out for active service. Is that the case?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to answer this question. I can say, however, that the 9th is under orders, the Quebec battalion. I know that there are offers from Halifax to send out two battalions; the 7th Battalion has also been ordered out.

Mr. BLAKE. I have a statement from Halifax that a portion of the Halifax militia is to be despatched to the North-West to-morrow. If that be the case it is extraordinary that the Government should not know of it here to-night.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The order may have been given since we have been in the House this evening, and the Ministers have not been in a position to meet. Of course orders must be given, as emergency occurs. The hon. gentleman may think it is strange that we do not know that this or that company has been called out while the House is sitting, but I am sure the House will understand that these things must and will occur, and we have not time to hold a Cabinet sitting on each occasion.

Mr. BLAKE. I quite agree in what the hon. gentleman says, but I think it was the duty of those who gave these orders, to communicate them to the hon. gentleman who is acting as leader of the House, before the adjournment, so that the House might be put in possession of the news by him. I do not blame the hon. gentleman who has been assiduously discharging his duties here, but I think we are entitled to know the latest orders.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11:30 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 1st April, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ACCOUNTS FOR PRINTING.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew) moved for:

Return of all printing done outside the regular contract for the Departmental printing from 1st January, 1872, to 1st January, 1879, and all vouchers and accounts relating to the same.

Motion agreed to.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before proceeding to the Orders of the Day, I desire to call attention to a return that was brought down last evening, just before the House closed, in response to a motion made by myself in connection with the Grand Trunk Railway. An Order of the House was passed last Session for papers, but they were not brought down. This year I placed another notice on the paper asking for additional information connected with the same subject. When I asked from the Government as to what they had done in respect to the matter, the Government discovered for the first time that they had neglected to notify the Grand Trunk Railway Company of the Order of the House of last Session. I find the first communication to the Grand Trunk is a letter from the Secretary of the Department, Mr. Bradley, dated 17th February, 1885. It is in these words:

"On 28th March, 1884, it was ordered by the House of Commons that a statement should be laid before it, showing the names of all stockholders in the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada, with the amounts of stock held by each of said stockholders at the close of the first year after the charter was granted or operations commenced. Also, the names of all stockholders in said company, and the amounts of stock held by each on the first day of the current year (1884).

"I am to request that you will be pleased to furnish the Department with the necessary information to enable such statement to be submitted to the House at an early date."

That is the first intimation the Grand Trunk obtained of the Order of the House of last year, and the Government are very much to blame in neglecting so important a duty as communicating this Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will confine himself to a statement in connection with the return.

Mr. MITCHELL. I bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker. On 19th February the Grand Trunk Company wrote the following letter:—

"GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY OF CANADA,
"GENERAL MANAGER'S OFFICE, MONTREAL,
"February 19th, 1885.

"SIR,—I had the honor to receive yesterday your letter dated the 17th, referring to an Order said to have been passed by the House of Commons on the 28th March, 1884, for a statement, 'Showing the names of all stockholders in the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada with the amounts of stock held by each of said stockholders at the close of the first year after the charter was granted or operations commenced. Also, the names of all stockholders in said company, and the amounts of stock held by each on the first day of the current year (1884).'

"I desire to say that your letter is the first communication which has been received by me, or as far as I know, by any officer of this company on the subject to which it refers.

"As the preparation of such statements would necessarily occupy a large staff for a considerable length of time, and entail a large expense upon the company, I beg to enquire under what legislation relating to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada they are called for in the form indicated.

"I desire, also, to respectfully point out that no such demand has been made upon the company in the past, nor upon any other of the railway companies operating lines in Canada, under like conditions to my knowledge; that no reason has been given for such an exceptional demand, nor has it been alleged that the information is required in the public interest.

"I beg also to state that I have no such statement under my control, nor does any such exist in Canada.

"I have the honor to be, Sir, your obedient servant,
"J. HICKSON,
"*General Manager.*

"A. P. BRADLEY, Esq.,
"*Secretary, Department of Railways, Ottawa.*"

Now, Sir, it will be in the recollection of the House that I put several questions during this Session as to when these returns would come down, and on the last occasion on which I questioned the right hon. the Premier, whose absence at this moment I regret, he stated he had received a communication from Mr. Hickson, and that Mr. Hickson said he had not a copy of the information in Canada, but would send to England, leaving the House to believe that it would come down, while it turns out that he sets the House at defiance, and asks under what authority the information is sought, and as no public reason was assigned for the demand he impliedly declines to give the information. That is what I take out of this correspondence. In the first place I hold that this House has a right inherent in itself to demand returns from every corporation, and certainly from every railway corporation which they have chartered and which is under their control, and so far as the public reasons for which this information is asked I think the fact that this company owes upwards of $46,000,000 to the people of Canada, principal and interest, is a substantial reason why the information asked for and given by other railway companies—information asked for by the hon. gentleman opposite who is daily asking for information from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which always gives returns when they are asked for, including the list of the stockholders of the company—I say that is the very information which has been asked for and ordered by this House this Session and last Session, and still this company refuses to give it. They question the right of the House, but whether the House has the right or not to order such information, I believe it is the statute law of the land that they should give it, and with the permission of the House I will read from the statutes. I hold that we have the right to ask this information irrespective of any legislation, but it is clear that under this statute they are bound to give it. I refer to the Act to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, chapter 24, 1881, section 2:

"And whereas it is expedient to amend section 30 of the Railway Act, therefore, the words three months after the end of the calendar year, are hereby struck out of said section 30, and the words 'three months after the 1st day of July in each year' are substituted for them; and the returns of capital, traffic, working expenditure, and all other information to be furnished to the Minister of Railways and Canals shall be in the form contained in schedule 1, appended to this Act, which is hereby substituted for schedule 1, appended to the said Railway Act, schedule 2 remaining in force for the weekly returns required by the said Act; and such returns shall be dated and signed by, and attested upon the oath of the secretary or some other chief officer, and of the president, or in his absence, of the vice-president or manager of the company, and such returns shall be made for the period included from the date to which the then last yearly returns made by the same company extended, or from the commencement of the operation of a railway, if no such return has been made, to the last day of June in the then current year; and shall in addition to the information contained in the schedule hereto, furnish such other information and returns as shall, from time to time, be required by the Governor in Council."

Now, there is a clear, distinct and express authority and command and power given to the Governor in Council to call upon railway corporations to make these returns. This return has been asked by the House and Mr. Hickson questions the right of the House. It is an insult to the House for him to take upon himself to question the right of the House to ask for that information, and that ground taken by a company which is indebted to the country to such an extent as they are. I ask the Government what

steps they have taken about this matter and what steps they intend to take to enforce this Order of the House and the law of the land upon this company. I await for a reply by some member of the Cabinet.

Mr. POPE. The steps we have taken are those usually taken when a motion is made of this kind. We have called on them to send that return, and the hon. gentleman has the answer they have given. We have taken the usual course.

Mr. MITCHELL. Let me ask the Minister of Railways whether he has called upon them by Order in Council. That is what I want to find out, and if he has, I think some steps should be taken in relation to Mr. Hickson's arbitrary conduct. If he has not, then Mr. Hickson is attempting to shield himself behind the fact that by a technicality they have omitted to comply with the requirements of the statute, and he thus evades supplying the information which has been asked for. I want to go a little further, since the Minister has not chosen to take up the matter, and ask what steps have been taken by the Government since they have had that reply a month in their possession. Has any action been taken to compel Mr. Hickson to submit to the law of the land and obey it like other citizens?

Mr. POPE. No further steps have been taken than the hon. gentleman sees. We have carried out the instructions of this House.

Mr. MITCHELL. Have you passed an Order in Council and sent it to him calling on him to give this information? That is the point.

Mr. POPE. That is not compulsory; it was compulsory on us to carry out the Order of the House. The hon. gentleman has just called that to my notice and I will consider it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hold that when this House passed an Order requiring papers to be delivered here the duty devolves on the Government to see that every legal step is taken to carry out that Order. If the Government have failed to take the legal steps necessary by passing an Order in Council which Mr. Hickson or anyone else in that position cannot evade, they have performed their duty, and then it will be for them and the House to consider what further steps shall be taken. Suppose I should take on myself that action and it turns out that they have not done it by an Order in Council, but by letter, the laches does not lie on Mr. Hickson, but the laches is upon the Government and now that I have called attention to the matter I hope they will at once pass the Order in Council.

Mr. BLAKE. The question is one of considerable importance. The amendment to the Railway Act which was made some Sessions ago, was made contemporaneously with the Act with relation to the charter of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the then Minister of Railways, Sir Charles Tupper, agreed that inasmuch as very serious and important questions, involving the material and other interests of the country, would arise from time to time under the provisions of that contract it was expedient that it should be accompanied by this general legislation with reference to returns and it was at my suggestion that the particular clause which the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) refers to, was introduced into the schedule, because it was felt that it might be that further returns than those specifically mentioned might be required, and I suggested hurriedly, for it was at the fag end of the Session, that whatever it was thought that the Government might in the public interest demand from the company, they should be clothed with the legal authority to procure, and the legal obligation be placed on the company to render such returns as the Governor in Council should order. I do not remember whether the general Act applies to all railway corporations.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, to all railways.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it does and certainly it ought to. Now, my notion with reference to returns asked for by the House is this: I apprehend that if the Government has the power under the law to compel the answer to a demand, then, when a member of this House invites the House and the Government to agree that there shall be a call for such an answer, it devolves on the Government to take whatever steps are necessary to execute that Order. There may be many cases in which the Government may refuse to ask the Order; there may be many corporations whom the Government has no executive power to compel to open their books or to answer our paper, and the Government may be obliged to ask the House to compel by legislation obedience to the Order. But if the Government has under the law of the land power to compel the granting of information which the Government itself, as a constituent part of the House, has agreed ought to be granted, by unanimously agreeing to the Order of the House for the return, then I agree with my hon. friend that the duty is incumbent on the Government to pass such Orders in Council, or take such other steps as are in their power in order to procure the return.

Mr. POPE. I agree fully with the hon. gentleman that the intention of that law is that the Governor in Council may act in the absence of this House; but I do not agree with him that, when this House has taken action upon a question of this kind, and the Government bring down a return, it is then the business of the Government to take further action when the House is in Session. I do not pretend to be a constitutional lawyer, but I do pretend to say that that is the common sense view. This matter was one in which the Governor in Council could act, when the House was not in Session; but when the supreme power is in the Chamber, it is for this House to see that its orders are fulfilled.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman for West Durham (Mr. Blake) mentioned the fact that at his suggestions these words were put in, specially applicable, as I understood him to say, to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. BLAKE. Applicable to all corporations; it was a general Act.

Mr. MITCHELL. Not for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company alone?

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly not.

Mr. MITCHELL. Because there is a special clause in the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, section 39, which says:

"The company shall, from time to time, furnish such reports on the progress of the work, with such details and plans of the work, as the Government may require."

I differ entirely from the position of the Acting Minister of Railways. I say it is the duty of the Government when they desire information, to get it under this section. He says it devolves upon the House to take this matter up and act. I differ entirely from him. The House has ordered this information to be furnished; the Government of the day are the executive of the House to carry out its orders, and if the law of the land points out how that is to be done, the duty lies on the Government to frame that Order in Council, which the law says shall be done before these people can be compelled to make these returns. Now, it is a very unusual thing for a company in such a situation to throw obstructions in the way of the Government. The Acting Minister of Railways knows that demands have been made

constantly by that company; we know the position they were in last year, when the Government came to their relief to get them out of an unpleasant difficulty—an act if perpetrated by any other person in this House who is less influential perhaps than those gentlemen, would be a very serious circumstance to him. I say it looks very strange that the Government would allow a whole year to pass over before seeking for any information, and then allow a month to pass before they give any information to the House on this matter. Now, having called the attention of the Government to the matter, I tell them that I hold them responsible for the carrying out of the law in having an Order in Council passed, so that if I should bring Mr. Hickson up to that Bar, for refusing to obey the Order of this House, there will be no loophole for him to get out of; and I hope the Government will take steps to carry out the Order of this House and the law of the land.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There can be no objection to the hon. member drawing attention to the fact that the return has not been completed according to the demand made by him and voted by the House. But he has no reproach to make to the Minister of Railways, who has stated exactly the case as it stands. The company were applied to for the return in question, and the Government have placed their reply before the House. My hon. friend says the return is not complete, and draws the attention of the Government to the fact; and it will be for the Government to judge whether the circumstance is such as requires them to use their authority according to the statute my hon. friend has quoted, and by Order in Council to ask that the return be made complete. What should have been done has been done, and the Government will consider, as the Acting Minister of Railways has said, whether they should act on the authority given them by the statute. Their first duty was to obey the Order of the House, and they have obeyed it.

Mr. MITCHELL. My hon. friend either misconceives the position taken by me, or he has not met the case. He says the Government have done everything they ought to have done. That is where I take issue with him. I say they should pass an Order in Council, and if he says they will do that, and take the necessary steps to enforce the company to obey the Order of this House, I have nothing more to say.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman having called attention to the matter, it should not now drift into a debate. If the Government do not do what is right, he can make a motion.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it is hardly fair for the hon. gentleman, when he has not been——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think there should be no debate.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—LAND GRANT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I can now give the answer which the First Minister promised to the question of the hon. leader of the Opposition in reference to the portion of the land grant which has been accepted and taken over by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The total area of lands situated in the 48 mile belt on the Canadian Pacific Railway, examined between Winnipeg and Calgary, also in Manitoba south of said belt and elsewhere, up to the 29th December, 1884, is 7,315,200 acres, out of which the company have accepted 6,561,920, equal to $89\frac{8}{10}$ per cent. of the total area examined, and they propose to reject $10\frac{2}{10}$ per cent. of the total area examined, namely, 753,280 acres.

Lands where situated.	Acres.
Between 1st and 2nd meridian	1,227,520
" 2nd and 3rd "	1,944,320
" 3rd and 4th "	524,160
" 4th and 5th "	1,072,640
" 5th and 6th "	115,840
In Southern Manitoba outside of railway belt	339,200
Elsewhere outside of railway belt	1,338,240
Total	6,561,920

There is not a note appended to this; the figures thus given are in round numbers, taking the full area 640 acres per section, but it must be understood that a certain proportion of this is water, the net area actually accepted being 6,524,000 acres. This is merely the proposal of the company, however, and has not yet been acted upon by the Government.

MANITOBA LEGISLATURE—SESSION OF 1884.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the Act of the Legislature of of Manitoba, intituled: "An Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Manitoba Central Railway Company," passed on the 29th April, 1884, has been received by the authorities at Ottawa? If not, whether any of the other Acts of that Session have been received, and when? If yea, when was the above Act received? Has any action been taken with reference to its allowance or disallowance, and when?

Mr. CARON. The Act of the Legislature of Manitoba intituled: "An Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Manitoba Central Railway Company," was passed on the 3rd June, 1884, and has not been received by the authorities at Ottawa. Chapters 1 and 54, both inclusive, of Acts passed by the Legislature of Manitoba, in the Session of 1884, were received by the Secretary of State on 29th August, 1884. No action has been taken with reference to the allowance or disallowance referred to.

CLEARING VESSELS WITHOUT HARBOR MASTER'S CERTIFICATE.

Mr. PAINT asked, Is a collector fulfilling the law by clearing vessels without the harbor master's certificate that such vessels have paid their harbor fees?

Mr. BOWELL. By the 28th Vic., cap. 30, sec. 2, the collector or principal officer of Customs thereat shall not grant any clearance, transire, or let pass any ship on which they are payable, until the master thereof produces to him a certificate of the payment of such fees or certificates of the payment of fees under this Act twice within the then present year.

N. N. ROSS, CHIEF CLERK, CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, What is the name and salary paid the successor of N. N. Ross (Chief Clerk Customs Department) and the position occupied and salary paid him prior to his appointment to the chief clerkship?

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman means the successor of Mr. Ross of Quebec, who has been superannuated and who was chief clerk at $1,600 a year, Mr. Carter, who was chief or landing waiter at that port, has been appointed at $1,400 a year. His previous salary was $1,000 a year.

MILITARY ORGANIZATIONS IN MANITOBA AND THE NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. TROW asked, Is it the intention of the Government, in view of the present disturbances in the North-West Territories, to accept the services of companies that are

organised at Portage la Prairie and other parts of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, and whether arms, accoutrements and clothing are in store in Manitoba to equip such companies for immediate service ?

Mr. CARON. Some of the companies have been accepted; offers of service have been received and have not been decided upon yet; the arms and clothing of every company the services of which we may accept will be provided.

TIMBER LICENSES.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, Total number of timber licenses issued since January 1st, 1882, and actual or approximate area covered by the same? Number of timber licenses issued up to March 26th, 1885, in the North-West Territory, and the actual or approximate area covered by the same? Number of timber licenses issued up to March 26th, 1885, in Manitoba and Keewatin, and the actual or approximate area covered by the same? Number of timber licenses issued up to March 26th, 1885, in the Disputed Territory, with the actual or approximate area covered by the same?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To the first question the answer is: The total number is 71, and the approximate area 3,072 square miles; in addition to the above 4 leases have been granted for 21 years. In answer to the second, the number issued is 17, approximate area 849 square miles, and two 21 year leases. In answer to the third, total number 35, approximate area 1,220 square miles and two 21 year leases. In answer to the fourth, total number 18, 899 square miles, and two 21 year leases.

Mr. CHARLTON. Does that cover the permits to cut timber from year to year ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I fancy not. That is not here. I have given the answers furnished to me by the Department.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will now find it convenient to make the statement I asked for a moment ago.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The position is not altered since yesterday, except that the Stony Indians have gone to Poundmaker's reserve, about 18 miles from Battleford, taking with them some cattle and horses that they have got hold of. The report from Major Morris, who commands at Battleford, says that he has 200 good men, and that there is no fear about holding his post.

Mr. BLAKE. The statement is made in this morning's papers that the deaths that had occurred at Battleford numbered four instead of two. Has the hon. gentleman any information on that ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, there is no information of that.

Mr. BLAKE. I think last night the hon. gentleman was not able to say whether any of the Nova Scotia militia had been called out.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Minister of Militia will be here just now.

Mr. CASEY. I understand there are two bands of Stony Indians differing very much in size and warlike character, one located at Eagle Hills and known as the Plain Stonies, and the other the Mountain Stonies, I think further south. Can the hon. gentleman say ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I cannot, but I have little doubt that the Stony Indians in the immediate proximity of Battleford, seeing that some stores were raided, had their cupidity aroused and thought that they would have some too.

Mr. CASEY. Can the hon. gentleman say what the numbers are ?

Mr. MACKENZIE. When I was up there last August, I was told that there was dissatisfaction among the Stony Indians in consequence of the withdrawal of rations. Does the hon. gentleman know if there was such dissatisfaction ? I was assured of it on the very best authority.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no particular recollection of that just now, but there is no doubt that, when the Indians have not any food, they always hang about the stores, so that it was impossible to get them to go to the reserves. All the Indians hanging about the different Indian stores were told that they must go back to their reserves, and food was given them, but very reduced rations in order to induce them to go to their reserves. Some would not go to the reserve, but would rather hang about on the reduced ration, the half ration, than go to work; but whether these Indians are included in that I do not know.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I was informed that they were rather better Indians for providing for themselves than the others in their neighborhood, and that those who were least industrious had the rations continued, while those who were most industrious had them taken away on the ground that they did not require them, and that this was the cause of the dissatisfaction I was assured by parties on the spot. If that is the case, it shows that the rule has not been applied very evenly, because they should all be treated alike. I admit the difficulty.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The whole theory of supplying the Indians is that we must prevent them from starving. In consequence of the cessation of the buffalo and their not having yet betaken themselves to raising crops, they were suffering greatly. Parliament has been very liberal in making grants, and it was the duty of the Government to see that the Indians were not allowed to fatten in idleness. Every inducement was held out to them to go on their reserves. Liberal supplies of cattle and seed grain, and food even on their reserves, if they would go to their reserves, were dealt out to them. Of course there was no necessity of pauperising the Indians who were self-supporting by sending them food, and, whether an Indian was an industrious man or otherwise, we could not allow him to starve, we were obliged to feed him, and I believe the officers of the Department exercised every discretion in giving them food to prevent them from starving, but at the same time every effort was made to save the public stores and induce the Indians to become self-supporting.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose as the Minister of Militia does not happen to be here I shall have to postpone any further enquiries for a little while, but I hope he will find it his public duty to be here very shortly.

INDIAN AFFAIRS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. MILLS moved for:

Copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and that of British Columbia, in reference to the Indian affairs of that Province, since December, 1882; also all correspondence with Government officials and others, upon the same subject during the same period of time.

He said: The House and the country will no doubt think that this is a favorable opportunity to bring

under the attention of the House the consideration of the Indian difficulties in one of the remote Provinces of the Dominion. It is well known to the House that the Indian affairs of British Columbia have been in a somewhat disturbed condition for a very considerable period of time, and that the Indians there have not at all been content with the policy which the Government has thought proper to pursue with regard to them. In fact, there has been so much discontent, so much uneasiness amongst the white population of the Province of British Columbia in reference to the Indian affairs that, during the past year, the Government of British Columbia thought it necessary in the public interest to appoint a Commission to enquire into matters connected with the administration of the Indian Department in that Province. It may not be out of place to call the attention of the House to the policy which has been adopted at different periods of time with reference to the condition of the Indian population in the Pacific Province. It may be convenient to divide the Indian policy into particular periods of time. Indian affairs were under the control of the Governor, Sir James Douglas, from 1849, to 1864. At that time his Governorship came to an end and the Indian affairs of the Province of British Columbia passed under the control of governor Musgrove, Governor Kennedy and Governor Seymour, and the affairs were in a large degree administered by Mr. Trutch. In 1875 a change took place, a different policy was adopted, the Indians were more contented, and that policy was continued until 1880, when the policy which prevailed between 1864 and 1875 has been again reverted to, and, I think I shall be able to show to the House, with precisely the same results which prevailed when it was pursued between 1864 and 1875. When Sir James Douglas was placed in the command of the Province of British Columbia, and was entrusted with the administration of its affairs, we find that he adopted pretty much the same policy in reference to Indian matters that had been traditionally pursued in the territory that now forms the Province of Ontario from its earlier settlement down to the present time. He did not take possession of lands belonging to the Indians without first extinguishing what is called the Indian title—not that the Government maintained that the lands actually belonged to the Indians, for it would seem that the Government there had admitted what was recognised elsewhere, that the title to the territory of which the Government of the United Kingdom had acquired the sovereignty, was vested in the Crown, but as a matter of public policy, and with the view of conciliating the Indian population, and reconciling them to the occupation of the country by the white population for the purpose of its colonisation and settlement, they admitted that the Indians had some interest in the lands of the country, and they did not undertake to sell out any portion of those lands, whether upon the mainland or upon the Island, for the purpose of colonisation and settlement, without first having extinguished the Indian title. I find that when the settlement was being made at Esquimalt the Government of Sir James Douglas dealt with the Indians for the possession of the country. In the deed of surrender, or treaty, there is this provision or understanding:

"The condition or understanding of this sale is this: That our village sites and enclosed fields are to be kept for our own use, for the use of our children, and for those who may follow after us; and the land shall be properly surveyed hereafter. It is understood, however, that the land itself, with these small exceptions, becomes the entire property of the white people forever; it is also understood that we are at liberty to hunt over the unoccupied lands, and to carry on our fisheries as formerly. We have received as payment, fifty-two pounds ten shillings sterling."

This deed of surrender was made between Sir James Douglas and these Indians. Then again I find that in Victoria Peninsula the same treaty provision was made with the Indians settled in that locality. There is a provision made, which is as follows:—

"Do consent to surrender, entirely and forever, to James Douglas, the agent of the Hudson's Bay Company in Vancouver's Island, that is to say, for the Governor, Deputy Governor, and Commissioner of the same, the whole of the lands situate and lying between the Island of The Dead, in the arm or inlet of the Comoson, where the Kosampson lands terminate, extending east to the Fountain Ridge, and following it to its termination on the Straits of De Fucas."

Then there follows the same conditions as in the other case. The condition or understanding of this sale is this:

"That our village sites and enclosed fields are to be kept for our own use, for the use of our children and for those who may follow after us."

In every case the Indians in that country seem to have reserved for themselves those lands of which they were in actual occupation, the lands which were necessary for fishing stations, the lands upon which their villages were built, the lands in which they were engaged in cultivating—these were reserved to themselves, while all the surrounding district was surrendered to the white population. They also reserved to themselves the right to hunt over the territories which they had surrendered to the Government until it came into actual occupation by the white settlers. Now we have as early as 1858 the views of the English Government upon this subject of dealing with the Indian population upon the Pacific coast. I will read an extract from a despatch from Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton, who was at the time Colonial Secretary, and which despatch was addressed to Sir James Douglas, Governor at the time in that country:

"I have to enjoin upon you to consider the best and most humane means of dealing with the native Indians. The feelings of this country would be strongly opposed to the adoption of any arbitrary or oppressive measures towards them. At this distance, and with the imperfect means of knowledge which I possess, I am reluctant to offer, as yet, any suggestion as to the prevention of affrays between the Indians and the immigrants. This question is of so local a character that it must be solved by your knowledge and experience, and I commit it to you, in the full persuasion that you will pay every regard to the interest of the natives which an enlightened humanity can suggest. Let me not omit to observe that it should be an invariable condition, in all bargains or treaties with the natives for the cession of lands possessed by them, that subsistence should be supplied to them in some other shape, and above all, that it is the earnest desire of Her Majesty's Government that your early attention should be given to the best means of diffusing the blessings of the Christian religion and of civilisation among the natives."

These were the views communicated to the English Government at this early period. At the same time that the colonisation of British Columbia and Vancouver Island was going forward, the Society for the Protection of the Aborigines had their attention called, it would seem, to some transactions which they thought did not indicate a sufficient disposition to properly protect the interest of the aboriginal population, and they addressed the Colonial Secretary a long communication upon the condition of the Indian population in that section of the country. Amongst other things contained in that communication is the following:—

"It would seem that a treaty should be promptly made between the delegates of British authority and the chiefs and their people, as loyal, just and pacific as that between William Penn and the Indians of Pennsylvania, but that more stringent laws should be made to ensure its provisions being maintained with better faith than that which was carried out on the part of the whites. No nominal protector of aborigines,—no annuity to a petted chief,—no elevation of one chief above another, will answer the purpose. Nothing short of justice in rendering payment for that which it may be necessary for us to acquire, and laws framed and administered in the spirit of justice and equality, can really avail. To accomplish the difficult but necessary task of civilising the Indians and of making them our truest friends and allies, it would seem to be indispensable to employ in various departments of Government a large proportion of well selected men, more or less of Indian blood (many of whom could be found at the Red River) who might not only exert a greater moral influence over their race than we could possibly do, but whose recognised position among the whites would be some guarantee that the promised equality of races should be realised. The adoption of these or similar measures would, we believe, propitiate the good will of the Indians; and instead of obstructing the work of colonisation they might be made useful agents in peopling the wilderness with prosperous and civilised communities of which they might one day form a part."

This suggestion made by the Society for the Protection of the Aborigines does not seem ever to have been acted on

by Sir James Douglas. No doubt he was better informed of the capacity and ability of the Indians to engage in self-government than the members of the Protection Society. But it is also certain that Sir James Douglas, while engaged in the administration of the Government, took care that no lands were expropriated for the use of the white population without the Indians who were in actual occupation of the country, first having been dealt with in reference to those lands. And every possible care was taken to secure to them the lands which they actually occupied, upon which their villages were located, and which they actually used for fishing stations atong the coast. The policy of Sir James Douglas is indicated in a communication which is addressed to the Secretary of State for the Colonies in February, 1859. I will read one or two paragraphs from that communication. He says:

"Attempts have been made by persons residing at this place to secure those lands for their own advantage by direct purchase from the Indians, and it being desirable and necessary to put a stop to such proceedings, I instructed the Crown Solicitor to insert a public notice in the Victoria *Gazette* to the effect that the land in question was the property of the Crown, and for that reason the Indians themselves were incapable of conveying a legal title to the same, and that any person holding such land would be summarily ejected."

It will be seen that Sir James Douglas recognised, not that the Indians had any legal title to the soil, for the title was vested in the Crown, but that the Indians did possess rights which other parties, the Crown or its assigns, should purchase, and it was just and proper as a matter of political expediency that the Government should pursue the policy that had been invariably pursued by colonies elsewhere and in Ontario, namely, conciliating the Indians by giving them some compensation for their actual occupation, with a view to securing their good will and promoting the peaceful settlement of the country. Lord Carnarvon, at the instance of the Colonial Secretary—for his Lordship was then Under Secretary of State for the Colonies—addressed a communication to the Governor of British Columbia on this subject, in which he says:

"In the case of the Indians of Vancouver Island and British Columbia Her Majesty's Government earnestly wish that when the advancing requirements of colonisation press upon lands occupied by members of that race, measures of liberality and justice may be adopted for compensating them for the surrender of the territory which they have been taught to regard as their own. Especially would I enjoin upon you, and all in authority in both colonies, the importance of establishing schools of an industrial as well as an educational character for the Indians, whereby they may acquire the arts of civilised life which will enable them to support themselves, and not degenerate into the mere recipients of elemosynary relief."

That was, it will be seen, the policy the Government had in view, and which Sir James Douglas, during the period he was engaged in administrating the Government, sought to carry into effect. This was not the fitful policy of the Imperial Goverment urged upon Sir James Douglas during the administration of the Colonial Department by Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton, only to be abandoned upon his retirement, but the Duke of Newcastle urged upon the administrators of the affairs of British Columbia the continuance of the same policy. The Duke of Newcastle, in a communication addressed to Governor Douglas, in 1861, said:

"I am fully sensible of the great importance of purchasing without loss of time the native title to the soil of Vancouver Island; but the acquisition of the title is a purely colonial interest, and the Legislature must not entertain any expectation that the British taxpayer will be burdened to supply the funds or British credit pledged for the purpose."

The Colonial Council in British Columbia had urged upon the attention of the Colonial Secretary the propriety of aiding the colonial authorities on the Island and mainland in dealing with this Indian question by granting a certain sum to be paid to the Indians for their claim to the country. This the Colonial Secretary declined to agree to, but at the same time he indicated his view to be in favor of a conciliatory policy towards the Indians, such as Sir James Douglas had inaugurated. In 1862 we find the Government making provision for the preemption of land by the Indian population in precisely the same way as by the white population, with a view to enabling those who desired to abandon their old position and adopt the right of holding property and adopt the habits of the white population, so that they might have the same rights in the settlement and in possessing land as individuals the same as the white population possessed. This policy came to an end in 1864. A different policy was then adopted, a policy less favorable to the Indian population. The Government were largely directed by a Mr. Trutch, who had some experience in Indian affairs in Oregon Territory and who introduced into the Province of British Columbia notions in dealing with the Indian population similar to those which prevailed in the territory south of the 49th parallel. The Governors who succeeded Sir James Douglas seemed to have been totally ignorant of Indian affairs; they took little interest in the matter, and they, in a large degree, left the policy to be determined by Mr. Trutch and those who were associated with him. So we find an attempt was made to deal with the Indians upon wholly different lines, and to circumscribe and limit the extent of the reservations that had been made for them at the time when they surrendered those portions of the country which had been given up for settlement. Reports were made by various parties connected with the Government which indicated their anxiety to carry out the wishes of the Government, and secure, with the assent of the Indians if possible, but secure, at all events, the surrender of the Indian reservations. I find a communication addressed to the Government on this subject. Mr. Trutch, writing to Mr. Moberly says:

"The Indian reserves at Kamloops and Shuswap, laid out by Mr. Cox, being considered entirely disproportionate to the numbers and requirements of the Indians residing in those districts, His Honor has instructed me to direct you to make an investigation of the subject on your way back from British Columbia, and to report, on your return to this place, whether in your opinion arrangements can be made to reduce the limits of these reserves, so as to allow part of the lands now uselessly shut up in these reserves to be thrown open to preemption."

Upon that a report was made, and Mr. Cox, a provincial official, expressed the opinion that the reservations were larger than was necessary for the requirements of the Indians; but at the same time the Indians tenaciously adhered to their reserves, and it would be extremely difficult to get them to assent to any diminution. Mr. Moberly, in a communication addressed to the Commissioner of Lands and Works on this subject, said:

"It appears to me quite out of the question that Governor Sir James Douglas could have given Mr. Cox instructions to make such extensive reservations for a tribe that I should say does not number more than 400 souls, and whoh ave not 100 acres of land under cultivation. I had various interviews with the Indians, the result being that these settled at Little Shuswap and Adams Lakes wished me to lay off the reserves in the manner I proposed."

And so on. Again he says:

"I made several efforts to induce these two chiefs to consent to a reduction of their claims, but without success."

And that certain white settlers wished to occupy the reservations of various other Indian bands that had been dealt with, on behalf of whom reservations had been made, for the purpose of white settlement, and efforts were made to induce the Indians to abandon a portion of these reservations, but in almost every case without success. Then we find that the Government, in some instances, granted preemptions of lands which had been reserved for the use of Indians. In some cases the white settlers had rented these lands, and after being in possession as tenants they applied to the Government for location tickets for permission to settle, and in many instances they obtained from the Provincial Government a title to those lands which had been, by treaty arrangements, made during Sir James Douglas's administration; and in fact I might say that in consequence of these titles being granted discontent was created amongst the Indian population, even before the union had been made with Canada. And if it had not developed to

the same extent that it did at a later period, it was because of the sparsity of the white population, because the Indians, when they were crowded out of the lands in which they found themselves placed by treaty arrangements, still had room to go elsewhere. Now, it was in this condition of things that arrangement was made for the admission of British Columbia into the Union. The 13th article of the terms of admission reads as follows:—

"The charge of the Indians and the trusteeship and management of the lands reserved for their use and benefit shall be assumed by the Dominion Government, and a policy as liberal as that hitherto pursued by the British Columbia Government shall be continued by the Dominion Government after the union.

"To carry out such policy tracts of land of such extent as it has hitherto been the practice of the British Columbia Government to appropriate for that purpose shall from time to time be conveyed by the Local Government to the Dominion Government in trust for the use and benefit of the Indians on application of the Dominion Government; and in case of disagreement between the two Governments respecting the quantity of such tracts of land to be so granted, the matter shall be referred for the decision of the Secretary of State for the Colonies."

The terms of union proceeded on the principle that the title of the lands of that country, which had not been extinguished by the treaties made with the Indians, was vested in the Government of British Columbia, and that if further reservations were required to be made for our Indians, the Local Government was to surrender its title to such an extent of territory as would place those Indians that were still to be dealt with upon at least as liberal a footing as those had been placed who were dealt with previous to the union. There was no special provision made in this arrangement for an Indian fund. There was no claim set up that the title to the lands that were unsurrendered was not in the Crown but in the Indian population; and so far as I know there has been no attempt to purchase the lands of British Columbia from the Indians and to set the titles so acquired against the claims of the Government itself. On the contrary there is provision that the title to those unsurrendered lands is in the Crown as represented by the Local Government, and the Government has in this article stipulated that the Government of British Columbia shall surrender an adequate extent of territory for the use of the Indians who up to that time had no reservations made on their behalf, and that if the two Governments cannot agree the matter may be referred to the Colonial Secretary. In 1875 there was not a little Indian discontent, which had grown out of the sale of lands, which the Indians had actually occupied, to white settlers, and in order to put an end to that discontent, and to carry out the provisions of this 13th article it was agreed that commissioners should be appointed. Each Government appointed one, and these two agreeing on a third party, that these three commissioners should have a right to determine the extent of territory which the Indians should have allocated to them, and that the two Governments would acquiesce in this arrangement. The decision of these commissioners was to be final with regard to the matter. That commission sat; it carried on its operations for some time. The Indians that were discontented after a good deal of delay, acquiesced—or at all events their acquiescence was had in the arrangement made in their behalf. In fact I believe in every case their assent was had before the arrangement was ultimately made, and, as I understand, up to the present time, no disturbance has grown out of the arrangements made by these commissioners, and that where the determination of the commissioners has been carried out in good faith, the Indians are perfectly contented. But I understand, Sir, that in many cases the Local Government have refused to acquiesce in the decision of the commissioners, by which it seems to me they were bound, and that the Department here has not insisted upon concurrence in the determination of the commissioners. So far have the Government here been from carrying out the views of the commissioners that I understand the commission was put an end to in 1880 or 1881, and that Mr. O'Reilly, a retired district magistrate, who is a brother-in-law of Mr. Trutch, who had taken part in the administration of Indian affairs in that country before, who was engaged in carrying out the policy which might be regarded as a policy hostile to the Indian population between 1864 and 1875, is again in charge of the Indian affairs of that Province. The Indian population, we know, are contented where the arrangements that were made by Sir James Douglas on their behalf were accepted; they are contented in those districts where the commissioners sat. I believe the hon. gentleman will find that there is not a single complaint made in his Department by any of the Indian population in those districts where the commissioners sat, where lands were set apart in their behalf, and where the Local Government have carried out in good faith the determination of the commissioners. But where this has not been done, serious misunderstandings have arisen, and the Indian population are in anything but a contented mood. I may mention one instance; I do not know whether it has come under the attention of the First Minister or not. I understand the Indian reservation near the 49th parallel, that was set apart many years ago for the use of the Indians, has been sold by the Provincial Government to a Mr. Haynes, who I think is Customs officer at that point, for $8,000. The result is that very serious discontent exists amongst the Indians over a very large district. Now, the hon. gentleman knows what serious difficulties the American Government had with the Indians of Chief Joseph, and I am well aware, as the hon. gentleman no doubt is, that those Indians were in communication with the Indians in British Columbia—that there was a sort of hostile confederation between them at one time, and that that hostile confederation was in a great measure broken up by the energetic action of the commissioners engaged in setting out Indian reservations. As soon as the Indians became convinced that these commissioners were earnestly acting in their interests, seeking to do what was just and fair by them, and exercising all the patience that the habits of the Indians require should be exercised, the Indians put the most implicit confidence in them, and they have remained contented since. But there is in that Province a very considerable population drawn from the mining districts of California and elsewhere, who are under the impression that an Indian has no rights that a white man is bound to respect; and that, no doubt, creates a good deal of the difficulty of the Department, and imposes upon it the utmost vigilance, and the necessity of selecting its agents with the greatest possible care. Now, I hold in my hand the report of a commission appointed by the Local Government to enquire into the Metlakatla difficulty. It is an extraordinary thing that a Local Government should feel that a Department which is not under its control, is administered in so unsatisfactory a manner that it should feel called upon to appoint a commission to deal with the subject. Now, amongst other things, I find that that commission makes this recommendation:

"The commissioners consider it would be highly expedient, and conducive to good government, that the management of Indian affairs should be transferred to the Province, the Dominion contributing to the Province for that purpose, sums of money corresponding to the annual appropriation for Indian affairs in British Columbia. The administration of the Indian Department is so inseparably interwoven with the administration of justice"——

I confess I do not see in what way it is.——

"and the preservation of peace and order, that the division of jurisdiction cannot be beneficial; besides which, the circumstance of the head office of the Indian Department being so far removed from the localities where the exercise of its jurisdiction is required—often at a very short notice—renders the due administration of Indian affairs very difficult, and it is apparent the authorities at Ottawa cannot have the full and thorough and rapid means of knowledge which are always at the command of the Local Government."

In fact, the report of the commissioners is an attack on the division of powers and duties under our constitution. It

says that the Indian Department, so far as British Columbia is concerned, ought to be provincial and not Dominion, and that its administration should be entrusted to the Province; and it proposes that while the Province is ready to assume the duties, the burden of expense should be borne by the Dominion. There are other statements with regard to Indian affairs in British Columbia that I will not weary the patience of the House by reading or discussing; but amongst other statements made to me is this one: that the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, who is also in charge of the Department of Indian Affairs, pressed upon a prominent member of the British Columbia Government a year ago, the propriety of making a deed of two acres, claimed by the Metlakatla Indians, to the Church Missionary Society. In fact the hon. gentleman did not seem to think that the Indians had any title to those two acres that would make it any part of his duty to seek to enforce their claim to them. He held that these two acres were part of the Crown domain in British Columbia that had been promised to the Church Missionary Society, and that they should be deeded or patented to that society. Now, the hon. gentleman knows that this has been a source of very great excitement and ill-will against the Indian population for a very considerable period of time, and that the Indian people are not at all satisfied with the interference of the Local Government in this matter. The Indians also complain that occasionally not only the British ships of war have been ordered there for the purpose of enforcing conformity to what they do not regard as the law, but as a violation of their rights, but that American ships of war have been invited to assist in the same work. Now, it seems to me that this is a matter requiring the most careful consideration, not by the Government simply, but by Parliament. It is part of our parliamentary duties to see that the rights secured to the Indian population under the law, whatever they may be, are strictly observed, that good faith is kept with them; that such measures as are necessary to promote their civilisation and well-being should be adopted; that their rights or interests should not be disregarded because they are obscure or weak, or without the means of making known their grievances; that the law should be fairly and equally administered; and that the Indian population of British Columbia should have the same protection, although in a remote district, as any other portion of our population. They should have the security of the law, so far as the law is applicable to their case. Now, I do not think it necessary to say more upon the question at this time. I have said enough to show that there has been a wide departure from that policy which was adopted during the time of Sir James Douglas, and which was again reverted to between the years 1875 and 1880, that a policy inimical to the well-being of the Indians, endangering the peace of the Province and the lives of white inhabitants in the interior, a policy calculated to place the Indians in hostility to the great majority of the white population has been pursued. At one time this policy very nearly led to a war. It is not improbable that it may yet lead to a war. The Indian population of British Columbia are numerous and enterprising; they possess more vigor than the ordinary Indian east of the Rocky Mountains; and when they learn of disturbance, of discontent, of war in the North-West, they will be far more restless than they would be if there was profound peace. The wars existing among the Indians in Washington Territory produced no little discontent, anxiety and excitement among the Indians in British Columbia, the rising of the Indian population in the North-West may produce it again; and I think in the interest of the public it is desirable that the utmost vigilance should be exercised in reference to Indian affairs in British Columbia, so that the troubles which at present exist in the North-West may not extend to that country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no objection to the production of these papers; there is no objection to the production of the whole correspondence of this date or any previous date the hon. gentleman may choose to put in his motion, but I cannot really understand the aim the hon. gentleman has in view in the remarks he has made. In the first part of his speech he seems to have devoted himself to the task of proving that the Indians of British Columbia have no title at all, that the land belongs to the Crown, and that they were provided for merely as a matter of political expediency from the time of Sir James Douglas down to the present. I think that a portion of the hon. gentleman's speech referred to a question nearer home than British Columbia. Then the hon. gentleman, after having deprived the Indians of all their rights and titles, except as a matter of political expediency, turns round and says the Indians have been badly treated. But there has been no change in the policy.

Mr. MILLS. Yes, there has.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman, and he must not interrupt me. There has been no change in the policy of the Government that I am aware of since the time that he so successfully administered the Indian affairs in British Columbia. He talks of the remoteness of British Columbia from Ottawa preventing the successful working of the machine. I do not know that the distance between British Columbia and Ottawa has increased since the hon. gentleman so successfully administered Indian affairs. The hon. gentleman says the policy was altered. I am not aware that it was, but he says that Mr. Trutch who was Commissioner of Public Lands, before British Columbia became a portion of the Dominion, introduced a harsher system. What he did before Confederation, I do not know; but I know since Confederation Mr. Trutch has not had anything to do with Indian lands. He is in no way in charge of Indian lands. Negotiations respecting Indian lands in the North-West are in the hands of Dr. Powell, who was appointed I think by hon. gentlemen opposite, as the Local Superintendent of Indian affairs. The hon. gentleman has barked up the wrong tree; he has waked up the wrong passenger.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Mr. Powell was appointed before we came in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That may be. At all events ever since he was appointed, he has been at the head of Indian affairs and is responsible to the Indian Department here as Superintendent General, and it is quite erroneous on the part of the hon. gentleman to bring Mr. Trutch into the matter at all. Then the hon. gentleman says that the system was altered with respect to the setting out of reserves. I am not aware that the system has been altered. It is going on at this moment; there were two commissioners appointed, as the hon. gentleman says. Mr. Sproat, who alone managed with the consent of the British Columbia Government, resigned. He resigned with the assent of the Government of British Columbia, and Mr. O'Reilly was appointed. Mr. O'Reilly was one of the original judges there; he is a man of experience, exceedingly popular wherever known, a very able officer and very satisfactory to the Indians, and he is steadily carrying on the laying out of the reserves for all the Indians that have not yet got a reserve; and hitherto there has been no refusal on the part of the Government of British Columbia to sanction any of the reserves laid out by Mr. O'Reilly. It is a very slow process, as the hon. gentleman knows. In the first place, a survey must be made before the final reserve is laid out, with all its limits, for approval of the British Columbia Government, but while occasionally they have stated that Mr. Sproat gave much too large districts to the Indians, and I heard the criticism

that Mr. O'Reilly has been doing the same thing, yet on the whole there has been no refusal on the part of the British Columbia Government finally to sanction the reserves as laid out by the commissioner. The hon. gentleman says there is great dissatisfaction among the Indians. If there is such dissatisfaction, it has not reached me, perhaps on account of the distance of which the hon. gentleman speaks. There is discontent at Metlakatla and one or two places where small bodies of Indians have been, I must say, improperly deprived of the land they have been in the habit of living on. The plotting of land near the international line, of which the hon. gentleman speaks, was, I believe, sold by the British Columbia Government, and at Williams Lake, I think, there is a small body of Indians who are dissatisfied. They found that the land of their reserve was given away. We have called upon the British Columbia Government to give lands elsewhere, and the Government of British Columbia, I must say, have very improperly, I think, told us that the Dominion Government must buy lands somewhere else, that, as the reserve or the land for this small band was given away by them, the title, the patent actually issued, they have said that the Canadian Government must purchase a reserve somewhere else. That we resist; that we deny. That is one of the questions, one of the few questions I may say, in which we are not in accord, but I have no doubt that justice will prevail, and that we shall be able to get land for these Indians elsewhere. Now, except in these one or two cases of hardship, almost individual hardship, I am not aware that there are complaints among the Indians, except at Metlakatla. Now, at Metlakatla a question has arisen, and the *odium theologicum* has arisen there. There is Mr. Duncan, who was formerly an agent for a society—he belonged to the Church of England, but I forgot the name of the society——

Mr. BLAKE. The Church Missionary Society.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He was formerly a lay reader, a Scripture reader and agent for that Missionary Society. Long before the Dominion had anything to do with British Columbia, there was a grant made, I think by by Sir James Douglas's Government, to the Church of England at this particular spot, Metlakatla, and a question has arisen now with Mr. Duncan, who has left the service of the Missionary Society and has taken a distinct position of his own, which, I think, could not be recognised by this Government, or any Government, or by the Government of British Columbia. However, there is no necessity to discuss that question just now. I would rather that that question should not be discussed, in the interests of peace, just now. I dare say those matters will settle themselves; but, in the meantime, the Government of British Columbia was apprehensive of serious difficulties at Metlakatla, because the Indians are not in accord. There is a majority, I believe a considerable majority, supporting Mr. Duncan; there is a by no means inconsiderable minority on the other side. The hon. gentleman speaks of a commission being issued, and he has read that commission which was issued the other day. Well, the British Columbia Government are responsible for the peace of the country. They can make such enquiries as they please. That is their affair. But it was proposed to appoint an officer to go to Metlakatla to enforce the laws of the land, which I must say are in great danger of being resisted. I will not say anything against the actuating motive of Mr. Duncan. He has done great service in the past, and I hope he will do good service in the future. However, he has taken a position quite opposite to that of the hon. gentleman. Mr. Duncan has taken the position that the land belonged altogether to the Indians.

Mr. MILLS. No, no.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He has told the Indians that neither the Dominion Government nor the Government of the Province has any right to interfere, that the land is the Indians, that it belongs to them and their ancestors, and he abjures and denies the right of either Government to interfere. Now, in the danger that there might be serious collision, an arrangement took place between the British Columbia Government and the Dominion Government. They say that they are poor, that they are impecunious rather, and that they would not go to the expense of appointing a stipendiary magistrate for the purpose of going to the spot; and, that really, when any question arose, he should have some judicial authority, and in order that there might be no breach of the peace, in order that the two parties in Metlakalta should not be brought into actual conflict, the Dominion Government have agreed, subject to the consent of Parliament, and Parliament will be asked to sanction it, to pay the salary of a resident stipendiary magistrate at Metlakatla to act judicially on the part of the British Columbia Government. They of course only could make such an appointment, and Judge Elliott, a gentleman who was county judge before and Gold Commissioner, a gentleman well known in that country, having great experience, was appointed by the British Columbia Government, under their command, under their authority to keep the peace and see that the law was carried out. Of course this Government had no right to pledge the Treasury of the Dominion to pay his salary, but it was of so much consequence that some person of authority should be there for the purpose of administering the law and keeping the peace that, confiding in a vote of Parliament to sanction the salary for some time, until the present unfortunate difficulty is settled, the promise was made. I hope that these difficulties will be settled. They always do arise, they must arise when we have so many questions arising between races so opposite as the Indian and the white man. The hon. gentleman is quite right in stating one thing, that the whites are always anxious to encroach upon the redmen, that it is the duty of the Government to protect the redmen as much as possible, that it is the duty of the Government to see that they get full justice. As the hon. gentleman says, in all the reserves that have been laid out the Indians are satisfied. Well, the system of settling them on reserves has been going on without a single day of interruption. Mr. O'Reilly went home to England on leave last year because he had already laid out, so far as he could lay out, reserves enough to employ the surveyors for the time that he was away. Those surveys have been finished, and I have no doubt, I have little doubt I may say, that the British Columbia Government will sanction those reserves as described by Mr. O'Reilly. Of course it is an enormous country. This has been going on for years and will go on for years. The Indians in the centre of British Columbia, far away from the white settlers at present, are allowed to roam over those immense hills and valleys undisturbed, and those portions of British Columbia where the white population have gone or are beginning to creep in are the first object of the Government. I must say I am not aware, with the single exception of Metlakatla in consequence of this trouble, that there is any dissatisfaction except in the one or two places, and I do not think there are more than two altogether, where the Indians have found that their ancestral hunting or fishing ground has been sold without their consent. The interests of these Indians will be fully protected. The interests of these Indians will be attended to, I may say that the Government, in regard to one small tract—and perhaps it was imprudent to do so—came to Parliament here and got a vote for a small sum to buy a location for a small band of Indians whose own ancestral plot had been taken away from them and sold.

In order to settle that matter we applied to Parliament for a small sum—I think the whole was $6,000, that was granted and the Indians were transferred to another plot. Well, when the Government here found that the Indians on William's Lake were brought in in the same way, we found it would not do for us to go on with that forever, that the Local Government would sell all the lands away from the Indians in those places where reserves had not been provided; and we declined. We said, no; if you have sold those lands, keep them out of it; we do not raise the question of title at all. We desire practically, and as practical men, if this particular plot of land was taken away, to try and get another plot of land elsewhere from the Government of British Columbia, which would be satisfactory. But the Indians will not go to the wilds; and the land that they are deprived of, as far as the British Columbia Government can deprive them of it, although they are willing to live on it, they will not go to the wilderness, and they want a tract of land as valuable, and as near civilisation, and as near their old locality, as possible. That involves a vote of money here, and we resist that, and we must resist it. If we go on the British Columbia Government will be asking better terms all the time, and insisting upon being compensated for any lands that the Indians may be deprived of. That exactly is the state of the case. The Indians in British Columbia are not at all, as the hon. gentleman well knows, like the Indians in the North-West plains. They are a hard working people as a whole. In some sections they are a very hard working people; they work in the mines, and sometimes they do work nearly as well, or quite as well—some of the tribes—as the white men. They want, more than anything else, to govern themselves. They give less trouble than any other red men in any other portion of the Dominion. What they want more than anything else, and what they ask for, is schools. I think my hon. friends in this House from British Columbia will state that what the Indians want is schools. Well, I should be glad to see them get schools, but that would involve a considerable vote, a heavy vote, from Parliament here, in order to give them what they want. Schools are being established. There is an annual vote, as the House well knows, for Indian purposes in British Columbia; and if the House was generous in granting a larger vote, I dare say it would be properly applied in the way of schools. They are not at all like the other Indians. As I have stated, they are industrious. Of course there are some tribes more industrious than others. They have broken up into various tribes and have various characteristics, like all the other Indian bands. But on the whole the Indians there give no trouble. They are not discontented on the whole, and they get the most liberal treatment, as far as the Dominion Government is concerned, that we can give them. The principle and practices of laying out reserves have been going on without one moment's intermission from the time the system was agreed upon; and if we can only settle this one matter of Metlakatla I am quite satisfied we will have no Indian trouble in British Columbia.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I desire to call the attention of the hon. member for Bothwell to the fact that I have already called for a portion of the papers mentioned in this resolution. The hon. gentleman's motion calls for the papers from December, 1882, and a few days ago I moved a resolution in this House calling for papers for the year 1884; so I think his motion will have to be amended. We cannot both move for the same papers, I presume.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will bring down the papers from 1882, and that will include my hon. friend's motion.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. First Minister said that I attempted to show that the Indians had no titles to the lands at all. I pointed out that the hon. gentleman himself had proceeded on the assumption that the Indians had no legal title to the lands. The English Government, however, while they maintain the title is vested in the Crown, as a matter of public policy, and for moral reasons, have considered the Indians as having a right which the Government ought to extinguish by communication and arrangement with them before they undertake to deal with the country at all. But the House will see from the observations of the hon. gentleman that he has followed a different view in the government of British Columbia, from what he has been trying to act on elsewhere. That view I do not propose to discuss on this motion. I think we will have an opportunity of considering that very fully hereafter. But let me say here Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman is mistaken in supposing that the Indians of Metlakatla are the only Indians that are at all dissatisfied. The hon. gentleman, I dare say, has been informed that the Indians have not permitted certain lumbermen to go to the woods, and on the Simpson River they have driven them off the timber reserves; that they have excluded others from fishing in certain districts, and that there is a considerable discontent existing among the Indian population elsewhere than at Metlakatla. But, Sir, it is a practice, no doubt, of the hon. gentleman, never to see a difficulty until actual disturbance, points it out to him very distinctly. The hon. gentleman refers to Mr. Trutch. Now, I did not say Mr. Trutch had anything to do with the administration of Indian Affairs at the present time. But I pointed out that Mr. Trutch had pursued a certain policy, that that policy was not in the interest of the Indian population, but that the Government at the present time had reverted to that policy; that they have appointed a Mr. O'Rielly, a brother-in-law of Mr. Trutch, as commissioner, who, during Mr. Trutch's administration, adopted towards the Indians a policy that was not a liberal policy and one not calculated to give satisfaction to the Indian population. Now, the hon. gentleman has said that this difficulty has all grown out of Mr. Duncan's statements to the Indians. It seems that Mr. Duncan has adopted the views, according to the gentleman's statement, of the hon. gentleman; and the hon. gentleman says that he holds that the Indians are the proprietors of the country. Now, I have Mr. Duncan's evidence in my hand and he does not say so; and neither do the commissioners, in making their report, say so. The commissioners, in their report, say that these views were first inculcated amongst the Indian population by Lord Dufferin in 1876, and the views then expressed spread amongst the Indian population; and it says that Mr. Duncan, for a long time, was against the notion of an Indian title. It speaks of the reserves of the Church Missionary Society in Metlakatla, of two acres at Mine Point, when the Metlakatla Indians complained of his carrying on business in the reserves, he reminds them that were it not for his efforts they never would have had any lands reserved to them at all. In no part of Mr. Duncan's evidence did he advocate any title. So the hon. gentleman has been misinformed as to Mr. Duncan's views, and Mr. Duncan has not used the expression which he has attributed to him. In fact the gentleman who has impressed the Indian population with that view most strongly on this continent is the hon. gentleman himself. Then again, the hon. gentleman says that a very considerable number of Indians at Metlakatla were opposed to Mr. Duncan. The report says there are about 77 of the grown up Indians out of 900 opposed to Mr. Duncan and the rest of the Indian population support him. But it is not a matter of any consequence to this House to know whether Mr. Duncan or Bishop Ridley is most in favor with the Indians at that particular point. I next bring to the attention of the House the fact that the action of the Indian Commissioner in setting apart reserves for the use

of the Indians in British Columbia is not as satisfactory to the Indian population now as it was before 1881, before the resignation of Mr. Sproat. That gentleman had resided among the Indians for many years, he had become thoroughly acquainted with Indian character, he was engaged in the active discharge of his duty; and although the hon. gentleman may not have changed his instructions or given any different orders, he appointed a gentleman long associated with the administration of Indian affairs in former years and who pursued towards them a policy more in harmony with the prejudices of those who think that Indians have no rights.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says Mr. O'Reilly was long interested in Indian affairs. I am not at all aware of that. He was a county judge, and like all other county judges he was not in any way connected with Indian affairs except as county judge and gold commissioner. So the hon. gentleman should not have made that statement, because Mr. O'Reilly had nothing to do with Indians at that time or at any time. I will state further to the hon. gentleman that the reserves are perfectly satisfactory to the Indians, and they will have large reserves, if, as there is no doubt, the British Columbia Government confirm them. The hon. gentleman spoke about dissatisfaction at Fort Simpson; but that region is practically part of the Metlakatla region. That whole district is under the same superintendent and management, and the feeling in Metlakatla extended up there.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. O'Reilly was acting as agent for the Commissioner of Lands and Mines in the settlement of Indian reserves. He was the agent through whom the Government sought to cut down the reserves and obtain from the Indians part of the land that had been ceded to them under the arragement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was exactly the same way as elsewhere.

Mr. BAKER. The members for British Columbia are no doubt deeply indebted to the mover of the resolution for bringing this subject before the House. There is one point in regard to which it is desirable that we should disabuse the minds of hon. members, and that is that the trouble at Metlakatla, so far as I am informed and know, is not due to the administration or the maladministration on the part either of the Dominion Government or the Local Government; but it is solely attributable to a religious squabble. A bishop was sent up there and the Duncanites said they did not want him, and would not have him. And this was the cause of the trouble. It has nothing to do with political administration or maladministration, but was purely and simply the result of a religious squabble.

Mr. GORDON. As a member from the Province of British Columbia, it is due to the House that I should offer a few remarks. I listened with considerable interest to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution, and I have been in some doubt as to what his object was in making his remarks. At first I thought his object was to attack the Government. A little later on I thought it was to attack the Government of British Columbia; and lastly, it has occurred to me that his object was to incite the Indians of that Province to pursue the same course which the Indians of the North-West have been incited to pursue towards the settlers of that part of the country. I am sorry to be led to that conclusion; but if the hon. gentleman's speech should be translated or interpreted to the Indians of British Columbia by some one in a similar position to those now leading the Indians in the North-West, it would have the result I have indicated. It would lead them to believe they had rights that they had never assumed heretofore. With respect to the administration of Indian affairs in British Columbia, I was surprised to hear the hon. gentleman state that a different policy had been pursued from that followed by Sir James Douglas. He endeavored to convince the House that the policy now pursued towards the Indians is less liberal; but had the hon. gentleman lived in British Columbia during Sir James Douglas' *régime*, he would have learned that the administration of Indian affairs was one of a very exacting character. Governor Douglas' mode of dealing with Indians was imperative—they had to obey; and so far as we know the Indian right to Crown lands has never been recognised. I do not think that the Government of the party to which the hon. gentleman belongs recognised those rights. When they applied to the Provincial Government for a transfer of lands between Nanaimo and Esquimalt from the Local Government the question of Indian title was not brought up or referred. When application was made for a grant of land for railway purposes, I do not remember that the Indian title was recognised in any way. To point out that the Indians of that country had undoubted rights to all the land allotted and unallotted there was to incite Indian troubles in the country. With respect to Indian affairs in Vancouver Island I know their advancement is not local; the Indians have been progressing, they have formed prosperous settlements, and at places where twenty years ago a man would have taken his life in his hands if he had gone amongst them one can now visit without danger. I have not heard of any discontent among the Indians with respect to lands. I was there when Salt Spring Island was open to pre-emption by the Dominion. I was in the country when Comox, which was inhabited by a very savage tribe, was thrown open to pre-emption, and the Indians never raised the question of owning the lands beyond some parts along the banks of rivers and their fishing grounds. These have been accorded them by the Dominion and Provincial Governments jointly, and no disturbances has arisen among them along the coast. The Metlakatla difficulty, as the House is well aware, is one of a religious character and I do not think either Government is responsible for it.

Motion agreed to.

ROGERS' FISH LADDER.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) moved for :

Copies of all correspondence and reports from W. H. Rogers, Inspector of Fisheries for Nova Scotia, to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, relating to the adoption of Rogers' patent fish ladder, and the places at which the said Inspector recommends it should be placed; also any instructions from the Department concerning the same; also a statement of moneys claimed or paid as a royalty or otherwise, on account of patent fishway; stating by whom and to whom such moneys were paid; together with an account of any other moneys paid by the Department and to whom, towards the construction of Rogers' fish ladder; the return to cover the years 1880, 1881, 1882, 1883 and 1884.

He said: This motion refers to a gentleman by the name of W. H. Rogers who has held the position of Inspector of Fisheries for Nova Scotia for a long number of years. The motion asks for all correspondence with respect to the patented fish ladder which has been patented by the said Rogers, and which I believe has been adopted by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Mr. Rogers is, I believe, one of the most inefficient officers which the Department possesses in Nova Scotia. He has held his position since Confederation, and has been placing his fishway in some of the rivers of Nova Scotia. Two years since in discussing the estimates with reference to the service with which Mr. Rogers is connected, I asked the Government to lay on the Table a report which had been made on the rivers of Nova Scotia by Mr. Veith, who was appointed by the Department to supervise the work of Mr. Rogers, extending over a number of years during which he has filled that position. Mr. Rogers has been paid a very liberal salary, and I find from studying the items, that he has drawn a large

sum for travelling expenses, from which we would be led to believe that this gentleman had been devoting some time to the duties of his position. I stated at that time when I asked for this report which was submitted to the Department of Marine and Fisheries by Mr. Veith, that I desired to know from the Government the reasons for the appointment of that gentleman. I certainly thought that it expressed a want of confidence in Mr. Rogers that another man should be appointed to supervise his work. The report at that time was refused, and it was stated by the Acting Minister of Marine that it was a confidential report and could not be brought down. Last year a motion was made in the other Chamber, and apparently it was not there considered confidential, because it has been brought down, and printed and circulated amongst the members. That report discloses a most deplorable state of affairs in connection with the river fisheries of Nova Scotia. If hon. members who are interested in this matter will glance over the report they will find that the law has been systematically evaded, that some of the most important rivers in Nova Scotia have been neglected, and that no effort seems to have been made on the part of this gentleman to enforce the law in any particular. So far as the counties of Shelburne, Queen's and Lunenburg are concerned, the rivers with which I am familiar, I can bear testimony to the fact that the statements made by Mr. Veith in his report are correct, and I believe the same could be said of every section of Nova Scotia. That report has been before the Department for two years and no action has been taken to instruct Mr. Rogers to enforce the law in a better manner, but, on the contrary, I believe Mr. Rogers' salary has been increased. The river fisheries of Nova Scotia might be made a source of revenue to the people; formerly they were very valuable, but during the last eight or ten years they have fallen off very greatly. It is true that the catch on some rivers has increased during the last year or two, but this cannot be said of all the rivers in Nova Scotia. I believe that this correspondence extends over a number of years, and perhaps it may be very bulky, but I think it would be well for the House to be placed in possession of the information contained in the reports. I believe that nothing will put the river fisheries of Nova Scotia in a proper position until the services of Mr. Rogers are dispensed with. I consider him, and I believe I express the views of every member from Nova Scotia, a perfect crank, especially on this subject of fish ways, and a large portion of his time, outside of drawing his salary, is spent on lecturing on temperance——

Mr. BOWELL. That is a good thing.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). Yes, but he is not paid for that, and in talking of the benefits of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. I believe the service would be greatly benefited if Mr. Rogers were superannuated and some more efficient person put in his place.

Mr. KAULBACH. The motion just made by the hon. member for Shelburne, asking for correspondence and reports from W. H. Rogers, as Fishery Inspector for Nova Scotia, to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, relative to the adoption of Rogers' patent fish ladder, and the places at which the inspector recommends it should be placed, is perhaps not uncalled for; but had the hon. member gone a step further in his enquiry and have asked why a patent was granted to Mr. Rogers, as inspector, for devising a means for the better performance of the duties he had undertaken, and for which he was receiving salary, it would have been more to the purpose. Mr. Rogers being a paid servant of the Government, one would naturally suppose the whole of his talent, time and services, would be at the disposal of the Government, and that if during the time he is so engaged as an employé of the Government, he should concentrate his energy and ability, and produce a means by which the service he was appointed to fulfil could be carried on more perfectly, then I claim that the means so invented is not his own properly speaking at all, but the property of the Government which employs him; therefore, I think that Mr. Rogers having invented what is termed a fish ladder, for the passage of fish, during the time he was engaged by the Government as fishery inspector, should not be considered as the patentee, for should he be so considered, he then certainly is not the one who should advise where the invention should be placed, as inspector, as he would naturally be biassed, being a party interested in a pecuniary sense, and his advice would not have the weight of one not interested in the matter at all, further than wishing to adopt the best means for the accomplishment of the object sought, and very often he would recommend, as he has done in several instances to my knowledge, already, the adoption of ladders where natural passes were perfectly practicable and offering reasonable prospects of satisfactory results. It is generally understood by experienced persons that where natural passes can be obtained, the bottom of the pass being like that of a running brook, they should be preferred to a smooth wooden surface; the former offering a means to aid the fish in getting up the river, while the latter being smooth, accelerates the flow of the water, and retards the progress of the fish, or in other words artificial means should only be employed where the natural passes are impracticable. I have every confidence in the present Government that they would do what is right, and believe had the hon. Minister of Agriculture considered the means he was placing in the hands of this man Rogers by granting him this patent, whilst he was acting in the capacity of inspector of fisheries, he would never have granted it. The hon. member has referred to the report of F. H. D. Veith on the preambulations of that gentleman as assistant to W. H. Rogers as Fishery Inspector, through Nova Scotia in 1881 and 1882, and in justice to Mr. Veith I would state that I have known Mr. Veith for some years, and to know him is to admire him, as I believe him to be a thorough gentleman, and one very capable of attending to the work that was assigned him as inspector. In fact, I know of no person more so, and the strongest evidence in support of this statement, is the report referred to itself. I can bear testimony to the correctness of his report on the rivers of the county to which I belong, and some of the adjacent rivers in the county of Queen's, having had occasion to visit them at the request of some of my constituents, in order to contrast more particularly the condition of the Medway, in the county of Queen's, with the noble and valuable river La Have, in the county of Lunenburg. The former having natural or open passes, and as a consequence affording an abundant supply of fish, whilst the latter, the largest in Nova Scotia, and about four times the size of the Medway, and formerly affording an unlimited supply of the finny tribe, thousands of barrels, offers not a salmon, shad or gaspereaux, in the running waters above flood tide now, owing to the obstructions recognised by Mr. Rogers, the inspector, in the shape of ladders placed in the dams instead of open passes. I state, regarding Mr. Veith's report, that I believe it to be most creditable and correct in every particular. He was not too lazy to visit every river of any consequence in that Province in the interest of the river fisheries, and see for himself, and give all the information respecting them without bias or partiality; and there is not a member from Nova Scotia in this House to-day but can stand up in his place in Parliament and say that he believes Mr. Veith has not only stated matters correctly as he found them, but can go further and state that so far as his own county is concerned, which has come under his personal knowledge, he has reported the truth in every particular.

Mr. McLELAN. I shall have great pleasure, if the House so orders, in bringing down the papers called for the motion of my hon. friend; and I think, when they are brought down, that we will find, from a great many persons who he will acknowledge are entitled to speak on the question of fish passes, testimony in favor of the principle, and the application of that principle, in Mr. Rogers' fish ladder. I myself, if I may give my own opinion, will say that among all the fish ladders which I have seen—and in the fisheries exhibition in London I saw a great many—I have seen no fish ladder that so fully meets the requirements as the ladder invented and patented by Mr. Rogers. It has been put in some of the rivers that Mr. Veith has reported upon, and I believe with very beneficial results. The testimony of the local officers at the places where these fish ladders have been adopted in Nova Scotia is that they have answered the purpose admirably. No doubt many of the rivers of Nova Scotia have for a number of years been obstructed by mill dams and otherwise, so that the passage of fish was prevented and the rivers nearly destroyed for fish-breeding purposes; but since the adoption of means for the passage of the fish, the increase has been very marked in a great many places where the ladders have been provided. Mr. Veith was appointed before I came to the Department. I do not know the circumstances which led to his appointment; but I assume that the hon. gentleman who moves this resolution, being a Nova Scotian, will claim for that Province the credit of being the principal fishing Province in the Dominion. The fishing industry there is very large, having regard to the number of people employed in it, and to the amount of capital invested; and if one inspector is to superintend and oversee that industry, his time must be very fully occupied. I presume that it was found that Mr. Rogers' time was so fully occupied that it was impossible for him to give close attention to the examination of the numerous rivers in Nova Scotia; so that Mr. Veith was appointed to devote a year or two to the special personal examination of every river of importance, from its mouth to its source, and to make a report, which he did in a very able and creditable manner; and his report, will afford us information which, I think, will result in great benefit to the rivers of the Province. Now, the hon. gentleman has stated that Mr. Rogers should not be permitted to place these ladders, or to dictate where they should be placed, without permission from the Department. I may say to the hon. gentleman that that is required. We called upon Mr. Rogers to state where he recommended that ladders should be placed, and to give all the particulars of each river as minutely as possible; and these reports of his are considered by myself, before permission is given. I think that is proper, as under the peculiar circumstance of Mr. Rogers being the inventor and patentee of the ladder, it is not right that he should place it without the sanction and authority of the Department. I do not know that the Government should have denied Mr. Rogers a patent upon his invention. It was some years ago, when his salary was about $700, that he invented this ladder; and I think in cases in which officers in the Civil Service have invented anything that is useful and patentable, it is the invariable custom to allow them a patent for it. It was allowed in Mr. Rogers' case, and it was some time afterwards that his invention was used or recognised by the Department. But the Department, having become satisfied that it was a good invention, thought it should be made available, except perhaps where there is a natural pass, which may be preferable. But where we have to place an artificial pass in a mill dam, I believe that of Mr. Rogers' is the right one to use, being better than any I have seen either here or abroad. When the papers are brought down I think the hon. gentleman will find that the testimony is in favor of the use of this ladder where a natural pass cannot be provided to meet the wants of the case. The hon. gentleman has referred to the fact that Mr. Rogers' salary has been increased. In one sense that is true, and in another sense it is not true. I found in the financial statement that there was so much allowed for salary and so much for travelling expenses, and the travelling expenses covered an allowance of $400, I think, for a clerk. I made the change that the sum previously allowed for the clerk would be added to his salary, and that he should have no allowance for a clerk. That is the only change made. He therefore pays his own clerk or does the work himself.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). When did that commence?

Mr. McLELAN. About a year ago, or perhaps less; the papers will be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. BLAKE. As circumstances prevented the Minister of Militia being here, I was asked by the First Minister to postpone the enquiry I was about to make as to whether there had been any order issued to send forward troops from Nova Scotia. I also desire to know, as to the movements of the troops which are on their way to Manitoba, when the hon. gentleman expects they will reach Port Arthur. I refer to those portions of batteries "A" and "B" which are on their way. I would ask the hon. gentleman also when he expects the Queen's Own and the 10th Royals to reach Port Arthur, and whether any communication has been had with the United States Government as to crossing their territory with troops and munitions of war for the North-West. I would ask also whether the Government has any intention of sending any men by the southern route.

Mr. CARON. The 66th Regiment of Halifax was called out last evening for active service. The 63rd Regiment has been ordered to go through its annual drill at headquarters, Halifax. The Governor General's Body Guard, composed of two troops numbering 40 men each, has been called out for active service, also the Cavalry School of Quebec, composed of one troop under the command of Lieut.-Col. Turnbull. These are the only changes, since the information conveyed to the House yesterday, so far as regards the calling out of the troops. With reference to the conveyance of the troops, I can state that the telegrams I have received indicate that they are proceeding as rapidly as possible. I do not consider it would be right, as I said yesterday, to give any further information in so far as the transport of troops is concerned. The hon. gentleman put a question whether any application had been made to the American Government. That I am not in a position to answer. The leader of the Government will reply to that.

Mr. BLAKE. I would ask the leader of the Government then.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There has been no application to the American Government.

Mr. BLAKE. I feel it my duty to say I think it is the duty of the Government to instantly make application or take some steps for the transport of some of our forces by the southern route, and not take the battalion from Toronto and London, the western part of Ontario, by the other route. I think that the circumstances which have occurred indicate that it is extremely important that every effort should be made and by all routes to get into the North-West as early as possible. I do not make these observations in a disposition to criticise anything that has passed, but simply under the responsibility of a solemn duty, as a suggestion of the course that ought to be taken without a moment's delay. It has been stated that reports have been received

indicating that there have been some further murders in the North-West—murders of telegraph operatives, I believe. Is there any truth in that?

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish also to give my opinion. I entirely dissent from the position taken by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake). I think the course he recommends would be quite impolitic and is not at all necessary. From what we can gather, the Government have taken every means to get troops into the country and to put down the disturbance. We have the means of transport over our own country and the troops will be in Winnipeg before we can get an answer from the American Government.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon, gentleman may cheer derisively, but I am satisfied they will. It looks as if the very suggestion to apply to a foreign country for means of transport were inspired perhaps by a feeling tc discredit the means of transport we ourselves possess. I may as well say to the Government what, in my opinion, is the course they should pursue. I have heard it stated by the First Minister that a commission has been appointed for the purpose of settling these difficulties. It is too late. It would be a false policy to let that commission go on now. The commission should be suspended for this reason, that before it could get there and before it could do anything, these men will have been surrounded and the insurrection practically suppressed; and the very existence of the commission would enable these traitors who are in the field to claim, that since a commission was sent to make terms with them as to what they are struggling for, they would submit and thus save their necks and escape punishment. It is in my opinion the duty of the Government to suspend that commission. In the face of open treason, you cannot dally with these men when you have the power to put them down. It is the duty of every man to support the Government; it is the duty of every man to sink party politics and feeling, and give the Government every confidence. It is our duty to give the Government all they ask; it is our duty to promote in every way we can public confidence in the acts and administrations of the Government until this outbreak is quelled; and if they have done anything wrong, if they are responsible in any way for the origin of the outbreak, we can deal with them then; but until the outbreak is put down let us support them and do not let us keep putting questions day after day, endeavoring to obtain information that can only lead to inspire the rebels with the hope that they have friends in this House. These, at all events, are my opinions.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 50) to incorporate the Fredericton and St. Mary's Railway Bridge Company.—(Mr. Temple.)

DIVORCE BILLS.

The following Bills (*from the Senate*) were severally considered in Committee, read the third time and passed, on a division:—

Bill (No. 97) for the relief of Fairy Emily Jane Terry.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 106) for the relief of Alice Elvira Evans.—(Mr. Edgar.)

Bill (No. 107) for the relief of George Louis Emil Hatzfeld.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 110) to incorporate the Rock Lake, Souris and Brandon Railway Company.—(Mr. McDougald, Pictou.)

Bill (No. 115) to amend an Act to incorporate the Sisters of Charity of the North-West Territories.—(Mr. Desjardins.)

REGULATION OF FACTORY LABOR.

Mr. BERGIN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 85) respecting factories. He said: Mr. Speaker, it will be fresh, no doubt, in the memory of many members of this House, that some years ago I introduced a Bill for the regulation of the hours of labor in the workshops, mills, and factories of the Dominion. The first Bill which I introduced was merely a tentative measure, to obtain an expression of opinion from the manufacturers, the workingmen, and the working classes generally of the country. I introduced it again the next year, and it will be remembered that at the request of the Government I withdrew it, the Government undertaking to bring in a measure. I believe, Sir, that there was a very general feeling among the members of the Local Legislatures of the different Provinces, that this Bill would trench more or less upon the powers of those Provinces, that it was interfering to some extent with the rights of property and with private rights. One of the most objectionable clauses, as I understand, was the clause with regard to education. That clause I have excluded from this Bill, and in that way have removed an objectionable feature. I shall, however, in the course of the remarks that I intend to make upon this Bill, refer again to this question of education. I may say here, however, that I have endeavored to meet, so far as it can be met, this question of providing for the education of the youth of the factory classes, by prohibiting the employment of any child under the age of thirteen years. In this way an opportunity is afforded for the education of children; and the Bill has this further merit that it does not clash with the education statute of Ontario, which provides that all children must be educated, and makes education compulsory up to the age of thirteen years. It may be asked, and it has been asked, why the necessity for this Bill; and I propose to answer this question by passing, as briefly as may be, in review, the history of the factory system as it existed in the mother country previous to the passage of the Factory Act of 1833. I have been told, Sir, that this measure is entirely in the interests of the working classes, and when I first introduced this Bill I was told it was fraught with so much danger to the manufacturer that it would close up a large number of our factories and of our workshops. But, Sir, the introduction of this Bill, time and discussion have done very much to do away with the false impression that existed with regard to the Bill, and I may say that to-day the measure has no warmer supporters than the manufacturers of this country. The factory system as it exists in Canada has not, I must confess, Mr. Speaker, up to this hour been productive of very great evils. I am willing to admit that, in many respects it, has been a boon and a blessing to the working classes of this country; but, Sir, that it may not become, as in England in times gone by, a blot upon the pages of our history, a crime against our civilisation, a shame and a curse, this legislation is now proposed. Public opinion has been brought to bear upon this question with an earnestness that compels legislation. It is universalle felt that something must be done to secure such reasonably aid as fairly comes within the scope of Parliament. This measure, Sir, ought not to, and must not, be made a party question. It is a question which appeals to Grit and to Tory alike; the interests of our common humanity involved, and the other interests involved are too great and too important to be made the foot-ball of party. Those interests, Sir, involve the future of the youth of the nation,

the health and the life, the faith and the morals, the welfare, temporal and eternal, of the children, male and female, of the working classes of this country. The interests of the great commercial and industrial classes are also involved, and they should be treated in a manner becoming the legislature of a people whose industries are amongst the principal elements of its prosperity, its growth and its success. Our towns and cities are great manufacturing centres to-day, swarming with busy life, whose men and women, whose boys and girls, toil constantly, early and late, in the production of national life. From the day when Hargrave, over a hundred years ago, invented the spinning Jenny, by which eight threads could be spun at one time, a machine displaced a few years after by the improved one of Arkwright, which, in its turn, was again displaced in 1779 by the more perfect machine of Crompton, known to-day as the Mule Jenny, a machine by which over a thousand threads can be spun at the same moment—from that day human labor was not displaced, but reinforced, so to speak, and made tributary to mechanical power. Watts and Crompton, by their inventions, the steam engine and the mule, have done wonders for the world, but alas! they have brought untold misery upon thousands and hundreds of thousands of the human race. Their self-acting, automatic inventions, whilst giving employment to vastly increased numbers, have also cheapened human labor. In the ateliers and the workshops all labor that does not call for the employment of much strength, of great physical power, is now done more by women and by children than by men. Now, for everything that can be done as well and as quickly by women as by men, women are preferred. This is in obedience to an economic law which provides that the force expended shall be in exact accord with the effect produced. Applied to industry this law means that the value of an article depends upon its quality as compared with the cost of its production. The custom which governs modern production is not to manufacture inferior articles, but by simplified and economic processes to reduce the cost of production. The desired end and aim of manufactures being their sale, they must, of course, be produced so that their real or actual value shall be less than their market value, and the difference between the real and the market value is the profit to the manufacturer. This profit is augmented or lessened by supply and demand, by free trade and protection, by the cost of production, and by other causes. Hence the chief end and aim of the manufacturer is to produce goods at the cheapest. Everybody knows that women and children work at lower wages than men. It is said that women have not the strength or power of men; consequently they ought not to be paid so much. That they are not paid so much is true, and it may perhaps at first sight appear that the argument against the payment of equal wages to women for the same work as men perform, is a reasonable proposition. But is it just? Ought not the remuneration to be in proportion to the service rendered? I will not discuss this question. I will content myself with calling attention to the custom, because in trade it has assumed the power of law, a custom which in a greater or less degree has had much to do in bringing about the evils of the factory system, a system which has made England the workshop of the world it is true, but at what a cost to her children! A system which, as it existed previous to 1883, was a shame to the nation and which when it was exposed by the labors of Fielden and Akroyd, and Sir Robert Peel and Lord Shaftesbury, disclosed an amount of cruelty and oppression such as had not even been exercised towards the negroes in the worst days of West India slavery. That such evils do not now exist under the factory system in Canada must be admitted—God be thanked—but we must not be unmindful of the fact that our industries are in their infancy, that we are dealing to-day, so to speak, with the first generation of factory workers. We must remember that our industries to-day are flourishing, that our competition is from without not from within, and that in very many of our industries our production does not at all equal our necessities. But the dark days must come when, through bad harvest and other causes, the purchasing power of the people will be lessened; when there will be over production and an increased number of industries, when competition will be keen and prices will be cut. Then will be brought into play that law to which I referred a moment since, and it will be attempted to extract more from labor. Human nature is now, ever was, and ever shall be the same the wide world over. The desire for gain is as great--humane as are our manufacturers in comparison with those of a century ago—and we must be prepared. They, like their prototypes in England in old days, will endeavor to extract from labor all they possibly can. The history of factory life in England, from the days of Hargrave and Crompton up to 1833, indeed to as late a date as 1865, is a sickening and a saddening one. With the introduction of the inventions of Hargrave and Arkwright, this age may be said to be the age of machinery. Previous to that date the manufactures of England, like the productions of the earlier days in this country, were home-made. The factory was really the home of the cotter, and none but the family were employed. There was no crowding of masses of men and of women into large towns; but as population and wealth increased with new and increased demands for productions; with new tastes and new wants calling for new industries, hand labor failed to supply the demand. Water-power and steam were called to the aid of the workers, and then for the first time the foundation was laid of the great industries that have made England the industrial workshop of the world. Water-power and steam were brought to the aid of all the handicrafts, except the hand loom; and then began the system under which crept in all the evils that for so many years have degraded factory life in the mother country. With Watts' discovery of steam and the introduction of the mule, came the monster establishments which supplied the world, and into which were crowded the old and the young, the strong and the weak, and I might say the halt and blind. I doubt not that many of the manufacturers were humane; that they were not naturally cruel; but as business grew and demands were made for the products of the loom and the anvil and the mine, faster than they could supply within the ordinary hours of labor, little by little, slowly but surely, came about the great evils which it took half a century to alleviate, if not to cure, by legislation. Of course those evils did not attain full growth in a day or in a year, but at last they reached the point at which public attention was aroused and many good men set themselves to work to enquire respecting them. Among the first were Dr. Dakins and Mr. Percival, who laid a very able and convincing statement before Parliament in 1796. They kept their views before the public until, convinced by their testimony and his own observation, Sir Robert Peel brought in a Bill in 1802. He failed to pass it. He pressed the matter again and obtained a commission to investigate the subject, and upon the report of that commission he founded a Bill which he passed, but it was of a nature so restricted that it was of little benefit. In 1809 the House of Lords took up the question and passed a Bill relating to cotton factories. Sir John Hobhouse tried to obtain a more general Act in 1825, but he did not succeed. Some years afterwards, in 1833, the Bill which is really the basis of the present factory laws, and of which they are merely the amplification, was carried, mainly by the efforts of Mr. Dunscombe, Mr. Brotherton and Lord Shaftesbury. From that hour, Sir, as I shall show presently, the condition of the operatives improved. Their children were educated and they began to educate themselves. Schools of design and of art were instituted all over the kingdom and were

taken advantage of by immense numbers of workers. In the history of the industrial classes nothing stands out more strikingly than the progress made in design and artistic taste by the artisans of England after the Factory Act of 1833, and none acknowledged it more chivalrously than the French artisans who came over to the first great Industrial Exhibition. And this improvement, Sir, in work and in art has gone on every year since, until to-day, in almost all departments of art, there is a taste, an elegance, and a finish which enables the English artist and artisan to compare his productions favorably with the best productions of the continent of Europe. This, Bill, Sir, provides remedies for a great number of the evils which are inflicted upon the youth of the country by the factory system. I do not propose to deal with those provisions *seriatim*, but whilst discussing the evil effects, as I believe and know them to be, of the factory system upon the young girls and boys of this country, I shall incidentally allude to many of them. Factory life whether in England, France, Germany, the United States or Canada, under the most favorable circumstances, under the wisest system of laws, and the most stringently enforced, affects most injuriously the health of the young people engaged in it. And I shall speak now more particularly of the evils that attend upon the working of the young girls in these mills. We all know, or we ought to know, that the most critical period in the life of a girl in this country is from 12 or 13 to 18 years of age, and that anything tending to detract from her health and strength at this period must be very prejudicial if not destructive. Dr. Edward Clark, who has given great thought to this subject, and has had large opportunities for investigating it, speaks of the employment of young girls in the mills in this way:

"A careless management of this function, at any period of life during its existence, is apt to be followed by consequences that may be serious; but a neglect of it during the epoch of development, that is, from the age of 14 to 18 or 20, not only produces great evil at the time of neglect, but leaves a large legacy of evil to the future. The system is then peculiarly susceptible; and disturbances of the delicate mechanism we are considering, induced during the catamenial weeks of that critical age by constrained positions, muscular effort, brain work, and all forms of mental and physical excitement, germinate hosts of ills."

The same authority, in addition to the other causes of disease among this class of girls, draws attention to the monotony, the depression, the daily fatigue and the constrained position of those operatives, as being most potent for evil. Dr. George M. Beard, in comparing the chances of life of factory girls with student girls says:

"The facts enumerated in regard to the brain labor of operatives (of which substantial illustration will be given), will indicate, if proven, that, if the labor is absolutely less in the aggregate with the working girl than with the scholar, its amount is indeed great, and, moreover, is performed under conditions themselves most unfavorable."

Dr. Beard, speaking of longevity, adduces the following reasons for the greater age of brain than muscle workers:

"Brain workers have less worry, and more comfort and happiness than muscle workers. Brain workers live under better sanitary conditions than muscle workers. Brain workers can adapt their labor to their moods and their hours, and periods of greatest capacity for labor, better than muscle workers. The death rate tables of 300 inhabitants of Preston, England, one hundred being taken from each of the three classes—the gentry, tradesmen and operatives—give surprising results against the operative class, both as to longevity and youthful deaths."

That is an alarming condition of things, fraught with the direst consequences, if what is stated be true. Dr. Jarvis, in the fifth report of the Massachusetts Board of Health, puts the matter very clearly. He says:

"The results upon the community of the loss of the young female operatives have already been shown. Bad as these are, if the evils of employment be to break down the health, rather than destroy life—as is the rule—a heavier burden is thereby entailed than results from actual death. Years of total invalidism involve both the loss of the individuals production, with its increase and the production and its increase of those who care not for the disabled. Nor is the loss by early death all that the commonwealth suffers in diminution of productive power in the period presumably devoted to profitable labor. Even while men and women live, they are subject to sickness, which lays a heavy tax on their strength and effectiveness. It is estimated by the English observations and calculations, that for every death there are two constantly sick, that is, 730 days sickness and disability for every death. Reckoning on the basis of calculation furnished by the data of the English "Sick-Club," it is found that there was in the year 1870 upon the people of Massachusetts of the working productive age a total amount of 24,554 years and 8 months sickness, or a disability equivalent to so much loss of labor to the community. The bases on which the English results are made up do not include sickness of less than a week's duration, or anything less than illness preventing labor. Hence a large amount of loss is annually experienced which the above estimates do not include."

In the same report he sums up the evils entailed on these girl workers, in the following words:—

"Amongst the women of factory operatives, much more than among the general population, the derangements of the digestive organs are common; *e. g.* pyrosis, constipation, vertigo and headache, generated by neglect of the calls of nature through the early hours of work, the short intervals at meals; the eating and drinking of easily prepared foods, as bread, tea and coffee; and the neglect of meat and fresh cooked vegetables. Other deranged states of a still worse character are present, *e.g.* leucorrhœa, and too frequent and profuse menstruation; cases also of displacement, flexions and versions of the uterus, arising from the constant standing and the constant heat of and confinement in the mills."

Dr. West, than whom there is no greater authority, takes the same ground. Amongst the various causes which render factory employment injurious to girls, standing in the same position from morning to night occupies a prominent place. If it be hard for a powerful man in rude health to stand in one position from morning to night, how must it be for the factory girls or little children? They are obliged to accommodate themselves to the work, and to the machinery. The great engine goes rolling on from morning until the night, never ceasing, and the poor child, if he would not be injured or destroyed, is obliged, no matter how fatigued, or worn, or ill, to follow the motion of that engine and keep pace with it. The action of the machinery is provocative of evil in more than one sense—in the sense I have just mentioned and others to which I will draw attention by and bye. Dr. Ames, in speaking of this subject, says, and he quotes authorities from a number of others, that it establishes the fact that the employés of the cotton factories suffer a disproportionate death-rate because of the action of machinery. A German writer, referring to this, says:

"Soon after entrance into the workshops, the workman perceives it (the dust) in a most unpleasant way. In those who are unaccustomed to it, it causes continual tickling in the throat, which incites hard coughing and occasionally whitish expectoration. In the first year of work the operative suffers constantly from bronchial catarrh; and a considerable proportion of those who come to this occupation from rural districts abandon it. Even though they may be only sufferers from constant catarrh without other worst symptoms."

That factory operatives should not be employed under sixteen years of age, I think, goes without saying; and I regret that the state of things is not such in this country than I can ask this Parliament to prohibit the employment of girls under eighteen and of boys under sixteen. No girl, until she has matured, and that is very rarely before eighteen years, should be obliged to stand from morning until night. She is not framed for it anatomically, and it is impossible for her to stand, during many hours, without fatigue, and without great injury to her internal organs. Her conformation is entirely different from that of a man. Amongst the many injuries that follow a girl's employment in a factory, are sexual weakness, insanity and consumption, and they are very certain to follow upon too early employment in very many of our industries. Working the sewing-machine by foot-power is much more injurious than working in the larger mills and factories, either cotton or woollen; and, Sir, because of this, I have excluded from this bill a clause which was in the bill of the Finance Minister, limiting factories to houses occupied by less than 20 people. Some of the children and young women of the industrial classes are more injured in the factories where sewing machines are used and worked by foot-power than in

the cotton factories; and I have reason to know that in these sewing machine workshops where foot-power is used, greater cruelties and hardships are undergone by the children and the young women than in the larger factories. They are worked for many hours longer and have less time for meals. I do not propose, Sir, to quote at any greater length authorities to establish the injurious effects upon the young people employed in these factories; but I can add my own testimony, now covering a large experience in a manufacturing town, that so far from being exaggerated, the reports of the inspectors of factories and of medical men in the United States and Great Britain as to the evils of the factory system upon girls and boys, who are worked under age, very greatly under-estimated them. Here, I will call attention, before I go to another branch of my subject, to one of the greatest evils attending this factory system—an evil which is confined almost exclusively in the cotton factories to young girls; I mean the piece system. I know a great many girls who have been able to earn $35 to $42 or $43 a month at piece work; but I do not know one of them, who has worked piece work for two years, who is able to-day to do a day's honest labor without fatigue, or without being confined to her bed for two or three weeks. Piece work should not be countenanced in the mills, at all events by young girls. In order to earn these large wages, some of them run eight looms at one time. It is not in human nature that for ten hours, day after day, a young girl can work at eight looms without injuring herself, not alone seriously, but I may say fatally; and the great majority of those who have earned these large wages, in my experience, now sleep beneath the sod. Thus far I have spoken of the effects of factory life upon females under the most favorable circumstances, as in our Canadian cotton mills, where they work only 60 hours per week. How must it have been in England and in France, where, before the introduction of the factory laws, the operatives were worked almost from infancy, and from before the dawn until long into the night, perhaps with only 25 or 30 minutes allowed them for refreshment; and what was that refreshment? A bit of stale bread and a cup of water—perhaps not once in the week a piece of meat, none too sweet, and a cup of tea. And they worked early and late, going through the rain and snow long before the dawn to the mills; their nakedness scarce covered because of the paucity of the wages, which did not enable them to purchase sufficient clothing or food. This, Sir, was the normal condition of the factory system before the factory law; long hours, over-work, misery, and starvation were the rule. Steeped in ignorance, there seemed to be no escape from their pauperism and degradation. And indeed, amongst those most strongly opposed to any effort being made to improve the condition of the working classes were the operatives themselves. They had no hope; misery-cursed, the humanity was crushed out of them, and they laid them down and died. Who that has not read the reports of the Factory Commission, and of the Committees of both Houses of Parliament, as well as the evidence on which these reports were founded—evidence given by the wisest and the best in the land, who had made themselves familiar with the evils and the barbarities of the factory system—could believe that such things could have existed in Christian England? As it was in England so it was in France, but in a lesser degree; and they were not slow in that country to see the good effects of the factory laws of England, and to profit by them. In France as in England, in nearly all the trades, women and children were employed instead of men. By no one, to my mind, have the evils of the factory system been more thoroughly exposed, and the remedies more clearly brought out, than by Jules Simon, the French littérateur, in his book "*L'ouvrier de huit ans*," published in 1867. Speaking of the employment of women and children, he says, at page 161:

(Translation.) "What was mostly required of the laborer thirty years ago? Simply strength. To-day, owing to steam power, he hardly needs any; instead of being a propelling power he is only the overseer of a propelling power. For this new work a man is not always necessary; a woman, a child may be sufficient. Now, wherever they are competent to do the work they are preferred because they cost less. From an economic point of view, we must admit that manufactures give to women and children salaries which no other kind of industry could give them. Here there is an increase of income for the family, provided the man, who is driven out of the factory, may find elsewhere employment adequate and equivalent to his strength. This is not always easy to find; in England especially, we hear of industrial centres where men are fed in idleness by their wives and children. Nothing would be more baleful than such a consequence if it was a necessary consequence. That the man should not work, it is unnatural; that the woman, that the child should be transformed into laborers, it is almost unnatural. It is also unnatural that the one who should be the head of the family should become its parasite. Finally, under such conditions the income of the family is diminished, because the woman and child are only preferred to the man with a view to economy. However, there is work for every laborer in the world, and when there is a scarcity of work for able-bodied laborers at a certain point it is always for a short time, or by reason of a defective organisation. Therefore the idleness of men must not be considered as the ordinary and necessary consequence of the introduction of women and children in the workshops. The evil is not there, or at least it is an evil which is essentially reparable.

"The introduction of women and children in the workshops tends to modify seriously the family relations, if not to annihilate them. That misfortune, for it is a misfortune, than which there is none greater, is chiefly due to the presence in the mills of married women for eleven or twelve hours during the day. As to children, who are not necessary to others, if we examine what are for them the consequences of their transformation into laborers, we find a few beneficial consequences, such as salary, the suppression of vagrancy, and a few truly baleful ones, as, for instance, the almost certain and almost irretrievable impairment of health and the total deprivation of education. It is clear that if we had to choose we should not hesitate for a moment, and that no degree of solicitude for the interests of industry, no degree of pity for the distress of families, could absolve society from the crime of thus abandoning the rising generations and permitting them to be killed body and soul; but we have no choice. What is to be done is simply to prevent the evil and to develop that which is good, and it is not without a certain amount of wonder that we add that nothing is easier. We have under our hand an immense amount of good to realise, without cost and without resistance, by a simple act of law; our only fault is that we do not think of it."

On page 166 of the same book the author goes on:

"Fatigue is no more the result of work but of the continuance of work. Now, the moment the prolongation or continuance of work are in question, the interest of the laborer and that of the manufacturer are altogether at variance. The higher the cost of lands, buildings and machinery, the stronger the desire of the manufacturer to distribute his regular expenses on a long duration of work; he diminishes them by half when the work lasts twenty-four hours instead of twelve, and so realises enormous profits. On the contrary as regards the operative, it will be readily understood that the work, even the easiest, when protracted, becomes for him intolerably tiresome, and if this is true as regards an adult who is in possession of his whole strength, it is a thousand times more evident as regards a poor child whose body and mind cannot, without real danger, be submitted to such long restraint, but this can only be felt on condition of thinking over it. One must reflect in order to understand the unfortunate condition of a child piecing up broken ends in a beautiful room but working too long a time at such an easy task. If, on the contrary, the mill is dark, encumbered with stinking matter, infected with miasma and greasy waste, mingled with breathing air, and if a child is retained during twelve and thirteen hours, carrying heavy loads, beating cotton and wool with his feeble hands, he becomes a fit subject of compassion for the least attentive and the least merciful. It is thus that at the beginning of this century the very aspect of the workshops was pleading the cause of the young apprentices and wonderfully cooperating with the eloquence of Sir Robert Peel."

As regards the employment of children under the age of thirteen years in the workshops, he quotes the following words, which were uttered in the English House of Commons on the 28th of February, 1843, by the Secretary of State, Sir James Graham, who was charged with the duty of introducing the Bill respecting the teaching of laboring classes, and which seem to be a summary of the whole question:

"In my opinion said he, if children under thirteen years of age, after having worked eight hours in the day, are sent to school, exhausted with fatigue, without having been able to enjoy any rest, any recess, it is impossible to hope that they will reap much benefit from any system of education even the best that might be procured for them; consequently it is my intention to propose that children between the age of eight and thirteen, who are employed in manufactories be not allowed to work more than six hours and a half per day. If they work at night they will not work in the morning; if they work in the morning they

will not work at night. By this means, each day either in the forenoon or the afternoon, the children will be three hours at school. I have every reason to believe that the manufacturers, desiring to cooperate heartily with the Legislature, in order to improve the education of the young people of our country, will accept with joy any measure which would be necessary to attain the end which is of capital interest."

On page 177 of the same work we read the following:—

"In the *Nouveaux principes d'économie politique*, published in 1819, Sismondi goes a great deal further than Wilberforce, Lord Ashley and Sir James Graham, setting out from this axiom: 'That laborers owe in return for the salary which is given to them all the work they can give without pining away,' he points out that the salaries of the children are taken out from that of the father and do not increase the income of the family by a single mite. Thus, he adds, it is without any profit to the nation that the poor man's children have been deprived of the only happy time in their lives, the enjoyment of that age when the strength of their minds and bodies was being developed in merriment and freedom. It is without profit to wealth or industry that even at the age of six or eight years they have been compelled to go into these cotton mills where they work for twelve or fourteen hours in the midst of an atmosphere which is constantly laden with hair and dust, and where they successively perish with consumption before they have reached the age of twenty years. We would be ashamed to calculate the sum which would be worth the sacrifice of so many human victims; but this daily crime is committed gratis."

On page 208 he says:

"It is not the presence of the laborer which pays the contractor, it is his work, and in order that this work may be well done it must be measured according to the strength of the workman. When a man goes beyond that limit he only gets tired uselessly; he injures his health and the contractor gains nothing. This is still truer as regards the child whose mental vigor and physical strength are more rapidly relaxed."

On page 216 we read the following, and I specially call the attention of the House to these remarks:—

"The law of 1841 by which parents are forbidden to place their children in manufactories before they have completed their eighth year, has somewhat restrained the liberty of the parents, and the same law, by forbidding to make these children work more than eight hours per day and to make them work at night, has somewhat restrained the liberty of the manufacturers. And yet is not this an excellent law, a necessary law and a very benevolent law? Before that law was passed there were working in the manufactories children which were only six years old; they were shut up during the whole day, and a day's work then meant thirteen or fourteen hours. These poor beings, after thirteen hours of hard work, had still, very often, to travel a quarter of a league or a half a league to get home, where they did not always find a bed. At that time the workshops were not in the sanitary condition in which we see them now. It was stated that in order to compel these six-year-old operatives to stand up during a whole day it was necessary to imprison their legs in a tin box."

Here, in Canada, the children's legs are not imprisoned in tin boxes, but they have to work when they are a great deal too young. I might here contrast the condition of the young females employed in the factories and mills of this country with the state of things in the English mills even to-day, and I can do so with some pride. In England, as a rule, the mills are crowded, dark, filled with dust and cobwebs, and the sole attempt at cleanliness is during the two periods of the year when they are obliged to lime-wash them. Gas is used in nearly all the mills in England for heating, and we all know that where large numbers of gas burners are used, and they must be used in these large factories, gas gives forth a great amount of heat, and the burning of this gas is most pernicious to the workers in the mills. The provisions for the comforts of the operatives in the English mills, are not by any means, so good as they are in many of our Canadian mills, and, if the Bill which I introduced in 1880, and which did not receive a second reading, did no other good than this, that from that hour the working hours were confined to sixty hours per week in all the large mills in this country, and that provisions were made for the separation of the sexes in certain portions of the mills, provisions which were necessary to decency, then, I say, that Bill accomplished a great work. In the American mills, such provisions are not made, and requests are constantly sent to the Legislatures of the different States by the factory commissioners, asking for the same provisions as are now made, under the influence of public opinion created by the introduction of this labor Bill, in our factories. And the closets, which were the great nuisance and the great shame, and which, by the manner in which they were placed, so that both sexes were obliged to employ them, were the cause of serious, and in many cases, fatal injury to the young girls, are now so placed that there is a perfect separation, as I said, of the sexes, the males going to one end of the mill, and the females to the other. But how is it in the United States? Look at almost the last report of the Massachusetts inspector, and he will tell you that the closets in the mills are so placed that none but the vile girls use them. Thank God, Sir, that, at all events is being done away with in Canada. I had a conversation last Session with a member of this House who had recently returned from England, and who had visited a large number of the manufacturing towns and closely observed the condition of the manufacturing classes. He is a manufacturer himself, all his means, I may say, are invested in our great industries, and, as a matter of course, he took a great interest in the condition of the working classes there and closely compared their condition with ours. And what did he tell me? He gave me the description of the interior of their mills which I gave you a moment ago, but he told me also that the girls in those mills scarce covered their nakedness with a smockfrock and that they went into the street so clothed, that in one sense they were obliged to do so because of the heat of the mills owing to the gas and to the machinery, but he told me that, with that, there was what we might expect, a want of modesty, to say the least, which we would be sorry to see in this country, or to believe that any of the factory girls of Canada would be destitute of, as it appears they were. When they went into the street, he said, they were not only noisy, but rough and rude in their manners, and they attempted to attract the attention of every passer-by. Thank God, our factory system has not yet produced such a state of things in this country, but we know that history repeats itself, and I warn this House that, if some provisions such as are made in this Bill are not carried into effect and made law, and that law stringently carried out, we must have in this country, and before very long, the same state of things amongst the factory classes that exists in England to-day. I might point to you as model mills, not because I live in Cornwall, to the two great cotton mills there. I might ask you to go with me and see how cleanly they all are, see how carefully the evils which I have spoken of are provided against, the electric light which gives forth no heat, the floors as clean as it is possible to make them, every invention that can be used to drive away dust and moisture, everything that will contribute to the proper ventilation of the mills, and care even is taken that the overseers, in the event of their falling behind with their work, shall not commit that monstrous crime, which is so often committed in large mills, of adding to the speed of the machinery and thereby increasing the danger to the workers, which is so often committed in the United States, and which exists to an extent that makes workers tremble when they are obliged to go to places like Fall River, where it is the custom, and not the exception, to increase the speed of the mill for the purpose of making up what they consider lost time in obeying the 10 hour law. A couple of years since a large number of the members of this House visited Cornwall on the occasion of the introduction of the light into the Cornwall cotton factory, and I regretted very much then, that the visit was made so late in the day that we were unable to ask the gentlemen who accompanied us to visit the principal streets of the town, not only in the factory section, but all over it, that they might see the beautiful homes earned by the factory operatives, the boys and girls, not only comfortably furnished, but some of them luxuriously, even elegantly furnished; homes that they had earned with their hard labor, and homes that they had made not only for themselves, but for their aged parents whom they had

brought into the town from the country. And I was the more anxious to do this because it was circulated far and wide that the factory system of this country was as vicious as the factory system abroad, and it was believed that our people were worked sixty-six and seventy hours a week, whereas they were only worked sixty. But, whilst inviting them to see these happy and beautiful homes, earned by these boys and girls, I would also have drawn their attention to the large number of little ones, far under the age, little ones that had scarce more than escaped, I may say, from the mothers' apron strings, who were toiling from early in the morning until six o'clock in the evening, and I would have asked them also, when looking at these little ones, to enquire as to the wages paid them, and they would have found that these children—and it is a great temptation to parents, because of the wages, to send their children to these mills—were earning from 25 cents to 45 cents a day—the gophers earning 45 cents a day—and I would have asked them to compare that with the wages paid in England in the times we speak of, when the children were worked from long before the dawn till midnight, when they were neither half fed nor half clothed, when they were taken there crippled and were lashed to a bench and forced to work for ten pence to one shilling per week, and our children are well fed and well clothed and are earning from 25 cents to 45 cents per day. The factory laws are deserving of all or a great portion of the credit for this, because if the same system that existed in England before 1833 had not been abolished by the factory laws and by the enforcement of them, that system would have been introduced into this country, and in time our masters would have become hardened like the masters in England, would have had as little compassion upon the little workers as they, and would have taken from them, I may say, the last drop of their blood. Sir, I could wish that English manufacturers some day could walk into our Canadian manufacturing towns, particularly upon a Sabbath afternoon, and see these people as they go abroad to enjoy themselves—see how happy they look, see how comfortably dressed they are, and see how they enjoy themselves, taking their rides in buggies, or, as is more frequently the case with us, who live on the banks of the St. Lawrence, taking their pleasure in the boats upon the river, gliding down mile after mile without very much exercise, and rowing back in the afternoon, obtaining after the week's labor an amount of rest, recreation and health which in no other way could be obtained. Of the cruelties and the atrocities practised upon children in England, in the old time, I can hardly trust myself to speak. Not paid enough to keep body and soul together, the parents were forced to send their children, as I said awhile ago, to the factories, where they earned from 9d. and 10d to a shilling per week. Not content with paying that price, the masters of the mills, in their greed, robbed the schoolhouse and playground, and, I had almost said, the cradle and the grave. For they worked the children and the crippled little ones, as it was proven before a Commission of Parliament, and before Committees of both Houses, during long hours, worked them under the conditions spoken of by Jules Simon in the extract I read a little while ago. The cruelties of the masters, sometimes, I am ashamed to say—ashamed for my human nature to say—was exceeded by the cruelty of the parents. Drunken parents, that they might find means for their debaucheries, sent their little ones to the mills, forced them there, and when they were sick or crippled, they carried them there, and if they refused to work, they tied them to a bench, and during the long hours they were obliged to work. And why? That the monsters, their parents, might live in riot and debauchery. I spoke a short time ago of the effects of long hours of labor upon children and upon young girls. I referred to the injuries that were inflicted upon children in the English factories through those long hours of labor. To a less degree, because of the lessened hours of labor, these evils exist in this country, as I shall presently show. There, a child working from before the dawn, as I said, and until late in the night—the noise of the machinery and the heat, helped to make him sleep, became fatigued, and too often human nature succumbed. Sleep overbore the poor little creature; a hand or an arm slipped into the machinery, and the limb was torn off. To the hospital he went, and, if death did not kindly come to his relief, he escaped but to wander about the country obtaining his support, seldomer from the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table, oftener from the poor man's crust. The life of the factory child was a terrible one. He was shut out from the light of heaven. He never saw the light of day except through the windows of the mill, which were darkened with dust and cobwebs. For the factory children there was no sunlight and no starlight. They were confined in Egyptian darkness, and doomed to barbaric ignorance. Their bodies and their souls had alike the light shut out of them. The masters grew richer day by day under this system, and the workers grew poorer. The gangrene gold eat out the master's heart. Wealth was worshipped. The tears, and the sweat, and the sinew of the workers were coined into gold; the land was filled with paupers, prisons, graves. Lines of suffering were tightly drawn over every little face; one and all they wore the factory stamp. Little human worms they were who spun the factory smoke of torment with the fuel of human life. For them, there was no childish glee, no tender prattle, no hours of play. It was always stint and moil from cock crow until starlight, their little wearied faces turned sadly up to God. Perhaps one of the most heartrending pictures of factory life that I have read is that drawn by a factory worker himself, but it is long, and it would detain the House too long to read it, and consequently I shall pass it over. The life of the peasant and of the operative in England, in those days, was a desperate struggle with poverty. Gaunt famine not only stood at every man's door, but had crossed the threshold. There went up an universal, despairing cry for bread. By the agriculturist the repeal of the corn laws was demanded; by the operative classes, education for their children and shorter hours of labor. Both these demands were resisted, and there arose an agitation which shook the very basis of society, and which threatened the destruction of the Empire. Great and good men set themselves to work. They espoused the cause of the operative, and in the end the battle was won. The Factory Act of 1833 became the law of the land, and from that hour, the condition of the operative improved. I shall not detain the House by further references to the evils of the factory system as it existed in those days, now half a century ago. But, Sir, I shall call your attention to the benefits which flowed from this factory law. One of the first and most important effects of the Factory Act, was to increase the wages, contrary to the opinion of the manufacturers, and of the employers of labor, which was that to reduce the hours of labor would be to reduce the wages, and this was one of the arguments they employed to induce the operatives to oppose factory laws. Mr. David Chadwick has given very strong testimony upon this point. He says:

"The common prediction of the opponents of those acts, was that they would reduce wages, that they would diminish production, and that the workers would throw away the leisure afforded to them. The exact contrary has happened—wages and production have increased, and a very large number of the workers, at least, have known how to make excellent use of their leisure."

Mr. Alexander Redgrave, one of Her Majesty's inspectors of factories, addressing the Congrès International de Bienfaisance, held in London in 1862, under the presidency of the Earl of Shaftesbury, quotes figures on this point. He says:

"In 1838 the imports of raw cotton amounted to 5,000,000 cwt.; and the exports of cotton yarns and manufactures was valued at 24,559,000. In 1860 the imports of raw cotton were 12,419,000 cwt.; the value of cotton yarn and manufactures exported, 52,000,000. In 1838 there were 4,217 factories, giving employment to 356,684 persons. In 1860 there were 6,378 factories, giving employment to 775,534 persons."

Another result, however, which is more directly traceable to protective legislation has been the improvement in the health of the workers, and on this point I will quote the opinion of Mr. Robt. Baker, one of Her Majesty's inspectors of factories, given before the Bradford meeting of the Social Science Association. He says:

"There were in 1856, and there are at the present moment, employed within the factories of the United Kingdom 682,517 persons, compared with 354,684 in 1835. Of these 387,826 are females, compared with 167,696 in 1835; and 46,071 are children between 8 and 13 years of age, as compared with 56,435. There is a gross increase of workers of 92 per cent.—the increase of females being 131 per cent., and nearly as many children as there were formerly; and yet all the diseases which were specific to factory labor in 1822 have as nearly as possible disappeared. We seldom or never now see a case of in-knee or of flat-foot; occasionally one of slight curvature of the spine, arising more from labor with poor food than from labor specifically. The factory leg is no more amongst us, except an old man or woman limps by, to remind one of the fearful past. The faces of the people are ruddy, their forms are rounded—their very appearance is a joyous one. What has struck me most is the wonderful change in the condition of the female part of the population since the passing of the Act. They are now fair and florid, strong and muscular—not only cheerful but full of fun. Instead of the sharp angles formerly seen in their figures, all the outlines are well rounded, particularly at the hips and shoulders. So striking a difference in 25 years I could not have believed, had I not marked and seen it with my own eyes."

Mr. Baker quoted the testimony of medical men,

"Who weekly visit mills, which employ, in the aggregate, upwards of 70,000 persons, of whom upwards of 40,000 are females, and 4,500 are children, and who all testify to the same fact, namely, the almost entire disappearance of deformity, and the non-appearance of any other disease specific to factory labor."

I might quote the opinions of Sismondi, Simon and Marchant and Baccarat and other high French authorities to show that the result is the same in France. Another benefit of the Factory Act is the improvement in the educational condition of the operatives. Mr. Redgrave further states:

"The masses have proved themselves worthy of the boon conferred upon them; they have not abused the gift; their intelligence has increased; their habits have improved; their social happiness has advanced; they have gained all, and more than all they expected from factory legislation; and they have not been intoxicated with success."

The death rate, too, has decreased. The life of factory operatives has been longer since the introduction of the Factory Act. We have seen them in the year 1832 sinking under the burden of over-toil, both premature and excessive; the factory population was below, not above, the general level of the working class. This condition is now reversed, and there is no doubt as to the beneficial effect of the Act in this direction. The condition of the people, as regards education has been improved. According to Mr. Redgrave:

"Much might be said of what the operatives have done with their leisure hours; how evening schools have been frequented; various mutual improvement societies have been appreciated; how the Easter and Whitsuntide holidays have been spent in more rational enjoyment than formerly; how the intelligence, subordination to authority, and the general tone and bearing of the operatives have kept pace with the advancement of the age."

And this accords with the testimony of Mr. Potter, who says:

"No greater contrast of misery and ignorance, comfort and education could exist than that shown, for instance, in the district of Blackburne and Calne in 1820 and 1860."

Other authorities give similar testimony on the same point; but it is needless to occupy the time of the House longer. The facts are beyond dispute. The beneficial effect of this legislation can no longer be called in question. The manufacturers themselves have borne the strongest testimony to it—the Crossleys, the Akroyds, the Brothertons, who have frequently spoken of the excellent results which have followed the adoption of the Act, and they have gone so far as to advocate an extension of the law to other classes of the community. This consensus of opinion, is a remarkable result of the Factory Act. And what was brought about in England was brought about here, to a certain extent, by bringing before Parliament and submitting to the people for their discussion and reflection a Factory Bill. I think I have shown beyond a shadow of doubt, that such has been substantially the effect in England of this factory legislation; that so far from wages having decreased, they have increased; that so far from the productions of the mills having decreased, they have increased. The experience of this legislation has been and is, that the men working only 60 hours per week, can produce more than they did under the old system of 16 or 18 hours a day. Not only is the production greater, but the work is better, and in both respects, the employers of labor have been largely the gainers. I have already adverted to the marvellous advances made in various industries by English artisans since 1833, as the result of the factory system of that year. The social progress and improvement of the working classes is very striking, and I would point to the various mutual and benefit societies and the protection societies which have been established by the factory operatives since those days. Before the passage of the Factory Act they had few or no associations of the kind. Now they have their Sunday schools, they have their benefit societies, they have their friendly societies, their building societies, their workingmen's societies, their cooperative associations; they have their insurance societies, their savings' societies, their workingmen's colleges, their reading rooms—they have everything that goes to educate the children and make them equal to the artisans of any country in the world, and they have taken advantage of them in a way which is a credit to the factory classes of England. I do not propose, Sir, to make any attempt to prove the necessity of education to the children of the laboring classes. It would be an insult to the intelligence of the House. We know, Sir, that if children be permitted to grow up in ignorance, if lessons of morality be not carefully instilled in their youth, we know what the state of their manhood and their womanhood must inevitably be. We know, Sir, it has been said, and said truly, that ignorance is the great recruiting sergeant for the army of criminals, and, Sir, we should take warning; we should not allow the children of the working classes to grow up in ignorance. A great number of them, however, are now growing up in ignorance, because of the long working hours. Children from ten years up to thirteen and fourteen and fifteen, are working in our mills from half-past six in the mornings until half past six in the evenings, with an hour's intermission at noon for dinner. Is it to be supposed—can it be believed for one moment, that children who have worked during a long winter day, or worse still, during a long summer day, in the mill, can be in any condition to attend the evening school; and, Sir, I know from the parents of these children, that when they attempt to teach them the Christian doctrines, to teach them their catechisms on the Saturday afternoons or the Sunday afternoons, the little ones fall asleep when they are talking to them, owing to the fatigue of the past week, and they are not able to teach them. Sir, this is a terrible condition of things. I regret that I do not see my way to ask the House to prohibit, as I said before, the employment of children under sixteen years of age. I trust, Sir, that I have not been understood in the remarks I have made as having condemned the manufacturers as a body. I think I have endeavored carefully to guard myself against that, and perhaps the best evidence I can give that I do not so intend is that the hon. gentleman who is to second my motion for the second reading of this Bill is himself a manufacturer and employs a large number of children. But I do condemn the system as

it existed in England, and I condemn the system as it exists in this country, which enables the masters to employ children at an age so early that it is impossible for them to obtain any education. I showed you, Sir, how steeped in ignorance, years ago, the factory classes were in England, and I contend that the same result will be brought about here unless we pass this law. I told you, Sir, at the outset, that the factories of this country had not yet developed very many great evils. I told you, Sir, at the same time, that we were dealing with the first generation of factory workers; and I would remind you that the first generation of factory workers who have been educated by their parents, and that the evils against which I have spoken are evils which will ensue in the generation of children now being employed, who have not had the opportunity of education, and that if we grow up in Canada a generation of ignorant children, without any education, without any knowledge of the Christian doctrines, that we are bringing up in our midst a class which will be most dangerous to the community, a class which will marry and bring into the world the same class to be worked from the same early age until manhood and womanhood, as this class is being now worked, and so it will go on generation after generation increasing in ignorance, increasing in degradation, increasing in everything which would be a shame to the country, and for these reasons it is necessary that we should have the children of this country educated; and if there are no clauses in this Bill providing for education, it is because education has been committed entirely to the Local Legislatures, and it would be an infringement upon the rights of the people of the Provinces to pass any law prescribing any particular hour or manner or form or system of education. But if it be found that not employing children up to 13 years of age we have not given them an opportunity of being educated, or have not given them a sufficient opportunity, why, Sir, we can amend this Bill hereafter as experience may dictate, and increase the age from 13 to 16 or 18, and I know there is sufficient manhood in the hearts of the masters of this country, to sacrifice a little of the profits they might otherwise gain, to the interests of the working classes employed by them. I told the House that these evils did not attain their growth in a day or a year, but that unless provided for by legislation, as I have just said, they would attain their growth. And, Sir, to show to you by an example near at home, an example in our own day, and an example at our own door, the evil effects of the employment of these young persons and these women, I shall ask your attention to some extracts from the most able reports made by the factory inspector last year and the year before, of the State of New Jersey, and, Sir, it proves that in this factory system, history repeats itself. There are over 15,000 young children and young women employed in the mills and factories of the State of New Jersey. There are 8,000 mills of different kinds in that State. The report says:

"The evils of child labor in all our manufacturing and business centres are painfully apparent. The sad results are to be seen in the faces and forms of the young children. Old faces and dwarfed forms are the offspring of the child-labor system. Children who spend their lives amid the din of machinery, and who are kept long hours on the treadmill of our stores, at the sacrifice of their health and education; and young girls of tender years who stand ten or twelve or fourteen hours at looms and counters, cannot develop into true mental or physical manhood or womanhood. I have noticed young girls in our manufacturing and business districts, many of them under sixteen years of age, employed in violation of the ten-hour law, who are physical wrecks, through over work. Child labor has increased in a greater ratio than adult labor, and the wages of parents and adults have sadly diminished, and in too many cases the parents have been unable to maintain their homes without the earnings of their tender offspring. The tendency to buy cheap labor, no matter how injurious its effects upon society, I regret to say, seems to prevail, and child labor is, therefore, eagerly sought after.... That such a disgraceful state of things should exist towards the close of the 19th century, and that at a time when improved machinery has developed our producing power to a marvellous extent, is not to our credit as a people. One would imagine that with the present means of production, the labor of children under fifteen years of age, would be entirely dispensed with, and the toil of adults considerably lightened. In a country where life is so intense, as it is in this, where so much is expected to be done in a little time, childhood and youth should be a time of free physical growth. But, instead of such being the case, we find childhood to be a period of long, killing drudgery for the children of the working people. This will continue to be the case, no matter how many labor laws we may have on our Statute Books, so long as these laws are wanting in adequate enforcement clauses; without such clauses they are a mockery and a delusion."

In his report for 1884, I may quote something more to the same end:

"The evils of child labor, child ignorance and female labor for long hours in factories, are so well known that it is unnecessary for me in this report to enter into a review thereof. New Jersey has, by its laws of 1883 and 1884, declared against child slavery, and recognised by its education provision that 'ignorance is the curse of God, knowledge the wings wherewith we fly to heaven.' But in order that our State may not take too much credit for its benign legislation, and believe that it has done enough, it may be proper for me in this report to quote the opinions of some eminent persons and papers on children, child education and female labor."

Speaking of the education and employment of young persons, Colonel Carroll D. Wright, of the Massachusetts Labor Bureau, in his report of 1874, said:

"Personally we believe in the extremest legislation in this direction, and, could we have the power given us, we would not allow a girl under 16 years of age to be employed in any kind of a factory or workshop. If she could be free until the age of 20, mankind would be the gainer."

In 1875, Governor Gaston of Massachusetts, cordially approved of the law limiting the work hours of minors and women to ten per day, and, towards the conclusion of an elaborate address, said:

"In manufacturing communities, instruction cannot be properly or safely neglected. The necessity of the pupil and the public interest alike, demand that those whose inheritance is that of labor, shall have both the time and opportunity for instruction which shall give to labor intelligence and consequently increase value and compensation."

Governor Washburne, of Massachusetts, and Dr. Robert Collyer, of New York, speak in the same way. The National Federation of Trades and Labor Unions of North America and Canada goes further, for it declares:

"Children should be kept from manufactories, workshops and mines. Our children should be superior to the present generation."

Much as I should regret that we should be compelled to exclude children from the factories, yet, if it be necessary in order to give them that moral and Christian education, which I fear we cannot give them at the early age of ten or twelve years, I would say keep the children out of the factories; for, as Senator Titus, of New York, says, and I fully agree with him:

"It is the just duty of the State to give its child-citizens such a moral and intellectual education as will fit them to intelligently discharge the duty which devolves upon every man of a free republic."

I say, Sir, that is the duty of the State, where it can do so without interfering with the rights of the parents, And this brings me to another objection which has been made against this factory legislation, and it is the last objection to which I shall refer. It is said that by prohibiting the employment of children at any age or at any time or in any manner, we are interfering with the private rights of parents, and are infringing upon the British North America Act which give the sole control of private rights to the legislatures of the Provinces. Now, Sir, I am willing to go as far as any man in Canada in support of the rights of parents. It is in me, as it has been from the beginning, a strong opinion that any law which interferes with the rights of parents, or with the control that they ought to exercise over their children, is a law which ought to be resisted. This, Sir, is the doctrine of the Holy Church whose member I am; but that church also teaches that when the parent, in the exercise of his authority, abuses it, and orders his child to do that which will injure him in mind or in body, that child, if he has come to the age of reason, is not only not bound to obey, but it is his duty to resist. He is not to obey the

parent who directs him to commit a crime, or to do that which will injure his body or his soul. And, Sir, in this connection, I say that when a child is ordered by a brutal parent to work when unfitted for work and too young for work the State stands *in loco parentis*, and has the right to prevent that parent from abusing the authority which God gives him over his child. There is much more, Sir, which I would like to say upon this question, and I think much that it would be of advantage to those who have not studied the question to hear; but I have already trespassed very long upon the patience of the House, and there are many others who, I understand, propose to follow me in the discussion of this question. Therefore, I shall close here. I feel warmly and I have spoken warmly upon this question; but I feel that the welfare of the industrial classes of this country depends upon our action to-day. I know, Sir, that many of the evils which attended upon the English system, will creep into ours if not provided against by legislation. The future of the children is in our hands; they appeal to us for protection, and I feel that that appeal will not be in vain. As I said before their health, their life, their faith and their morals are at stake, and they ask us to give them all the aid and all the assistance which it is in the power of this Parliament to give. That the factory boy may grow up strong and vigorous, full of life and health, a good Christian and a good citizen and a valuable member of society; that the factory girl may grow up an intelligent and a virtuous woman, a true wife and a loving mother of healthy children, devoted to the duties of her station; that they may, both boy and girl, not be killed through over work, that they may not grow up puny and delicate and dwarfed in mind and body, that they may not, through cupidity on the part of their masters, be maimed or crippled for life by machinery, that their lives may not, through the lack of proper precautions, be endangered by fire; that they may not in any other way be victims of the want of care and forethought on the part of their superiors, that they may not become victims of the moloch gold, as was the case in England; that they may not become holocausts on the altar of mammon—these are among the objects of this Bill. That it may not be said of Canada, as it was said of England, and too truly said, that the wheels of her industries are driven by the heart throbs of her little children—that no such wail may go up from Canada's children to-day as went up from England's children before the passage of the Factory Law, depends upon this Parliament. Sir, the snows of winter are fast melting away; the earth will soon be clothed green, there will be bud and blossom and leaf on every tree, the air will be filled with the music of the birds, and the flowers will be forth in all their beauty, and smiling in their mother earth's old face will say all her children should have happy hearts. What more appropriate season than this springtime to give to these little toilers the boon they crave, and thus build for ourselves a monument with passionate heart's of love for corner stones.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. gentleman who has introduced this Bill deserves not only the thanks of every philanthropist in the country, but the thanks also of a very large portion of the community who are comparatively helpless. At the present time, when our manufactures are as yet in their infancy, it is specially important that a stringent factory law be introduced, so that the evils complained of, may not be allowed to grow to such an extent that vested rights and other considerations may be given as reasons why they should not be removed. If we take into consideration the deterioration of physical life and strength, the consequent great loss to the nation in the reduced ability of our laborers to perform their work, through the violation of the laws of hygiene and labor in the factories, the importance of this measure is but too apparent. I have here a work written by the Rev. Joseph Cook, who, I believe, is inferior to none at the present time as a thinker or a writer on this question, and into which, in his work on labor, has gone very extensively and exhaustively. He gives, as a result of his examination, a comparison showing the large amount of loss to the country through the evils of lax factory laws. He says:

"In Massachusetts, during the seven years from 1865 to 1871, 72,700, says Dr. Jarvis, 'died in their working period.' In the fullness of life and in the fullness of health, they would have opportunity of laboring for themselves, their families and the public, in all 3,600,000 years.

And this largely attributable, he says, to the disposition of factory proprietors to take the longest hours of labor and the greatest amount of work out of those who are laboring at a time when their physical strength is least able to endure it.—

"But the total of their labors amounts only to 1,700,000 years, leaving a loss of 1,900,000 years by their premature deaths."

Dr. Cook goes on to say that in any factory legislation it is extremely important to discriminate between the kind of labor suited for males and that suited for females, as the physical nature of each is not the same. Eminent physiologists tell us, that the proportion of the strength of the two compared, might be represented as 16 to 26; yet, notwithstanding that fact, the custom of the country has compelled both classes to be employed in the same kind of work during that period of life when there is the greatest difference in their physical strength and endurance; that is, they are compelled to work at a kind of labor for which physiologically they are unfit. The eminent writer goes on to say:

"There is an establishment in Boston, owned and carried on by a man, in which ten or a dozen girls are constantly employed. Each of them is given, and is required to take, a vacation of three days every four weeks. It is scarcely necessary to say that their sanitary condition is exceptionally good and that the aggregate total amount of work which the owner obtains is greater than that when persistent attendance and labor are required."

He endeavors to impress on those who are legislating in the interests of factory operatives, the great importance of introducing those changes, or, at least, of making such laws to compel factory owners to allow certain classes of their operatives to enjoy a few days rest periodically during the year, and he says the aggregate number of hours of labor during the year, collected from those who have adopted this principle, has given the very clearest proof that the results have been very beneficial. Again he takes very strong ground as to the right of allowing boys and girls to be employed at the same kind of labor. The hon. member (Mr. Bergin) spoke at some length, and I think very eloquently and correctly, in reference to the anatomical construction of the different sexes. And in reference to the physiological changes that take place at certain periods in life that, if there is a difference, there ought to be a difference in the kind of labor at which they are employed and this ought to be understood, so that those who are engaging children very largely are not, from year to year, violating those laws of nature in a way which must ultimately result in the reduction of the strength of the individual and the degeneracy of the race. It is of the utmost importance, at this time in the history of our country, before the manufacturing operations have grown so large that it would be difficult to pass any Bill, from the opposition it would receive from manufacturers, to introduce a very stringent factory law. Again, it is important from the fact, that we find that manufactories are growing up very rapidly in the last few years, and as time advances we must expect them to increase. It is especially important, when we consider the carelessness of those who are employing young children who, at that time of life, are scarcely responsible for what happens to them, and those who are at the same time allowing the looseness which is characteristic around these factories, in the preservation of the dangerous machinery which is in operation at every hour of the day. It is especially important too,

considering the degeneracy of the health and strength that must result from the want of carrying out proper sanitary regulations in these factories, and it has been found in England and other countries which are engaged largely in manufactures that a stringent factory law has been one of the causes which have brought about this improvement in the condition of the operatives, which has made it hundreds per cent. better than it was years ago. It has also brought about those benevolent societies which have induced the operatives to continue their work through life and have provided for them in old age and sickness. It has also induced operatives to cooperate with the manufacturers themselves on the principle of cooperation, and the result has been the improvement that has been made not only in machinery but in sanitary regulations and carefulness in the guarding of machinery, the separation of the male and female, and as to the periodical seasons of rest that should be enjoyed, as to the reduction of the number of days' labor in the year, all these things have been largely attributable to the factory legislation which was introduced years ago in England and in Germany, and lately in the United States. I think, if we gave the subject that attention it deserves, and would consider, as the Rev. Joseph Cook says, the number of years of valuable labor that is lost to the country through the early or premature deaths of those operatives who have been virtually worn out before they come to years of maturity at all, it would be a strong argument why a Bill of this kind should be introduced. I think we should remember also the tendency to degeneration of the species from the fact that, with half the operatives in some of the towns where these regulations are not as stringently carried out as they ought to be, or in some States where the factory laws are not so advanced as in others, the degeneracy of the human species is such, that large numbers of those engaged in factory labor is dependent upon others for their support at that time of life when they ought to be enjoying the greatest strength of manhood or womanhood. I have only been disappointed that the hon. gentleman who has charge of this measure did not force the Bill through earlier, so that improvements or amendments could be made from year to year as the circumstances or the necessities required, and I think, when it is passed, we shall find in a short time the beneficial effects that must follow from it, and that many amendments may be made in it, in the interests of that class who have no power to redress these evils which are tending to sap their constitutions and weaken their health in the vigor of life. In reading over the Bill for a single time, it appears to me that there are many other clauses or many other regulations that might be introduced that would be beneficial; but I presume that, like all other measures, it cannot be expected to embody in itself perfection the first time, and I have no doubt it contains very many valuable clauses that, if carried out by factory inspectors, if carried out by those men who take an interest in this subject, if carried out by manufacturers themselves, and if carried out in the interests of the operatives of the growing industrial class of the country, must result in great good, so that I think every hon. member in this House will feel proud in after years of having assisted in carrying through such important legislation in the interests of a class of humanity that are not able to legislate for their own wants.

Mr. MILLS. This measure is one of very great importance. It is a measure in which a very large number are interested, a measure on a subject on which legislation, in every country where there are manufacturing establishments, is required, but it is a measure which I think does not fall within the constitutional functions of this Legislature. It proposes to deal with a subject which, the Provinces hold, falls within their jurisdiction. Ontario has already enacted a law similar to that proposed by the Bill before us. The Legislature of Quebec is, at this moment, considering the question, and will no doubt enact a measure before its Session closes. It is useless to deal with a subject that lies beyond our jurisdiction. Those interested in legislation of this kind, desire it at the hands of those who have the power to enact it. They do not want a lawsuit instead of legal protection. This Bill regulates the employment of children, young persons, and women, in mills and factories. It aims at protecting their health and morals. It says that their hours of labor are longer than is desirable; and it proposes to regulate contracts between employer and employed. I look at the interpretation clause, and I find it defines a child, as a person under thirteen years of age. The Ontario law says a child is a person under fourteen years of age. This Bill defines a young person to be one between thirteen and eighteen years. The Ontario law defines a young person to be one between fourteen and eighteen years of age. This Bill forbids any young person or woman remaining in the factory room during the hours allowed for meals. The Ontario law does the same thing. This Bill contains precautionary measures for the purpose of greater safety to the employed. The Ontario Statute does the same thing. It declares, in the matter of contract, that certain days shall be regarded as holidays. If we have the power to enact these provisions in favour of the laborers in factories, we have it to regulate the hours of labor in the shop and on the farm. We were mistaken when we declared that a Sabbath Observance Bill was outside our legislative authority. The provisions of this Bill are very far reaching, because, if it is properly before us, we may claim jurisdiction, not only over the relations of employer and employed, but over the whole subject of property, except its transfer, and over all our civil relations. The question which we have mainly to consider in connection with the Bill before us, is a question as to the location of the police powers. These powers, in their widest sense, embrace the laws relating to public health and morals, and the protection of one individual against possible injury by another. They are based upon the maxim, *Sic utere tuo ut alienum non lædas.* They assume that the interests of the members of a community are varied, and those of one man may not be consistent with the well-being of another. A system of police is a system of precautions. It embraces a region of legislation within the domain of civil rights, which lies contiguous to the criminal law. Police legislation ends where the general criminal law begins. It is regulative, and is intended to prevent offences, to preserve order, to protect property and health. Police regulations deal with property and civil rights. They impose restraint upon personal freedom. They subordinate the interests of the few to the general well-being. Under our system of government, these regulations are largely carried out through the agency of municipal institutions. Police legislation has to do with the establishment of markets, with the regulation of market fees, with the preservation of the peace. Under it, provision is made for the use of thoroughfares. It says how a person using a highway or street shall drive, which side he shall take so as to avoid collision, and so as to enjoy the largest measure of freedom without interfering with the freedom of others. It provides for the prevention of fires in towns and cities, and for their extinguishment when they arise. It authorises the destruction of buildings and private property to prevent the spread of a conflagration. It adopts precautions against the introduction of contagious diseases, and it seeks to confine them when introduced. All those regulations which a community find it necessary to make in order to prevent one man from interfering with the comfort and well-being of another in the use of that freedom which the law allows him, are police regulations, and are a part of that department of jurisprudence embraced within the division, designated—"Property and Civil Rights." This regulative power known as police, is largely incident to other

powers. What we are called upon to consider is, whether, lying, as it does, on that side of civil rights adjoining the criminal law, we have here the power of shifting it within the domain of criminal jurisprudence. My contention is that we have not. I maintain that these regulative powers are an essential part of our civil rights. We have but to look at the etymology of the word Civil, and to its use, to discover the essential idea which it represents. We distinguish between the man who is a savage and ourselves, by the use of the word civilised. The one, has his conduct and actions, in his relations to others, regulated by law, and the other has not. Bouvier, in his Law Dictionary, gives as the legal definition of Civil, reduced to Order and to regular government. All those ordinary regulations upon which the State rests, are embraced within Property and Civil Rights. Why do we say in what way a public thoroughfare shall be used? What shall be done to protect the public health? What to preserve the public morals? What obligations between man and man the law will enforce? It is for the purpose of defining civil rights, to mark their limits—to preserve peace and good order, and to see that one man, in doing as he pleases, does not please to interfere with the property, health, comfort or freedom of another. Under our Federal system, the criminal law and criminal procedure are placed under the jurisdiction of this Parliament, but it is limited and restricted by other provisions of our constitution. It does not here embrace every offence committed against the law. It is not used here in its most comprehensive, nor in its most restricted sense. Crime, says Blackstone, generally denotes an offence of a deep and atrocious dye. Acts of an inferior degree of guilt are denominated misdemeanors. Criminal law in section 91 of the British North America Act has a more comprehensive meaning. It embraces those wrongs committed against society which are in themselves bad, and which are prosecuted and punished in the name of the Sovereign. It was never intended to embrace within the limits of criminal law, as here enumerated, those police and municipal regulations which are established for the purpose of promoting morality, decency and good health. The location of these powers is a matter of history. They have, with us, been uniformly entrusted to municipal authorities. We, so far as the Province of Ontario is concerned, find the Municipal Act of 1866, makes police provisions, and no city or town could get on without them. Our Constitution provides that property and civil rights in a Province, shall be under the exclusive control of the Provincial Legislature. It provides for the imposition of punishment by fine, penalty or imprisonment, for enforcing any law of the Province made in relation to any matter coming within any of the classes of subjects under Provincial control. It has charge of municipal institutions. If it can be shown that regulations made relating to factories fall within its domain, it does not at all follow that because it is necessary to enforce their observance by penal provisions, that it ceases to be under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Province. One would suppose from some of the observations made in reference to criminal law, that a different rule of construction was to be applied to this section of the Constitution, from that which is applied to the other clauses. They regard criminal law as a kind of sacred enclosure into which a Provincial Legislature has no power to enter. The provisions of the Constitution are an enumeration of powers. It does not deal with definitions; and this particular provision can only be regarded as exclusive, to the extent that no portion of the criminal law is carved out of it. A Province may find it necessary, in the discharge of its legislative functions, to make a disregard of certain of its mandates, a crime; but it does not by reason of this expediency, lose its jurisdiction over the principal subject, nor does it exceed its own authority in so legislating. The punishment and penalties which a Local Legislature may find it necessary to enact, are part of the Provincial Criminal Law, and there is nothing in the constitution which forbids the Legislature of a Province from declaring that certain offences against its authority, are crimes. A crime is sometimes defined to be a violation of law, to which a penalty is attached; and the constitution expressly authorises Provincial Legislatures to enforce their authority by fine, penalty, or imprisonment. Let me suppose that a Local Legislature declares, that keeping open bar on polling day, shall subject the offender to fine and imprisonment. No one questions its authority. But suppose the Local Legislature of a Province declares that the party who keeps an open bar on polling day shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be subject to fine and imprisonment. Can it be seriously argued that they may not so characterise the offense? Can it be supposed that they may not use technical terms, so long as the meaning attached to them, does not in fact claim a greater authority than they possess? Have they a right to legislate on the principal subject? Have they a right to enforce their legislation by the penalty and punishment they propose to employ? If so, the jurisdiction is theirs; and this Parliament cannot interfere because the Province may call the offense a crime. That thing which the constitution expressly authorises a Provincial Legislature to do, great judges and jurists have called a crime. How then, can it be said such a body cannot legislate upon the subject? No jurisdiction can be conferred upon the Federal Parliament in this way. This Parliament cannot create for itself jurisdiction over a civil right, by making a violation of civil regulations criminal. We look not at the penal provisions, but at the principal subject matter, to settle the question of jurisdiction. What do the promoters of this Bill propose to do? They propose to make regulations for the preservation of the health of those who are employed in workshops and factories—to limit and define certain civil rights. They propose to deal with the relations between the employer and the employed. This is as much a matter of civil right, as the relation between attorney and client, physician and patient, guardian and ward, or parent and child. The object of this Bill is to define and regulate this relation. It states the obligations of the employer to the employed, and it enforces these obligations by fines and penalties. It interferes with the freedom of contract. I do not complain of this interference, I do not say that this is not a proper subject for interference and regulation, but I say, that we are not the parties who are authorised to interfere. Upon what principle or theory do we propose here to legislate? A court of equity interferes where the parties do not stand upon a footing of equality, where the one may unduly influence the action of the other. Upon this principle the law regulates the charges of cabmen. If you arrive at a station, and there is only one cabman there, he cannot charge you $5; the State steps in and interferes with the freedom of contract. It fixes certain responsibilities upon common carriers. Upon these principles the Imperial Parliament subjected the contracts between landlords and tenants in Ireland to judicial supervision. Now, if we here interfere in this matter, it is not to create a crime, but to regulate the civil relations of parties, and to define their civil rights and responsibilities. We may, with the same propriety, define the relation between farmer and farm hands, between master and apprentices. There is no relation in civil life that is not equally under our control. A Provincial Legislature may regard factory legislation as of immense consequence. It may seek to secure the most perfect obedience to any measure, it may enact on this subject by making its violation highly penal; but because the violation of the mandatory part of the Statute may cause the party to be severely punished, it does not follow that the location of the power to legislate, is

thereby changed. A penal clause will not transfer the right to legislate upon a Provincial matter, from the Provincial Legislature to the jurisdiction of this Parliament. It is not the subject of crime with which this Bill deals. This measure, if enacted, would not become a part of the Criminal law This is a Bill respecting factories; it relates to the construction of factories; it regulates the hours of labor; it restricts employment; it defines the relation between employer and workmen; it deals with civil relations. The regulations here proposed relate to morality and health. The question as to how a Provincial Legislature ought to regard a violation of these regulations is a question subordinate and incidental to the main subject. The constitution authorizes the Local Legislatures to inflict punishment by fine, penalty or imprisonment, for the purpose of giving effect to any law within its own exclusive jurisdiction. Whatever it may be necessary to do, for the purpose of enforcing obedience to Provincial law, it can do. There is such a thing as Provincial Criminal Law. Fine and imprisonment, as here provided, are not always civil remedies, but Provincial Criminal Law. Provincial Criminal Law is not a system of Criminal Law. It is not a distinct branch of jurisprudence. It is always subordinate to some other power. The use of the word penalty, confers upon the Local Legislature a wide discretion in the means which it may employ. It may judge what the penalty shall be, and how it shall be enforced. In the case of Russell *vs.* the Queen, Mr. Benjamin argued that if the Canada Temperance Act related to Criminal Law, it was Provincial Criminal Law. The Judicial Committee said:

"No doubt the argument would be well founded, if the principal matter of the Act could be brought within any of these classes of subjects, but as far as they have yet gone, their Lordships failed to see that this has been done."

What is the rule here laid down? It is this: That we are to look at the principal matter of the Act, in order to determine the question of jurisdiction. What is the principal matter of this Act? It is the regulation of the relations between the employer and the employed, in factories. It is the regulation of the use of machinery. It is a matter of police, regulating the civil rights of certain parties, and it imposes restrictions on the use of property. If it is necessary to make a violation of these regulations criminal, it must be done under sub-secsion 15, of section 92, and not under sub-section 27 of sec 91. The principal matter here dealt with is, not crime, but the regulation of certain civil relations, and the uses of certain kinds of property. It regulates the hours of labor. It restrains the employment of persons under certain ages. It provides for the protection of parties against accident by machinery. All these provisions, in my opinion, it is desirable should be made, but the legislative power to make them is not vested in this Parliament. The penal parts of the Bill cannot create for us a jurisdiction. They are subordinate and incidental to the principal matter, which clearly falls within the enumeration—property and civil rights. There would be no end to the confusion that would certainly arise, if it were in the power of this Parliament to take over control of a subject, by making any violation of the law relative to it, a crime. The local legislatures have here exclusive jurisdiction over the principal matters of this Bill, and they are the sole judges of the means to be employed for the enforcement of any law upon the subject. A local legislature enacts a law relating to the holding of Provincial elections. That is the principal matter. It provides, as incident to this, for the purity of elections and for the preservation of the peace. It provides against stuffing the ballot-box, against its destruction, against stealing poll books, against false personation. It may inflict as severe a penalty as this Parliament can for similar offences committed against its own election law. There is nothing in the constitution to prevent it declaring some of these offences misdemeanors or felonies. It may deal with the subject of crime as an incident of the power expressly conferred upon it. Just as this Parliament may deal with the subject of property as an incident of its power to incorporate a railway company. It cannot go beyond the proper incidents of the principal matter. It cannot deal with the subject of property generally; but it can deal with it so far as may be necessary to the incorporation of a railway company. In the same way the local legislature may provide for periodical elections. It may determine who shall vote at those elections, how they shall be conducted, within what time the vote shall be polled; what public functionaries shall be employed, what duties shall be assigned to them, and what punishment shall be inflicted upon those who disobey the law—so far local legislatures may deal with offenses—so far they may create and punish crimes; but a local legislature cannot deal with crime as the principal matter. It may say that no liquor shall be sold on polling day; that every bar shall be closed; and that whoever disobeys these provisions of the law shall be held guilty of misdemeanors, and shall be punished specifically as stated. It may provide for the punishment of riotous proceedings. The local legislatures are not the helpless creatures that some gentlemen maintain. An ordinary person may knock down the ruffian who assaults him; and can it be supposed that the Local Legislature is totally incapable of self-protection or of securing respect for its own authority? If it were without power of punishing offenders, it would be the most helpless body in the world; but the power of creating and punishing crime are expressly given to it; but only such crimes as arise from disobedience to its exclusive jurisdiction. This Parliament cannot deal with any subject under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Local Legislature, under the pretense that it is necessary to make disobedience to the law a felony, in order to secure its proper observance. The Local Legislature being seized of the principal matter, is the sole judge of the enormity of the disobedience, and of the character of the punishment that ought to be awarded. Violations of provincial law do not fall within the domain of criminal jurisprudence, as enumerated in section 91. They are expressly excepted. In England it has been held, that a party may be indicted for the non-payment of his assessment, and an innkeeper may be indicted for not receiving a guest; but it does not follow that this Parliament, by making the failure to pay the municipal taxes an indictable offense, or the exclusion of a person from a hotel an indictable offense, could thereby acquire authority to pass an assessment Act, or a measure for the regulation of inns. Nor does it follow that it could extend the domain of the criminal law over offences committed in disobedience to Provincial Legislation, seeing that power to punish such offenses, is not left to be implied, but is expressly given among the exclusive powers conferred upon Provincial Legislatures. Baron Martin in the case of the Attorney General V. Radloff, says:

"There are many crimes properly so-called which are liable to be punished on summary conviction. But there are a vast number of Acts which in no sense are crimes, which are also so punishable; such, for instance, as keeping open public houses after certain hours, and a variety of breeches of police regulations which will readily occur to the mind of any one. The bringing tobacco into this kingdom is of itself a perfectly innocent Act; but the requirements of the public revenue, which induce the legislature to impose a very high duty upon the article, probably render it a matter of necessity that they who bring it into the kingdom without payment of the duty, should be subjected to a penalty, but this cannot affect or alter the intrinsic and essential nature of the Act itself, and it seems to me that it cannot be denominated a crime according to the ordinary and common usage of language, and the understanding of mankind."

In this definition the word crime is used in a more restricted sense than it is in other instances. We must define the word crime in such a way as not to make one portion of the British North America Act conflict with another portion. It is clear that the words "criminal law" in the 91st

section are not intended to embrace every offense which may be committed against law, and for which a penalty is imposed. In the case of the Queen *vs.* Boardman, Chief Justice Richards in delivering the judgment of the Court, said:

"There can be no doubt that it was intended that the Local Parliament should not only have power but the exclusive right to legislate on some subjects and to impose punishment, by way of fine and imprisonment, for enforcing the laws they may make in relation to those subjects. We think we must, therefore, come to the conclusion that when the Imperial Parliament use the words 'The Criminal Law' and 'including the procedure in criminal matters' in the British North America Act, they did not mean that the Local Legislature had not the power to legislate so as to punish by fine or imprisonment with the view of enforcing the laws, when such power is expressly given by that Act. The conclusion which we may properly arrive at is that they shall have the exclusive power to legislate in this way in those matters in which power is not given to the Local Legislature to legislate."

Mr. Justice Littledale defines the word crime to mean "an offence for which the law awards a punishment"; but this definition embraces many offences which the Local Legislature alone can lawfully punish. In Lucas *vs.* McGlashan, the Court of Queen's Bench in Ontario decided that where a penalty is imposed as a punishment for the violation of an Act of Parliament, for a public object, and when such penalty is recoverable in a summary way before a Justice of the Peace, who may commit the offender to the common jail until the penalty is paid, the offence which may be so punished is a crime. In the case of The Queen *vs.* Roddy it was held that the punishment inflicted for the sale of intoxicating liquors on Sunday was punishment for a crime, but this comprehensive definition of crime embraces many Acts that the Local Legislature has unquestionably the right to enact. Sub-section 27 of section 91, gives to the Parliament of Canada exclusive authority to legislate on the subject of criminal law and procedure in criminal matters. The British North America Act gives to the Local Legislature exclusive authority to make laws in relation to property and civil rights. One of these provisions is not more comprehensive than the other. Each, apart from other restraining provisions of the British North America Act, might be taken in its widest sense; but we must look at the Act itself to see whether these provisions are to be so taken. We find that the exclusive right to legislate on the subject of property and civil rights, is limited by the powers relating to Marriage and Divorce, Interest, Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, Bankruptcy and Insolvency, Shipping and Navigation, being placed under the control of the Federal Parliament. These are so many special powers carved out of the grant of exclusive legislative authority over Property and Civil Rights and vested in the Federal Parliament. No one can deny that the power to legislate on Property and Civil Rights, is limited by these special grants. So we find that by sub-section 15 of Section 92 the exclusive power to legislate, in reference to crime, is limited by the special power conferred upon each Province to impose punishment by fine, penalty or imprisonment, for the enforcement of its own laws. This principle is clearly recognised in the case of Pope *v.* Griffith, decided by the Queen's Bench of Quebec. In that case it was held that a Provincial Legislature has power to regulate procedure affecting penal laws which such legislature has the authority to enact. In this case Pope had been summarily convicted by two justices of the peace, under the Quebec License Act, for having sold, without license, a quantity of spirituous liquors. He was fined $20 and costs. He appealed to the Court of Queen's Bench on the ground, that certain provisions of the License Act were *ultra vires*, as they amended criminal procedure—a subject that was under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada. The appellant admitted that the Local Legislature had the power to attach a fine, penalty or imprisonment for a violation of the license law; but that in doing so, it had created a crime, and that all procedure connected with the infliction of punishment for this crime must be fixed by the Federal Parliament, but the court held that the Federal Parliament had no power to prescribe rules for conducting prosecutions under Provincial Legislation. Mr. Justice Ramsay, in delivering the judgment of the court, said:

"Whatever may be the definition of a crime, I would remind those who lean too much upon definitions, of their danger. It will not be denied that in one sense of the word, the Act of which appellant is accused, is a crime; but it is equally plain that it is not a crime in the sense of sub section 21, of sec. 91, of the British North America Act. Now, if the signification attached to the word criminal, is restricted when referring to law in this sub-section, why should it be used in a different sense when applied to procedure? It cannot be presumed that in one short paragraph, particularly a paragraph of an enumeration of powers, the legislature should have intended to apply two different meanings to the same word, especially when by doing so they would be transferring the legislation with regard to a purely local matter, to Parliament. The rule is all the other way. Sub-section 16 of section 92 reserves to the Local Legislature generally the right to make laws affecting all matters of a merely local or private nature in the Province. What can be more local than the procedure to give force to a local law? If this view be correct it is not a question of clashing, and the provision of section 91 giving superior authority to the emuneration of the powers of Parliament does not apply. The powers are perfectly distinct. Parliament makes the laws of procedure affecting the criminal law which it enacts. Each of the Legislatures makes the laws of procedure affecting the penal laws which they enact respectively."

And in the case of Page *vs.* Griffith the same doctrine is laid down by Mr. Justice Sanborn, who, in delivering the judgment of the court, said:

"When the power is given by the British North America Act to the Parliament of the Dominion to provide procedure in criminal matters I understand a reference to be had to the general public criminal law comprised in the criminal statutes of the Dominion, and in the common law. This view is confirmed by the Criminal Procedure Act, which has no reference whatever to local penal laws, but to laws enforced throughout the Dominion."

And in the case of Coté *vs.* Chauveau, Mr. Justice Casault lays down the same doctrine. In the case of Keefe *vs.* McLennan, the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia held:

"That the Provincial Legislature is entitled to legislate with a view to regulate within the Province, the sale of whatever may injuriously affect the lives, health, morals, or well being of the community, whether it be intoxicating liquors, poisons or unwholesome provisions. If such legislation is made *bona fide* with that object alone, even though, to a certain limited extent, it should affect commerce."

I have made these citations, with the view of showing how each of these enumerated powers is to be defined, in order to assign to it, its due sphere of operation. These authorities are sufficient to show that where it is deemed necessary to make disobedience to a Provincial law an offence, the Provincial Legislature is the proper legislative body to do so. The Provincial Legislature has the right to regulate a market; to make police regulations in reference to slaughter houses, and butcher shops, in towns and cities. The relation of the different members of a community to each other, is a civil relation, and is a Provincial matter. A Provincial legislatnre may declare that a certain thing is a nuisanee the abatement of which it may authorise, or it may confer upon a municipal body power to deal with the subject. It may legislate generally on the subject of public health in towns and cities. It may establish boards of health. It may adopt a series of measures for the preservation of the peace and morals of the community, for the promotion of education, for the prevention of crime, and for the regulation of civil rights. In doing so, it exercises its police and municipal powers. The criminal law referred to in the 91st section of the British North America Act is not precautionary but punitive. It declares certain wrongs done against the State, or to persons and property, crimes; and it provides for their punishment. It is not regulative but deterrent. It does not, in the case of forgery, undertake to say when one man may lawfully subscribe the name of another to an instrument by which he may be bound. This is wholly outside of its province. It defines

the wrongful signing, which it makes criminal. The law which limits and defines rights and liberties, by which conflicts and crimes are prevented, even though enforced by penal sanctions, is not the criminal law enumerated as such by the British North America Act. The powers which may, in some degree, be regarded as municipal powers can be ascertained from the municipal laws of the Provinces and from various Imperial Statutes relating to Local Government, and local boards of health which indicate the direction in which municipal institutions must grow, and what other departments of human conduct they may be made to embrace. These bodies have power to remove nuisances; to prevent the introduction of disease; to prevent the spread of disease; to make sanitary regulations; to regulate trades; to make new streets; to determine the character of buildings which may be erected; to provide proper drainage; to change the location of a market; to make regulations with reference to offensive trades; to make provision as to the structure of the walls of buildings; and to make the necessary provisions for securing compliance with its own sanitary regulations. They may insist upon the drainage of buildings, and upon the right of inspection; so that the health of the community may not be endangered. They may require the deposit of plans for the laying out of streets and in the erection of houses. They may order houses to be taken down that are in contravention of their bye-laws. They may blow up or otherwise destroy buildings to prevent the progress of a conflagration. They may order the destruction of unsound meats. They may, upon the same principle, regulate the erection of factories and workshops, and to see that proper provision is made for the protection of the lives, the health, and the morals of those employed. They may make laws for the protection of apprentices, of women, and of children. They may regulate the hours of labor. They may forbid manual labor on Sunday. They may prevent the obstruction of highways, punish prize fighting, and cruelty to animals, because all these are measures dealing with the relations of the members of the community to each other, in their civil capacity. They are among the civil rights which our constitution assigns to the Provinces. I am opposed to legislation here, because we have not the legal authority to legislate. Factory legislation is very important. The principle upon which it proceeds is, in my opinion, thoroughly sound; but our constitution assigns to the Provinces legislative control over the subject, and we ought not to deceive those who are specially interested, by professing to do what we have not the power to do legally, and what would only result in useless and costly litigation. There is no difference in principle between legislating against laboring on Sunday, and legislating to forbid parties engaging to work in a factory more than a certain number of hours on a week day. We have admitted that it belongs to the Local legislature to say whether the whole community shall or shall not be allowed to work more than six days in the week, or not. It equally belongs to the Local legislature to say whether those who are engaged in factories, shall be allowed to labor more than ten hours in a day. I think such legislation has proved advantageous, both to the employer and employed. It is desirable, not because manufacturers are hard and exacting, but because all will be compelled to follow the practice of those who are most exacting; and what is reasonable and proper, in order to be generally acted upon, must have the sanction of law. I have no doubt that if the hours of labor were shortened, the community would gain by the result. No doubt a man will do more work in sixty hours than in fifty-four, but if he labors the ten hours a day throughout the year, it is extremely doubtful whether he will do more than if he labors but nine hours a day; and it is certain that he will do less in a lifetime. There will be in his case, less vigor, and less intelligence and fewer years. It is by the general intelligence of the workingman that new inventions are made, by which the power of labor is indefinitely increased. For these reasons, I think, that the subject of factory labor is deserving of the most careful attention. But this attention is most demanded at the hands of those who are authorised to legislate on the subject of "Property and Civil Rights." To them it belongs and not to us; and I trust that nothing will be done to hinder or impede necessary legislation, by raising any dispute upon the question of jurisdiction, or by undertaking to legislate here. The subject is placed by the constitution under the exclusive control of Provincial legislatures, and to them we must look for whatever legislation may be required. The stand taken by the Secretary of State, and by the Prime Minister, shows that they can no longer claim jurisdiction for this Parliament, but must leave it to be dealt with by the Local legislatures, where it rightfully belongs.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. After hearing the very able speech made by my hon. friend from Cornwall (Mr. Bergin), and the very able speech also of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, I must say that it would hardly be the proper thing to take a vote upon this matter this evening. I think the hon. gentleman who has brought this measure before Parliament has given very strong reasons from his point of view for the Bill as he has laid it before the House, but on the other hand the hon. member who has just sat down has tried to show, and I have no doubt has established with many, that there are grave doubts, at least about a large portion of this Bill being brought in its proper place by being brought into this House. Under these circstances, I think it would be better for this House to give time to hon. members to consider and weigh well this measure and the reasons that have been given on both sides, and under these circumstances I would move that this debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman received no further information of the state of affairs in the North-West?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The news we have received from Battleford—that is, in continuation of the news given to the House by the FirstMinister to-day—is to this effect: that a number of Indians who had not gone to the reserve with the others have been prowling about, and that there is a rumor which has not yet been confirmed, and which I hope will not be confirmed, that an old man, the repairer of the Government telegraph line, had been killed by these Indians. The other news we had from the head man at Battleford, shows that the volunteers, as well as the other parties who have taken refuge in the barracks, are confident that they can hold their ground and wait for reinforcements that will reach them at the proper time. This is the news, and I think the rumors that have been carried into the House from outside of very grave events in that direction are not well founded, at all events the Government have received no news of that kind.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am sincerely glad to hear it I am sure, but before we adjourn the House will remember that at six o'clock a question of very great importance was under discussion as to which one or two members of this House expressed their opinion. Now, I cannot reconcile it to my own sense of duty as a member to let the House adjourn without saying, that I, at least, for my part, regret exceedingly to hear that the Government did not deem it to be their duty to apply to

the United States Government for authority to move troops, if necessary, by the southern route. I fully admit that the Canadian Pacific Railway have done all that possibly can be done, in all human probability, to facilitate the transport of our troops; but I do submit most earnestly for the consideration of the Government, that this is no time for false sentiments or for adherence to red tape or antiquated etiquette. Every gentleman here knows perfectly well that, let the Canadian Pacific Railway Company do all that mortal man can do, with three gaps, at least, if not four, between this and Winnipeg, it is utterly impossible that the Government, by any exertions, can bring their troops across by the northern shore, in anything like the time that they might, had they made arrangements with the United States Government. Now, I am aware that in former times the United States Government did not, on a memorable occasion, consent to facilitate the progress of our troops; but I feel convinced that at present, and more particularly while there may be going on an Indian outbreak of large dimensions, the United States Government would not refuse to afford those facilities. Had it been possible to have used that southern route, the hon. gentleman knows, and we all know, that at least 1,000 troops who are now on the route from these Provinces, could have been in Winnipeg to-day—in all human probability they might have been in Winnipeg to-day. Now it would be a matter of the very greatest importance, and it would have added enormously to the strength of our position there, if our troops could have been in Winnnipeg this day, and I say that they might to-day have been there. I say, also, that it is quite possible—and I hope the Government will bear it in mind—that at this season, when a thaw may happen at any moment, that the southern route may be very much the best we can use. I recollect well a few months ago, in the month of September, crossing over—not this part of the route, but the route from Port Arthur to Winnipeg, our progress was interrupted nearly two days by a severe rain. Now, the hon. gentlemen must remember, and I think the country will expect that they should remember, that under the circumstances, days may mean weeks, or may mean months. I wish to impress upon them the importance of making the attempt, at any rate. They cannot control the United States Government, but they can at least enquire of them whether they will give their consent to take troops in case of need by the southern route.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I must be excused if I do not give an answer to the hon. gentleman. The Government feel as much as the House themselves the responsibility that is resting upon them, but they must be left to their own judgment in this matter, whether they communicate to the House what they are doing or not. There are matters that we may communicate to the House, and those we do communicate; but there are others which, though we may be pressed to do so by the hon. gentlemen opposite, we must be excused if we do not communicate. They are of such a nature that it would not be for the public interest to do so, and of course we must rely upon the support of Parliament in being reticent in this matter.

Mr. DAWSON. If the news which has been received to-day is correct, as to the progress of the corps that came up from Quebec along the North Shore, the difference in time in getting to Winnipeg will not be very great. It was reported that the troops reached Heron Bay last night. Heron Bay is within less than 100 miles of Nepigon Bay, and with the arrangements made they should get to Nepigon in less than a day from that place. Once at Nepigon there is uninterupted railway communication without any further breaks clear through to Winnipeg, and away west beyond. Now, I do not think the difference in time will be very great; and I think it is a matter of very great importance that these troops should have been sent through our own country, and not through a foreign country; for many members in this House will remember that on a former occasion when we sought to send our troops through the United States, through a short canal at Sault Ste Marie between the two great lakes, that canal was shut against us, causing us immense delay, inconvenience, and expense, in getting the troops through otherwise.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, but the state of things is very much changed since then, as we have it on the authority of the hon. Minister who has just spoken, for, on the 23rd March last, he made this statement in the House:

"On the other hand, I must say that, so far as the relations between the United States Government and Canada are concerned, the most amicable relations have existed and exist now. Whenever the United States Government have wished to cause some of their troops to pass over our territory for survey, or for some other reason, special permission has been asked and has been granted, in the same way as the request has been made, and I have no doubt that, if a similar request were made on the part of our Government, the same permission would be given. Of course, there was an allusion made to the time when we had troops to send to Manitoba, and to the fact that these troops were not allowed to go through the Sault Ste. Marie Canal. That may be, but things at all events have changed since that period, and I must say that the relations between the two Governments are of the most friendly nature possible."

Mr. WOODWORTH. The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), and his friends must know that if the troops went through the United States they would have to make two breaks, at least, one at Chicago, where they would have to join the Chicago and North-Western, or the Chicago, Minneapolis and St. Paul, and then after they got to St. Paul they would have to change cars again. Besides that they would have to go through a country where there are certainly many secret organisations, and some of these cranks or crazy men belonging to them might possibly attack the troops, which would possibly stir up strife between this country and the United States, and only make "confusion worse confounded." With all due deference to the hon. gentlemen opposite, and without imputing any improper motives to them, I do think that the Ministry, composed, as it is, of as able men as there are in the Dominion, with the solicitude and anxiety they have, and the hourly consultations that are taking place—I think the Opposition might at least allow the Government to act unhampered and without unduly criticising them as to the course which they ought to pursue in a crisis like the present; and let them, as the Minister of Public Works says, pursue the course that they think best fitted to put down this unhappy rebellion in the North-West. Let the Opposition assist them all they can, and then if they have any complaints to make against the Government, after the insurrection has been suppressed, let them make those complaints here in Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. While we are assisting the Government as much as we can, a part of our duty is to assist them with our counsel and advice, and that we have given.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The hon. member for West Durham made a remark to the hon. Minister of Customs last night, which is a very significant one. Sometimes the tender mercies of the wicked are cruel.

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before the House adjourns I desire to call your attention to an article which has appeared in a Quebec newspaper called *Le Nouvelliste*.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation.) I see that the hon. leader of the Opposition is laboring under an error which is pretty common, and which is not far from holding me responsible for that article. The author of the article in question, after having reproduced and commented upon what *La Minerve* and the *Mail* say about the probable causes of the troubles in the North-West, concludes by a banter aimed

at one of the members of this House who commands a battalion which has been ordered to the front, and the writer ends by a sort of insinuation, or a sort of appeal, to the volunteers of Quebec, calling upon them to desert the flag. Mr. Speaker, the fact itself that I now rise to denounce the article in question must prove to you that I am not the author of it, and that I entirely disown it; it does not at all express my sentiments. Having, myself, the honor to command one of the rural battalions of that Province, if the authorities would call me to the front I should be the first to run to the defence of my country. This article furnishes me the occasion to answer to a great many charges which have been brought against me on various occasions. I am not at all the editor of *Le Nouvelliste*. It is true, I have a right to publish whatever I feel inclined to write in that journal, and I have exercised that right on several occasions. I like to take the responsibility of what belongs to me, but, on the other hand, I am bound to say that I am not the editor of that paper. The only right I have is to insert my writings in it whenever I feel disposed to do it. I cannot appreciate the article to which I have just alluded, except by saying that it is a disgrace to our nationality, and I think that every man of sound judgment, every man who loves his country, will be ready to disown it, as I do myself.

Mr. COURSOL. I have had much pleasure in listening to the remarks made by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry), and if I address myself to the House in the English language, it is because we know that the article in question will be translated in the English newspapers. The article is calculated to do a great deal of harm. It is unjust, unfair and unwarrantable. If I rise, Mr. Speaker, on this occasion, it is to protest against such an article and to defend the honor of two members of this House, two gentlemen whom the House respects for their character, for their knowledge, for their ability, and especially for their independence of character. Why, Sir, the paper in question said that either Mr. Ouimet—I presume it alludes to Lieutenant-Colonel Ouimet, member for Laval—or Lieutenant-Colonel Amyot, member for Bellechasse, were the only two French members of this House who had been called to organise battalions and proceed to the front. Both of those gentlemen know their duty as soldiers, and they obeyed the command; and to charge those gentlemen with having private interests and with acting so as to obtain seats on the Treasury benches, is to cast a slur, an aspersion on their character; and the opinion expressed in that paper, that French Canadians should follow the advice given by it, is injurious to the French nationality. The French Canadians are loyal. The French Canadians are prepared to defend their country. They have done so already, and when a French Canadian becomes a soldier to defend his country, he is prepared to do it at any time and at any cost. If those two members left their seats, left their families, left their homes, left their business and left everything dear to them in this world to go to a land far away and expose themselves to all kinds of danger, surely they should not be aspersed and attacked in this manner in their absence. If Mr. Ouimet and Mr Amyot were here, they could defend themselves. But I thought it was time to rise in my seat and protest against such an attack made upon them and defend them. I thought that the article might cause some harm if it was not protested against. It may possibly induce some French Canadian to act in the manner suggested by the paper; but I believe it will not. I know that from one end of the country to the other, French Canadians are prepared, at all times, to be friends of peace, order and loyalty. I know that whenever a regiment of French Canadians may be ordered to the front it will go, and it will go willingly and cheerfully and be prepared to defend the honor of their flag, and, if possible, prevent bloodshed in other parts of the country. I say so feelingly.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). I know Colonel Ouimet personally, I know the battalion he commands, and I am sure that on all occasions that officer will do his duty and the battalion will do their duty. I speak as a brother in arms. I am an old volunteer myself, and I feel that if my services are required, although my age might prevent me doing as much as those who have the advantage of younger years, I will be prepared to go at once and perform my duty.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 2nd April, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE EASTER ADJOURNMENT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that when this House adjourns this day it do stand adjourned until Tuesday next, the 7th instant, at three o'clock in the afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

ARREARS DUE ARGYLE HIGHLANDERS.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Victoria) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to pay the arrears due the Argyle Highlanders, Military District No. 9, for services performed at Lingan, County of Cape Breton, in the year 1883, and when?

Mr. CARON. The Lingan volunteers were called out under the law in aid of the civil power, the municipality being responsible for their pay. Under these circumstances it is not the intention of the Government to pay the amounts to which the hon. gentleman refers.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—LEVELS, GRADES TANGENTS, &c.

Mr. BLAKE asked, With reference to each 100 mile section of the Canadian Pacific Railway from the summit of the Rockies to Moody—what is the number and the aggregate length,—1. Of the levels? 2. Of the grades from 0 to 10 feet, from 10 to 20 feet, and so on, by gradations of 10 feet, with the average grade? 3. Of the tangents? 4. Of the curves of each degree, with the average curve, and the total number of degrees of curvature.

Mr. POPE. Of course I have not the information, and it is impossible to get it, unless the hon. gentleman gives notice. In any case it could not be brought down this Session.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—EQUIPMENT.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the valuation of Intercolonial Railway equipment given to the House is the cost or the value at present prices of the property? Whether it comprises anything more than rolling stock; and, if so, to what amount?

Mr. POPE. It is the cost price, and it only refers to the rolling stock.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—DUTIES ON ROLLING STOCK.

Mr. BLAKE asked, What amount has the Canadian Pacific Railway Company paid in duties on rolling stock in each year since the contract was let?

Mr. BOWELL. It is impossible to answer that question, as the Department keeps no special accounts with importers as to the number of any articles they may import. If the hon. gentleman desires to move for the information, I will send to the different ports and endeavor to get it, but it will certainly not be obtained in time for this Session.

CUSTOMS POLICE IN NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. FORBES asked, Who are the Customs detectives or police for the Province of Nova Scotia? What provincial divisions are given to each? How are they paid, by a commission or salary? If by salary, what is its amount and by whom paid? What are their duties and what are their instructions?

Mr. BOWELL. There are no detectives or police in the Province of Nova Scotia connected with the Customs Department; consequently, that answers the other portion of the question.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. BLAKE. I would ask the hon. leader of the Government whether he has any further communication to make with reference to the condition of things in the North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no other information to be given that I am aware of. At Battleford, the houses outside of the barracks have been raided and plundered of any provisions and food there was in them. The officers in command at Battleford, saw some of the Indians carrying off some goods from the houses. They limbered up one of their guns and fired a few shots, and the Indians ran away. There is no communication from Col. Irvine as yet. I believe the river is absolutely impassable. I received a telegram from Mr. Dewdney this morning, from Regina, stating that all is quiet among the Indians along the line of the railway, and that Pieapot, whose loyalty was more than doubted at one time, was with him at the time the telegram was sent, and was willing to move his Indians south to the boundary altogether, in order to get outside of the scrape.

Mr. BLAKE. I see in a paper this morning the following:

"The Hon. Mr. Royal, member of the House of Commons for the county of Provencher, starts to-day for the North-West. He is sent there by the Government on a diplomatic mission to the half-breeds to enquire about their grievances."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Royal is going up of his own accord. He told me he was going during the recess, that he might see some of the half-breeds or Indians whom he knew very well. That was the statement he himself made to me, but there is no arrangement of any kind with the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. Have any arrangements been made for chaplains to accompany the forces?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know that there are chaplains.

Mr. POPE. I think there are some.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Minister of Militia will be able to answer that question. I know there are plenty of doctors to attend to the body, but I do not know that there are chaplains.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When the hon. gentleman spoke of the river being impassable, did he mean both branches of the Saskatchewan, or which?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the south branch. For instance, at Clark's Crossing the river is quite impassable at this moment, I am told.

SUPERINTENDENTS OF LETTER CARRIERS.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved that the resolution (p. 270) to provide for the appointment of one or more superintendents of letter carriers be read the second time and concurred in.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does this continue to give unlimited power of appointment? I remember that in the discussion in committee a good deal was said as to the desirability of fixing the number of superintendents, and I understood, if my recollection is right, that the hon. Secretary of State said he would consider the propriety of fixing the number.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman does not remember exactly correctly. This resolution is only to fix the salary. The Postmaster General said he would probably be obliged in the course of the year to appoint one or two. The number will be mentioned at the time the estimates come down; but this resolution is only to say that when they are appointed the salary shall be higher than $600, which is the limit of the salary of a letter carrier.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the resolution goes further than that.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I understand that the resolution goes further, but when the Bill comes my hon. friend will see that it will only provide in the schedule what the salary shall be. There will be no provision in the Bill saying what number shall be appointed.

Motion agreed to, and resolution concurred in.

CIVIL SERVICE ACTS, 1882, 1883 AND 1884.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved that the resolutions (p. 273) respecting the Civil Service Acts, 1882, 1883 and 1884, be read the second time and concurred in.

Mr. MULOCK. I had hoped, after the discussions we had in the committee, that the hon. Secretary of State would have seen his way to make some modification of these resolutions. I took the liberty at that time to make some suggestions which the hon. Secretary of State expressed himself as approving of to some extent. I thought at the time that he was sincere; but as for any proofs of sincerity I do not see that he has at all modified his policy. The resolutions deal with a scheme for civil service examination which I do not think is the best one under the circumstances, nor do I think that the cost is as low as is necessary. I need not trouble the House with repeating the objections I made before, further than to express my regret that the hon. gentleman, the Secretary of State, has not seen fit to adopt any of them. However, in case I should not then have made myself sufficiently clear, I will again, before it is too late, mention what I think would be the best practicable scheme for carrying out this work. The subjects for examination are, I understand, principally subjects that are taught in the ordinary schools of the country. It is true a certain portion of the examinations, such as the examinations for promotion, are not of a technical character, and the ordinary examiners do not hold them. This scheme therefore does not get over that difficulty. With regard then to the general system of entrance or qualifying examinations, I think that a scheme such as the following might be adopted. Let there be one person in, say, Ottawa, who can act as registrar and will prepare the questions. Let those questions be sent to several points and there delivered to the candidate for examination. The answers given by the candidates and the values of their answers could be transmitted to the registrar at Ottawa, who will make up and promptly publish the results. In this way the examinations will cost a great deal less and the result will be made known much sooner. I am told that it has happened in civil service examinations,

that months have elapsed before the candidates received the information as to whether they had passed or not. That is a very unfair way of dealing with the candidates, and should not be allowed to continue. By adopting the scheme I have outlined, the results may be made known in a week from the commencement of the examinations. I have made enquiries and I find that the examinations last over five days. Now, if the system I suggest were adopted and examiners appointed for the time being to conduct examinations, they would deliver out the first set of papers the first day, another set the next day, and so on, and they could proceed each day with the preceding day's papers and hand in the preceding day's work. So that at the end of the examination, the examiners would be only one day behind in the matter of making up the results, and in two or three days more all the candidates would know whether they had or had not passed. I am sure the Secretary of State cannot justify the present system, if it is to be continued, so far as the want of despatch is concerned. To say that it is necessary the results of the examinations should not be made known for months after the candidates have undergone examination is in itself enough to condemn the present system. I hope the hon. the Secretary of State will be able to review this matter and will not force his resolutions through in this way. I would again say a word on behalf of a class of our people who, I think, ought to be considered in this scheme. I refer to the teaching profession. They are eminently qualified to conduct these examinations, competent men are to be found in every part of the whole Dominion. One of the greatest institutions of Canada is our school system, and there is not a city, town, or hamlet, that does not to-day supply a good teacher well qualified to impart instruction in the subjects for the examinations to enter the civil service. A great many of those men who have retired from the teaching profession are available for this work, and I think it is due to this great class of our citizens that they should be recognised in this way, if the public service should not in any way suffer. On the contrary, instead of suffering, it would be greatly benefited by their appointment; and I cannot approve of resolutions which contemplate the appointment of more permanent officers in the service of the Government—officers who in a short time will be applying for more salary and in due time to be superannuated, whilst by the scheme I propose there will be no permanent appointment, the examiner being appointed but for the year. It may be that he will be reappointed, but he has no guarantee of reappointment. The examination is not his whole occupation, and thus there is a means at all times of improving the system, and there is a guarantee that we will not have fixed, permanent charges upon the revenue whenever it may be deemed desirable to make a change. On all these accounts, I think the scheme is a good one for the purpose of examination and for the purpose of economy; and I hope to appeal to the Secretary of State to see if he cannot modify his resolutions.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not think I can yield to the requests of my hon. friend, at least to the whole of them. The system has been established after a long trial and after a good deal of study on the part of those who before me were at the head of the Department, and it exists also in England and the United States. The suggestion of my hon. friend that teachers should be selected to be sub-examiners might be taken into consideration and I do not say we will not adopt it. They are a class of people who deserve to be encouraged, but my hon. friend must not forget that those sub-examiners have nothing to do with the correction of the papers; they have only to look after the examination, they have only to see that the examinations are conducted without any fraud. All the papers are collected without any names attached, being simply numbered, and are sent to the central bureau where the number of points are determined according to the efficiency of the officers. My hon. friend suggests that a different period of the year should be selected for the examination. I have submitted his suggestion to the bureau, and I think we might arrange in our regulations so as to meet his view. As to the system itself, I do not think it should be changed. I do not believe there will be any gain, either in efficiency or in economy, by adopting the system proposed by my hon. friend.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman, the Secretary of State, says this system has been established after a long trial. I do not quite see that the phrase "long trial" can be applied to the experience we have had of this system in Canada, for it is only a very few years since it was established at all as a preliminary to appointments in the civil service. I do not see how they can therefore claim that long experience has proved the wisdom of the present system of appointing examiners. He goes on to point out that what the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has suggested in regard to school teachers only applies to the case of those who are appointed as sub-examiners, who have nothing to do with the preparation of the examination papers, but have only to do with seeing that the examination itself is properly carried out. I fancy, however, that the hon. member for North York intended to suggest that there are school teachers who are qualified, not only to act as examiners, but to prepare the examination papers. I understood my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) to state that there were teachers qualified to act as examiners, not merely as sub-examiners.

Mr. MULOCK. What I meant to say was that one person can prepare the papers, because of course all the candidates are obliged to pass on the same set of questions. I do not care what you call him; he could act as registrar and prepare the papers. Those papers would be distributed throughout the country at various central convenient points, the candidates would assemble at those respective points, and there write and hand in their answers to persons who would preside at those examinations and read these answers and value them, and make their returns to the central officer.

Mr. CASEY. It seems I was partly correct only in my interpretation of what the hon. gentleman said. He means that the papers should be prepared by one authority but examined by those who actually conducted the examination at each place. There might be objections to that plan. It might be better, perhaps, if all the answers to questions were valued by the same person who prepared the papers. There is certainly no high school teacher, and I believe there are very few public school teachers, in Ontario at all events, and I do not suppose the standard is much lower elsewhere, who are not quite capable of preparing any such papers as were prepared last year. I hold in my hand the report of the Board of Civil Service Examiners containing all the questions which were submitted last year, and I see nothing here that is not within the range of an ordinary public school education, I see no paper that a public school teacher holding a first-class certificate in Ontario could not readily prepare, and the answers to which he could not readily value. I think that, in objecting to the plan of my hon. friend from North York, of engaging examiners for the occasion, the hon. the Secretary of State confuses the idea of a Civil Service Board with the idea of a board of examiners. He understands that in England the examiners are permanently appointed. Speaking now from recollection, for I have not looked over the reports for a year or two, but speaking from the last report of the Civil Service Commission which I saw, that is not my recollection. The Civil Service Board in

England is a permanent establishment, but they do not prepare the papers, they engage examiners.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Here they do both.

Mr. CASEY. Yes, there is the difference. The Civil Service Board there does not prepare the papers. Here the board is charged with the double duty of taking some general charge of admission to the service and preparing the questions for examination. I think the English plan is the better one.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. And more costly too.

Mr. CASEY. Perhaps it is more costly, and perhaps it is not. The English Civil Service Board controls the service. A Minister in England in a corresponding position to that of my hon. friend could not appoint a sessional clerk or a charwoman or a messenger about the English Parliament buildings. All that is done by the English Civil Service Board. They have absolute control of appointments to the service, although these appointments are confirmed in the last instance by Order in Council. No Minister can appoint of his own motion and without the recommendation of the board, anybody to the civil service of England, and the civil service there includes many grades below what we are accustomed to call the civil service here. So that the board there have certain duties outside of conducting examinations, and, if we had a board here performing those duties, and also a board of examiners, we would have to pay them both a very considerable salary; but our Civil Service Board here has really nothing to do except to prepare the examination papers. I think a very small board, clothed simply with the power of calling upon this or that distinguished scholar in the country to prepare examination papers and with the duty of having these papers submitted to the candidates and the answers returned to this examiner for consideration need not be costly, need not be paid nearly as much as it is proposed to pay the present board. It is pretty well established, from the facts given now and formerly by my hon. friend from North York, who has special means of knowing about such matters from his connection with the Toronto University, that, by simply engaging some college professor or high school master, or even some public school master to prepare the papers and look over the answers, the examination could be conducted at less expense than it is now. I think the Government are making a mistake in not adopting the English system so far as to engage examiners for the occasion and get the best talent in the country for what they were able to offer. There are some other objections to these resolutions, but, as they are to be incorporated in the Bill which has yet to pass its second reading, and can be better discussed in committee, I shall say no more about it at present, except to support the protest made by my hon. friend from North York.

Mr. FOSTER. In trying to follow the hon. gentleman who has just sat down and the hon. gentleman from North York, I cannot find that they quite agree with each other, and scarcely know what they are driving at. If the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat wishes to have a board to act as the board does in England, and then to have examiners to do the duty of examiners in England, that involves a change in the policy of the Civil Service Act, which we are not now discussing. If we were discussing a change in the policy of the Civil Service Act, a change which would go in the direction of making it even less political than it is, I should be able to support suggestions in that line a very great length. I believe that the ideal civil service will be reached, and will only be reached, when we have eliminated party politics from it as far as possible; but, as it is not upon the policy of the Civil Service Act that the discussion is taking place, I shall say nothing about that. There is an objection against appointing local boards of examiners, these same local boards to have the arrangement of questions——

Mr. CASEY. That was not what was proposed at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Upon which the candidates are to be examined.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, it appears he did misunderstand my views at all events. I did not propose to establish local boards of examiners at all, but I proposed that the examiners should not be permanently appointed, but that the Civil Service Board should call upon so and so this year, or the next year, as they chose, to prepare examination papers, and that the duties of the board should consist of submitting these to the candidates and returning them to the examiners to be valued.

Mr. FOSTER. Then was it the hon. gentleman from North York who proposed that the examiners should be appointed locally and should have both the duty of preparing the questions and examining the papers?

Mr. CASEY. Only examining the papers.

Mr. FOSTER. I said at first that I could not quite catch the drift of the remarks of the hon. gentleman, but there is this which is an objection to having local parties appointed and changing the parties for the purpose of arranging questions for the examination of applicants for the civil service, that the kind of questions that ought to be set for applicants in the civil service is not such probably as the greater scholars would set and as those who are engaged in university work or even in college work would be prone to set. I think that any board of examiners who attempt to arrange questions for civil service applicants will probably make mistakes at first, and it is only by becoming aware of their mistakes and by making their questions for examination more fitting the next time that they will come to have questions in some way proportionate to the needs of the service and which will form a sufficient test of those who apply. I believe that a permanent board, taking this matter up from year to year, seeing each year the defects which may have become apparent to them from the preceding year's operations, will then be able to amend their list until at last they get the questions which are most desirable. I should also think it well to keep the civil service examiners as far as possible removed from local influences, so that they would be relieved from even the suspicion of being liable to favor certain localities. I do not mean favoring certain localities designedly. But you take for instance a man in an educational institution in a certain Province; he perhaps has been the teacher or the professor or the tutor of a great many men who may come up; his teaching runs in a certain direction and this may very well make it easier for those in his locality to understand the drift of his questions and to answer them far better than those who have not been accustomed to his teaching. I think if we keep them from these local influences we will avoid suspicion of favoritism; and we will avoid that other difficulty which I have mentioned and which will put those from other localities at a disadvantage. I say again, as I said at the beginning, that whenever a well devised scheme shall be put forward for removing the civil service of Canada as far as possible from party and political influences, I shall be ready to give my voice and vote in favor of it. I consider the patronage which is thrown upon persons in Parliament in connection with these official appointments, is always an injury to the persons themselves and is really one of the most disagreeable things in political life.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad to find such an able and eloquent assistant in the person of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken.

Mr. FOSTER. I don't wish the hon. gentleman to look upon me as an assistant.

Mr. CASEY. I certainly cannot look upon him as a leader in this particular matter, because the system of non-political civil service which he advocates, is one which I have been advocating here for ten years, and in connection with which I claim that I have made some progress in having induced both parties in this country to advance even as far as this Bill goes. I have great hopes that with the assistance of the hon. gentleman on a future occasion, and with the assistance of many more who, I know, feel as he does in this matter, quite apart from all questions of politics, we shall be able to induce both parties to take a step further and do away with political patronage altogether.

On the fourth resolution,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT I want to call attention to this fourth resolution. It reads as follows:

"4. Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that when the duties of any superior officer or clerk, during his absence or by reason of his demise, but not through superannuation, are continuously performed by an officer or clerk of an inferior class or junior rank during a period of more than three months, the officer or clerk performing such duties may, on the recommendation of the deputy head, concurred in by the head of the Department, by Order in Council, and provided that funds are available under Parliamentary vote for such payment, receive in addition to his ordinary pay the difference between such ordinary pay and the pay of the officer or clerk whose duties he has performed for the time he has performed such duties."

Now, I think that is very objectionable, both in practice and as establishing a principle. I think that if you put a junior clerk to discharge the duties that are performed by a superior officer, you have no right whatever to give him the pay of that superior officer; and I foresee that under cover of this, very grave abuses are likely to be practiced in the service. I have no doubt whatever that under cover of this men of inferior rank in the service who have no right whatever to receive large pay, will be found on many occasions to be put in positions where they will receive a pay far beyond that which their standing in the service entitles them to. I think, Sir, that none of these officers, as a rule, will be called on to do any more duty—at least will not do any harder work—when they are doing the duties of the superior officer, than they are in their ordinary position. It does not by any means follow that because a man is doing the duties of an officer higher in the service than himself, that he is compelled to work more hours. I do not think the principle is good, but at any rate I object entirely to the idea that he has the right to receive the full difference. I think at most, if the hon. gentleman insists on pushing this provision, he should provide that the Governor in Council might have the power to make some addition to the salary, but that it should in no case exceed one-half the difference between the ordinary pay of the inferior officer and the pay of the superior officer whose duties he was performing.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is the law now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In any case, I say that if it is the law now, it is a very objectionable clause in the law. I say that if an inferior clerk is allowed to continue for many months, and perhaps for several years, in the receipt of a very much larger salary than he is entitled to, the sooner the law is altered the better. In that respect I am very much obliged to the hon. gentleman for calling our attention to it, if it is the case, and I think it opens the door to an abuse that ought to be remedied.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It was the law when the hon. gentleman himself was in power.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Very possibly it may be so.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The only change we made was to make the resolution more intelligible. I think my hon. friend will see that the change is an improvement—it is to prevent, if an officer was superannuated, that another officer should have the right to claim the difference in the salaries; because before his nomination to the office of the person who had been superannuated, this inferior officer might claim the difference. I wanted to take away this privilege, so that when the head of a Department superannuates a civil servant, he will have to wait for the appointment of another officer, and no one shall have the right to claim the difference between the salaries for performing the duties of the higher office. The other change in the law is this: We have added the words "by reason of demise," which are not in the law as it now stands. I understand that if an inferior officer, by reason of the death of a superior officer, is obliged to perform the duties of the superior officer, for more than three months, he has a right to be paid the difference between the salaries of the two positions. That is the only alteration proposed in the law. There is no danger and there has not been any, with one exception, perhaps, that vacancies will remain very long open. Generally the positions are filled rapidly to meet the necessities of the service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose this is not the time to move an amendment, or at any rate, that an amendment had better be moved in committee. If the law is as stated, I think it should be amended. I do not propose, not having examined the several Civil Service Acts to controvert the statements of the Secretary of State, within whose province this matter lies; but I believe an abuse might be committed—although I do not say that abuses have been committed, either by the late or the present Government—and I will submit an amendment at a subsequent stage.

Motion agreed to, and resolutions concurred in.

DUNDAS AND WATERLOO ROAD.

House resolved itself into Committee to consider resolution (p. 451) to give effect to an agreement made by the Department of Public Works with Dr. Allen Holford Walker, for the sale and transfer to him of the Dundas and Waterloo Road.—Sir Hector Langevin.

Resolution considered in committee, and concurred in.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 120) to give effect to an agreement made between Dr. Allen Holford Walker and the Public Works Department for the sale and transfer to him of the Dundas and Waterloo Road.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INFECTIOUS OR CONTAGIOUS DISEASES AFFECTING ANIMALS.

Mr. POPE moved second reading of Bill (No. 41) respecting Infectious or Contagious Diseases affecting Animals. He said: The Government have found in working the Act that the provisions are not sufficient to enforce the penalties and to carry it out. The Bill, therefore, contains clauses for the collection of penalties, and in order to enforce the Act. That is its object.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

PROPOSED COLONIAL AND INDIAN EXHIBITION.

Mr. POPE moved that the House resolve itself into committee to consider certain resolutions (p. 451) respecting the proposed Colonial and Indian Exhibition to be held in London in the year 1886. He said: I may say that these resolutions refer to the Indian and Colonial Exhibition to be held next year. In the course of

correspondence with the High Commissioner we were asked to join in a guarantee fund, of which India was to guarantee $100,000, and we were asked to guarantee £10,000 sterling, or $50,000. We gave an assurance that we would submit such a proposition to the House. I may say that in the case of the Antwerp Exhibition we had to pay a considerable sum of money for space—about $5,000. In this case we have nothing to pay for space, and we are supposed not to have anything to pay at all. The exhibition is generally expected to be self sustaining. It was deemed better, however, to raise a guarantee fund. India has promised $100,000, and as I said before we promised that the $50,000 which they asked us to guarantee should be asked from the House.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the proportions that the other colonies pay?

Mr. POPE. The proportion that India pays is $100,000, but I cannot say for the others.

Resolutions to be reported.

EXPLOSIVE SUBSTANCES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the second reading of Bill (No. 95), respecting explosive substances. He said: This Bill is based on an Imperial Statute lately passed, and it is in fact and substance the same Act. The discovery or invention of these explosive substances has greatly endangered life and property, and all European countries and the United States as well, have found it necessary to adopt stringent regulations for the protection of life and property, and the prevention and punishment of the improper use of these dangerous explosives. I shall only take the second reading at present, and shall not ask the House to go into the committee until after recess.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course there can be no objection to legislation of this kind. I observe, however, from the useful memorandum appended to the Bill that there are considerable differences in form, if not in substance, from the English Bill. I have not been able to refer to the English Bill, and I would ask the hon. gentleman when we go into committee to give some more definite information as to what the differences are.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I presume it is a fact that there are differences in language, though not in substance, and it was for that reason that I did not ask to go into committee at once.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

BRIDGES, BOOMS, &c., IN NAVIGABLE WATERS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 101) to amend the law respecting bridges, booms, and other works constructed over or in navigable waters under the authority of Provincial Acts. He said: As I stated the other day when I introduced the Bill, its object is to enact a new clause which had been left out of the previous Act, and perhaps I had better read the memorandum which I have upon that subject, which will show how the case stands:

"On the 14th of February, 1882, a petition was received from some 40 merchants of Weymouth, N.S., complaining that the bridge built by the Western Counties Railway Company over the Sissiboo River was a serious hindrance to navigation, on account of the pier being too short, and asking that 100 feet be added to the length of the pier.

"The chief engineer caused an examination to be made and reported (28,517) that the bridge in its present condition was an obstruction to navigation, and recommended that the company be ordered to extend the pier 100 feet up stream. The company was written to but declined to take any action, and the Department of Justice was then asked what steps this Department should take to compel the railway to make the required addition to the pier.

"The Deputy Minister of Justice (54,985) reported to the effect that the company could not be compelled to do anything to the bridge for the purpose of improving the navigation of the river. He explained that at the time the bridge was built (1876) the Act, 39 Vic., chap. 15, was in force, by the fourth section of which it was provided that a railway company shall as to any work constructed under the Act be subject to the Act 35 Vic., chap. 35, "An Act respecting Bridges." 39 Vic., chap. 15, became section 71 of the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, and was repealed by that Act. The fourth sub-section of section 71 Consolidated Railway Act makes the same provision as that made by 39 Vic., chap. 15, section 4.

"The 71st section of the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, was repealed by the 10th section of 45 Vic, chap. 10, 1882, which latter Act makes no reference to 35 Vic., chap. 25 (the Bridge Act), and contains no provision similar to section 8 of 35 Vic., chap. 25. This provision of section 8, of 35 Vic, chap. 25, is to the effect that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council has power to direct an engineer to inspect a bridge, and upon his report to condemn the bridge, or any portion of it, or any works or appliances connected with it: and, with the approval of the Governor in Council, to have any alterations made, or to order a new bridge. The Deputy Minister of Justice expresses a doubt as to whether this clause, even if it was still in force, would apply to alterations in railway bridges for the purpose of improving navigation; and suggests the consideration of the question whether 45 Vic., chap. 10, should not be amended. The Department of Justice was asked to prepare a draft Bill, which is now submitted."

The Bill is to this effect:

"The Governor in Council may, from time to time, make, revoke or alter such orders or regulations as he deems expedient for the purpose of maintaining existing facilities for navigation, or for securing better facilities therefor, respecting any work to which either of the said Acts apply, or of which the plan and site were or are hereafter approved under any Act of the Parliament of Canada; and the local authority, company or person constructing, owning or in possession of any such work shall be subject to such orders or regulations.

"The ninth section of the Act first herein mentioned is amended by striking out the words, 'or the River St. John.'"

So that this Bill will apply to all works built under plans approved by the Government. If a work so built afterwards causes an obstruction to the river, the companies who have constructed them may be compelled to make such additional works as will remove the obstruction to navigation.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then, you withdraw the river St. John from the exceptions in the former Bill?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes, the river St. John should be put on the same footing as other rivers.

Mr. BLAKE. The principle I think on which the river St. John was excluded was that it was a treaty and frontier river.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There were a number of rivers put on the same footing at that time. The St. Croix river was one.

Mr. BLAKE. It is not a very large stream. I do not think there are any railway bridges across it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There is a Bill in force for building a bridge, but I do not think it has been built.

Mr. WELDON. The St. Croix is entirely above navigable water.

Mr. GILLMOR. The St. Croix can be bridged above navigable water. There is a bridge across it now.

Mr. BLAKE. Would this clause have the effect of entitling the Government to call upon a company, which had a bridge legally built for a great many years, to alter that bridge in order to improve the facilities for navigation?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think it would. But if we give the privilege to a company to build a work in a river, that privilege should not carry with it the power to destroy the navigation; and therefore, if a pier of a bridge causes an accumulation of sand or silt which obstructs navigation, and the engineers say that that can be avoided by extending the pier, or giving it another direction, I think that should be done. There is a bridge across the

river St. John, the piers of which so obstruct navigation that there is great danger of vessels being thrown upon them; but this, the engineer says, could be remedied by the construction of guide piers. There may be other rivers similarly obstructed. There is a bridge of the Grand Trunk Railway Company on the river Richelieu, one of the piers of which has been damaged so that the stone has fallen down into the river. We want to be able to compel the company to remedy this evil, though I know that the Grand Trunk Railway Company has promised to do it without being compelled to.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, I can see that cases of that kind would come within the law, because the franchise of a company to construct a pier involves the obligation, I fancy, to keep it in such a state of repair as to prevent its being a nuisance. As far as I can judge, the hon. gentleman's object is a very reasonable one, and a great deal of good may occasionally result from this Bill. There is just one suggestion I wish to throw out to him, that is, as to the possible degree of circumstances with reference to very large works. We are not dealing with the simple question of maintaining navigation. But we are giving power to the Government to compel companies to make alterations in order to facilitate and improve navigation. Take, for instance, the Victoria bridge across the river St. Lawrence, which we will suppose was built upon plans which were approved by the Government after full consultation. Supposing that after an interval of years it is suggested on the part of the Government that navigation is interfered with by the piers rather more than was expected, or that a new kind of pier would give greater facilities for navigation. A certain element of uncertainty exists as to the degree of control—I do not say arbitrary but discretionary control—the Government may exercise as to very large works. If the Bill had reference only to slight improvements such as the hon. gentleman has stated, I presume that all the companies would be quite willing to submit to it, and it would not create the element of uncertainty which might prevent the investment of capital.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I examined the provisions of this Bill carefully before bringing it in, and I thought it could not be interpreted in that way. It would be a very extreme thing if it were; but being left in the hands of the Governor in Council, the matter must necessarily come before Parliament. There is no reason to suppose that for the purpose of annoying the company the powers so given would be used to cause a large expense to the company.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not suggest that.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I know the hon. gentleman did not, but I only wish to show the improbability of the measure having that effect. I think the provision of this Bill is such that it will benefit the public without being contrary to the interest of the companies, because, after all, if work of that kind is obstructing navigation beyond the obstruction intended to be allowed by aiding the company and by the creation of the work, that obstruction should be removed to as great an extent as the work would allow. A work having been allowed after the plans were approved of by the Governor in Council, if afterwards it is found to obstruct navigation, the company would not be called upon to destroy it, but might be called to make some additional work so as to prevent the obstruction and render the facility of navigation greater.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, considered in committee and reported.

SECRETARY OF STATE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved second reading of Bill (No. 102) to amend the Act respecting the Department of the Secretary of State. He said: This Bill is only to determine more clearly the appointment of the Deputy-Registrar General. The first section names all the instruments that require to be registered by the Registrar General. The second section provides that the Deputy-Registrar of Canada shall be appointed by commission under the Great Seal. Section four of the Act creating the Department of Secretary of State says: "And the Department of Registrar-General of Canada shall, from time to time, be appointed under section two of this Act"; but section four only mentions the appointment of an officer who shall be called the Under Secretary of State and of other officers. This clause is to provide that the Registrar-General whose name is at the bottom of the most important documents going abroad shall be appointed under a commission of the Great Seal.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, considered in committee and reported.

BANK OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved second reading of Bill (No. 105) respecting the Bank of British Columbia. He said: The preamble states the circumstances under which this is necessary. It is an order to bring the bank under the general provisions of the banking law.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

CONSTRUCTION OF DRY DOCKS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved second reading of Bill (No. 108) to amend the Act to encourage the construction of dry docks by granting assistance on certain conditions to companies constructing them. He said: I explained the other day to the House the object of the Bill. It is to give to the city of Halifax the same power as is given to incorporated companies.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, considered in committee and reported.

DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST—ASSISTANCE TO THE FAMILIES OF MILITIAMEN.

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

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before that motion is carried, a telegram has just been put in my hand, to which I call the attention of the First Minister. It reads as follows:—

"Officer commanding 'B' Battery declined issuing rations to wives and children of men going west. Subscriptions taken up in city, and City Council intervening to prevent great distress to these people."

I have no doubt the officer has acted according to the customary rules of the service, but I would mention to the First Minister what he knows as well as I, that the wives and children of the men of "B" Battery, unless some considerable indulgence is extended to them, will be apt to be in very considerable distress, with the usual allowance which is all that their husbands, I think, are entitled to receive, and I submit, under the circumstances of the case, that there is no fear of any mischievous precedent arising if some reasonable indulgence is shown to these poor people. The First Minister, I am sure, will see that steps are taken to provide against the wives and children of these men who are going to the front being dependent even on the City Council. This comes from an alderman, and I have no doubt is substantially correct.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The matter will be immediately taken into serious consideration. Of course, if assistance is given to the wives and families of the men of "B" Battery, it involves giving assistance to the wives and families of all the militiamen going to the North-West. However, it will be taken into immediate consideration.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Mr. BLAKE. I would ask the hon. gentleman, as Tuesday is a Government day, to give us some idea of what business he will take on that day. I suppose the House is likely to be rather thin on the first day of the resumption of business, and it is all the more necessary to know what the hon. gentleman proposes to do?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot well promise now, but I will inform the hon. gentleman some days before the House meets, say at the latest by Saturday. I can have it announced in the press.

Mr. BLAKE. That will be quite satisfactory. It is quite possible, I would suggest to the hon. gentleman, that we might make some progress in Supply. As far as I can do so, I will promise that there will be no obstruction to Supply on the first day if the hon. gentleman thought it proper to proceed with it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that would be a very good thing to do. Going into Supply when the House is thin, we can get through a good deal of business perhaps, and with the assistance of the hon. gentleman I have no doubt we can do a great deal.

Mr. BLAKE. I will endeavor to help the hon. gentleman through.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 5:05 p.m. until Tuesday next, the 7th instant.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 7th April, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ENQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to call the attention of the Government to the fact that on the 7th March, 1883, upon my motion, an Order was made by the House for papers connected with the complaints of the inhabitants of Prince Albert and that neighborhood, which Order has not yet been complied with. I would ask an early compliance with it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will take a note of it.

Mr. LAURIER. May I ask also when the papers with reference to the Short Line Railway will be ready.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Very shortly.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 101) to amend the law respecting bridges, booms and other works constructed over or in navigable waters under the authority of Provincial Acts.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)

Bill (No. 102) to amend the Acts respecting the Department of the Secretary of State.—(Mr. Chapleau.)

Bill (No. 108) to amend the Act to encourage the construction of dry docks by granting assistance on certain conditions to companies constructing them.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)

SUPPLY.

House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Charges of Management.

Financial Inspector..... $2,600 00

Mr. BLAKE. I would like to ask if this is Mr. Tims?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Does Mr. Tims discharge any duties in connection with the Audit Office as well as in connection with the Finance Department?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. He discharges the duties of Financial Inspector and audits the railway accounts, both for the Audit Office and the Finance Department.

Mr. BLAKE. Is that the only audit of the railway accounts that takes place?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I cannot speak positively of that, but I think it is the principal audit?

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will state on concurrence how that is?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. I must say it seems to me an arrangement not in accordance with the spirit of the law, which is that the audits of the Audit Office ought to be independent audits, and not those of any other officer of the Government.

Office of Assistant Receiver-General, Montreal... $5,600 00

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. gentleman explain the increase of $100? I see it is stated that it is owing to a short estimate.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This $100 is an estimate for books and printing.

Office of Auditor and Receiver General, St. John. $11,000 00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Salaries are $9,100; extra clerk last year, $730; contingencies, $1,170. In 1883-84 contingencies amounted to $918.08. It is proposed to increase the salary of the older clerk, now receiving $1,200, to $1,300. The officer who previously held the position received $1,400 a year. He was superannuated three years ago, and the present officer who discharged his duties remained at $1,200. The salary of an officer appointed during the present year to take the place of another who was superannuated is raised from $800 to $850. The name of the senior officer who was superannuated was Mr. Paterson, and Mr. Jordan is appointed in his place.

Mr. BLAKE. The statement seems to indicate that the changes were in consequence of the proposed increases in the salaries.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. member will observe that the increase is $500. It has been found that the contingencies exceed the sum allowed last year, and it has been found necessary to make it $500 to cover the expenditure of last year and the year before for contingencies. There is no increase in the number of employés.

Office of Auditor and Assistant Receiver General, Winnipeg..... $6,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. There is an increase here.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The salaries are $5,970, leaving for contingencies, $930. When making up the estimates for 1883-84 there seems only to have been allowed $630, which sum was not enough, as $940 was spent. There was no extra clerk.

Mr. BLAKE. Board allowance, $900. Is it found that the expense of living there continues to be so much higher that it is necessary to continue this board allowance, which we were told would soon be unnecessary?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is still an allowance to several officers in the different Departments, but it is being reduced.

Mr. BLAKE. But you are taking the same money.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Quite true, but it does not necessarily involve the expenditure of that money. It will

depend upon circumstances whether it is spent, but it was thought better to ask for the same sum. We are not prepared to say at this moment whether the amount that was allowed for board allowance could be reduced at once.

Mr. BLAKE. It will be much easier to save it if the hon. gentleman does not take it.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It will be pretty safe in the hands of the person who has charge of it, not speaking of myself.

County Savings Banks—New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and British Columbia..... $16,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. There is an increase here.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We have previously taken a vote to cover the probable establishment of new offices; but that is not now considered necessary in the Lower Provinces, as the Postmaster General is establishing the Post Office Savings Bank system there. I may state that the salary paid to persons who act as agents for the savings banks is regulated from $200 a year to $400. It depends upon the amount at deposit, and as these deposits are increasing after they reach a certain point the agents claim $50 increase of salary. For instance, if the deposits should go up from $25,000 to $50,000 or $60,000, they would be entitled under the scale to $50 increase of salary. The proposed increase is not for new offices but for any increases that may be necessary from the increased deposits in the savings banks.

Brokerage and commission on $637,022.27 sinking fund on loans of 1874, 1875, 1876, 1878 and 1879. $4,477 67

Mr. BLAKE. How comes that increase of nearly fifty per cent.?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This increase is caused by the increased amount invested in the sinking fund, and also because the brokerage for this was omitted in 1884-85.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not understand how the amount of the sinking fund should increase, but I could understand its decreasing the amount that is required in each year. I could understand its remaining the same, but I do not understand how it should increase.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. As the amount of the sinking fund increases year after year, of course the commission would increase for the investment of the sinking fund.

Mr. BLAKE. As I understand, the sinking fund is invested in some of the public securities of the Dominion. By some loans, at any rate, it was restricted to particular securities, but the later sinking fund, those I think at any rate taken up when my hon. friend near me was in office and some before, the authority was to invest in any of the public sterling securities. You are obliged to pay a certain rate—one per cent., or a half per cent. a year—on the amount of the loan. You buy certain stocks, and there they are. The work is done as to that. The question, I suppose, is the brokerage or commission on the operation of the year. Well, the operation of the year is the purchase of the stocks that are required in that year to provide sinking funds under the agreements. I can well understand the hon. gentleman's first explanation, had it been consistent with the facts, that there was a new loan.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I see it is not in this item.

Mr. BLAKE. Very well. Then I do not see how the amount increases.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The interest we receive on the sum that is invested has to be reinvested, and, as the sinking fund increases, the annual receipts of interest increase, and therefore there is an additional investment. Suppose we had five million dollars invested in four per cents. There would be $200,000 received during that year to be reinvested. Again the next year you invest an additional $1,000,000 say. There is the interest on that additional $1,000,000 to be reinvested, and that of course increases the amount.

Mr. BLAKE. The figures the hon. gentleman has given are very large. I see the amount is stated here, "brokerage and commission on $627,022.27."

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I am only illustrating.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not see how it makes 50 per cent. advance.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. A portion of it was not estimated for the last year, and that makes the difference.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then it ought to go into the supplementary estimates.

Mr. BLAKE. Is this partly to cover an under estimate of last year, or is it for the approaching year?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is all for the approaching year, but they did not estimate sufficient for the current year, and this is what is required for the next year.

Brokerage and commission on $124,879.05, sinking fund on loan of 1884..... $936 59

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. gentleman state the terms of brokerage and commission? This is a new charge.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The commission is ½ per cent. and the brokerage ¼ per cent.

Financial Commissioner in England..... $1,500 00

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain that?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is a sum paid to Sir John Rose for the services thus rendered.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman will find this item fully explained in the correspondence between the Auditor General and Mr. Courtney, the Deputy Minister. The balance was due, as far as I can understand, to Sir John Rose for services rendered in connection with the different loans.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not understand this to be an old charge at all.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No, it is for the next year.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not understand it to be a charge of an ancient character. I understand this is the first time a charge of this description appears in the Public Accounts at all. The Auditor-General's report, to which the hon. gentleman referred, indicates a payment of a gross sum of $9,555.70 during the course of the last financial year to pay Sir John Rose for services as Financial Commissioner since 1874. It was a lump sum, a settlement of account for his services for a period approaching 10 years, and it was not based upon the principle of an annual payment at all, but, if I rightly remember, the Governor General's warrant was for an amount for commission on certain financial transactions which he negotiated for the Government at periods somewhat remote. These were brought up and settled in this way, which I think was a most objectionable way, because the services were ancient—I do not mean to say they ought not to have been remunerated, that is not the question now under discussion, but they had been rendered years and years before—and, if it was intended that a remuneration should have been paid to Sir John Rose for them, Parliament should have been asked to vote the sum. Instead of that, as if it was a matter of unforeseen emergency, which could not have been put in the estimates, and which could not wait until Parliament should meet again, during the recess a Governor General's warrant issues to pay Sir John Rose this considerable sum. This sum was based almost entirely, if I remember aright, upon a commission at a particular rate upon a particular transaction, some

tolerably large financial transaction which Sir John Rose negotiated, but the hon. gentleman does not explain what are the current services of Sir John Rose, the usual services in respect of which it is intended now that he should appear, I presume, as an annual recipient of this allowance of $1,500, nor does the hon. gentleman explain how it is that, in view of the appointment of the High Commissioner, who we were told was to discharge our financial transactions, was to take up a great portion of those transactions which had previously been discharged by our agents, which was to save us a great deal of the money we had paid in commissions to them, while those commissions are not saved and that work is not done which the hon. gentleman has formerly pointed out, there is now for the first time an additional charge made for a Financial Commissioner. It seems to me some further explanation of this item would be proper to be made.

Mr. BOWELL. I think, if I read an extract from the Order in Council bearing upon this point, it will be the best explanation that can be made:

"The Minister represents that Sir John Rose has acted as trustee for the investments of the sinking funds placed on the London markets since 1874, and in addition thereto has had charge of the dealings with the Imperial Government in reference to the commutation of the stamp duty on the inscribed stock, arranging the half yearly payments of the commutation, and receiving and paying the same on the treasury, and at the same time he has sent detailed advices as to the amounts of such payments to the treasury and to the Government of Canada.

"The Minister upon carefully looking over the accounts as prepared of all the transactions in question finds that from 1874 to June, 1883, the amount of debentures which were inscribed in stock was £5,888,200; the amount invested in the several sinking funds, £636,200, and the amount paid into the Imperial treasury for commutation on stamp duty, £20,926; aggregating £6,545,326 sterling.

"The Minister recommends that Sir John Rose be allowed a commission for his services in connection therewith at the rate of $\frac{3}{100}$ of one per cent., and that a special warrant, as there is no appropriation from which the amount can be defrayed, do issue to pay to Sir John Rose the sum of £1,963 10s. sterling, being in full payment of such commission at the rate aforesaid, to the 30th June, 1883.

"The Minister further recommends that this same percentage be allowed to Sir John Rose for the future services of the same nature, and that a vote for the same be placed in the estimates each year hereafter.

"The committee submit the same for your Excellency's approval."

This recommendation was adopted by Council, and it will explain the sum of $1,500 now under discussion, being $\frac{3}{100}$ per cent. for the labor performed in respect of the different services set forth in the memorandum.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it would seem that the High Commissioner does not effect any saving in the annual charge in this regard.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Sir John Rose was continued as financial agent for the transaction of business of this kind after the appointment of the High Commissioner; and that part of the duty still continues to be discharged by Sir John Rose.

Mr. MITCHELL. It appears to me that it is about time this was stopped. If we have a High Commissioner in London, I suppose he went there for the purpose of attending to the business of the country, and it is about time that such a vote as this was stopped and the business transferred to the High Commissioner. The country will expect something of that kind to be done.

Mr. BLAKE. Instead of being stopped, this is the first time it is proposed that the service be paid by a commission. It never was suggested before.

Mr. MITCHELL. The principle was established of paying Sir John Rose for this work, but it was before the High Commissioner was appointed. Now that we have a High Commissioner, we should not perpetuate the practice by placing an item in the estimates so as to make an annual charge on the country.

Mr. BLAKE. Even the principle has been established since the appointment of a High Commissioner, and it is established under the Order in Council which has just been read, and which was passed during the recess. Many of these services were rendered several years ago. No proposal was made to Parliament in respect of payments in regard to them. During the recess a lump sum of $9,555 is passed by Order in Council, and now for the first time Parliament is called on not merely to pay for those past services but to engage to pay a commission in future.

Mr. MITCHELL. The work done in the past had to be paid for. But this is a proposition to make an annual charge on the country, and this is the first time the matter has been discussed in Parliament. It would be well to have an expression of the views of hon. members with a view to stopping this useless expenditure.

Expenses in connection with the issue and redemption of Dominion notes..... $9,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. There is an increase of $2,000 under this head, and it is mentioned that the amount covers one extra clerk.

Mr. BOWELL. This increase is owing to the large number of bills which, it is estimated, will be required during the current year; and for the services of an extra clerk, as mentioned in the estimates.

Mr. BLAKE. What will be the increase in the quantity of small notes?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The circulation for $1, $2 and $4 notes has largely increased, and is still increasing.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the extra clerk to be a permanent extra clerk?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. At what salary.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The appointment is not made. It will be made at $400, unless the party passed such an examination as will entitle him to something more.

Mr. BLAKE. The increased amount asked for is $2,000. How much is estimated to be for the salary of the new officer, and how much for other expenses?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The appointment will be that of a third-class clerk, and the balance of the amount asked for will be for increased cost in connection with the notes.

Mr. BLAKE. Considering the statement of the Minister that the clerk will be a permanent clerk, I think the salary should be voted in the usual way, and not enveloped, not to say obscured, in a gross sum of $9,000.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. With respect to the destruction of the notes, it is considered more economical that the work should be paid by the day, because if the work is not heavy, we do not require to employ so large a staff.

Printing, etc., including commutation of stamp duty, etc., of country savings banks $20,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. Here is a large increase.

Mr. BOWELL. It is on account of the stamp duty on the debentures for the new loan during the incoming year.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Not only so, but the duty will be 12s. 6d. instead of 7s. 6d.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it for the loan of 1884 or the loan which is to be made?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. One proposition was to extend the existing loan and the existing inscribed stock for 10 years, which would save the issuing of new bonds and the expense of inscribing new stock. It is desirable to take a vote to cover whatever may be required.

Printing Dominion notes..... $25,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. Here is a decrease of $10,000. Are we going to give up printing Dominion notes?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We have a large number printed at present and stored in the vault.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the Minister state what the arrangement is for printing, and whether it is put up for competition?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The contract was made in 1873, I think.

Mr. MITCHELL. How long does the present contract run?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. About two years, I think.

Governor General's Secretary's office.....$9,890 00

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. This is only a statutory increase.

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot help expressing the opinion that this is a most mischievous statute. It is like charity, it covers a multitude of sins.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, but each offence is stated.

Mr. BLAKE. And the hon. gentleman does not seem to be the least ashamed of it, either.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; the law has been sustained by both sides of the House. Whether it is wise or not is another thing.

Department of Justice.....$17,860 00

Mr. BLAKE. Here are also considerable increases.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. They are all statutory except one clerk, $400. The Deputy Minister of Justice stated that the work of the Department increased year by year, that there is no reason to believe that it will at any time be less than it now is, and that the clerical assistance given by one third-class clerk is very necessary.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman indicates one of the reasons why I object to the present system. By the report of the Deputy Minister of Justice it is clerical assistance that is wanted, and I am quite sure that a good deal of clerical assistance is wanted there, though I do not express any opinion as to the necessity of increasing the present staff. But you find that what is wanted is somebody to write a good hand, you put him in, and he will go on getting $50 a year increase, rising into the second-class and into first-class, and eventually becoming a handsomely salaried officer, when all that is wanted is that he should be steady and write a good hand.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is something in that, but the hon. gentleman will see that a clerk who enters the service to-day and goes on year by year will be more able to perform something else than mere clerical work. He will learn something of the work of the Department, and though his salary does increase $50 a year, which is a moderate sum, he will be able to give more service to the country, he will be more useful to the Department, and in the course of twelve years he will have got up to the top of the ladder in his class, and he will get $1,000. I think, after twelve years service, if he is at all capable, he should have that salary. That has been the opinion and the practice all along, and I do not think when an officer begins at a salary so small as $400, if he is an attentive clerk, a sober man and a faithful servant that he should be deprived of the small increase of $50 a year, which, in twelve years, gives him only $1,000.

Mr. BLAKE. The question is one of system—of the exingencies of the service. There are men who begin as writers and who no doubt develop powers and capacities which will enable them to rise, to the advantage of the service. But a large proportion of the whole public service is in its nature and essence clerical and mechanical, and the difficulty is that your system is not one adapted to getting through the best amount of work at the reasonable price of that work. You have certainly in the civil service a demand for clerks who are possessed of intelligence, ability and administrative power; I quite admit it. It is unreasonable to expect that you will get those men without giving them an opportunity to rise both in rank and in salary, I quite admit that. But I also aver that there is necessarily in this great establishment, as there is in almost every business establishment that I know of, a very large demand, and the largest demand by far, for persons whose duties are clerical or ministerial—writing, copying papers accurately and in a good hand—men of methodical habits, in respect to which there may be improvement for two or three years but in respect of which the maximum of efficiency is reached in two or three years, and in respect to which, therefore, the maximum of emolument should be reached by about that time. But instead of that the system is one in which those who enter at a minimum of $400 are always continuing, and, in the discussion we had before we went into committee, the Minister of Finance in accounting for the increases to the annual charge on the civil service mentioned a large sum, I think about $150,000 as being a charge due to the statutory increase. Part of that is not merely justifiable but eminently fitting, but a large part of it, however, is for services that are not important services, and for increased efficiency which cannot exist from the character of the services rendered. The difficulty is one of system—of principle.

Civil Government.

Department of Militia.....$41,440 00

Mr. BLAKE. Explain.

Mr. CARON. There is little explanation to give. The hon. gentleman must have seen that I have made considerable reductions in the Department and that with all the statutory increases there is only an increase of $800 over the amount voted last year, due to the transfer of one officer and his replacement by another. Mr. Light was promoted on the 1st of July, Mr. James having resigned; he is receiving $900 instead of $1,000, which his predecessor was receiving. The salary of the architect for 1884-85 was increased from $1,100 to $1,550, the additional $450 being placed in the supplementary estimates. Mr. James was an architect employed in the Public Works Department, and when the Public Works connected with the Militia were transferred to my Department, it became necessary to secure the services of an architect, and Mr. James was selected.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think this is the same gentleman to whom such a large amount of extra money was paid.

Mr. CARON. I do not know. I am not aware of any extra pay being granted to him since he has been in my Department.

Mr. MILLS. I observe that in 1877-78 the cost of this Department was $35,750; it is now $5,000 more, and I am not aware that there are more onerous duties devolving upon the Department of Militia now than there were then. I notice also that the Department of Justice has increased $2,660 since then, and the Penitentiaries branch $1,450, an increase in the departmental expenses of those two Departments of upwards of $13,000, although there are no two Departments in the Government in which there has been less increase in the amount of work than in these two Departments.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman indicates how little he has followed what has been going on in connection with the Department of Militia. He must know, from the changes which took place last year, that we have three additional infantry schools, and we have a school of cavalry. Every hon. gentleman will understand that the creation of

these new schools, and the establishment of "C" Battery in British Columbia, which will shortly take place, have increased the work of the Department of Militia very materially. I am perfectly safe in saying that the work of that Department has more than doubled within the last two years; and I can say that if it were not for the efficiency of a most excellent staff, which the Department very fortunately possesses, it would be quite impossible to do the work which is now being done with the present staff.

Mr. BLAKE. Apart from the subject which has just been suggested, it seems to me to be rather serious that the hon. gentleman should have arranged for the establishment of this architect's branch at the expense which now appears to be incurred. The Government last Session proposed to Parliament to take over from the Public Works Department to the Militia Department a portion of the work which had formerly been done in that Department. It was objected to, amongst other grounds, on the score of expense. The Government declared that it was not expensive, and they pointed to their vote. They said: All we ask from you is $1,100 for the salary of an architect. If I remember aright, there had been a larger vote in the estimates, and the hon. gentleman in the progress of the discussion struck out a portion of the projected expenditure on account of the architect, and really reduced the cost to something quite modest. When he said: Now, you can complain—it is a very little one—will you really complain of this $1,100? So the hon. gentleman got his vote through; then he decides by executive authority to propose to Parliament to pay $1,550 for the current year instead of $1,100, and we are to have, he tells us, in the supplementary estimates, a vote of $450 to meet this extra amount; and now he proposes a salary of $1,600, from which it is apparent that the $50 increase applies to this officer as well as others. Now, I maintain that when an alteration in any of the public establishments, involving an increased charge, is proposed to Parliament, it is the duty of the Government to reasonably ascertain what the real charge will be, and to state that to the committee and the House, so that we may know really what it is we are sanctioning. If a proposal is made to us, and we are told it will cost so much, and then it is carried out at a cost of 50 per cent. more, there is no use of discussion in a financial aspect.

Mr. CARON. If the hon. gentleman was not accustomed to criticise every act of the Government, I would have expected him, instead of criticising this change, to have made a complimentary remark as to the very economical plan which has been adopted by the Department to secure the services of a very excellent architect and a most reliable man. Last year, when the charge of public works connected with the militia was transferred from the Public Works Department to my Department, two salaries were provided: there was an engineer, at a salary of $1,800 a year, and an architect at a salary of $1,100 a year. I considered we could very well begin by dispensing with the engineer, and I retained the smaller salaried officer. After some time, and after considering the matter very fully, I found that it was impossible to secure the services of a competent architect such as I required for that branch of the Department for less than the amount which now appears in the estimate. The matter was decided by Order in Council. Mr. James was transferred to my Department, and the salary he is now receiving from the Department of Militia he was then receiving from the Department of Public Works; and I think the hon. gentleman will see, when we reach the Public Works Department, that we have made a very economical and efficient arrangement. The staff is very small, being composed merely of an architect and one draughtsman under him. Under these circumstances, considering the statutory increases, considering the large increase in work which is being entailed by the creation of these schools of infantry and the school of cavalry, I think that the estimate for the salaries attached to the Department of Militia is really this year very low.

Mr. BLAKE. I am very glad to be able to compliment the hon. gentleman whenever I can.

Mr. CARON. It is not often.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope he will give me the opportunity to do so. I cannot compliment him, however, upon having told Parliament last Session that it would require only $1,100 to carry out his plan, having told us that after full consideration, because his first plan was more expensive, it involved the appointment of two officers, but he listened to and took part in the discussion in this chamber, and after an interval he said: I think I can get along with one officer for $1,100; I cannot compliment him for having found that for us last Session, and having immediately afterwards found out that he was mistaken and that it would take $1,600 instead of $1,100 to carry out the plan which he assented to on the theory that it would cost $1,100 only. I do not think that is a subject for compliment and I cannot compliment him upon it. If I could compliment him, I would be glad to do so, as anyone who looks at him must be anxious to do. He has referred to the increased amount of work done in the Department, of which I know nothing. But of this I am quite sure, that the hon. gentleman will always ask for all he wants, and what I have been impressing upon him to-day is that he ought to ascertain fully what his wants are before he comes to Parliament to vote the estimates, and particularly to vote these changes. He says Mr. James is a very excellent architect. I dare say he may be. I have not said a word against Mr. James. I have neither the pleasure of his personal acquaintance nor of knowing anything of his professional merits. This does not involve the question of Mr. James' merits or of his salary at all. The circumstances of his receiving a salary in the Public Works Department equivalent to this one is some indication of what the value of his services in that Department appears to have been. I think his name also appears in the Auditor General's report as one who had been able to obtain more money than his salary by working in extra hours.

Mr. CARON. Not in the Militia Department.

Mr. BLAKE. No; this was before he came into the virtuous Department, this was when he was in the Department of Public Works. It is another thing altogether. I do not profess to say that the hon. gentleman's officers work extra hours. Although I may not compliment him, I am sure I never said anything so ill of him as that. "J. James twelve months' salary, $1,500; extra work, 265 hours, at 75c. an hour, $198.75; total $1,698.75. So if the hon. gentleman will adopt the plan of his hon. friend beside him, he may arrange for Mr. James to turn an honest penny more.

Privy Council Office..... $21,002 50

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is the statutory increase to the chief clerk, assistant clerk of the Council, then there is a first-class clerk at $1,400. That is new, and I propose that it be struck out just now, as there is some misapprehension about it. The rest are the same except the statutory increases.

Mr. BLAKE. Not quite. There is a third-class clerk.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, I forgot that. There is a third-class clerk at $400. The increase of the business, which is enormous, requires an additional officer.

Mr. BLAKE. It is not proposed to continue the payments for extra hours, I suppose?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is under consideration.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman assures us that the increase is enormous ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The increase of the business, yes.

Mr. BLAKE. I am surprised how the hon. gentleman manages to get on without that first-class clerk he has just abolished so summarily.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may ask later in the Session to have him to assist me.

Department of the Secretary of State..... $42,322 50

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain this.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We are going to restrict the expenditure, that is all.

Mr. MILLS. There is an increase of $10,300 over the expenditure of 1878, and that included the cost of the police branch, which is now transferred to another Department of Government, so that, if that were included, there would be an increase of a very much larger sum. As it is, however, there is an increase of $10,230, and the hon. gentleman, I suppose, will be able to tell how it is that the cost of managing that Department is so very much greater than it was before this economical Government took charge of the administration of public affairs.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I hardly believe my hon. friend is serious in this remark. I might tell him that there is some increase in the work of the Department. The Department is one of routine, but, routine as it is, when there is a large amount of business done, there must be some additional facilities for doing it. Well, we have done without that. Everybody knows, for instance, that the working of the Scott Act alone, the details of which are almost entirely in the Department of the Secretary of State, has given us a great deal of work more without any increase. The correspondence with the High Commissioner, which necessarily increases very largely, has also been done without any increase. The different details of routine in connection with demands for Acts of incorporation under letters patent have necessarily also increased considerably, and have not caused in the Department any increase in salaries. When we come to the details of the Department, I shall take pleasure in explaining whatever is necesary. I do not take special credit for it, but I think I have done what was necessary as the head of the Department to prevent any increase. I took the Department as I found it; I took it with the desire of reducing the expenditure, and I think I have succeeded. The Under Secretaty has just now handed me a detailed comparison of the expenditures for 1878 and for 1884, which, perhaps, might be interesting to my hon. friend, who is so fond of details, and I will give it to the House for his benefit. I don't attach as much importance to those details as my hon. friend does, but still as he would no doubt like to hear them. I will read them. Number of letters received in 1878, 8,800; in 1884, 18,500. Letters sent in 1878, 6,078; in 1884, 10,900—I give round numbers. Documents engrossed and recorded, in 1878, 5,700; in 1884, 14,000. Canada *Gazettes* issued, in 1878, 1,187; in 1884, 1,360. As concerns addresses by Parliament, I must say that my hon. friends opposite were not more inquisitive last year than we were in 1878, because the addresses in 1878 were 198, while last year they were 262. Fees received—which might be important, in 1878, $1,326; in 1884, $8,076. Requisitions for binding and stationery, in 1878, $4,900; in 1884, $8,900. Value of stationery and printing supplies, in 1878, $55,000; in 1884, $108,000. Value of goods received in 1878, $54,800; in 1884, $105,600. Number of charters issued, 1878, 11; in 1884, 37. The salaries as mentioned in this statement were in 1878, $39,142.50; now they are $47,888. This is the statement, the correctness of which I do not question, although I do not attach great importance to it. Although my Department is not very important politically, I have done my best not to increase the expenditure, and I have succeeded.

Mr. MILLS. In 1878 the police force was in charge of that Department, but it is not now. That makes a considerable difference.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is not included in this statement. The details I have given only comprise the inside service of my Department in both the periods I have named.

Mr. BLAKE. I observe there is a chief clerk less in the hon. gentleman's Department in the correspondence branch. How has he disappeared ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Mr. Jones has been superannuated.

Mr. BLAKE. And a first-class clerk put in his place, I suppose ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Mr. Pulford has been promoted. The first-class clerk was a promotion.

Mr. BLAKE. I observe in the Queen's Printers branch a first-class clerk additional.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That was a transposition from one Department to another.

Mr. BLAKE. From one branch of his own Department to another ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. From my Department, not from another Department.

Mr. BLAKE. The numerical staff seems to be the same.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes; so far as the number is concerned.

Mr. BLAKE. I should judge from the look of the columns that it was a promotion of one second-class clerk; for I see in 1884-85 there were two second-class clerks, and in 1885-86 there is to be but one second-class clerk.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This is asked for in the Queen's Printer's branch. It is a promotion which will take place.

Mr. BLAKE. I see in the numerical staff of the Queen's Printer branch, besides the proposed promotion, there is ans increase of one.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The work in the Department was more than the staff could do, and for some time past a messenger has been employed as clerk, and I think he will be promoted to a third-class clerkship.

Mr. BLAKE. As far as I can judge there seems to have been a good deal more work. There has been such an enormous amount of printing done outside the contract that it must involve a good deal of trouble to the hon. gentleman's officers to prune down the expenses and see that the term of the contract prices are adhered to. If that is intended to be attained by the promotion of one second-class clerk to a first-class clerkship and by the addition of a third-class clerk, we can all agree to it, but if all the other results which hitherto have obtained with reference to outside printing are to be continued, I do not think it will do as much good.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There has been no increased work on account of outside printing. All I can say is that if some printing has been done outside—speaking only of my Department—there has been no increased expenditure, but the contrary.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not speak of the printing that has been done in the hon. gentleman's Department, about which I do not know and cannot speak. But the hon. gentleman is aware that this branch of his Department is charged

with the supervision of the printing accounts of all the Departments, and therefore,—shall I call them the sins of the hon. gentleman's colleague?—come upon his shoulders more or less with reference to the printing that is given to others than the contract printers.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. As far as that is concerned I am ready to take the personal responsibility for the printing accounts of the other Departments that pass through my hands; and I suppose that my colleagues will be prepared to explain the expenditures in their Departments when the proper time comes.

Mr. BLAKE. We have the explanation now, but whether it is a good one or not I do not know. I was satisfied the hon. gentleman would be quite willing to take any responsibility without his assurance.

Department of Indian Affairs..... $34,722 50

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This consists of the statutory increase of $50, and there is an addition of a third-class clerk and of a messenger, caused by the increased business of the Department.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There has been a constant increase for the past three or four years. This makes an increase of 11 clerks since 1882-83, amounting to $12,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Department is worked very hard and the officers are very zealous, and the increase of business occasions an increase of work in the Department. When the hon. gentleman is Minister he will find that out for himself.

Mr. CAMERON. I hope I will never be Minister under the responsibility the hon. gentleman is under now.

Office of Auditor-General..... $20,200 00

Mr. BOWELL. There have been no new appointments; the increase is for promotion.

Department of Finance and Treasury Board..... $56,942 50

Mr. BOWELL. There is nothing in this but a statutory increase. There have been no additional officers appointed.

Department of Inland Revenue..... $36,467 50

Mr. COSTIGAN. $750 of the increase is occasioned by the statutory increase of $50 to 15 officers. Then it is proposed to increase the number of second-class clerks from 8 to 12, reducing by the same number third-class clerks. There is also promotion to 4 clerks and $30 increase to the messenger, and there is a reduction of $50 to Mr. Stewart, who is estimated at $1,200 and was only paid $1,150.

Mr. BLAKE. Are these promotions under the Statute or in advance of the Statute?

Mr. COSTIGAN. These clerks have all passed promotion examinations and hold certificates. The reason I ask for the increased number of second class clerks is because the work required to be performed is that belonging to second-class clerks. There are only three first-class clerks who are old officers of the Department.

Department of Customs..... $34,900 00

Mr. BOWELL. The chief accountant has been promoted to the position of assistant commissioner at a salary of $2,800 per annum; that is the only change, with the exception of one first-class clerk superannuated on account of ill-health. The total estimate is something less than that of last year, and the expense of the inside service is $34,900 this year against $44,610.21 in 1877-78.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have the Public Accounts for 1877-78, and they only show $28,450.

Mr. BOWELL. You must add the contingencies and other expenses. The $7,900 increase since 1878 was due to the statutory increase, and the work done in the Department is some 25 to 50 per cent. more than that done then.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is ill-timed to take any objection to extravagance in the Customs Department. I think the hon. gentleman should make up his mind to deal more generously with the officers in that Department by judiciously increasing the salaries of those who do the work.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The commissioner gets $3,200; the assistant commissioner $2,800, and the chief clerk $2,400 I think they are living in high carnival all the time and there are no farmers who realise anything like that.

Mr. MITCHELL. My remarks apply more particularly to the outside department. There may be some autocrats and magnates outside, in whose favor I have not a word to say, neither as to the way they perform their duty nor their courtesy to the public, but I refer to the clerks and tide-waiters and the people who do their actual work. They draw nothing like the salaries they ought to get.

Mr. GAULT. In Montreal they complain they are starved out altogether, and I know the Minister of Customs to be one of the most careful men I know of.

Mr. PAINT. Whenever I have visited the Department I have been received with every courtesy.

Mr. BLAKE. That must be very gratifying to the committee and the country, but it is hardly relevant to the discussion. Is the $2,400 or the $2,800 paid under the operation of the Civil Service Act?

Mr. BOWELL. It is the same amount as was paid to his predecessor. That office was not filled for some years. $2,800 was the sum paid to that gentleman's predecessor who held the position of assistant commissioner and I am quite sure those who appointed him knew his worth too well to make it necessary for me to speak of him as an officer.

Mr. BLAKE. The statutory increase amounts to something within $8,000. Is that the aggregate amount of the statutory increase? Because if it is, it brings into bold relief the operation of that system; it amounts to 25 per cent on the estimates of 1878. We know you may promote a clerk at a time and a certain statutory increase belongs to him; but another clerk comes in at a lower rate or a clerk is placed in another class, and the general result is not, therefore, that all the statutory increases which are made come to be net additions to the cost of the service. I should like to understand what the hon. gentleman means by this statement about $8,000.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman has explained it. It is the aggregate amount to which I referred. During 1878-79 the amount was $800; 1880-81, $1,050; 1881-82, $1,082; 1882-83, $1,030. The hon. gentleman knows that, though an officer may be superannuated or the office become vacant by death or any other cause, yet if another man is appointed, even though he be a third-class clerk and receive a much less salary, he is entitled to the same statutory increase, $50 a year, until he reaches the maximum of his class.

Mr. BLAKE. Then does the hon. gentleman wish the committee to understand that, had it not been for the abominable statutory increases, the vote would have been for $27,000?

Mr. BOWELL. Precisely, if it had not been for the statutory increases, the vote asked for would have been just so much less. If a clerk receives a statutory increase this year it goes on continuously. What I wished the committee to understand was that through the operation of this law, there has been just so much added to the total increase.

Mr. BLAKE. The increase in this vote under the operation of the statutory increases has reached 25 per cent.

Mr. BOWELL. It may be so.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In 1874 there were 24 officers in the Department. In 1878, under the Mackenzie Government, there were only 23. Since that time the number has increased to 29.

Mr. BOWELL. To 30.

Mr. LANDERKIN. While there was a reduction made in the Department as regards the number of clerks, the present Minister was charging the late Premier day after day, while he held office, with corruption and extravagance, and with having too many officers. Now there is an increase. What explanation has the Minister to make.

Mr. BOWELL. Exigency of the work.

Mr. FORBES. I asked the Minister the other day in regard to detective police in Nova Scotia, and I was told there were no detective police in connection with the Customs Department. I find a charge of $106,030 for salaries, office rent and contingencies, outside service, Customs, Nova Scotia. On this point I have received a communication from some parties which bears upon this matter. It is a letter from a Boston house.

The CHAIRMAN. We are not dealing with the outside service.

Mr. BOWELL. It will be quite right for the hon. member to bring this matter up when the outside service is under discussion. If the hon. gentleman will, however, look at this question, he will find that the answer I gave was literally correct. He asked——

Mr. MACKENZIE. I object.

Mr. BOWELL. I think as a matter of courtesy, the hon. gentleman should have allowed me to make this statement without entering an objection.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I notice that one of the officials has been superannuated. Will the Minister tell us the officer's age, name, and how long he was in the service.

Mr. BOWELL. The officer was Mr. Hay, who has been in the service 20 or 30 years. I do not know his age. He had not, however, arrived at that age which would justify his superannuation on the grounds of age.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What was his age?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know. He was superannuated on a doctor's certificate, stating his inability to perform work in the Department, and he had been absent a number of months.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How long has he been in the Department?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not exactly know.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not want any hon. member to sneer by asking what is the color of his hair, when I am endeavoring to obtain information. If hon. gentlemen wish to be impertinent they will find a Deputy Speaker who will take cognisance of their actions.

The CHAIRMAN. No such remark has reached my ear.

Department of Postmaster General..... ..... $161,620 00

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain.

Mr. CARLING. The very large increase in the business of the Department necessitated additional clerks, and we have provided for six additional third-class clerks and the promotion of eight third-class to the second-class, and statutory increases make up the amount.

Mr. BOWELL.

Mr. BLAKE. The explanation is not so long as the vote. The hon. gentleman might have entered into further details without wearying the committee.

Mr. CARLING. I shall be very glad to give any explanation the hon. gentleman may wish. The large increase in the business of the country causes additional clerks to be required. Of course, the hon. gentleman is well aware that a large number of post offices have been established in all parts of the Dominion during the last few years, and that a large increase has taken place in savings banks and money order business. This increase has necessitated the employment of eight additional clerks, and their salaries, together with the statutory increases, explain any difference in the vote. This is a very large Department, and a very large number of employés obtain the statutory increase.

Mr. MILLS. I observe that the amount asked for by the the hon. gentleman is $161,620 as against $85,950 in 1878. The number of employés has nearly doubled during that period; it being 172 as against 92 at that time. I think the hon. gentleman should show the committee that this very large increase is necessary. The hon. gentleman knows that the country has not doubled in population or in wealth while the expenses of his Department have nearly doubled.

Mr. CARLING. All I can say is that the number of post offices in 1878 was 5,378; and in 1884, 6,837. The number of miles of mail route in 1878 was 38,730; and in 1884, 47,131. The number of miles of mail travel in 1878 was 15,427,323; and in 1884, 20,886,316. The number of letters in 1878 was 44,000,000; while in 1884 it was 66,100,000. The number of savings banks deposits in 1878 was 25,535; while in 1884 it was 66,682. The money orders issued in 1878 amounted to $7,130,895; while in 1884 they were $10,067,834. In 1878 the number of countries with which Canada had an exchange of money orders was but three, while in 1884 it was 68. These figures with the largely increased number of contractors with whom we have to deal and the increased accommodation we have to give more especially to the rural districts, show that there must be a large increase of business and that it necessitates an additional number of clerks. I find that in 1882 the number of clerks was 146, and there were then 19 extra clerks, while at the present time we have only four extra clerks in the Department out of the 180 for which we ask.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend was not speaking of the year 1882 but of the year 1878, and I do not think that the hon. gentleman has been successful in showing that the increase in the cost of the Department was only in proportion to the increase in business. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will kindly explain why it is that in the first item under Savings Bank offices, the chief clerk and superintendent is given without any salary, while a foot note explains that it is included in the Money Order office.

Mr. CARLING. The same gentleman who superintends the Money Order office superintends the Savings Bank, and only one officer is paid for both.

Mr. BLAKE. Is this introduction of his title here a new thing?

Mr. CARLING. No, I think not.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I wish to point out that while in 1875 there was a great increase in the cost of the Department on account of the free delivery in cities, yet I notice that there was very little increase in the amounts required for the Department or in the number of officials in the Department during those five years. In 1874 there were 78 officials in the Department, and in 1878 there were only 93, or an increase at the rate of only 7 a year during the Administration of Mr. Mackenzie, while now I find that there are 180 officers in the Department.

Mr. CARLING. No; not now; 180 is the number we are asking for.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is the number the hon. gentleman is asking for and it has almost doubled during the period of the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. The amount increased during the late Administration only to the extent of $15,000, notwithstanding that they gave the people in all the cities a free delivery and gave increased accommodation and postal facilities all over the country. The fact is that although we are increasing the vote under this Administration I find that there are great difficulties with regard to postal accommodation at the present time. Some time ago I applied to get two post offices established in my own county at a little additional expense, but although we have doubled the number of officials in five years and have doubled the vote for this service we are unable to get this accommodation. I would like to know how it is that while the increase in the number of officials and the increase in the amount expended have been so great, in reality we have not as efficient a service in our part of the country as we had five or six years ago.

Mr. CARLING. I am rather surprised to hear the hon. gentleman state that he has applied for two post offices in his own county and cannot get them, when he knows that I told him personally that I had decided to establish those offices when I could get the men to fill the positions. Under the circumstances, I do not think he should have made the statement he has made. With regard to increased mail accommodation, I think I can appeal to hon. members in this House and that they will bear me out when I say that increased mail accommodation has been given in almost every county in Canada. When applications have been made for additional service or for increasing the service from a weekly mail to twice a week, or from a mail twice a week to three times a week, or from a tri-weekly mail to a daily, all these applications have been fairly considered and acted upon by the Department whenever it was possible to do so. So far as I am aware the post office service has given perfect satisfaction in every part of the Dominion, and if there are any hon. gentlemen who say that they are not getting satisfactory mail service, I think the number must be only a few, and the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) must be one of them. I do not think he means to cast reflections on the management of the Department, but I can assure him that in every county in every part of the Dominion from which applications have been received, they have been carefully considered by the Department, and that everything possible has been done to improve the mail accommodation for the people generally.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is true that the hon. gentleman told me that he was going to establish the post offices I spoke of, but I have since had letters from parties there saying that nothing has been done and no effort made to put his intentions in force. I repeat that it is correct that in my own county the accommodation is not as good as it was, and I think the hon. member for North Bruce can bear me out. They have a mail in the morning of one day but not the next day until noon, instead of having it every morning, and I say that unless arrangements are made by which the people can get communication by one railway or the other it will be a great disaster to the people in that part of the country. I am not overdrawing the matter, nor am I making these remarks with a view of making charges against the hon. gentleman, because I must acknowledge the courtesy and kindness with which he has treated me in any matters I have brought to his notice. The fact is, however, that a good many places remain now as they were five or six years ago, and several offices that should have a daily service have only one service out of two or three times a week, though they are entitled by their revenue to better accommodation. Now that the hon. gentleman knows that this is the condition of things I hope that he will see that those people who are entitled to increased facilities will be accommodated, seeing that the number of officials and the cost to the Department are increasing so rapidly. I think it is the duty of the Department to give the people of the country every possible facility for the transaction of their business.

Mr. CARLING. I think the hon. gentleman understands that the Department has no power to get railways to run trains every day if their business does not warrant it. I think he will agree that the mails are carried in every case where passenger trains are run.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think they are not.

Mr. CARLING. I think the hon. gentleman will find it so.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not like to contradict the hon. gentleman, but I know it is not so.

Mr. SPROULE. I know something of the matter referred to by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), and I do not think he is quite fair in his statements, because when the line was opened along the railway running north and south the mail between Durham and Walkerton was taken off, but the people petitioned to have it reestablished. I think I carried that petition myself, and the hon. Postmaster General reestablished the daily mail between Durham and Walkerton, which virtually gave the people a daily mail east and west as well as north and south.

Mr. MITCHELL. I feel called upon to say one word on this matter. I would not have said anything but that the action of the Postmaster General and the Department has come in question. I have had a good deal of experience in connection with the postal arrangement of my county, and I have had reason to visit frequently the Post Office Department; and I can say this for that Department, that there is no Department of the Government which I have had greater satisfaction in visiting, or from which I have received greater courtesy or consideration than from that Department—every officer in it, from the Postmaster General down.

Mr. McNEILL. So far as my own riding is concerned, I can say that we have had an enormous increase of mail accommodation there through the kindness and attention of the Postmaster General. In the northern part of that riding, where there was only one mail a week, they have now in some places three, and in many other places two a week. I know that the people I have the honor to represent feel the greatest satisfaction at the manner in which the Postmaster General has done his duty in this respect.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. member for North Bruce is aware that the mail does not come down on the train every morning?

Mr. McNEILL. The hon. member for North Bruce is perfectly well aware that the mail, which during the period to which the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) has referred, was most irregular in its arrival at Wiarton, which was carried from Owen Sound in whatever way could be contrived, is now received there daily. It was received with the greatest punctuality every day until the change was made in the arrangements for running the trains. It is now brought in the most rapid possible manner in which the Post Office Department can send it, that is, by the trains which are placed at his disposal by the Grand Trunk. As for the arrangement of running the trains, I suppose the Postmaster General is scarcely responsible for that.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If the hon. Postmaster General would have the mail carried on every train he would confer a boon on the country. I am confident that the people in the hon. gentleman's own section are not sat-

isfied with the present mail arrangements. As the hon. Postmaster General seems to labor under doubt, I can tell him that there is no mail on the night train. If he would place one on that night train it would be a great benefit. I know that the people of East Bruce and South Grey are not satisfied with the present arrangements. But if the hon. member for North Bruce does not want it for his constituency, I am satisfied.

Mr. McNEILL. Does the hon. gentleman desire an additional mail a day?

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Postmaster General is desirous of having a mail on every train. That is not the case at present.

Mr. McNEILL. I should be very glad to have two mails a day, provided it was consistent with the public interest. But I understood the hon. gentleman to complain of the great expense.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I certainly do complain of the expense increasing so rapidly when we have not a more efficient service than we have.

Mr. VAIL. I am aware that the Postmaster General is establishing a good many post offices in Nova Scotia as well as in other places, which must naturally increase the work in the Department here. Now, I do not think the country is disposed at all to object to an increased expense for post office accommodation. If there is any expenditure willingly paid by the people, I think it is that of the Post Office Department, provided they get the necessary post office accommodation. For my part, I am very glad to see the Postmaster General establishing these new post offices; and it is sometimes necessary to establish post offices in localities where there are only a few people to be accommodated. I must endorse what the hon. gentleman for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) has said. In what little communication I have had with that Department I have been treated with courtesy, and have always found the Department willing to listen to any proposal with regard to post office accommodation that was fair or reasonable.

Mr. GAULT. I would like to say likewise that in the city of Montreal, where we had formerly only one delivery per day, we have now three or four, and the office is in a much better state than it was before the Postmaster General came into office. He has done everything to make the post office itself a cleanly place, and has had improvements and alterations made which have not only added very much to the comfort of the employés, but benefited the post office altogether. To day everything is going on satisfactorily.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I beg to add to what has already been said that the Post Office Department gives very general satisfaction on the north coast of Cape Breton. The hon. Postmaster General has nearly doubled the service in that quarter during the last three or four years. There are only a few sections which require increased service there, and I hope the hon. Minister will see his way clear to give us the additional service required. I quite agree with the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) that there is no expense which the people more cheerfully pay than the expense on the post office service in every part of the Dominion.

Mr. PAINT. I wish to say that the Postmaster General is deserving of all the compliments he is getting.

Mr. MILLS. I am glad that some hon. gentlemen can congratulate the Postmaster General upon the excellent accommodation which has been given by his Department. I received a communication some time ago from a gentleman, I think of Kingsville, stating that for many years—a quarter of a century—they had at that point a daily mail until quite recently, and that, although there are many daily papers taken there, the postal accommodation has been reduced to, I think, three mails a week. I sent that communication to the hon. gentleman, and I have not yet learned what action the hon. gentleman has taken with reference to it. I hope that the question has been considered by the Department, and that the hon. gentleman is by this time prepared to say what has been done. I would also remind him that I forwarded to him some time ago a communication from certain parties from the township of Tilbury asking for the establishment of a post office and have had yet no reply, although this was made some five or six weeks ago.

Mr. CARLING. I am glad the hon. gentleman has called my attention to this. Our usual plan is to send the application to the local inspector. I will enquire if he has made a report.

Mr. BEATY. Toronto has some complaints to make against the Postmaster General. He does not give us enough clerks and letter carriers and does not pay enough salaries to those he employs. The common complaint is that the work is too large and the pay too small.

Mr. IRVINE. I have the honor of representing a constituency where there are no letter carriers. I must say of the Postmaster General that on meeting him in the lobbies or corridors, I have always found him very suave and polite, but I have always understood that it was not the slightest use for me to ask for the establishment of a post office. I ventured to mention the matter to the hon. the Minister of Customs, but he said it would be contrary to all precedent to grant my recommendation, that I should support the Government, and I have told my people that it was no use for me to apply for a post office.

Mr. CARLING. Any application or petition from the people asking for the establishment of a post office in any part of a county will have my best consideration. It will be sent to the inspector to enquire into and report thereon; but of course in the appointment of a postmaster the Government's friends will be consulted as has always been done by hon. gentlemen opposite. However my desire is to give increased post office accommodation irrespective of politics.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think it is scarcely fair to repeat conversations of a friendly and private nature, but I may say that I told the hon. gentleman precisely what he has been told by the Postmaster General, that the establishment of a post office would be made irrespective of politics; but that the appointment of a postmaster would be made after consulting the hon. gentleman's opponent.

Department of Agriculture..... $46,635 00

Mr. POPE. There are no changes in this item of any consequence. One clerk died in the Patent Branch; his salary was $1,400 a year, and two first-class clerks were appointed at $1,200 a year each. In the statistical branch there are two third-class clerks.

Mr. MILLS. In 1878 the amount voted was $38,290, or $8,345 less than the hon. gentleman asks, and yet the hon. gentleman thought that in 1878 the cost of administering the Department was extravagant. He is bound to give some explanation of this extraordinary increase. If there was an extraordinary state of prosperity in the country, the increase might be intelligible; but under the circumstances it can only be classed as highly extravagant.

Mr. POPE. The increases have taken place by carrying out the Statute, almost all of them. There have been some new branches added to the Department. There has been a great increase in some branches of the Department which took a great deal more labor than before, and that has been supplied. Those are all the increases I know of.

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. gentleman give an explanation of this Statistics Branch? I see he has added by 50 per cent. to the number of clerks in it. There were but four there, but three in fact, and there are now five. There is a statistical officer. Then there is an attaché, whatever that is. I could have understood an attaché in connection with the High Commissioner's office, as it is a diplomatic office. There is an attaché. Then there are three third-class clerks instead of one, and then there is a guardian. Well, in the other division there are two model guardians. I do not know whether they are guardians of models or model guardians, but he calls them model guardians.

Mr. POPE. They are all model guardians.

Mr. BLAKE. Are they? Then I wonder that they stay with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. POPE. That is the reason why they do stay.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose it is found that the hon. gentleman needs a guardian. There is this guardian of statistics. I should like to know what his functions are. Is he to take care that no one tampers with the figures, or what is it for? I should like to know what the functions of the statistical officer are, what are the functions of the attaché, the diplomatic part of the Department, what are the functions of the guardian, and how it is that two more clerks are required for that branch of the Department.

Mr. POPE. With respect to the statistical officer, he was appointed some little time ago. He has charge of the statistics, of the census. The attaché is one who has always gone by that name both in your time and in ours, and who has been employed on the vital statistics. All the returns are made to this genleman. His salary has not been increased. It remains just as it has been.

Mr. BLAKE. Why is he called an attaché.

Mr. POPE. I cannot tell you how that is so, but it has been so all the time. The guardian was employed when we had 40 or 50 clerks, and he had the care of the census papers in the absence of those people, and attended upon them as messenger of that branch. With respect to the other, it is a new branch of mortuary statistics. This is a new branch of the Department.

Mr. BLAKE. And the hon. gentleman has two new clerks on the staff. Are these some of those who are at present paid as extra clerks?

Mr. POPE. No, they were paid—I explained that a little while ago—as extra clerks on the census, and now they are put in here as permanent clerks. There is a mistake in this which I want to correct. The third-class clerk at $800 should be $850, and the one at $650 should be $600. The mistake was made in the Finance Department in distributing the amount. The total is just the same.

Mr. BLAKE. Is this one at $850 a new one?

Mr. POPE. No, it is an old one.

Mr. BLAKE. And the other two, are they old or young?

Mr. POPE. Not very old, nor very young.

Mr. BLAKE. Just the right age.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman says the increase is only a statutory increase, but he will not be able to make out that the statutory increases would increase the cost of the Department by upwards for $18,000 in seven years. By looking at the estimates for 1878, we find that there were 30 clerks in the hon. gentleman's Department. In the estimates before us, there are 46, an increase of 16 clerks.

Mr. POPE. I said there were some new branches, and an increase of business, but it is mostly a statutory increase.

Mr. BLAKE. Have these other third-class clerks been appointed, or are they to be appointed?

Mr. POPE. They have been appointed.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it is proposed to bring in a vote to pay them as third-class clerks during the current year?

Mr. POPE. This is the vote.

Mr. BLAKE. This commences from the 1st July next.

Mr. WILSON. Does the hon. Minister find that the returns come in so rapidly that he requires an increase of clerks in reference to the mortuary statistics? Perhaps he will explain to us something in reference to it, as to the working of the system and the means he adopted to collect the mortuary statistics from the different parts of the Province. For my part, I must confess that the system adopted, or that proposed to be adopted, as far as I have been able to learn, will be very inefficient, with very small results; and it would appear that it is certainly not necessary to increase the number of officers in that department to record all the work that this wonderful board will accomplish, if in other parts the services are performed in a similar manner to that in which they are in my part of the country.

Mr. POPE. To what place do you refer?

Mr. WILSON. I could give my hon. friend an instance of the manner in which they are to be collected in St. Thomas, the place where I reside. I might call his attention to the city the Postmaster General lives in, and see what the result of the system has been in that location, Perhaps I might call the hon. the Minister's attention to other places; and he might, before he asks us to increase the number of officers and the expenses, give us some explanation as to why he finds it necessary to increase these offices and these officers.

Mr. POPE. I have explained that there is no increase. This is altogether a new branch. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by the parties who are collecting statistics. Does he know who they are? Does he know how they are selected? Does he know by whom they are appointed? Not by me. I appoint them, but they are selected by the people themselves. They are the ordinary officers of the town or city in which this takes place. I do not select the people at all. We take these men, whatever their politics, whoever they may be. They are appointed because they are appointed by the place itself as medical officers. These men I take invariably. I know some are on one side of politics and some on the other. This has been in operation only about a year. So far as it has gone, I am sure the hon. gentleman will find that it is quite satisfactory for a new machinery, which takes some little time and some experience to perfect. For my part, I am quite satisfied with the way it is going on. The hon. gentleman must not say, he must not insinuate, that there is any politics in this matter, because I do not select these men myself. The people of the towns and cities and places select the men, and they are appointed by me.

Mr. WILSON. The Minister says that no politics exist in the selection of these officers, and he asks me whether I know by whom and in what way they are appointed. I do know, and I know that in some cases the officers are appointed after the word has been sent by the Minister to these localities requesting them to appoint an officer. It may be that no politics may exist, but it may also be known to the hon. gentleman who would be likely to be recommended in localities where his friends would be in the preponderance, and very likely he would know the kind of officers who would be appointed. But what I complain of is, that without giving us any results of the working of this new office, the Minister now asks us to grant more public money to carry it on. I state dis-

tinctly that there are more clerks appointed here and that the amount of salaries is increased. Of course it is a new branch, as the Minister says; but why is it necessary to have this new branch? He should give some reason for this new appointment, showing that he has done more work last year than the year previous.

Mr. POPE. It may possibly be considered a foolish thing to do, but it was proposed by a conference of medical men, though the hon. gentleman may think them quite unfit to make the proposition. This has been pressed upon me for a great while, and I tried to carry out the views of these medical gentlemen who met here in conference, and to the best of my ability I have carried them out. There is no increase in the expenditure. In fact the vote is $20,000, and it will come in another place. Last year we thought we could reduce that vote, and we put it at $15,000.

Mr. WILSON. I am not finding any fault whatever with the hon. gentleman for doing a foolish thing, as that would not surprise me in the least, neither am I finding fault with the recommendation of the medical men. What I find fault with is, that the information given us by the Minister does not warrant us in voting intelligently upon the estimates before the House.

The Committee rose; and it being six o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. When the Committee rose we were engaged in discussing the statistical branch of the Agricultural Department, which the hon. gentleman stated was recently established. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will state whether its operations are confined to the collection of mortuary statistics, or whether it performs other statistical operations.

Mr. POPE. The statistical officers I speak of here are just now engaged in compiling the agricultural statistics. The hon. gentleman will remember that we were to procure, as far as we could, statistics from local governments. We did so in Manitoba, and although I have not been able to do so in Ontario, I hope soon to do it there also. We are now compiling the statistics from the North-West Territories and those that have been collected in the Lower Provinces. The clerks engaged in the office are mostly girls who, I find, do as much work as men for much less pay. They have been engaged for the last month in compiling the agricultural statistics that have been collected. I may say to the hon. gentleman that in collecting these statistics I employed the Post Office Inspectors and gave them $100 each. They were to get these statistics through the postmasters as far as they could be got. Whether the result will be satisfactory I cannot say yet; I hope it will be. Very few persons are engaged on the mortuary statistics—I think four; and in that particular branch these four persons have all they can do.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman mean that of these permanent clerks, the vote for whom we are now taking, four are engaged in mortuary statistics?

Mr. POPE. No, only two.

Mr. BLAKE. Are these two new ones?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. And are they under the immediate control of the statistical officer, or of Mr. Taché, or under the hon. gentleman's control?

Mr. POPE. Of course they are under the control of the statistical officer who oversees them; but they do their own work, and they have a room to themselves.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see there are two officers appointed. Who are they?

Mr. POPE. There are four ladies in the room, two of them are temporary; the other two were engaged on the census, and have been a long time in the service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Under whose charge is this statistical branch?

Mr. POPE. Mr. Layton.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who are the ladies?

Mr. POPE. The one who has charge in that room is Mrs. Lister. Then there is Miss Fraser, Miss Rose and,—I forget the other one's name.

Department of Marine $22,562 50

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There appears to be an additional chief clerk here. Who is the gentleman appointed?

Mr. McLELAN. There is no appointed clerk here. The officer who is now doing the work of accountant was already a first-class clerk. Of the chief clerks connected with the Department, one went to the Fisheries branch, and the other remained. The one who went to the Fisheries branch was the accountant. One of the first-class clerks may be made chief clerk at $1,800.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That practically means having three chief clerks in the Department instead of two.

Mr. McLELAN. In the two Departments, yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What service requires a second chief clerk?

Mr. McLELAN. Accountant to rank as a chief clerk.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That means that the gentleman's salary must run up to $2,400 or $2,500. Formerly a chief clerk was considered a sufficiently high officer to discharge all the duties of accountant; and although this arrangement may not involve any very material addition at present, it involves at least $600 in the long run, if I recollect the rule of the service.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes and no.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who is the officer?

Mr. McLELAN. He is not appointed. Mr. Gourdeau, who was formerly in the account branch of the service, has been acting as accountant.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think there is no other Department, which has so many chief clerks proportionately. There are several other increases of smaller sums.

Mr. McLELAN. No other increase except statutory increases.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a total increase of about $1,800.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes, about $800 on account of statutory increases, and the promotion of the acting accountant to the position of accountant.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I notice that in this Department one officer was superannuated from 12th October, 1883. Who is he; what was the cause of the superannuation; what is the amount paid?

Mr. McLELAN. That refers to Mr. Whitcher, commissioner of fisheries, who was superannuated in October, 1883, after 33 years service. His age was not quite sufficiently advanced to lead to his superannuation; but he had very strong medical certificates, and in consequence of the division of the Department and the medical certificates, I superannuated him. He receives about $1,300 a year. The old accountant of the Marine branch and the commissioner of fisheries received together $4,800. The old accountant was

made deputy head at $3,200, leaving a balance of $1,600, or $300 after superannuating Mr. Whitcher.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the reason for the large increase in the cost of managing this Department from 1874 to the present time? Why are there more officials now than then?

Mr. McLELAN. I do not remember the number in 1874. I know there has been very little increase.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There were 18 in the Department in 1874.

Mr. McLELAN. When I went into the Department there was a very large number of extra clerks employed. Most of these have been made permanent, and provision is being made for the appointment of three more of these extra clerks. I propose, if the work continue, which is very heavy, on the inspection of steamboats, the examination of masters and mates and the distribution of the fishing bounty, to make more of the extra clerks permanent, and so reduce the staff of extra clerks and arrange that all the clerks may appear in the estimates.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In 1874 the cost of management was $20,000; at the present time it is over $36,000, or an increase of over $16,000 in five years. How does the Minister account for that?

Mr. McLELAN. A very large proportion of the increased amount is for statutory increases of salary. The work of the Department has very largely increased since I took charge. There have been added light-house and life-saving stations, signal service, inspection of hulls of steamers, and the meteorological service has very largely increased. In fact, in every branch of the service the work has almost doubled.

Mr. DAVIES. Who are those whom it is intended to make permanent clerks?

Mr. McLELAN. I have not made a selection yet.

Mr. DAVIES. Does the hon. gentleman intend to have a separate accountant for each branch.

Mr. McLELAN. One of the clerks who was in the account branch previously went to the fishery branch, Mr. Mackinson, a very excellant accountant, and he performs the duties, and will continue to do so if his health permits. His health failed during last summer, and under a medical certificate he obtained three months' leave of absence. He has somewhat improved.

Mr. DAVIES. Is it intended to have two separate accountants—one for each branch?

Mr. McLELAN. There will be a separate account in each branch.

Mr. DAVIES. What justification has the hon. Minister for having two accountants. I understood him to state last year that this division of the Department would not involve any increase in the public expenditure.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman will understand there were three or four, or perhaps five persons employed in the account branch of the Department previous to the division of it. There was the chief accountant, Mr. Mackinson, Mr. Gourdeau, Mr. Owen and one or two others who assisted in the accountant service. The chief accountant went into the fisheries branch, and took at least two of those who formerly worked in the account department. His salary was $2,400 before leaving. Mr. Gourdeau has been acting accountant since, and it is proposed to give him an increase of salary.

Mr. DAVIES. Is he first-class or second-class?

Mr. McLELAN. Second-class.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think I understood the Minister of Marine to say that Mr. Whitcher had been retired on account of ill-health. Now, I am sorry to hear that Mr. Whitcher has been in ill-health, but I had the pleasure of seeing him recently and he appeared to me to have made a very admirable recovery, and we know that he was a man of very great energy and activity—perhaps too great for the comfort of some of his superior officers. It occurs to my mind that the excercise of the superannuation in his case requires more explanation than that we have yet had. Mr. Whitcher, whatever he may have been at that moment, does not at present look like a man whose services ought to be lost to us. The hon. gentleman knows that in addition to our annual expenditure the sum of $1,400 or $1,500 for the superannuation of an officer like Mr. Whitcher is a considerable sum. There was some little discussion or dispute in the newspapers between Mr. Whitcher and other gentlemen in the Department, and it occurs to me that as there may have been some things that had a greater influence on the superannuation than the ill-health of Mr. Whitcher, we should have more explanation as to the reasons for his superannuation.

Mr. McLELAN. Mr. Whitcher, almost ever since I became connected with the Department, has been making application out for superannuation, alleging that his health was such that he was not equal to the discharging of the duties of his office as they should be discharged. He brought, on two or three occasions, certificates from medical men confirming his statement, and upon his request, and the strong certificates of these medical men, I finally assented to his superannuation. The hon. gentleman will see that, as his salary was $2,400 and the salary of the old accountant in the Marine and Fishery branch was $2,400, making $4,800; and a deputy was appointed at $3,200; a balance of $1,600 was left which will go against Mr. Whitcher's superannuation, so that the increase in the Department will be small, in fact the whole arrangement has been made without any increase, because these officers, after long and faithful service, were entitled to some increase, at any rate.

Mr. DAVIES. Was the amount of Mr. Whitcher's superannuation calculated on the number of years actual service, or was any term added or subtracted?

Mr. McLELAN. Some was subtracted.

Mr. DAVIES. Why were they subtracted?

Mr. McLELAN. For several acts of insubordination which were not satisfactory to the Department five years were deducted.

Mr. DAVIES. What were the acts of insubordination?

Mr. McLELAN. His term was 28 years, and he was allowed 23.

Mr. DAVIES. What were the acts of insubordination?

Mr. McLELAN. There were several. I think the hon. gentleman had better move for the papers, and then he can get all the information.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; the information is in connection with this subject.

Mr. BLAKE. It was stated widely that something had been done or said by Mr. Whitcher, which was not regarded as correct by the hon. gentleman in connection with the Fishery Exhibition; that Mr. Whitcher made some statement as to the non-success or the inutility of the scheme of fish-hatching which the hon. gentleman thought was an improper proceeding, and that this had occasioned a difference and a breaking off of those relations which ought to subsist for the good of the service between a Minister and one of his chief officers. How about that?

Mr. McLELAN. That was one act of insubordination, but that was not the first. I think in the year previous to that, he had published a preface to his report in which he made some statements which were altogether unjustifiable. It was so strong and so great an offence that I felt that some action should be taken, but Mr. Whitcher acknowledged the wrong and retracted it. I hoped he would have given no further occasion, but hon. gentlemen, when they see the certificates of the medical men in connection with Mr. Whitcher, I think, will not ask for further explanations of the matter, as to his condition of mind, and the state of nervous irritation—such that the doctors said they would not be responsible for his acts. Taking everything into consideration, upon his own request, which had been made for years previous—or for at least a year previous—I thought it was in the public interest to grant him his retirement.

Mr. DAVIES. It seems hard that if Mr. Whitcher's state of mind was such that he was not responsible for his acts, and therefore it was necessary that he should be superannuated; that he should be further punished by having five years deducted from his term. That is an explanation which I think requires some supplementary explanation. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if Mr. Whitcher was not suspended before he was superannuated, and for what length of time, and whether he did or did not receive any pay for the time for which he was suspended?

Mr. McLELAN. He was suspended for two or three months,—I think in August, and he was superannuated in October.

Mr. DAVIES. Did his pay go on?

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Mr. DAVIES. So he lost his pay for three months, besides losing five years on his superannuation, and all because he was in a state of mind that he was not responsible for what he did. I think, Sir, that is terrible treatment—perfectly unjustifiable treatment for any public officer. I am told that he has been in the service 32 or 33 years, and at the end of that time he became so mentally incapable that the Minister says he is not responsible—

Mr. McLELAN. I do not say that he was not responsible, but the doctors said that if he continued at his work in that state of nervous irritability, he could not be held long responsible for his acts, and upon that statement, looking to the future, and taking the doctor's certificates in that light, I thought it would be well to grant him his superannuation.

Mr. BLAKE. Were these certificates given while he was under suspension?

Mr. McLELAN. No; one was given previously, and the other after.

Mr. WELDON. Was his application to be superannuated made in writing?

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that Mr. Whitcher's age is given as 55 in the superannuation memorandum attached to the Public Accounts, and I observe also that he is declared to be superannuated on the score of age alone, and nothing is stated about ill-health. Now it appears from the Minister's statement that there is a great deal more than ill-health the matter with him. When the matter was first brought up the hon. gentleman said it was on the score of a physician's certificate; now it appears it was on the score of alleged repeated acts of insubordination, and further, that considerable penalties have been inflicted upon him. It seems to me that we should have those certificates of the physicians at a convenient time.

Mr. DAVIES. If I understood the hon' gentleman aright there were two acts of insubordination, one was for affixing a preface to his report which was unjustifiable in the Minister's opinion. The offence was afterwards condoned; but there was a subsequent act of insubordination which was the act for which he was punished, and not the one the Minister has described. Now, I think the House and the country are entitled to know what was the particular act of insubordination for which he was superannuated or punished by having five years taken off his allowance.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I happen to know something about this. Those gentlemen opposite, who are taking Mr. Whitcher's part so strongly, ought to know that it was upon his continuous, pressing request that he was superannuated. For a long time he used to come to me, as an old friend of mine, complaining that he was harshly used and ought to be superannuated. There is no doubt that he did not get along well with the permanent head of his Department, and he implored the Government to superannuate him. I used to say to him, "You cannot say you are not fit to do your work, and therefore the Minister has a right to retain you." He used strong language as to the effect his position had upon him and would have unless he was relieved, and then he produced, not one, but several certificates, stating that his health was in great danger if he was not superannuated. So he was superannuated, as my hon. friend has stated, on account of the state of his health. He was in such a state of mind as affected his health, bodily as well as nervously. He was superannuated at his own request, he makes no complaint, and I believe he got off very well.

Mr. DAVIES. That does not affect the question I asked the Minister of Marine; what was the particular act of insubordination for which he was punished by having five years taken off his allowance?

Mr. McLELAN. No one particular act of insubordination. I told the hon. gentleman before that he had been repeatedly, ever since I went into office, applying for superannuation on account of ill-health. As I know, he was in that state of mind which made it almost impossible for him to discharge the duties of his office; and upon repeated applications and certificates from medical men, I recommended to Council that he be superannuated.

Mr. DAVIES. Surely the hon. Minister does not want the House to understand that he was punished by having five years taken off his allowance for applying repeatedly for superannuation. What I want to know is, why were the five years taken off? Does the hon. Minister decline to state.

Mr. McLELAN. I will give the hon. gentleman all the papers with the particulars.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It appears that Mr. Whitcher was in the Marine and Fisheries Department for about 33 years, and had acquired a very comprehensive knowledge of the whole subject of fisheries. It appears, however, that he differed from the Minister of Marine; and as soon as he differs from that distinguished individual, the hon. Minister thinks his mind is going, and it is looked upon as an act of insubordination, that after giving 33 years of his life to the subject, he does not believe in this fish-hatchery business.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Besides, it is so to be remembered that a very considerable addition is made to the expenditure the Civil Service when you superannuate an officer. We are now paying for the Civil Service $1,200,000 against $833,000 under the late Government. In addition to that, we are paying $200,000 a year for superannuation in place of $106,000, which was paid six or seven years ago. I submit that the House is bound to watch jealously the exercise of the authority given to the

Government in superannuation matters. The superannuation allowance is becoming a practical and serious grievance. Why, I recollect when hon. gentlemen opposite could find nothing so deserving of censure as the increase of the superannuation allowance to $106,000. Now it is $200,000, and we want an explanation of the reason for the superannuation of an officer known to many of us as an active and vigilant officer, although he may have had the misfortune to differ from the Minister, by which $1,400 is added to the superannuation expenditure. The Minister knows that when a man is superannuated at 55 years of age, a very good reason should be given. The $1,400 which are paid are not in any way saved. We know that the work Mr. Whitcher has done, has to be done by other officers, and we know that in the course of a very few years they will demand and get just as much payment as Mr. Whitcher did.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) is in error in stating that there was a difference between the Minister and Mr. Whitcher. There was no difference between us upon any particular point of policy in the Department. Mr. Whitcher does approve of fish hatcheries just as much as I do. I know that there was an unhappy state of matters between Mr. Whitcher and the deputy head of the Department for many years. I hoped that it would have passed away, and that Mr. Whitcher would have settled down to his work, but it continued to grow worse and worse every year, until his physicians certified that it was likely to result in serious injury to Mr. Whitcher if he was not permitted to go; and it was upon repeated applications, and the certificates of medical men, that superannuation was granted to him.

Mr. DAVIES. Then the hon. Minister, as I understand, says that it was not in consequence of the publication of a letter in which Mr. Whitcher gave his views on the want of success of the fish hatcheries that he yielded to his application for superannuation.

Mr. McLELAN. If that had been the consideration that moved me, and that alone, it would have been a dismissal.

Mr. DAVIES. But Mr. Whitcher was suspended for a certain number of months for which he received no pay. Was the cause of the suspension not a public letter in which he gave his views upon the success of the fish hatcheries? We are spending thousands of dollars yearly on the fish hatcheries, and if Mr. Whitcher put his views on record, and if those views were in accordance with the facts, he should not have been punished, but was entitled to credit for putting them on record.

Mr. McLELAN. Mr. Whitcher was not suspended for the publication of any honest view.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am not satisfied with the increased expenditure in this Department. When the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) was at its head, there were only employed in it eighteen officials, and its annual expenditure was only $17,530. To-day that Department employs 31 clerks and costs $36,412. I do not believe the increase of work is sufficient to warrant that increase and I wish to ascertain how this money is being expended.

Mr. McLELAN. I have already answered the hon. gentleman. When I went in, there were a number of extra clerks employed, and I appointed three or four permanently. My predecessor, Mr. Pope, also appointed permanently others who were there as extra clerks. When the work seems likely to continue, I think it advisable to make the officers permanent. Since 1878, there has been a large increase in the business, several new services having been added to the Department, which more than doubles the work, taking the work as a whole. The temporary clerks previously employed, though they did not count, were there all the same, and perhaps their wages by the day amounted to more than they do now per year.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has not given the House the information to which it is entitled in reference to the case of Mr. Whitcher. In England, it is not considered to be any violation of the duty of a public officer to discuss any question of departmental administration. There are many men connected with the Admiralty Department in England who are to-day writing on the subject of the navy.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not one.

Mr. MILLS. Over and over again it has been done.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MILLS. The questions as to the construction of turret ships, and as to how ships shall be plated and so on, have been discussed again and again by departmental officers. It is not on that ground, I fancy, that the hon. gentleman took exception to what Mr. Whitcher did. If Mr. Whitcher believed the fish hatcheries were not producing satisfactory results, it was important that he should state honestly and clearly his views and the reasons for them. It was specially important when, perhaps, the exhibition of the Canadian Government would lead to mischievous results in England; but I understand the Minister to say it was not for that Mr. Whitcher was suspended and punished by having withheld from him three months' salary, but it was for a dishonest expression of opinion; it was for maligning the Department publicly by stating what is not true. That is what the hon. gentleman suggests was the reason. If that be the reason, it would be a reason for dismissing Mr. Whitcher, but not for retiring him on a pension. If what the hon. gentleman intimates was the fact, namely, that Mr. Whitcher was not responsible for his actions because his mind was off its balance, Mr. Whitcher was not a subject for punishment. That might be a reason for retiring him, but not for witholding from him three months salary and taking five years off his time of service. The House is entitled to further information. When we vote public money, we give our sanction to the Government as regards the appropriation which the Government asks, and it is therefore our duty to see that we get the fullest information before voting the money, as it is the duty of the Ministers to give that information.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would like to know what the hon. gentleman desires. The question is simply whether Mr. Whitcher was properly superannuated or not. The other question is whether, if he was superannuated, he ought not to have got a higher rate than was allowed him. Which does the hon. gentleman advocate?

Mr. MILLS. We are asking information.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Here we have this fact that an officer of the Government, a civil servant, applies for superannuation. He declares that his health will not allow him to continue in office; implores for superannuation and produces satisfactory evidence, the usual evidence of medical testimony, to show that his health will not permit him to go on. Well, he was superannuated. The hon. gentleman cannot say but that, under those circumstances, he was superannuated because his health was broken down, and at his request. Then as to the fact that his superannuation allowance is not so large by five years as it might have been, that is no loss to the public. If that is at all an injustice, it is an injustice which Mr. Whitcher has a right to complain of, and protest against, and apply to Parliament, if he chooses, for redress. He does not do so; He never has done so; he does not do so at all. He is superannuated of right; he is superannuated of necessity; he could not attend to his work, and he did not attend to his work.

Why, Mr. Chairman, I am, in fact, personally chargeable, perhaps, with an undue disregard of the public funds in getting him leave of absence after leave of absence, in order to enable him to recover his health and his capacity to attend to his work, but he found he could not do so, and his medical man said he could not do so, and thereupon he was superannuated, and the question with the Government simply was: Shall we dismiss him or remove him without giving him anything, or shall we give him a superannuation allowance? We gave him a superannuation allowance and he has not complained of it.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman says the public interest has not suffered because five years were taken off the number of years on which Mr. Whitcher's superannuation is calculated, and he also says, that because Mr. Whitcher has not complained to this House of the manner in which he was dealt with, the mouths of hon. members should be stopped. I differ with the hon. gentleman. I think this is an important matter, a very important matter, the calculation of the years allowed to the members of the Civil Service who are superannuated. We find sometimes that the Government add on ten, twelve and fifteen years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. DAVIES. I think so. I think I have seen twelve and even fifteen years added.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. DAVIES. Ten, at all events.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, ten.

Mr. DAVIES. In other cases they take off five years. This is not a discretion to be exercised arbitrarily, to be exercised by the Government of the day in favor of some person they approve of and against others they may happen not to agree with, politically or otherwise. This is a question which should be decided on principle, and, when we see years added to or years taken from civil servants, the public have a right to be informed and we have a right to ask —we would fail in our duty if we did not ask—the ground upon which it has been done. Up to this moment there seems to be some great reluctance on the part of the Minister of Marine to give the House the information. He will not say whether it was or not because of the publication of that letter which Mr. Whitcher wrote. If he tells me that that was the cause, I shall be able to form a proper conclusion as to whether it was justified or not. We all know what was in the letter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not.

Mr. DAVIES. Then the hon. gentleman could not have exercised his discretion, at all events, in cutting off these five years. So the House has not the information.——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Move for it.

Mr. DAVIES. I am asking for it here in Supply. Surely, if we cannot get explanations when the moneys of the country are being voted in Supply, there is no time to get them. The hon. gentleman tells me to move for it, when he knows perfectly well that in all probability I could not get the motion brought on this Session. This is the time to ask for the information, and the Minister ought to give it. There is an important principle involved in this superannuation allowance, and, if Ministers are to be allowed to exercise their discretion in adding to or deducting from the number of years, it is calculated to be an engine of great oppression in one case and of favoritism in the other; and in this case, when they take five years off an old public servant who has been 32 or 33 years in the service, the public have a right to know clearly the reason why. I know that Mr. Whitcher is a very efficient officer. I happened to be associated with him in the Fishery Commission some years ago, and I know that the services he rendered to the country were very valuable services; and, if I find a gentleman with whom I was associated at one time punished in this way I may be pardoned for asking the reason why. If it is for publishing a letter saying that the money expended in the fish hatcheries was not producing the results the country thought it was or which it was stated at the fish exhibition that it was, if he was punished for telling the truth, he was punished for stating a fact which one of the Ministers stated. The Minister of Justice stated the same thing and he was not punished for it. I think there is something behind this which the House has not got at. I think the Minister of Marine would do better to give us the facts. We are told that there was a dispute between some deputy and Mr. Whitcher. Well, we do not know who was right and who was wrong. Perhaps the deputy was wrong, but he is considered to have been right because he is a great favorite of the Ministers and has since received promotion.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I think you are wrong there.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman from British Columbia says the gentleman who has received promotion is not the favorite of the Minister. I understand the present Deputy Minister of Fisheries is the gentleman that the Minister referred to.

Mr. McLELAN. No, I did not say so.

Mr. DAVIES. Then I was wrong. I thought he said the gentleman who now occupies Mr. Whitcher's position and who was then a subordinate in the Department had some differences with him.

Mr. McLELAN. It is not the same deputy.

Mr. DAVIES. The Deputy of Marine? Whether that is so or not I do not know, but we are entitled to the information. There was also another statement which the Minister made which appeared to me most extraordinary. He says the work of that Department had doubled since 1878. That is news to me. I would like to know in what respect. A few years ago you had charge of all the rivers and streams, and you had immense labor in issuing licenses and in controlling those rivers and streams. You have not any of that work now. In former years you had the licensing of the American fishing vessels, and there was an immense amount of work there. That has all ceased. Where has the work increased, I would like to know?

Mr. McLELAN. That had ceased before 1878.

Mr. DAVIES. I dare say it had; but the licensing of the fishing in the rivers and streams had not ceased, but was in full operation in 1878, and it involved an immense deal of labor.

Mr. McLELAN. No.

Mr. DAVIES. It involved a great deal of labor, and an immense mass of correspondence, and a great deal of litigation. We are all cognisant of these facts, those of us who come from the Maritime Provinces, and I should like to know from the hon. gentleman in what branch of his Department there has been such an increase as to justify this enormous expenditure, which is going on rolling up year by year?

Department of Fisheries $12,850 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Be good enough to explain the alterations which have been made here. There are one or two additional appointments, and some alterations in salaries.

Mr. McLELAN. I have explained that. The hon. member had raised the question on the fisheries, and I made the full explanation then of the changes which had been made, that the office of the Commissioner of Fisheries was

abolished by Act of Parliament last year, and a deputy head created for that branch.

Mr. WELDON. I would like to know how the Fisheries Department has increased. As pointed out by my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) a great part of it consisted in looking after the leases and licenses on rivers, which are now taken away from the Department.

Mr. McLELAN. The reduction of work on that account has been comparatively trifling. All these rivers have to be looked after, and it entails almost as much labor on the Department, with the bare exception of issuing licenses. All these streams have to be looked after by the Government, and the fishery branch, as the hon. gentleman knows, has had a very large amount of work thrown upon it by the fishermens' bounties. A large number of claims for bounty are forwarded to the Department to be examined, and to be reported upon, and from 25,000 to 35,000 checks are issued for the payment of those bounties.

Mr. DAVIES. I understand the Minister to give one extraordinary explanation, and that is that the work has increased because the rivers and streams have passed out of his jurisdiction.

Mr. McLELAN. I did not say that. I said that part of it in respect to rivers and streams had been very slightly diminished, but that it had been largely increased by the fishing bounties. I stated previously that the great amount of increased work had been mainly in the Marine Department.

Mr. DAVIES. I understand the only explanation of the increase is confined to the payment of the fishing bounties. That is no justification for this enormous increase in salaries, because the Minister knows well that he gave extra pay to the gentleman who signed these checks—if I remember well he paid $400 extra. So that cannot justify the tremendous increase in this Department; so that the only branch of this service, in which he has pointed any increase of work, that work has been paid for extra. In this connection I think the House would like to have the benefit of the experience of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), who formerly filled with so much credit to himself and the country, the position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries. We would like to know whether, in his opinion, the increased work in this Department justifies the enormous increase in the expenditure.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would say to my hon. friend, whom I am always pleased to meet and to talk with, that when I occupy the position, which I hope some day to occupy, on the ministerial benches, then he will have a right to question me, and I will be able to answer him without his putting a notice on the paper. However, I may say that the policy of giving bounties to fishermen on the coast, has led to a large increase in the business of the Department that would involve the employment of some additional hands, how many I do not know. I have taken very little interest in the Department, my applications to the Department not always having been as successful as I would have liked, though doubtless the Minister had good reasons for refusing them.

Department of Public Works..... .....$41,290 00

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There are a few changes in the different branches. The short-hand writer, Mr. McKay, having died, a third class clerk was put in his place at the minimum salary of $1,100. The third class clerk that comes next is in consequence of a young man being taken on at a salary of $400 instead of $800, that the previous clerk received. The secretary and chief clerk of the corresponding branch, Mr. Ennis, died the other day, and his successor begins at the minimum salary of $1,800. There are only four clerks in that branch, one of them having been transferred to the accountant's branch. There is an increase of one in the number of third class clerks, because one in the accountant's branch has been transferred to the correspondence branch. In the accountant's branch the number of third class clerks is increased by one who has been brought in from the correspondence branch. The other increases in salaries are the statutory increases.

Mr. WILSON. I think, taking the estimates in this Department as a whole, the Minister will not require as large a staff in the future as he has had in the past. While on this point I would like to call his attention to the fact that during last summer he sent two engineers up west to examine and report upon the harbors of Port Stanley and Port Burwell as a harbor of refuge, a great loss of life having taken place in those localities. I supposed the reports had been made to him as to the importance of a harbor of refuge at one or both of those points, and soon after the House met, about the 9th February, I think, I moved for the correspondence in connection with this matter. In a short time the answer came down which stated that no such report had been made to the Minister up to that date. I have waited patiently to see those reports, but I have received no information whatever up to the present time. I suppose these engineers have been unable to make a report, because they have been so hard at work during the winter. Now, this is an important matter, and it seriously affects the traffic on those lakes. It has been strongly represented to the Minister of Public Works as being an important matter, not only in the interests of that section of the country, but also in the interests of the unfortunate mariners who are compelled to ply their avocations on the lakes. I would say here, that when these surveys have been made so long since, when the matter had been in the Department for such a length of time, when we are giving liberal salaries to pay those who are employed there to do the work, when the Order of this House had been passed calling for the report in reference to the matter of this survey, I think it is the bounden duty of the Minister in charge not to allow this Session to pass by without bringing down the report of these engineers. If the Department was overrun with work and unable to furnish a report, the matter would be different. Why this delay should have taken place is unaccountable to me, and I think we are entitled to get a report of some kind, either favorable or unfavorable. I do not see one dollar placed in the estimates even for repairs in that locality, and I would urge on the Minister of Public Works that he should impress on his subordinates to do their duty at once. The Postmaster General is also interested in the locality, and I would urge him to press on his colleagues to have a report made at the earliest date.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is hardly the thing for an hon. member to bring up this matter on the organisation of the Department. The hon. gentleman must see that I cannot be expected to give information in regard to these matters at this time. When the votes for works come on, I expect then that hon. members will put to me questions about the different works, and I shall be in a position to answer their enquiries. But I cannot be expected on this vote to say that such and such a work will cost so and so. Nevertheless, I will answer the hon. gentleman in this way: There is no disposition to hide from him or from the House anything connected with these matters. The reason why the report was not brought down was this: We send an engineer to make a survey; he does so and makes certain observations and technical remarks which are submitted to the chief engineer. When these are all laid before him the chief engineer prepares a report, which is sent to myself as

head of the Department, and that report is the report which is to be laid before Parliament. That is the explanation as to why the report in question has not been laid before Parliament, but when we take up the estimates of the different works, I shall be able to give the hon. gentleman, even if the report is not ready, particulars as to the cost of those works should Parliament order them to be undertaken.

Mr. WILSON. I think it was quite proper and in place to ask these questions at the present time. The Government are asking Parliament for a vote for the Department of Public Works. The Department has employed engineers to prepare reports on different works, and it is the duty of the Minister to see that they make their reports, so that hon. members may be in a position to see how matters in which they are interested stand. As regards details that will come up afterwards, the Minister is quite correct in stating that such information can be furnished when the votes for the different works come up. It is a shame, however, that we should have to wait for reports when engineers have had ample opportunity to prepare them. That is what I complain of. I ask that this matter should be no longer delayed, but that the report of the engineers, at all events as regards the general result, should be submitted so that I might have an opportunity of seeing it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is not the time when the hon. gentleman can expect the details for which he asks, and I am sorry to say I cannot give them now. When the votes for different works are before the House I will be in a position to answer him, and he may be sure that I will answer him, as I always do, as fully as I can. The reason why the report is not laid before the House is because the chief engineer has not laid it before myself. He has the responsibility of his reports, and he will therefore not submit them unless he is fully prepared to answer for them. When this matter comes before us in Committee I will be in a position to give the hon. gentleman and the Committee all explanation and information that can be expected.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What the hon. gentleman says with respect to the Department is no doubt correct enough. He has not increased, apparently, the expenditure. But I observe, in looking over the Auditor General's report, that in connection with the offices of chief architect and chief engineer, and all the rest of them, a practice has crept in which requires the notice of this House. I find the hon. gentleman is in the habit of employing a large number of extra clerks. According to the Auditor General's report some of these clerks obtain amounts for extra services, which aggregate almost a second salary. I will give the House some idea of the mode in which this is done. I find by the Auditor General's Report that Mr. Billings has a salary of $1,262 a year, but that in addition he got for extra work $680, raising his salary to almost $2,000. Mr. Curran has a salary of $1,100, but he did extra work to the amount of $912, making his salary $2,116. Another gentleman named Mr. Ewart has a salary of $1,600, but he did extra work, for which he was entitled to $603, making a salary of $2,328, and so on and so on. I am also informed that a great number of the temporary clerks are to all intents and purposes permanent, and that some have been five years, some seven years, and some eleven or twelve years in the Department. It appears to me there is very considerable abuse likely to creep in. I can understand a man being able to do a moderate number of extra hours work, and probably under the peculiar circumstances of the case, it may be allowable to pay him for it. But it is not at all desirable that men in receipt of a salary of $1,100 or $1,200 should receive $700, $900 or $653 for extra work. That practice tends to two things: First,—to give to those parties a salary above what apparently the Department thinks them worth; and second, it causes the work to be badly done. I do not think that a man is likely to do an honest day's work in the Department and do four or five hours extra work. Either the departmental work will suffer or the extra work will suffer, and it is quite clear that this is becoming a very general practice in connection with these particular offices, those of the chief architect and chief engineer particularly. I should like to hear what the hon. gentleman has to say on that point.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am very much pleased that the hon. gentleman has given me an opportunity to explain this matter here, it having been investigated elsewhere when I was unable to be present. This is not a new matter. It existed while the hon. gentleman was in office during five years. It existed previous to his being in office, and it has existed since. It is a custom that has been followed for twenty years. And, therefere, if it is bad to-day it must have been bad then, and I am only surprised that the hon. gentleman, with the care and attention he devotes to public matters, did not discover that during his five years of office. This was the custom then, and it is the custom now, and the reason is obvious. These officers being there as architects or engineers, they know exactly the work of the office; they know these special works, and therefore if you bring a new hand to attend to that work you will have to pay him a large salary to do so, because you have him only for a short time and he must be as able a man as the clerk you have there already, and therefore by paying this man so much an hour for the extra time, you save money to the country and you have better work done. Another reason is this, that if we had to take a new staff to do this work at the office, we would have had to have other rooms in other localities. We have not the space; all the space allotted to the Department as well as to the other Departments is as small as it can be; it is all occupied, and therefore we do not have this work done by them. Besides this work that has been done so by officers of the Department—for example the lands for public buildings, etc.—this has saved a large sum of money to the Department and to the country. Had we employed extra architects or engineers to do this work, we would have had to pay them the ordinary rate of two, three, four or five per cent on the cost of the work, and if we had done that instead of paying $5,000, say, we would have had to pay $10,000, and therefore it is another saving to the Department. The hon. gentleman hints, although he did not say it positively, that a number of these officers have been there for a term of years—five or seven years. There are some who have been there twenty years, who were there when the hon. gentleman was in office and previous to that. These extra clerks when the work does not press, when Parliament does not vote money for new works, drop out and are not employed, and are therefore not paid, and the result is that being extra clerks we are not obliged to give them superannuations and thus increase the expense of the country. On the other hand the expense of the staff is not increased permanently, and you have a number of clerks who after a certain time, if vacancies occur, have a preference and should have a preference over others, by being there and having shown their faithfulness, their ability and capacity. If some of these persons drop out they have a right to say when a vacancy occurs, we have worked in the office before, and though it was only temporarily we showed our ability, we showed that we were fit for the work; give us a chance and employ us. I must say that I found that permanent officers of the Department had at different periods received extra pay for extra hours. I stopped that practice last April or last May. I said it should not be done. It was done I think in only

three or four instances, when the work could not be delayed, but I gave orders that permanent officers should not have extra pay for any work that they did beyond the ordinary office hours. But coming back to this matter, I must say that the work these extra or temporary clerks have been performing has been performed beyond their office hours, that it has been paid for as such, and that so far from the country having lost, the country has gained by it, because that work was done better and at a cheaper rate than if we had taken extra hands to perform it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I beg to observe this: I can understand that there might be some excuse for the employment of these men for short periods, but I do not think the hon. gentleman will find in the case of any of his predecessors, that men were employed for a period of 1,200 hours extra work in the course of a year. That means —because they were not employed the whole time—that these men, in addition to doing or being supposed to do eight hours work, which I suppose is the regulation of his Department were obliged to do or declared that they did, a matter of four or five hours a day on the average for the whole year, taking one particular case. I doubt if he did or could get good work out of them for that time, and I doubt if he will find in the annals of the Department, that officers were employed in this fashion. I said I could understand, and I believe it has been the case, occasionally to employ them for short intervals. But he is not employing them for short intervals; he is adding 50 or 60 or 80 per cent. to the salaries of some of these officers, and I hold that that practice is an abuse, in spite of what the hon. gentleman has said, I say, it might be desirable to employ them in this way for a short time, but I do not think it is desirable that men receiving $1,100 or $1,200 a year should practically be raised to $2,000 a year, and I do not think the hon. gentleman has in the slightest degree intimated a discontinuance of the practice. I do not think we get good value for our money, and as to his other argument that it would be necessary to employ other men and pay a certain percentage of the amount of the job, I think it would be quite possible to get that work done at much lower rates. It is quite true that in the case of architects employed casually they charge such rates, but that is simply because they get only casual jobs, and I think it would be better to have one or two men employed in the Department, if need be. It has come out that sometimes these men were entitled to be employed at home and were entitled to keep their own time. I dare say that in most cases they did fairly by the Department, and that in cases where the man was paid by his work, fair estimates were made, but I say it is a practice open to serious abuse, and I think that it is a practice which carried on at this rate should be discontinued.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The practice has been carried on for twenty years. I believe it would be better that it should be changed, and for this reason it was that, over a year ago, I stopped the extra pay to permanent officers. The present will probably be the proper time to reduce this practice to a minimum, because apparently by the estimates before us, the works to be prosecuted during the next year will not be so numerous as those executed during previous years. The hon. gentleman mentioned just now that a number of these clerks gave themselves the time during which they had been occupied. Well, as the hon. gentleman supposed, the work could be easily ascertained by the head of the branch. For instance, he would know perfectly well that a plan would certainly take so many hours to execute, and when it was brought to him he could see how it was performed. There must be a great deal of latitude in that way; you must rely a great deal upon the honor and honesty of the officer, and when he is away, you can only ascertain what he has done by the plan or the report he brings back of the work entrusted to him. I think the system was not a good one in the beginning, and I do not think it is better now; and therefore, though we must always have extra clerks, we may have a larger number of hands when the work has increased, and avoid giving extra hours to the clerks.

Mr. DAVIES. I understand, that in the hon. gentleman's opinion it is necessary to continue this practice of paying temporary clerks for the extra work they do after hours. I understood him to say, with respect to the permanent clerks, that the practice was a vicious one, and that he intended to discontinue it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I said this was a proper time when a change of system might be tried, because the number of works we shall have this year will be much smaller than those of last year or the previous year. Next year we need not have extra hours, or we may have more time in which to perform the work, and therefore we may have a few additional hands to cover the work that would be performed in extra time by the extra clerks.

Department of Railways and Canals..... $46,500.00

Mr. EDGAR. I observe among these proposed salaries there is a new chief clerk called a law clerk. I would like the hon. Minister to say what are the duties of this law clerk at $2,050, and how the duties have been performed hitherto without charge upon the public service.

Mr. POPE. There is no new office. This man has for years acted as law clerk although he has not appeared in the estimates as law clerk; and you will find, if you look at an item below, of seven second class clerks, that there is a reduction of $1,200 or $1,500, which was what this man had. He is one of the most important officers of that Department.

Mr. EDGAR. What is his name?

Mr. POPE. Mr. Fissiault. He has been a long time there, and has been one of the most important and necessary officers of that Department. Every lease and contract given must pass through his hands, and the work of preparing these documents he has done for years, and done well. I am not quite sure that in putting him here we are acting entirely in accordance with the Civil Service Act; but I am quite sure that he ought to have that increase. The item might lie over, or if hon. gentlemen allow it to pass I will explain it on concurrence.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Perhaps the hon. gentleman will state whether or not this official is a professional man employed in the Department for giving professional advice on matters connected with the Department that necessarily arise there.

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. CAMERON. If so, what is the necessity of employing a lawyer for that purpose? The hon. gentleman has the Minister of Justice and the Deputy Minister of Justice to refer to, and surely there can be no necessity for employing a professional man to do what these two officials are there for the purpose of doing.

Mr. POPE. I can only tell the hon. gentleman that this officer is a very great necessity, and that we could not get on in the Department without him. He has all he can do in going over the different leases that have been given for years and years, and in looking after contracts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When was he appointed?

Mr. POPE. I cannot tell. He has been there ever since I have been there. My hon. colleague says he was there as early as 1870.

Mr. WELDON. I do not understand what the hon. gentleman means when he speaks of leases in connection with the Railway Department. As for contracts, we know that

they are looked after by the Minister of Justice or his agents, and all matters connected with railway contracts must pass through the Department of Justice; so that the law clerk seems to me to be unnecessary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is quite true that the Minister of Justice and the Deputy Minister of Justice have charge of legal matters, but the hon. gentleman will understand that the circumlocution office would be a trifle to this Department if every lease of a water power, or the infinity of contracts that go on as a matter of course, were sent over by a reference to the Department of Justice. All important contracts, of course, are settled by the Minister of Justice, and all important advice and counsel of every kind is given by the Minister of Justice; but it is absolutely necessary that, in the first place, a register should be kept of all the leases and renewals of leases so that at a moment's notice a contract or lease may be renewed without any necessity for referring to the Minister of Justice for his opinion as Minister of Justice or as Attorney General. All matters of importance, of course, must go finally to the Department of Justice, but this is for carrying on the ordinary every day run of legal documents issued to the public.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman does not tell us whether this gentleman is a first or second-class clerk, or what he is, who is now proposed to be made a chief clerk.

Mr. POPE. I think he was what we formerly called a senior second-class clerk.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a great deal of force in what the First Minister says as to the impossibility of loading down the Department of Justice with all these minute details, but to instal this gentleman as law clerk, will give him a certain official position. We will be recognising him as a sort of adviser to the Department, and the Department might not unreasonably throw the responsibility upon him as legal adviser for doing a great many things which they might not otherwise do.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps we had better let the whole item stand over.

Departmental Contingencies.

Privy Council.....$5,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is an increase here of $1,000. Have you been taking to passing such a quantity of Orders in Council that this is necessary?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There have been a great many.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Too many I fear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. By the requisition of the Clerk of the Council, he thinks that the contingencies of that office will probably amount to $5,000.

Mr. DAVIES. You spent $8,611 last year on a vote of $4,000. How much do you propose to expend on this vote of $5,000? I notice subscriptions to newspapers, $844. Are you going to save on that?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We may cull a little here and there; we will only look at true honest papers.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope you will not leave out the only independent paper.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We must listen to the voice of the *Herald* angel.

Mr. MILLS. The only ground upon which we can justify a vote of contingencies is to provide for expenses that cannot be accurately calculated or foreseen. It seems to me that where a certain expenditure occurs year after year, the hon. gentleman who is responsible for it, ought to be able by this to provide for it in detail.

Mr. DAVIES. I observe $633 for extra clerks during last year; will there be a decrease or increase in that item? I observe also that a very large amount was paid for extra services, amounting to $1,200 in all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We are sometimes obliged to employ temporary clerks, when the pressure on the staff is too great. The staff has been kept down, perhaps, too much. It is our desire to have as little temporary work as possible, because a good deal of the work is confidential, and the reputation of the staff—who are, I believe, a very good body of gentlemen, in whose reticence we have every confidence—should not be hazarded by the employment of outsiders. What extra work is done, however, consists in mere copying work not of a confidential nature.

Mr. DAVIES. I was not criticising adversely the vote, because, not having the information, I am not in the position to do so. What I wish to know is on what basis the hon. gentleman supposes he will be able to do next year with $5,000, when last year he had to spend $8,000?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When the hon. gentleman is a Minister, he will find he must depend upon the permanent officers of the Department, and when the deputy head says that amount will be sufficient, I take it that I must accept his statement.

Mr. VAIL. I see an amount of $371 paid to the Hon. A. P. Caron. I think it would have been better to have paid it to somebody else.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I suppose the money was paid to him, and I suppose it is right to say so.

Mr. WELDON. There is an amount of $500 for books.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, there is a small Privy Council library, with books of reference.

Department of Justice (Penitentiaries Branch).....$2,250.00

Mr. BLAKE. Is any portion of this intended to cover the expenses of the special enquiries that are going on continually at St. Vincent de Paul, with so little result?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, that will be paid out of the St. Vincent de Paul vote. This is the same vote as last year.

Department of Militia and Defence.....$8,000.00

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I see these departmental contingencies in the bulk, have increased some $50,000 since 1880, and some $2,000 of that amount has been in this Department. It is the same amount as last year, but $2,000 more than it was at that time.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman, if he refers to the previous estimates, will see that this apparent increase was provided by a vote in the supplementary estimates for three or four years previous to 1884. So far as last year and this year are concerned, the expenses of the Department have considerably increased from the additions which have been made to the force. There are the new schools of infantry, and the battery which is about to be organised in British Columbia, but which is now represented by an officer who has been sent out for the purpose of administering the district as deputy adjutant-general and commandant of the school of gunnery. The expenditure for paper and everything connected with that branch of the Department has considerably increased:

Department of the Secretary of State.....$7,000.00

Mr. DAVIES. Last year this Department spent $9,783 for contingencies. How does the hon. gentleman propose to get through with so much less this year?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. By retrenchment, I suppose.

Mr. DAVIES. Is the retrenchment to be in cab-hire or in books, or in what particular?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I dare say we can make a slight retrenchment in books for instance, forgetting for a moment that the Department of the Secretary of State is essentially a *department des lettres.* Telegraphing might perhaps be reduced a little. At all events, we will try to do with the amount we are asking.

Mr. DAVIES. If you retrench in books of reference and cab hire, you would not make the reduction you propose. But the extra clerks last year cost nearly $2,500, and I thought perhaps the Secretary of State was going to cut down that expense.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I dare say we can in regard to one or two at all events. Mr. Harrison has been put on the regular staff, and another is replaced by another clerk in the Department. One of them will disappear. One of the messengers also I think will go on the regular staff during this year. At all events, the hon. gentleman will see by the details that we have done the best we could, and we will try to do with the estimate we are asking.

Mr. BLAKE. It the hon. gentlemen have done the best they could last year and spent so much, how are they going to manage next year and spend so much less?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We are improving every day.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Public Accounts do not show it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have not gone particularly into the list of details, but, for instance, there was the engraving of the seal, which will not be repeated during next season.

Department of the Interior..... .... $20,000.00

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It will be observed that in that Department there is an increase of $14,000 since 1879-80. It had increased from $6,000 to $8,000 in 1880-81, but it appears to have gone up to a very considerable amount now, $20,000. It was the same last year, and the increase was very rapid between 1881 and 1883.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no doubt. The printing has been very great. The vote is the same as last year. It is for printing, stationery, travelling expenses, and so on. The printing last year cost $8,000 and the stationery, $5,000. It is for supplying all the books and paper and everything connected with every land agent and every officer, including the land board at Winnipeg, besides the Department here. It is a necessary expense, I have no doubt. Mr. Burgess gives me a memorandum showing the expenditure last year. There was $8,000 for printing, and $5,000 for stationery, and the rest is for other cognate expenses.

Mr. PATERSON. I suppose that includes the maps that we get as well?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Everything, maps, lithographic plans for each township, besides general maps of the sections.

Finance Department and Treasury Board..... $11,000.00

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is an increase of $4,000.

Mr. BOWELL. It is the same as last year.

Mr. PATERSON. I am comparing it with the last year of the Mackenzie Administration, that was characterised by the hon. Minister of Customs as such a grossly extravagant year.

Mr. BOWELL. No question but it was true.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the arrangement with respect to these savings bank clerks? I perceive here a large number who I think are officers of the Finance Department, who are paid certain sums for balancing the savings bank books. Part of the expenditure for 1883-84, which is substantially the same as what you are asking this $11,000 for.

Mr. BOWELL. That is one of the items about which I did not make any enquiry; but I think if the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) will refer to the contingent account of the Receiver General, and add that to the contingent account of the Finance Department, he will find it much about the same. The $11,000 covers the contingencies, that were covered at the period to which the hon. gentleman refers, of the Receiver General's office—the Treasury Board and the Finance Department, which, I think, is about $10,700.

Mr. PATERSON. How much was the Receiver General's office?

Mr. BOWELL. $2,449 were expended to June, 1878. This other covers the other Department, and it is about equal to the sum voted in 1878-79.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Recurring to the Department of Indian Affairs, the hon. gentleman was right; this figure does not include the maps in the Department of the Interior. It includes all the books and binding, all the register books and all the account books for every land agency and every land office. I have seen Mr. Burgess and he says it exceeds $8,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many agencies would that cover?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All the agencies.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many are there?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not remember at this moment.

Mr. PATERSON. The travelling expenses of some gentlemen employed by the Department and charged under contingencies, are quite heavy. There is a gentleman named Deville, whose travelling expenses amounted to $881.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He is the Surveyor General, and I have no doubt that those are professional journeys taken by him in his official capacity. He is a very good officer. He succeeded Col. Dennis, and afterwards Lindsay Russell. He came in after Lindsay Russell retired.

Mr. PATERSON. And a deputy, Mr. Chisholm, received $609 for travelling expenses.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Chisholm is a very good officer in the North-West; he is a very active man.

Mr. MILLS. I observe that the hon. gentleman asks $20,000 for contingencies, and for the Indian branch $7,330, making for the Interior and the Indian branch $27,330. In 1878-79 the contingencies of the Department of Interior, which embraced the same service, was $6,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, well!

Mr. MILLS. Seeing that the Government is with the expressed determination to reduce the expenditure and to prevent the extravagance which prevailed at that time, I think the hon. gentleman should be able to explain to the House how it is that he has so signally failed in accomplishing the extraordinary feats of economy which the country was led to expect he would accomplish, after he has had seven years to do it in?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman had a son which he clothed in a little velvet jacket, that would be extravagant; but if seven years afterwards he clothed him in common cloth, he would find that, in consequence of the expansion of the boy, he had grown too big for his clothes. There was an economy in the article, although,

from the expansion of the young lad, it cost a little more. And so it is with the Department of the Interior. Seven years ago the business was comparatively small to what it is now. I think my hon. friend should admit that. The child has grown much larger, and it takes more cloth, more thread, and more labor to make his clothing, and it costs more than it did seven years ago.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the comparison is between clothing my hon. friend and clothing the present Minister of the Interior.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is it. Carried. I do not want this whole item thrown over. I shall make explanations about the increase in the Indian affairs on concurrence. I have not got the information, that is all. I will make full explanations on Concurrence, with the consent of the hon. gentleman opposite.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I will just make a remark with reference to what the hon. gentleman is saying. I have called attention before to the great inconvenience of the practice of taking twenty different items, not having any close connection with one another, in one vote. I think it would be convenient if they were made separate votes. Either this should be done, or it should be understood that we take the amounts item by item.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Although embraced in one resolution, every item can be discussed.

Department of Customs..... .....$7,000 00

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In regard to the Customs Department, it is only fair to notice, as we point out when increases occur, that here is a decrease from $8,000 to $7,000; and I suppose the Minister is warranted in asking for that sum, as we find the total expenditure last year was only $4,790. If his Department was to be compared with some of the other extravagant Departments, it would make a very fair showing for the Minister of Customs. The reason I mention this is that perhaps his example might have some influence with his colleagues—the Minister of Inland Revenue or the Minister of the Interior. If the Minister of Customs can reduce the contingencies of his Department, it seems as if other Ministers might do so. I find, on looking over different entries, for instance cab hire, that the Minister is enjoying good health and is able to walk in Ottawa; or perhaps the explanation may be found in the fact that his Department is one where people have to call on him, instead of his having to go and see them. At all events there is certainly no fault to be found in regard to the contingencies of his Department, and other Ministers might follow his example, and be able to curtail the expenditure so as to save some of the $50,000 increase which has taken place since 1879-80.

Mr. MITCHELL. The Minister of Customs is a very close fellow.

Mr. PATERSON. How does the Minister of Customs effect his saving? The Committee would like to know, so that his colleagues might obtain a lesson.

Mr. BOWELL. One mode of saving is by not employing a large number of extra clerks, as my predecessor was in the habit of doing. For instance, in 1878-79 he spent nearly $12,000 on contingencies.

Mr. PATERSON. My reference was with respect to your colleagues.

Mr. BOWELL. My colleagues are quite able to take care of themselves. I was going to give an answer which I should have given before recess to an hon. gentleman opposite, who asked why the number of employés had increased. The difference in the management of the Department between my predecessor and myself is, that I have all the clerks placed on the permanent staff and do not keep a number of temporary clerks and pay them out of contingencies, as was the practice of my predecessor. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) crosses the floor I shall be very glad to give him a lesson in regard to economical administration.

Mr. PATERSON. I suppose there is nothing taken out of contingencies and charged to another account?

Mr. BOWELL. One or two clerks on the temporary staff have been placed on the permanent staff, and contingencies have been relieved to that extent. That explains a part of the reduction.

Mr. DAVIES. The Minister of Customs has stated that his colleagues can take care of themselves, and from an examination of the contingencies account I think they have shown themselves pretty well able to do so. They take care of themselves, for they do not seem to walk about at all. Why is the Minister of Customs and all his assistants able to get along year after year without spending any money on cab hire, while the other Ministers cannot walk about Ottawa but have to expend from $250 to $500 on cab hire. Yet they seem to be physically as strong as the Minister of Customs. Is he the only economical member of the Administration? I think we should have some explanation, not as to how the hon, gentleman's colleagues are able to take care of themselves, but as to how they take care of the people's money. If he can carry on his Department without an expenditure for cab hire, and without cheese paring, other Ministers might effect some reduction. There will be occasions when cab hire is requisite, and a reasonable sum should be allowed; but I find that 5, 6, 10 or 12 clerks in a Department have accounts for cab hire, while the Minister of Customs has none at all. Some explanation should be given.

Mr. PAINT. A very pertinent question would be to ask what was the cab hire at the West Northumberland election.

Mr. DAVIES. Only in case those who used the cabs got the money to pay for them from the public.

Mr. MILLS. To which particular Minister does the hon. gentleman put the question.

Mr. PAINT. I put it to the ex-Minister of the Interior.

Mr. PATERSON. The Minister of Customs has told us that the Ministers are able to take care of themselves. While the hon. gentleman had saved $1,000 on contingencies, the Minister of Inland Revenue is going to expend $1,000 more. The Minister of Customs was able, together with all the staff of his Department, to get along without cab hire, but the Minister of Inland Revenue expended $167 on that item, and officers in his Department spent different amounts. I do not want to criticise these items in a spirit that would lead anyone to infer that I thought Ministers were acting above the proper dignity of their position. I can quite understand that the Premier of this country should, if he thinks fit, ride in a cab; but the charges for contingencies and travelling expenses look, to one not acquainted with all the particulars, to be very large, and it becomes a question that may fairly be asked when the head of one Department is enabled to retrench to the extent he has done, why some of his colleagues cannot, without loss of dignity, follow his example.

Department of Inland Revenue.....$9,000 00

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is an incaease of $1,000 for 1885-86 as compared with last year. These contingencies are increasing in that Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. So it appears.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I presume that when the hon. gentleman enquires the reasons, and I show him why they are increasing he cannot object.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Can the hon. gentleman give me any idea of what particular item of contingencies he expects will be increased this year?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There will be really very little increase over the present year, as I ask for only $9,000. Besides the extra clerks which we had to employ in connection with the extra work, owing to the Liquor License Act, a great amount of additional work has been thrown on the Department in different ways, and as the $9,000 will include the special vote of last year, the estimate will be no greater than for last year. The contingency account, I think, will compare favorably with the account for 1878 which was $11,000.

An hon. MEMBER. $10,000.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No, it is here $11,000, but even if it were only $10,000, it would then be $1,000 more than I am asking now. Of course the work of the Department is increasing largely. Several matters have been added to its duties, among them the adulteration of food, which has entailed a good deal of work on the Department.

Mr. PATERSON. Could the hon. gentleman give us some explanation with reference to the travelling expenses of some of the parties mentioned here. For instance, Mr. Mial, the deputy head, $600; Mr. Johnson, $550; and Mr. Walsh, $220. What particular services were they engaged in which necessitated travelling? As I understand the hon. gentleman has inspectors, and I supposed that they did the outside work largely, but it appears that there has been something calling for these other gentlemen to attend to this work.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot tell exactly the particular duties on which they were engaged. Of course the deputy Minister is often called away on important business connected with the Department in different parts of the Dominion. Sometimes disputes arise and the deputy has to go and make enquiries, and it has happened that on several occasions Mr. Mial has gone to Toronto, Quebec, Montreal and other places. But I am satisfied that every time he went that there was good reason for his going, and he went in the interests of the Department and not on a mere pleasure trip.

Mr. PATERSON. Of course, I do not know. I was only asking for information. I supposed that disputes arising between the inspectors and other parties would be referred to the Department, and that the hon. gentleman would be guided by the report of his inspectors. I think, if I remember aright, one of these gentlemen signed some report with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway, in conjunction with the chief engineer, and I wondered whether this item or any part of it had any reference to it. At any rate, I would like to know what cases they are which warrant the deputy Minister going outside when we have inspectors.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The inspectors have, of course, their duties to perform. I can tell the hon. gentleman one time and that was when it was thought necessary that the commissioner should visit some of the cities, with reference to the working of the Adulteration of Food Act. The Act provides the machinery by which the municipal authorities may work in conjunction with the Dominion authorities if they choose. That was a subject with which no inspector would be supposed to be acquainted, and as the commissioner was familiar with the working of the Act he was the only one who could properly explain it to the local authorities. That is one occasion on which the deputy had to make visits to outside places.

Mr. PATERSON. I notice that Mr. W. J. Johnson is mentioned as incurring travelling expenses. On what particular mission was he engaged?

Mr. COSTIGAN. He is the inspector over the Weights and Measures branch of the Department, and last year he visited every division of the Dominion as near as he could, and made an examination of the standards in every office, reporting on the condition of the office, its efficiency, the amount of work done, how the work was done, and so on. His reportwas very valuable, and assisted in reducing the expenditure of that branch. As the hon. gentleman knowe, it has been largely reduced within the last few years, and I trust next year to be able to reduce it a little more. At the same time that we are extending the service, for instance, in the North-West, we hope that a large amount of work will be done at a cheaper rate than formerly.

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. Walsh is allowed $220 for travelling expenses. What duties does he perform?

Mr. COSTIGAN. He is my private secretary. He was sent once or twice on public business connected with the Department, of a rather confidential nature, on which he has made a report, which I have no objection to showing to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. VAIL. It is hardly fair to compare the contingencies of 1877-78 with those of the present day. Out of the contingencies of the former year, over $3,000 was paid for extra clerks, and, in 1879, some $4,000 was paid for extra clerks. Since that time the charge for these extra clerks has been transferred to the list of extra clerks, so that that amount should be deducted from the contingencies at that time, in order to make a fair comparison. Consequently, the amount asked for contingencies for the Inland Revenue Department, instead of being $9,000 as at present, should be a little over $3,000, deducting the extra clerks.

Mr. McLELAN. When the list is being considered and we say that transfers have been made, hon. gentlemen tell us there has been an enormous increase in the expenditure. We say there has not been an increase, only there have been some transfers. So it is unfair to take the position the hon. gentleman takes.

Mr. VAIL. We are quite willing to take Civil Government and contingencies together.

Mr. BLAKE. When we ask why there has been an increase in the regular list, the hon. gentleman says oh, we have transferred from the contingencies to the list and there has been no increase; and when we come to the contingencies he says the amount is no larger than it was. As the hon. gentleman for Digby (Mr. Vail) says, the true test is to take the contingencies and the amount for the service together. I would ask the Minister what proportion of the expenditures embraced in this account are involved in the administration of the Liquor License Act.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot tell exactly, but I think I can give the hon. gentleman that information on concurrence.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman, when he was asked to account for the increase in the Department mentioned, amongst several important particulars, the Adulteration of Food and the administration of the Liquor License Act, which involved the employment of several extra clerks, and what I was anxious to know was how much the amount approximately is.

Mr. LANDERKIN. What amount of revenue was received from the licenses granted under the Liquor License Act last year? Was any portion of the money received as revenue by the Department? If not, what was done with the money paid for the licenses under that Act?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Of course the Department receives no money. Under the Act the surplus receipts in any division go to the benefit of the municipality, I think.

Mr. DAVIES. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that that is the ruling of the Department? Because some of the municipalities in the Maritime Provinces are in doubt about that?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is not the ruling of the Department. The question is one of law, but it has not arisen yet, and there is no final settlement. As far as I know, all that has been paid out of the license revenue as yet has been for contingencies. I understand that the commissioners have made advances to the officers to such an extent as they deemed safe, not in the way of salary, because no salary has been approved of by the Governor in Council.

Mr. BLAKE. Have the officers made returns to the Department of the receipts? I received a letter a short time ago intimating that a very large salary had been received by the officer, and that the commissioners had divided the rest among themselves, at the rate of $5 or $6 a day, so that in point of fact the receipts had been absorbed.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have full information as to the receipts all over the country. As to the division of any money between the commissioners and the officers, there is nothing to show that in any of the reports. Of course, as I say, some inspectors and commissioners have received small amounts on account. I know of no case in which any man has taken more than what might be considered a fair salary, and the amount has been fixed by the license commissioners who are authorised to appoint inspectors, and to fix their salaries subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. The commissioners place a different valuation upon the services of their officers in the different parts of the country. For instance in Montreal a very liberal allowance was made which in Fredericton might be considered disproportionate.

Mr. BLAKE. Was it not the duty of the Governor in Council to revise those determinations of the commissioners and to come to a conclusion upon them so that the salaries might be fixed? And what is the decision of the Department as to the commissioners' own pay? The commissioners might, to a certain extent, be entrusted with the decision of what their officers' services are worth, but not of what their own services are worth.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The law does not provide for any salaries; in some cases they have allowances. The question is whether they should not be allowed, not a salary, but something for their services and that question is not decided.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). In some of the western counties, they take all they collect. The Department should come to a decision and not allow the commissioners to gobble up the whole of the receipts. Nearly two months ago I moved for a return on the subject, and it is not yet brought down.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It will be brought down pretty soon. The hon. gentleman asked for a return for all the receipts under the Liquor License Act, and all the payments and disbursements in every division all over the country, so that it involves a good deal of labor. I think it is a little out of the usual way of proceeding to discuss so fully this subject which is not really before the House now, but must come before it in a short time.

Mr. BLAKE. This is really the vote for administering the Act.

Mr. COSTIGAN. You are discussing the contingencies of the Department. No one will pretend to say that in asking $1,000 I intend to cover the expenses connected with the outside administration of the Act. It is for the inside service.

Mr. BLAKE. It has to do with the administration of the work generally. We wish to know what services we are getting for the money we are voting; and we find nothing done in the Department in the way of regulating these things although the Act has been in operation nearly two years.

Mr. TROW. If no stipulated sum is paid to these commissioners, does each commissioner report the amount he collects?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. TROW. In the county which I represent, I am informed large sums were collected, and the inspector disappeared to the other side of the line, with the money I presume.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot answer that statement. We have received returns from all our inspectors and have no evidence to show that any of them have gobbled up the money they received, but I have information to show that the commissioners, out of the receipts, have paid some of the inspectors a small advance, pending the settlement of their salaries.

Mr. DAVIES. Is the money received by these commissioners, in the several counties, paid into the credit of the Government, or is it still in the hands of the commissioners? and do they make out of it what disbursements they please? Applications were made six months ago to the Minister by these commissioners to have their salaries fixed, and I presume the Department has not yet come to a conclusion. The Minister, however, cannot have allowed these commissioners to retain, in their hands, the money they collected.

Mr. HESSON. I am sorry the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) should have made the statement he made in reference to the inspector at Perth. My hon. friend is not well advised or he would not have made it, in justice to a gentleman who has been unfortunate in business. The gentleman referred to deposited the money he collected in the Merchants Bank to the credit of the commissioners, and the only amount he used for himself was the amount of $150 for his services, which he was authorised to do. The balance is at the credit of the commissioners to my certain knowledge. I may add the inspector in question gave, when appointed, the best security, that of two gentlemen well known to my hon. friend, and with whose security he would be perfectly satisfied. The inspector referred to did not take away, when he left the country, a cent to which he was not entitled; in fact he did not take all that he was entitled to, for he was still entitled to a considerable sum for the work he did.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In answer to the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) I would say that it is likely the license fees are collected and placed in the hands of the commissioners whose duty it is to pay contingent expenses and salaries, and deposit the surplus in the hands of the Receiver General to the credit of each county.

Mr. TROW. In reference to the inspector at North Perth, I am informed that he collected money from parties to whom he gave no receipts, and that there is no account for. I know parties who paid him $15 each, and there is no return for it and no receipt given to the parties, so you need not defend the party in that respect, and I question very much whether the moneys are deposited.

Mr. HESSON. I can only repeat what I said before that it is not correct that in every instance where the parties applied for their licenses they paid the fee of $10 and $5, making $15, and in every case where it was paid, that was deposited to the credit of the license commissioners for the county. I took the trouble of going to the bank and making the enquiry on behalf of a gentleman who felt

he would be the losing party in the event of the amount not being deposited there, as he was afraid it might not be. Having made the enquiry I know whereof I speak, that the money in every instance was placed to the credit of the board of commissioners, and that he took no money except what they allowed him as a portion of his salary for one half of the year—$150, I think.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to call the attention of the Minister to one thing which has not come before the attention of the House to-night in this discussion, that is, the necessity as soon as possible—or I might put it a little stronger, and say the necessity which, in my opinion, existed before this of having taken some action with reference to the salaries, not so much in reference to the commissioners, who are not very hardly worked, but to the inspectors who have been appointed, especially in Scott Act counties, who have been at work under that appointment for more than a year, some of them for a year and a half almost, and who have not received, I was about to say, a single dollar for their work. If there be an amount of confusion with reference to the boards of commissioners and inspectors in license counties, that confusion cannot exist to so great an extent in Scott Act counties, and it is scarcely fair to make appointments and have men do work under those appointments for a year and a half, and have them not receive a dollar of salary, and not receive either any information as to whether they are to get any salary, as to what salary they are to get, and as to when they are to get it. Take, for instance, the inspector in my own county. He gave up his business and went to work on the faith of his appointment, and he has been at work, and has been doing it well, for a year and more, and he has not yet received a single dollar, and I have not been able to receive any information as to what scale will be fixed, as to when he may expect to look for his pay, or anything in connection with it. I think this matter ought to receive the attention of the Government, and ought to have received the attention of the Government before this.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). I have a letter from an inspector who was appointed in one of the Scott Act counties in the Maritime Provinces, and he says:

"I have had 41 cases for violation of the law before the stipendiary magistrate, and out of that number 25 convictions, now all appealed to higher courts. As yet I have not received one cent for my services in this matter. The Chief Inspector has tried the Department of Justice, but to no purpose."

Again he says:

"We are liable, if we neglect our duty, to be fined, and for one I would like to get some remuneration for my services. If the Government will refuse to pay officers appointed by it to carry out its laws, as one officer I would refuse."

I would join the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) in asking the Minister of Inland Revenue to state the intentions of the Government in reference to the payment of these officers.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am most anxious to have the matter settled and that these men should receive their pay, and it is the intention of the Government that they shall get their pay. The question of salary is, I think, in a fair way of being finally settled, and I hope to their satisfaction. With regard to the question put before by the member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), if he looks at the 56th section of the Liquor License Act he will find it clearly disposes of the question of the suplus in every license district.

Mr. DAVIES. It goes to the municipality.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes, except in Prince Edward Island, where I think it goes to the Provincial Treasurer. I suppose that was fully discussed at the time. The remarks of the hon. gentleman will receive every attention. I have received communications from these men. I know they want their money, and, in some cases, where the revenue was allowed to be dealt with in that way, they have received an instalment.

Mr. DAVIES. What I am anxious to impress upon the hon. Minister and upon the House is that, in regard to the municipalities who now complain that they do not receive the moneys which were placed in the hands of the commissioners under that License Act, the surplus moneys after paying the inspectors' salary and the remuneration to the commissioners themselves, the reason the surplus money has not been received by the municipalities is that the Government have failed to do what they should have done, that the Government have failed to fix and settle, as the law directed they should fix and settle, what remuneration should be paid to the inspectors and what to the commissioners; and the complaint of the municipalities that they cannot get possession of the moneys which the law intended should be theirs, and which should have been in their coffers long since, is answered by the Minister to night in his statement that the fault lies with the Government alone in that they have not done what they should have done, fixed these salaries.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very glad to hear two assertions which have been made by the Minister of Inland Revenue, one that the Government intend to pay these men, and the other that it is in a way of being speedily settled, and I hope it will not get out of the way of being speedily settled. I may state, in addition to the instance I gave in reference to my own county, that in the city of Fredericton matters are even in a worse state. An inspector was appointed; it is a city and the duties were very onerous and very hard; he has been at work nearly a year and a half; he has not received any salary; he has not received even an authoritative statement as to the amount, not even an answer as to whether he will be paid at all or not. Private men, temperance men, had to come to the front and raised some $600 or $800 out of their own pockets, and advanced for the Government to that inspector. Now, I hold that it is not a proper thing, and it is inducing a great deal of dissatisfaction, and the longer it is allowed to go on the more dissatisfaction it will induce. If the Government are going to fix these salaries and pay these men, I think they ought to do it as speedily as possible, and not call upon private individuals to pay their own officers.

Mr. BLAKE. Can the hon. gentleman give any reason for the delay? He has not done the tavern people much good, and he does not seem to have done the municipalities much good.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I have no other explanation to give except what I have already given. I have not been actuated by any desire to serve the tavern-keepers particularly; but the only case in which the municipalities would derive a benefit would be where there was a surplus standing to their credit, and these surpluses are very rare.

Mr. BLAKE. We cannot tell whether there would be a surplus or not until the hon. gentleman does his duty and decides what the charges are to be.

Mr. TROW. I think it would be right and proper on the part of the Government to refund the moneys collected to the applicants or the municipalities where they reside. Evidently they have no right to collect such funds, and they should refund all the moneys collected.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is a matter I was about to bring before the notice of the Minister. I understand that the amount contributed by the hotel-keepers is used for the purpose of paying those inspectors, sub-inspectors and commissioners. If the hotel-keepers were obliged to take out a provincial license under the Act passed last Session, of what benefit was the payment of this $15 to them? You compel them to take out a provincial license and at the

same time impose a tax of $15, and of what benefit is that to the hotel-keepers? Is this tax imposed upon them merely for the purpose of keeping up the inspectors, sub-inspectors and commissioners? I think it is a most iniquitous thing. It is a hardship on the hotel-keepers. They are harassed very much as it is; it is difficult with many of them to get along; and I do not think the Government should insist in placing this impost upon them, when at the same time they tell them by their Acts in this House that they shall take out a provincial license and pay provincial fees. I think the Minister should take this opportunity of letting us know whether it is his intention to pay back to these hotel keepers this $15, which was wrongfully, and I think unlawfully taken from them, and for which they received no adequate compensation. The hon. Minister might also tell us what is the salary fixed for the inspectors and the sub-inspectors. I would also like to know, for instance, in the counties outside the cities, what are the salaries? No doubt the Minister can tell us, and then the hotel-keepers can know for what they are paying this money. At the present time they have not the slightest idea, when they are obliged to take out a provincial license, of what benefit it is to them to pay this unlawful tax of $15 in every county.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Carried.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No, I am not going to allow this to be carried. I am going to find out something about this or I will know the reason why. I think I am asking a fair and proper question, and that I am entitled to be informed upon this matter. I want to know what this tax, imposed by the amended Act of last Session, is expended for. I moved for a motion two months ago, and I was told by the Minister of Customs that we would get it in a short time. It did not involve many figures, nor much expense; it was of much importance to the House, and I wish the Minister to let me know if it is his intention to refund to the hotel-keepers this money that they have paid.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not think the hon. gentleman's question is a fair one. As to the constitutional question, the hon. gentleman can get his information from the Supreme Court. But he cannot convince me that we are taking money wrongfully by exacting this $15. He has opened up a discussion which ought not to take place on this item, I think. I have told the leader of the Opposition that the question of salary is not yet settled, but I trust it will soon be settled, and that the hon. gentleman will be informed what salaries will be paid to the inspectors, sub-inspectors, if any, to the commissioners, and that the whole of that information will be laid before the House before very long. As to whether the fees paid to these men for licenses will be refunded to them, that is the question I am not prepared to answer—if the hon. gentleman expects an answer.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do expect an answer, and the hotel-keepers expect an anwer to this question. I think it is a proper question; because after the Act was passed last Session or the Session before, amending the Liquor License Act, compelling them to take out a local license in addition to this, then of what earthly use was the Dominion Act? Whether it suits the inclination or the wishes of the Ministry to let me know about this, I think I am quite right in asking it, and that the question is a very proper one.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I think the question of the hon. gentleman for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) is a reasonable and proper one. He does not base the question upon his own view of constitutional law, but upon a judgment of the Supreme Court which is, that the Liquor License Act of 1883, and the amending Act of last year, are not worth the paper they are written on, and as a consequence, that the whole action of the Government, and the whole proceedings of the Government, from beginning to end, in connection with it, are wholly illegal. They had appointed an army of officers throughout the Dominion, to enforce this Act; they have exacted from the liquor dealers, improperly and illegally, $15 for every license, and having done so, I say it is the business of the Government to refund these men that money. I think my hon. friend's question is perfectly proper, and I think the Government ought to be in a position to say now what they propose to do with respect to their illegal legislation and their legal proceedings under that illegal legislation.

Mr. MILLS. The observations of the hon. Minister are a curious commentary on the declarations of the Government. He has given us information as to the uses which could have been made of the moneys collected from the hotel-keepers and others under the License Act. He does not represent the sum collected as a large one or a sum that has contributed towards the improvement of the revenue of Canada. I was under the impression, and I dare say many others were, that the Government, although they claimed the exclusive right to issue licenses and control them, did not pretend to say that they could determine to what purposes the money so collected should be applied. In the British North America Act it is expressly provided by the 92nd section that the Local Legislature shall have exclusive right, amongst other things, to legislate on the subject of shop, saloon, tavern, auctioneer or other licenses, in order to the raising of a revenue for provincial, local or municipal purposes. Now we want to know whether the money shall be applied to local and municipal purposes, or whether the revenue shall be for provincial purposes? From what the hon. gentleman has stated here, he has led us to suppose that the Local Governments and Legislatures have nothing in the world to do with it, that they have not a word to say as to how the money should be applied, and that the hon. gentleman after imposing this burden upon certain sections of the population, has left it to the commissioners to say what shall be done with the money. I am not going into a discussion of the constitutional question involved by this legislation upon licenses, but I am calling the hon. gentleman's attention to the position in which these revenues now stand according to his own statement. I think, however, the House, so long as the Government have assumed to control the uses of the money, is entitled to some explanation from the Minister as to the amount of money that has been collected in each of the Provinces, and the amount they have been entitled to pay to the officers, and the amount that is still under the control of, or at the disposal of the Government and its officials.

Mr. COSTIGAN. For the third time I inform the hon. gentleman that I cannot be expected from memory to give a statement of the receipts and expenditures throughout the Dominion. I said to some hon. member before, when he asked the question, that I should be most happy to furnish the information. With respect to the disposition of the surplus, the Act declares how the surplus is to be applied. It is not a question of revenue. It was understood when the fees were placed at $10 and $5 that those sums would merely cover the working expenses of administering the Act, leaving the provincial authorities the right of collecting what they chose. We made it a condition, acting in a friendly spirit towards the Local Government of Ontario, that the applicant for a license from our commissioners must first have paid to the local authorities the amount demanded by them before he got a license from our commissioners. With our officers it was not a question of revenue, it was a question of administering the Act, and determining who should have licenses and who should not, and charging a fee which was supposed, at the time, to be sufficient to cover the administering the Act. We provided also, knowing that in some places the receipts might exceed the expenditure, that where they did exceed the expenditure,

the amount was to be paid over for such use as that to which the municipalities might appropriate it. Nothing could be more fair.

Mr. TROW. The hon. Minister has stated that no license would be granted unless the provincial fees were first paid. Yet at the same time there was a vicious principle involved. Under the municipal law the number of hotels was decided according to population. The inspectors employed by the Dominion Government overrode that principle, and gave parties licenses even if they had no bonds, simply on the fact that they had paid the amount required to the Ontario Government. There was no other restriction.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. TROW. They gave no bonds, although they had to give to the municipal authorities bonds for the proper observance of the by-laws; whereas the greatest outcasts could obtain a license from the Dominion Inspector.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). With respect to travelling expenses of the Inland Revenue Department. I understood from the Minister that Mr. Walsh is his private secretary. How long has Mr. Walsh been his private secretary, may I ask.

Mr. COSTIGAN. He has been in the employ of the Government since 1882.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron.) I understand that this Mr. Walsh, of whom I know something, has been in the employ of the Government since 1882. He is engaged, I understand, in private and confidential missions. That is his mission on earth. He is, I understood the Minister to say, occasionally employed in private and confidential missions, and when the sum of $220 travelling expenses was paid to him, he was engaged in a private and confidental mission. That is, I say, his mission on earth. In June, he was in the west riding of Huron. He was there on a private and confidential mission. He undertook to visit the hon. gentleman's countrymen and coreligionists on a private and confidential mission. He did not succeed in his private and confidential mission, although he was there actively engaged for the whole period of two weeks. I do not suppose that amount of $220 was paid to him on account of that private and confidential mission; but no doubt a reference to the Public Accounts for 1882-83 will show that Mr. Walsh was paid his travelling expenses while engaged on a private and confidential mission in the west riding of Huron. I have no objection to Mr. Walsh visiting West Huron on a private and confidential mission, so long as his expenses are not paid by the Dominion of Canada for services of a private and confidential character that do not exactly belong to the Department of Inland Revenue. I have known Mr. Walsh. I had the pleasure of seeing him while he was engaged in West Huron on a private and confidential mission. It was not a successful mission.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We have the deputy minister, $600; Mr. Johnson, $550, and other assistants different amounts; and then we have the Minister's own travelling expenses. These together, and they include the expenses of the private secretary, who was on a private and confidential mission, not explained, but whose expenses are expected to be paid by the public, amount to a very large sum. Now, what I want to know is, whether the accounts are kept the same way as regards all the Departments?

Mr. BOWELL. I suppose so. The accounts are all sent to the Auditor General and the Finance Department, and I presume they are all kept in the same way.

Mr. PATERSON. I cannot find any account of appraisers' travelling expenses. The hon. gentleman is aware that Mr. Fraser visited my town.

Mr. BOWELL. Appraisers are stationed permanently at different points, but Mr. Fraser may occasionally go away. These accounts are only up to June last year.

Mr. PATERSON. Travelling expenses in other cases are found under the head of contingencies, and I presume it is the same with the Customs Department.

Mr. BOWELL. I suppose so. These accounts are sent to the Auditor General, and I presume they are kept the same way for all the Departments.

Mr. PATERSON. Do you know, as a fact, whether there have been any travelling expenses incurred during the last year.

Mr. BOWELL. There have.

Mr. PATERSON. Do you know the amount, as we desire to know that especially, the hon. gentleman having apparently managed his Department with so much economy.

Department of Public Works $8,500 00

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I expected that the Minister of Public Works, who so promptly explained the items in his own Department, would probably volunteer some statement with reference to the increased contingencies.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is a decrease.

Mr. PATERSON. Not as compared with 1878-79, and taking the two Departments together. There is quite an increase.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot explain that to the hon. gentleman; I can only explain my own Department. After examining the probable expenses of next year, I think that $8,500 will be enough to meet the contingent expenses of the Department.

Mr. PATERSON. Taking the Department of Railways and Canals, which I had to do for the purposes of comparison, I find that there is a considerable increase.

Department of Agriculture $15,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the cause of this increase?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The contingencies of this Department were $8,000 under the extravagant Administration of the Mackenzie Government, and $15,000 is asked for now.

Mr. McLELAN. I find that in 1878-79 the sum of $15,480 was spent, and that in addition to that the Minister instead of charging his own travelling expenses to contingencies charged them to immigration, $1,099, making a total of $16,199, while all that is asked for now is $15,000.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman had better take the estimates instead of the expenditure, as the only way we can compare one year's expenditure with another is by placing the estimates against the estimates and not against the expenditure. If the estimates were exceeded in that year they may be exceeded this year.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The question is the actual money taken out of the people's pockets.

Mr. PATERSON. We cannot take the actual expenditures this year, as the hon. gentleman may say that perhaps the Minister is asking for a sum which is insufficient to cover the expenditures.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As a matter of fact, in 1878 we spent $158,000, and in 1884, $203,000 if my memory is right.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman is talking about my contingencies; well there were $4 over $14,000 spent, and I am quite sure that that will not carry me through, and I

can only say that I have to employ a very large number of extra clerks. I find it much cheaper to do that, so far as patents and those things are concerned, than to have permanent clerks. They are charged to contingencies and this is a business which is increasing every year.

Mr. VAIL. Does the Minister of Agriculture say that he does not employ so many extra clerks as were employed in 1878, because he pays $1,000 more for them than was paid in that year.

Mr. POPE. Yes, I may employ more, but I am more economical.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the less we hear about the economy of the Department of Agriculture the better. I have been looking over some of the pamphlets and documents of that Department, and on that subject I think an hon. gentleman beside me could tell the House something. I do not think a more wanton waste of public money I ever saw or heard of than a great deal of the money which is spent in the hon. gentleman's Department for pamphlets, etc. If he boasts of his economy he had better look to the pamphlet of the Rev. Mr. Bray, for which he paid $5,000, and which, I venture to say, never brought one immigrant into this country, and if anybody did see it, they would take it as an example of extraordinary lack of business capacity to allow such a thing to appear as being published by his Department.

Mr. POPE. When that question of pamphlets comes up which the hon. gentleman has discussed at public meetings I will be ready to discuss it, but we are not considering that now. I did not pay $5,000 to Mr. Bray, but $2,500.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And somebody else paid the other $500.

Mr. POPE. I think the pamphlet is a good one—not a good pamphlet but a good book to lay on the table of any gentleman in the country, and I am prepared to defend it when the time comes. Let not the hon. gentleman make any mistake about either that pamphlet or anything else, as I am prepared to defend the outlay of my Department.

Mr. DAVIES. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he was prepared to favor us with a copy of that book. I should feel honored to have one. I applied at the library in hopes that I could get an examination of it, but I found that he had not placed one there, and I tried several other places but did not succeed. If he will give each of us a copy I am sure we will take it as a great favor, for I would like to take it home with me.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As some of the public plunder.

Mr. DAVIES. It contains a very handsome portrait of the First Minister.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is worth something.

Mr. DAVIES. And there are some fourteen vignette portraits of the hon. gentleman's colleagues on the next page and that is worth more. Then we have the portrait of the hon. gentleman who presides over our deliberations, the Speaker, in the centre.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You are envious because you are not there.

Mr. DAVIES. I could not hope to adorn such a galaxy.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is true.

Mr. DAVIES. But I am quite anxious that my constituents should see it. The hon. gentleman says it is such a book that he would not be afraid to lay on the table of any gentleman. I hope he will lay it on our tables so that the representatives of the people may take it home to their constituents and show them what they are paying for. It is most interesting reading as we had an opportunity of hearing in the Public Accounts Committee the other day, containing not only a eulogy of the First Minister himself, but a eulogy of the hon. gentleman presiding over the Department of Agriculture, and if we can get that book before the Public Accounts Committee, when that item comes up, we may be able to place on record a few excerpts from the pamphlet, showing what an able and economical gentleman presides over the Department. I will hold the hon. gentleman to his promise to give us a copy apiece.

Mr. POPE. I did not.

Mr. DAVIES. He said he would be very happy to lay it on the table of any hon. gentleman. Do I understand him to say that he won't? If not, can he tell me where it can be had? I will give a dollar or two for a copy of it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hand over your money.

Mr. DAVIES. If the right hon. gentleman will hold the stakes, I will buy a dozen copies.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We want something for our money.

Mr. PATERSON. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to give as a reason for the increase of $1,000, that it is to be used in the employment of extra clerks during the coming year?

Mr. POPE. I say a very large amount is paid in that way; but there are very large amounts also paid for paper and various other things. A little while ago hon. gentlemen wanted to know why we did not put in more for contingencies. I put in no more than what I consider fair and honest.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I understand what the Minister has stated, and I see that in the Auditor General's report there is an explanation by the hon. gentleman's deputy of the increase, to the effect that there is a good deal of extra work in connection with the patent office. Still, I find that there is only about $2,000 for extra clerks, and I would like to know if the increase in the way of fees from the patent office in the coming year is likely to be larger than it was last year.

Mr. POPE. About six months of the year have gone, and up to this time there has been fully as much as during the first six months of last year. Of course, searches, engraving and paper, are all increasing, and every patent costs a certain amount of money. I anticipate that in the coming year the $1,000 increase will be fully required for these and similar services.

Department of Marine and Fisheries..... $8,000 00

Mr. VAIL. How much of this has to go to extra clerks?

Mr. McLELAN. The amount is reduced by $500, and we expect not to pay so much for extra clerks in the coming year as last year. The amount expended last year was $7,960, and I estimate that this year the vote will cover all the expenses. It is $40 more than was expended last year, and $300 or $400 less than was expended for contingencies in 1878.

Mr. VAIL. In 1878, $8,270 were expended for contingencies, out of which $2,715 were paid for extra clerks. I understood the Minister a little while ago to say that the extra clerks had been taken from the contingencies account and placed on the regular list, and that that was the reason why the expenses for the Civil Service had been largely increased. I do not see that that is the case. If they have been transferred to the civil list, and at the same time a considerable number are paid out of contingencies, they are just about double what they were before.

Mr. McLELAN. I referred to the extra clerks who were kept on the whole year. During the time we are classifying the Fishery Bounty claims, we employ several extra clerks, who are not paid out of the vote for fishing bounty service, but out of contingencies.

Mr. DAVIES. The point I understood the hon. gentleman to make was this, that whereas last year we paid $2,253 for extra clerks, and that sum was included in the contingencies, this year you propose to lessen the number of extra clerks by appointing permanent clerks; so that your contingencies account ought to be reduced by the salaries you now pay to the extra clerks you intend to dispense with.

Mr. McLELAN. I did not state that I positively intended to do it. If I found it in the public interest I might transfer them from the contingencies account to the permanent account.

Mr. VAIL. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) did not exactly touch the point I wanted to make. The point I wanted to make was this: The hon. Minister of Marine a little while ago gave as the reason why the civil service account had been increased, that the extra clerks had been taken from the contingencies accounts and placed on the permanent list. I find that that is not the case, but that the same number of extra clerks are charged to contingencies as in 1878.

Mr. McLELAN. What I stated was that there had been a transfer of the number from the extra service to the permanent service; but I stated why there should be a cause for the extra clerks to be called in at times.

Department of Railways and Canals $6,000 00

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I pointed out awhile ago that there was an increase of some $4,000 in the contingencies for the Departments of Railways and Canals and Public Works combined, since hon. gentlemen opposite came into power, and the hon. Minister of Public Works says he has decreased his part. I suppose the blame lies with the Department of Railways and Canals for the increased expenditure.

Mr. POPE. I do not know whether it does or not, but I am quite willing to accept it. So far as the Department of Railways and Canals is concerned, you must understand that a good many railways are subsidised, and we have a great deal of that kind of thing to do; and while the expenses last year were $7,000 I think we might reduce the expenditure to $6,000.

Mr. DAVIES. I notice that in "Departments generally," one item appears under the curious heading of "Certain matters and supplies, $179." Can the hon. gentleman explain that?

Mr. PATERSON. While he is getting ready to answer, I will take the opportunity of asking the Minister of Customs if he will answer my question now. How is it that we find in "travelling expenses" in his Department, only the sum of $4.25 paid to one E. L. Saunders in the contingencies, while there are large sums in contingencies for the travelling expenses of the other Ministers and other officers in all the other Departments. How does the hon. gentleman reduce his contingent account?

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the Auditor General's Report, Part ii., page 317, he will find $200 for the Minister's travelling expenses; $345 for the commissioner; $115 for the accountant, and $134 for the collector of Customs, Winnipeg, who is also inspector for that Province.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman sat very quiet and accepted all the praise I gave him for having reduced his contingent account and allowed me to censure, by comparison, the Minister of Inland Revenue. Now, it appears the Minister of Inland Revenue put openly before us all these different items while the Minister of Customs has his in another place. Instead of quietly accepting all the commendation I gave him for economy, the hon. gentleman should have informed us that there was a considerable amount to be added to the contingencies of his Department and not have allowed an unfavorable comparison to be made to the detriment of his colleague.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is as wide of the mark in this as he is ignorant of the books he has in his hand. These are portions of the total of contingencies in my Department; the hon. gentleman led this Committee to suppose that the Department of Customs and the Department of Inland Revenue and the other Departments kept the Public Accounts.

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. BOWELL. That was the only inference to be drawn from the hon. gentleman's remarks. He says that while he was complimenting me on the small amount, comparatively with others, of expenditure in the contingency account, I sat quietly by and listened to them without calling his attention to what he says was an incorrect statement. Such was not the fact. The hon. gentleman knows, or if he does not, the ex-Finance Minister can inform him, that when the accounts come to the Department of Customs they are sent to the Auditor-General who places them in such part of the book as he may think proper, and so far as the individual Department is concerned it is not at all responsible. These are the travelling expenses in connection with the inspectors that occur every year, and they are not taken out of the contingencies but are a special item. The expenses connected with the Board of Appraisers are also taken from that item and not from the contingencies.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman need not assume such an air of superior knowledge and intelligence in communicating this fact, and he need not emphasise so much in saying that if I am ignorant of it I can get the information from the ex-Finance Minister. I was not asking the ex-Finance Minister but the hon. gentleman, and he cannot cover up his retreat in that way. If there be ignorance, it is he who has displayed it. I mentioned the amount charged against contingencies and said that all that I could find was $4,000. The hon. gentleman sat very quietly and accepted it. I said it was strange that there were no travelling expenses, and he retorted that he supposed that there had been no travelling.

Mr. BOWELL. No, I did not say that; I said distinctly there had been some.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman said supposing there had been none. I said, what about your appraisers? Have they not travelled? He replied, do yo not know that the appraisers' place is in Ottawa, and that they settle the cases here?

Mr. BOWELL. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. PATERSON. I think you did.

Mr. BOWELL. You may think so, but I did not.

Mr. PATERSON. Getting angry about it will not mend the matter in the slightest degree. The hon. gentleman is very free with his insinuations about lack of knowledge, but he must listen to what I have to say, and *Hansard* will show who is right in this instance. When talking about travelling expenses, he said, assuming the same air of superiority, do not you know that the appraisers' place is in Ottawa and that the cases come before them there, and they are not supposed to travel. I said I thought Mr. Fraser had visited my city, and the hon. gentleman said: Well, perhaps he

was, but not this year. The hon. gentleman may rise with temper and cast out recklessly insinuations of ignorance, but, if he knew then what he knows now, he sat there and accepted praise that was not deserved on his part, and allowed his Department to be complimented in contrast with other Departments of the Government.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not desire to continue this. I do not suppose, because the hon. gentleman speaks a little loud, that he is angry, and he must not suppose, if I speak to him in not as loud and boisterous a tone as he speaks to me, that I am necessarily angry. I have a habit of saying what I have to say as distinctly as he does, though perhaps not quite so loudly. When he referred to the question of appraisers, I asked distinctly what appraisers he meant, and I explained not that the appraisers' business was done at the head office in Ottawa, but that they did not travel to the different ports. Then he called my attention to the fact of Mr. Fraser. Then I asked him again if he referred to the general appraiser connected with the Board of Customs, and I told him then distinctly that Mr. Fraser had been in Toronto and that there had been travelling expenses. I did not try to hide the fact because I knew there had been travelling expenses. I did state, as he says, that probably the time Mr. Fraser was in Brantford might come within the current year and not last year.

Mr. PATERSON. Did not the hon. gentleman ask me whether there had been any travelling expenses this year, and whether Mr. Fraser had been there?

Mr. BOWELL. Did I not what?

Mr. PATERSON. Did you not ask me if he had been there this year, and was it not another year?

Mr. BOWELL. Did I not just explain that? The hon. gentleman is as captious as some of the hon. gentlemen by whom he is surrounded.

Mr. DAVIES. It is a singular fact, and one calculated to mislead any honest enquirer——

Mr. BOWELL. That is not you.

Mr. DAVIES. Then I will assume that the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) and his friend beside him are the two honest enquirers, and I say it is very strange that the classification of the contingent expenses of the Customs Department is different from that of any of the other Departments. While the travelling expenses of every other Minister is charged under the head of the Department, the travelling expenses of the Minister of Customs and his assistants are charged under a different head altogether. When I found under the head of the Department "travelling expenses, E. L. Saunders, $4.75," any honest enquirer would imagine that was all the travelling expenses. In the other departments, I found the travelling expenses were charged $400, $500, $600, or $700, as the case may be, and I thought the Minister of Customs was entitled to credit for not having expended as much as his colleagues, but at page 317 I find charged for travelling expenses $200 for the Minister himself, $345 for his commissioner, and $115 for his accountant. In point of fact his travelling expenses, for himself and his assistants, are as large as those of any of the other Ministers, and the travelling expenses of his subordinates, as might be expected, are larger—they have more travelling to do. I am glad the discussion has come up, because I find the hon. gentleman is not half so economical as I thought he was. There is one thing he is entitled to credit for, unless the expenditure is hidden away in some other part of the book, and that is in regard to cab hire. I find that in the Privy Council this amounted to $928, the Department of Justice, $141; Department of Militia, $206; Secretary of State—he was a little extravagant—$345; Minister of the Interior, $521—I suppose he had more to do—with Indians, $22 extra; the Auditor General, $5.50—he seems to have been very economical; Finance, $96; Customs, *nil.* I want to know if, in any other part of this book, I can find cab hire. If not, the hon. gentleman is entitled to credit. Inland Revenue, $213; Public Works, $355; Post Office, $161; Agriculture, $112; Marine and Fisheries—another economical Department, $9.55.

Mr. McLELAN. That is all.

Mr. DAVIES. I commend the hon. gentleman for the economy he has displayed in that particular branch. I am not speaking of travelling expenses, but of cab hire in the city of Ottawa alone. Railways, $259; total, about $3,500. I think, in respect of that one item, the Minister of Customs has been entitled to some little praise, although in respect to the travelling expenses he has received undeserved praise, and he received it very blandly and swallowed it all.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is $5,489 to add to the $4,000 that appears under the head of contingencies, and there is no amount asked for to cover the amount we find on page 317. I feel it is my duty to say to the Minister of Inland Revenue, after blaming him by comparison with the Minister of Customs, that now it turns out that he is not so very much to blame after all.

Mr. BLAKE. There are several lessons to be drawn from this. My hon. friend from Brant is good-natured we know, he is fond of looking at the best side of things. Let him observe that appearances are deceitful; that, whenever hon. gentlemen opposite, or any one of them appears to be better than his colleagues, he will find the explanation in some other part of the book. That is all that is necessary, a little further investigation, and he will find that one is as bad as the other. Then, the Minister of Customs said his colleagues could take care of themselves, but it seems he takes a little better care than his colleagues do. But he says it is not his fault, it is the Finance Department and the Auditor General who have done this and have placed him in this position. So his colleagues cannot take care of themselves, but they take care of him to their apparent prejudice, they arrange his travelling expenses so as not to appear in the same category with their own, and the Minister of Customs is blameless, except for accepting my hon. friend's compliments, which we all felt there must be some explanation of. He is entirely blameless in regard to this arrangement of his travelling expenses. There is some little angel who sits up aloft and takes very good care of poor Mac.

Mr. BOWELL. I am much obliged to the hon. gentleman, and especially for the latter part of his speech. All this is an attack upon the Auditor General, and I will take pains to call his attention to the fact. He is not a colleague of mine; he is independent of the Minister of Customs, and is responsible to the Parliament of Canada. If he tried to hide this up, this Parliament should call him to account for it. I lay no blame on the Minister of Finance for the way in which his books are kept. Hon. gentlemen, I know, think a great deal of the Auditor General and his abilities. I know I do, and why this was put differently from similar items in regard to others I am at a loss to know; but, when the member for Queen's (P.E.I.) (Mr. Davies), tried to throw the responsibility upon me, and would make it appear to anyone who might read *Hansard* in the future that I had tried to hide this up——

Mr. DAVIES. No. I rise to explain.

Mr. BOWELL. I merely wish to have it put right, whether the hon. gentleman makes the charge by insinuation or inuendo or with that sarcasm with which he surrounds his very pretty little speeches. He does not carry that very pleasant, handsome face and smile with his words

into the book, and the result would be that those who read it in the future would come to the conclusion that the Minister of Customs had, in order to hide up certain expenditures of his Department, put them in some hole and corner of the book, in which idea he was very ably and eloquently assisted by his very eminent leader. If there is any responsibility in connection with hiding it up, if hiding up it is, it is due to an officer over whom no Minister of the Crown has any control at all, who is responsible wholly and solely to this Parliament for what he does.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. the Minister of Customs was astute enough to understand perfectly well that the complaint was not so much that this item did not appear with others of a similar kind, as that he complacently and improperly received compliments which were not due to him, and sat smiling while those compliments were bestowed upon him, leading the House to understand that he deserved them, while all the time he did not deserve one of them.

Mr. SPROULE. He was smiling, perhaps, at the parties who, after looking all through the book, never found it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the Minister of Customs is in error in saying that the Auditor General was any to blame in this matter.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say he was to blame.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Or that he has been the cause of this mistake. The Auditor General does not prepare the Public Accounts, but he prepares a statement which he lays on the Table for us. Now, in the Public Accounts for 1878, under the head of contingencies, Civil Government, I find the travelling expenses of Mr. Burpee's assistants were charged, as was the case with all the other Ministers. This alteration in the Customs Department which prevailed in our time has taken place in the Finance Department, and in no respect in the Auditor General's Department. Apparently what has been done has been this: That a certain item, which appears in the Estimates at page 75, that is called miscellaneous contingencies, head office, extra printing, stationery, advertising, telegraph, etc., that apparently has been made to include the Minister's travelling expenses. I think it is an error in the mode of keeping the accounts which ought to be rectified. It certainly was not an error which occurred before, because in our time the Minister made a detailed charge of the travelling expenses in the Public Accounts for the year, which I think should be done now.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman who last spoke is quite correct, and he will find that this is the first and the last year that these particular items appear in the Finance Minister's report, precisely as they did in the year to which he has referred. This is the first time they have so appeared, and why it is so I cannot explain.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The error is not in any respect the fault of the Auditor General, but it lies in the Department of the Finance Minister who compiled the Public Accounts. The Auditor General's business is to inspect and check the vouchers, and to call our attention to any matters that may deserve it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister of Customs, in bringing this matter before the Auditor General and pointing out his fault to him, will undoubtedly tell him how it came to be a subject of discussion; how the Minister of Customs had been sitting quietly in his seat accepting the compliments for great economy in reference to this matter; and when he was asked to explain to his colleagues that there was a larger amount, did not take care to say: "Oh, I am in the same position as they are;" but he quietly left his colleagues to take care of themselves.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the Minister of Customs adhere still to the statement that an error has been committed by the Auditor General, or is it in the Public Accounts solely which are prepared in the office of the Finance Minister? When he spoke first on that part of the subject and declared that these Public Accounts were prepared by the Finance Minister's office and by the Auditor General, he included both Departments. I answered him in the way he spoke. Then when he replied to me he said it was exclusively done by the Auditor General. We know the Public Accounts are not prepared by the Auditor General. He prepares the Appropriation Accounts for which he is responsible to the House. The Finance Department prepares the Public Accounts, and it is in the Public Accounts the change has taken place. It is, therefore, one of the hon. gentleman's colleagues and not the Auditor General who appears at present to be responsible for the change which has produced this discussion.

Mr. PATERSON. I understand the Minister will do better next time.

Mr. BOWELL. When I spoke of accounts, I spoke of them distinctly, and when I said the Auditor General was responsible for this, I had reference to his own report exclusively and not to the other; I did not hold the Auditor General responsible for anything that was in the Finance Minister's report. That is the only explanation I have to make. I will say to hon. gentlemen, as I said a few minutes ago to the hon. gentleman for Brant (Mr. Paterson), this is the first time the Auditor General has placed these accounts in this way. Why he has done so I never asked him. If the House desires me to ask him I have no objection to do so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. He has placed them in that way because his book is a comment on the Public Accounts. If the Public Accounts placed them in a particular way he must follow suit.

Mr. BOWELL. When money is drawn for travelling expenses the account is sent with the vouchers to the Auditor General who audits them. If the proper vouchers do not accompany them he will not pass them, and he makes these entries from which this book is compiled. How far he obtains information of that kind from the Finance Department I am not prepared to say. I think it is unnecessary for me to go to the Finance Department to obtain information of this kind, because it goes to the Auditor General for audit, and from these accounts he makes the entries in his book. I suppose that is the practice of his Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. Minister will look at the Auditor General's report he will see that gentleman is obliged to follow closely on the lines taken in the Public Accounts. What has been done so far is, that the parties who prepared the Public Accounts have placed these items where they never appeared before, and that is the reason why the Auditor General likewise has been obliged to place them there. It is nothing to him in what particular way they appear. He could not compel the Minister of Finance or his deputy to place a certain set of items last year in contingencies of Civil Government, and this year in the contingencies attached to the collection account.

Contingent expenses of High Commissioner in London, and to provide £100 for salary of secretary, hitherto charged to unforeseen expenses $2,500 00

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). This is not a large amount—only $2,500 for the purpose of helping to sustain and maintain our Ambassador at the English Court. It is a luxury of course, and we must expect to pay somewhat for luxuries of this kind. The commissioner costs us about

$15,000 a year—$10,000 for his salary, and about $5,000 for contingencies. We have spent somewhere about $40,000 odd in purchasing a residence for our representative at the English court, and also spent considerable money in furnishing that establishment. Last year I find we voted $4,500 for contingencies. The Public Accounts show that we spent $5,186 for that purpose. That, I believe, covered the rent, fuel, light and taxes, and the services of a secretary. Having purchased this mansion last year, I suppose we shall not have to pay any rent, and therefore the amount is lessened by some $2,000. That is, so far, all right and proper. But, after all, I am very much inclined to the opinion, from what has been said in the House this Session, that the office is more ornamental than useful, and that the distinguished gentleman who occupies the position can fill it in an ornamental fashion, though he is a vigorous and useful man in his way and place. But I have grave doubts as to whether or not it is really worth our while, at the very considerable expense we are incurring, to keep a representative of the Canadian Government at the Imperial court. We have bought the house and have furnished it, comfortably, elegantly, in the best style, from the silk plush curtains with silk vallences, fringe, gimp, gilt cornices, down to the sauce-pans in the kitchen. Everything is furnished for our representative to the English court. I have here a detailed statement, every item is put down, and I believe the return brought down to Parliament shows exactly what we have expended in furnishing this establishment. It is interesting reading. I commend it to your attention, Mr. Chairman, and I strongly advise you to read it. I advise every hon. member to read it. We hear a good deal about printing documents, and I commend the printing of this document. I think among the farmers, mechanics and business men of the country, there can be no more interesting literature than this detailed account I now hold in my hand. It is very interesting and it covers the whole furnishing of the house. I am sure it will prove invaluable to farmers, business men and mechanics in helping them to furnish their houses. It is so interesting I cannot allow the item to pass without drawing the special attention of the House to some of the items it contains. You will find that a servant's bedroom on the fourth flight of this palace we have in London cost, for the furnishing —carpet chairs and little nick-nacks of that kind—only $240. It is not expensive for the furnishing of a servant's bedroom in the attic of our palace in London. You will find that a back bedroom on the third flight cost only £72 16s. 10d. That for a back room on the third flight is surely cheap enough. There is, in addition to furnishing the back room on the third flight, an amount of £69 1s. 1d. for furnishing the dressing-room in connection therewith, making a total amount of £141 17s. 11d., or in our currency a little over $700. Then there is the left front bedroom on the third flight, the furnishing of which cost $385. Everything is stated with the greatest particularity so that no one can misunderstand. The furnishing of a back bedroom on the second story cost £142 18s. 9d., and the dressing-room in connection only £72 19s. 3d., or together £285 18s., or in our currency $1,075. Surely that is most economical; surely it is not extravagant that the furnishing of a back bedroom on the second flight should cost only $1,075. The furnishing of the front drawing-room cost $2,181, and that sum does not include a great many nic-nacks which appear in other parts of the account. The dining room cost $1,170 and so on. All this is surely not too expensive for the honor and dignity of being represented at the English court by so distinguished a gentleman as he who formerly presided over the Department of Railways here. When he was here, and we were all glad to see him and sorry to lose him, he posed as an apostle of temperance for the last year or two. It was quite proper that a Minister of the Crown should be so, and that he should carry out his principles in every respect. There must be some mistake in regard to this account. It states that there were furnished 36 port glasses, 36 sherry glasses, 36 claret glasses, 36 champagne glasses, 48 tumblers, 4 quart decanters—for water not for whiskey—4 pint do.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Any corkscrews.

Mr. CAMERON. There will be a great deal of corkscrewing in this account before we get through with it. There are two claret jugs, eight plain handled carraffe setts, two plain do., two claret jugs, engraved and flat-sided. Some are round and some are flat-sided. There are in all 22 decanters and twelve or fourteen dozen of wine glasses. You will find in the account that there are provided for this ambassadorial establishment bins for the purpose of receiving, until they are old and mellow, and fit for men of taste to drink, the wines that are bought for keeping up the social element in the Ambassador's establishment. There are wine bins to contain 84 dozen bottles, and one dozen small zinc labels so as to distinguish the claret and champagne. Everything is done with the utmost regularity and the greatest order. We have reason to be proud of the manner in which we are inaugurating our mission to the court of St. James. The thing is done in style. You will find, I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that if you had this account printed and distributed amongst your constituents in the great city of Halifax, and especially among the farming element, how delighted they would be after the hard labors of the day are over to sit down and read about 84 dozen of wine, 36 champagne glasses, 36 port glasses, 36 claret glasses, with all the etceteras in connection with the interesting feast in prospective. Not only is our Ambassador supplied with these things, but with every other thing which human taste, human ingenuity, or human skill could imagine. Here we have in the account of Miss Reynolds, and I observe that our Ambassador has bought a great many things through Miss Reynolds, among other things a fry basket, an omelette pan-wrot, an oval fry pan, a tin baking shell and a York pudding tin. I suppose it is quite right that our Ambassador occasionally visiting that charming portion of England, Yorkshire, should want to know something of it, and he gets, therefore, a York pudding tin. In addition, he gets a copper sauce-pan, a fish-kettle and a sauce-pan and steamer. Now, I suppose it is all right, but why the Canadian Government should buy brushes and whisks for our Ambassador in England, is one of the things which no man can find out. Then we have a set of skewers, a flour dredge, a funnel, a sugar dredger, a box of larding pins, a dust pan and a red cake-tin—but I am out there, I give it up. Then we have a tin tea-pot and a square canister and a cook fork, and we have further, a chamber pail and two foot baths. These are all tin, Mr. Chairman, and I hope you are paying great attention, because they are of great importance. Then there are two wood spoons and a dozen wood spoons and four more wood spoons, and six more of them and a rolling pin. Now, what on earth is he going to do with a rolling pin? Surely he is not going to come in contact with any European autocrats so that he may be required to use a rolling pin. Then we have a hair sieve and a wood pail, and a clothes horse and a decanter drainer. Further, we have to provide him with quilts, with bed rugs and with blankets, and there are so many of them that we are quite sure that he will be kept warm enough. Then we provide him with shades to keep the glare of the gas light or of the electricity from his delicate eyes; there is a red dagmar shade, a frame shade, a silk shade, and a frame for that silk shade, the whole amounting to £9 16s. Now there is another interesting item here, and I think perhaps it is the most interesting of all in this long account, an item which gratified and pleased me beyond measure when I read it. It is under the head of dressing room adjoining the bed room

of our Ambassador, and it is for a child's cot. I was not aware that our Ambassador was in that line of business just now, though I suppose that we may congratulate hon. gentlemen opposite upon the interesting event which is likely to take place, otherwise a child's cot would not be purchased. I dare say the First Minister knows something of this matter, because I have no doubt the news would be communicated by wire to him across the ocean. Then further on we find a carriage, and though it does not say what kind of a carriage, I judge it must be a baby's carriage, which, as a matter of course, would follow a child's cot. It only cost 3s. 2d., a very small sum, but it is a very small article. Now, if it is the case that it is a child's carriage, I think we have reason to congratulate ourselves, should it be a boy, that we are bringing up a man who will at some future day occupy the important position of second Ambassador for this Government. The amount is large—several thousand pounds; in fact the whole expense connected with the High Commissioner, the purchase of that building and furnishing it, including the wine bins and the wine glasses, and the child's cot and the child's carriage, come to over $42,000. I do not think in the present condition of affairs, with the enormous drains on the public Treasury, that we are in a position to continue this sort of thing much longer. My own opinion is that it would be a good thing to dispose of our building and sell the furniture, including the wine bins, and the wine cellars, and the glass, and the child's cot, and recall our present Ambassador and not appoint anyone to succeed him. So far as the people are able to judge the services of that Ambassador they have not so far been of practical utility, and it seems to be a solemn farce to ask the country to pay an outrageous bill of this character in order to maintain a little spurious dignity of that sort. We have accomplished nothing so far by keeping him there. When the Minister of Finance wants anything done, he does not trust it to the High Commissioner. When the First Minister wants anything done, when he wants any interviews with the Colonial Secretary or the Imperial Government, he does not entrust it to our Ambassador. We have saved nothing in the way of expense, and we have added enormously to the cost by the payments we have made on account of this building and the furnishing of it. Sir, there are many items, there are thousands of dollars which no sensible man, paying the money out of his own pocket, ever would have incurred and that no Government who had really at heart the prosperity and interest of his country would have sanctioned or asked the sanction of Parliament. I have only mentioned a few articles and I challenge any man, any supporter of the Government, to sit down and read that account and feel it to be otherwise than I have felt it to be —an absurdity from beginning to end, that we have established an Ambassador at the Imperial court at such enormous cost. I do trust that this folly and this nonsense will end, that the property will be disposed of, and that Sir Charles Tupper will be called from his mission, and be replaced by nobody else.

Post Office and Finance Departments—amount required for balancing and computing interest in depositors' accounts—Post Office Department, $1,450; Finance Department, $1,000..... $2,400 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice that there are items in contingencies charged to the same accounts. Are they to be continued?

Mr. BOWELL. I am not aware. The explanation I have received of this is, that at the end of each year it is necessary to balance all the accounts, which has to be done very rapidly, necessitating the employment of a number of officers for that purpose.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What I say is that you will find in the contingencies of 1884 that about $2,500 is charged for a similar service. It is quite clear that if we are making an extra charge for that, we should not have the same amount in the contingencies which we have just passed. There ought to have been a corresponding reduction.

Mr. BOWELL. I will make enquiries as to that.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12:50 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 8th April, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 121) to amend the Act 45 Vic., cap. 41, respecting the sale of railway passenger tickets.—(Mr. Woodworth for Mr. Patterson, Essex.)

PUBLIC DEBT OF CANADA.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT (for Mr. CHARLTON) asked, Gross amount of the public debt of Canada on March 31st, 1885? Net amount of the public debt of Canada on March 31st, 1885?

Mr. BOWELL. Gross debt on 31st March, 1885, $257,118,336.97; net debt 31st March, 1885, $192,129,009.00.

STEAMER *LANSDOWNE*—COMMUNICATION, P. E. I. AND MAINLAND.

Mr. JENKINS asked, Is it the intention of the Government to send the steamer *Lansdowne* to assist in keeping up communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland?

Mr. McLELAN. Enquiries have been made on the subject, and it is under consideration.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—REJECTED LAND OUTSIDE RAILWAY BELT.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Has the Canadian Pacific Railway Company rejected any land outside the railway belt? If so, how many acres in southern Manitoba, and how many elsewhere?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have rejected, or rather objected to some land outside the railway belt. I will send the hon. gentleman the paper.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY—LIST OF SHAREHOLDERS.

Mr. MITCHELL asked, Whether in view of the answer made by the General Manager of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to the Order of the House, requiring that a list of the shareholders of that company be laid before this House, it is the intention of the Government to cause an Order in Council to be passed, under the provisions of the Act 44 Vic., chap. 24, requiring the Grand Trunk Railway Company to give the Government the information demanded by this House?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The matter is now under consideration.

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT.

On the Notice of Motion for Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:

That in the opinion of this House such portions of the License Act of 1883, and the Act to amend the Liquor License Act of 1883, as the Supreme Court of Canada has declared to be *ultra vires*, should be suspended unless and until the same shall be decided by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to be *intra vires* of the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) said: This is a very important motion, that will elicit a good deal of discussion, and, as we only sit to-day till six o'clock to dispose of Notices of Motion, it will be quite impossible that it can be disposed of. I am aware that there are a large number on both sides of the House who propose taking part in the discussion, and I desire to get the honest and independent sense of the House upon the proposition that is laid down in this motion, and I think it would be better if hon. gentlemen would consent to allow this motion to stand until Monday. It will then be the first Order of the Day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will not be an Order of the Day.

Mr. CAMERON. If the discussion is entered upon to-day, and not finished by 6 o'clock, it will not be reached again this Session, because the hon. gentleman has given notice of taking every Wednesday, and therefore it could not possibly be reached, and I think it is desirable that the opinion of the House and full and free discussion should be had upon this question. I have asked the Government to allow the matter to stand until next Monday, with a view of having that full and free discussion and an independent expression of opinion upon the subject. I have asked them to take the same course as was taken last year when the late lamented Mr. Houde submitted his motion to the House. I believe the Government gave him a day for the discussion of it, and the discussion was proceeded with and the sense of the House taken upon the question. I ask the Government in this instance to do the same thing, and allow the matter to stand until Monday, when we can have a full discussion of the question, and the sense of the House taken upon it the same day, instead of discussing the question piecemeal and with a chance of having no expression of opinion from the House at all upon the subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, let it stand.

THE CANADIAN AGENT AT PARIS.

Mr. BERGERON moved for:

All papers concerning the appointment, instruction and salary of Mr. Fabre as Canadian agent at Paris (France), and the reports from that gentleman to the Government, since his appointment.

He said: This is a very important question, and I beg the indulgence of the House to say a few words upon it. This Parliament has been working for many years to obtain as much as possible immigration, and this country has spent lots of money for the purpose. In fact I may say that the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was only undertaken with the intention of bringing into the North-West as many immigrants as this country could bring into it. I may say that the National Policy, which was inaugurated by this Government in 1879, was not only for the purpose of restoring our finances and giving employment to our workingmen, but also because we relied upon immigration to this country. It seemed to me a few years ago that one country in particular had been overlooked by us as a source of immigration, and that was France. That great country had ignored, for one hundred years, that 60,000 Frenchmen had been left on the shores of the St. Lawrence and had been forgotten by old France. A few years ago a gentleman now sitting in this House, the hon. Secretary of State, being then Prime Minister of Quebec, renewed commercial relations with France. He called to his assistance a gentleman who was perfectly well fitted for the service, and appointed him agent in France of the Province of Quebec. The Dominion Government then took advantage of the occasion to appoint him likewise agent for the Dominion of Canada, and he has since occupied that double position. When Mr. Fabre was first appointed he knew perfectly well the immense task he assumed. He had a small salary, he had heavy expenses to meet, and a great deal of work to do. Still, with a degree of patriotism which I am happy to acknowledge in him, he accepted the position. At first he was not known in Paris; indeed Canada was scarcely known in France. I remember that only three years ago, when I was travelling through that country, I met many men of education who, when I told them that I was a Canadian, did not know what I meant. They called us Americans, and were quite unaware that people speaking French were living on this continent. Mr. Fabre, by his work, by his energy, by his lectures delivered before all the great institutions in France, has made Canada known in that country. He has been a great auxiliary to the English Ambassador at Paris, Lord Lyons, and he has also been of assistance to our High Commissioner in England—to Sir A. T. Galt and to Sir Charles Tupper. Mr. Fabre has delivered lectures before the Commercial Association of Geography, in Paris; before the Polyglotte Institution; before the Colonial and Maritime Institution of Studies; and about a month ago he made a tour in the northern provinces of France, delivering lectures, making Canada everywhere known, and doing an immense amount of good to this country. In recognition of his services, France appointed him a Knight of the Legion of Honor, which is considered in that country, as it is in every country, a great honor. He has attracted the attention of France, of Belgium, of Switzerland, to this Canada of ours, and has done a great deal to attract from those countries to Canada the class of immigrants which we most need, that is, farmers: and he has done all that for a very small remuneration. It is not my intention to beg anything for him from this Parliament, but it is my desire to draw the attention of the members of this House to the fact, that a man who does a great deal of good to this country should be so remunerated that other countries will see that we know how to appreciate and reward patriotic service. When Mr. Fabre was appointed by the Quebec Government, he was granted a salary of $2,000, and the Federal Government gave him $2,000 more, with an allowance, I think, of $500 for contingencies, which would make a total of $4,500 received from Canada. At first, his office was a very small one. I visited it and found it in a poor locality, which did no honor to this country. Still, he did the best he could with the means at his disposal. In that office there were maps of Canada and representations of the products of this country, agricultural and mineral. To that little office people came from all parts of France to get information about Canada. Now, every hon. gentleman here knows that the old Bourbons and Orleanists of France, those who do not share the opinions of the Republican party, are anxious to leave that country. Those having property, and particularly those having children, do not want to live in a country where, at any moment, they expect another revolution. They wish to find a home for themselves and children in a country where the institutions are stable, and where they are sure to live in peace. They go to Mr. Fabre's office to get information. A great many of them have already made settlements in the North-West, and our agents consider these people as the best immigrants we could get. Later on Mr. Fabre had to enlarge his office, but he had to do so at his own expense, and at a sacrifice on his part. I would now like to impress upon the Government and the House the duty of assisting him in a more substantial manner, and of giving him an office more in

harmony with his position as the representative of a great country like Canada. It was always a wonder to me that we left him to pay the expenses of such an office. I certainly think we ought to pay him such a salary as will enable him to render those services to Canada that we expect of him. Mr. Fabre has been invited, as I said before, to visit different parts of France and deliver lectures. Well, Mr. Speaker, he had either to go at his own expense or to accept money from the different societies who had invited him to speak to them. I say that the representative of Canada in France, or in any other country, ought to have his expenses paid by us; he must not be dependent upon the people among whom he is living. He must be able to say that the Canadians are proud of their representative, and are not willing that he should be dependent upon foreigners for maintaining his station in a proper manner. I should be sorry to see this question looked at from a party point of view, or from a sectional point of view. This is a Canadian question, it is a national question; and I believe this Government would be doing its duty to the country by giving Mr. Fabre a salary which would enable him to do honor to the position he occupies. Sir, no one in this House can deny that immigration from France, from Belgium, from Switzerland or Holland, would be among the best that we could get from any part of the world with which to settle the millions of acres of land that we have in the North-West. Unfortunately, the recent troubles in the North-West may prove a temporary check to immigration, but that is another reason why the Government should have educated and capable gentlemen like Mr. Fabre, who will be able to convince Europeans that this little insurrection in the North-West is not serious, that it will soon be suppressed, and that people going there will receive some of the best land in the world, and will be in a position to educate their children, and to become Canadians, and help in making this country one of the most prosperous not only on the continent of America, but in the whole world. I do not intend to trouble the House further on this subject. I shall be glad if some other hon. member from any Province or of any party will support this motion and press upon the Government the demand which I make, to put Mr. Fabre in a position to do, as we expect him to do, as much good as possible to Canada.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has passed a most eloquent eulogy upon our agent in France, and has urged very strongly from his point of view the granting of a higher salary to that gentleman than he now receives. He told us in opening that Mr. Fabre had shown great patriotism in accepting this position at the quite inadequate salary attached to it. I do not know how the facts may be, from my personal knowledge, but I know it was generally understood for some time before Mr. Fabre was sent to Paris, even during the existence of the late Goverment when Mr. Fabre was supporting that Government, that he was very anxious to get this appointment, and instead of accepting it with reluctance and from feelings of patriotism, he seemed to be very glad to get it, and the appointment and salary attached seemed to be rather a favor conferred by the Government on Mr. Fabre than a favor conferred by Mr. Fabre on the country. It, perhaps, would hardly be fair to draw a hard and fast conclusion from the circumstances, but still the circumstances themselves are worthy of being remembered, that during most of the time when the Liberal Government was in power Mr. Fabre was a supporter of theirs; that he was appointed by that Government to the Senate; that he remained for a considerable time their supporter; that later on he grew cool in his allegiance to them; and immediately after the present Government came into power he accepted a position under that Government and became one of their warmest supporters. But what I have to deal with particularly is Mr. Fabre's conduct and achievements as immigration agent in France. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has pointed out that France has been too long neglected as a field for immigration. There was a great deal of force in that assertion. No doubt a very desirable class of immigrants could be obtained there. We know already from the French element amongst us what class of immigrants could be obtained, what hardy and enterprising men have come to Canada, and that in the north of France particularly, where Mr. Fabre is laboring, the population comprises a vast number of people who would prosper in this country. It is certain that very desirable immigrants could be obtained from that region. But I do not know that the efforts of our agent so far have been crowned with the success that one would have expected from a gentleman of his eloquence and ability acting for immigration purposes among a population with whom he is so much in sympathy. I have not seen the immigration report for this year; I do not think it has been brought down. In the last report I have read I saw a statement that Mr. Fabre succeeded in obtaining one immigrant from France in return for $4,000 a year salary, and the expenses of his office. That was not a very startling degree of success it will be allowed. I was astonished at his small success until I came across a copy of a most interesting paper published by him in Paris called the *Paris-Canada*, an "International Organ for Canadian and French Interests"—as it is described—"director, Hector Fabre;" published at the office of the Canadian Agency in Paris. The object of the publication is to promote the interest of immigration to Canada and closer international relations between France and Canada. It may be taken, therefore, that it shows clearly and fully Mr. Fabre's methods. I have been very much struck with a few passages in this paper, which I propose to read to this House, and then it will not seem to hon. members so astonishing that Mr. Fabre has only achieved the brilliant success of sending one or two immigrants a year to this country. The article from which I shall read is a report of some of the lectures delivered by Mr. Fabre in the north of France. The report is taken from a local paper, the *Libéral de Cambrai*, but it is printed here by Mr. Fabre himself with approval, and may be accepted as a correct report of the proceedings on that occasion. I may say that the whole effect of those lectures, and the whole direction of them, was to show that the population of Canada is essentially French. He declares that the population is almost entirely French, and that the French language prevails throughout Canada. I will make a quotation in regard to that point later on. But he draws no distinction between those parts of Canada where French is spoken and the other parts of the country. This, of course, is on account of his overflowing patriotism, because he has been so much impressed with the glories of the French part of Canada that the rest seems quite small in his eyes. But it is not to this I referred when I said that this paper removed my astonishment at his want of success. Before coming to the question of climate and resources of Canada I must quote what he says about the character of the Canadian people generally. I am translating as I go along, and perhaps the translation will not be very elegant English. He says:

"After more than a century since the loss of Canada to France most of her people have preserved their French manners and speak French in preference to English. But in their contact with the English the French have become wiser, and the bent of their minds has become more practical, so that while France since 1761 has passed through numerous revolutions, no revolution has troubled Canada. The Canadians, far from criticising bitterly each act of their Government, willingly recognise that the art of governing is essentially difficult. One has even sometimes seen Canadians refusing liberties that were offered to them by their rulers."

Now, I do not think in this extract that our worthy representative in Paris correctly pictured the feelings of Cana-

dians. We have seen acts of Governments bitterly criticised from time to time, and it is a fact that we in Canada have never heard of Canadians as a people refusing liberties offered to them by their rulers. The whole drift of the passage is to create the impression that the Canadians are a peculiarly docile people, easily governed, and a people who find no fault with their rulers. I am not at all sure that the right hon. the leader of the Government could give that character to the people, or that he could even say that the French Canadian people are so easily ruled and so sure to refrain from finding fault with their Government as Mr. Fabre represesents them. He goes on to state that :

"The Canadians are very prolific and there is no family which has less than eight or ten children. The number of these often amount to 25 or 30. One does not know in Canada what a marriage portion (*dot*) is. All marriages there are made from inclination."

These are very interesting details, and they will no doubt be found very useful to intending immigrants ! He goes on to pay a high compliment to the dress of the Canadian people. He says:

"The costume of the Canadians is that of the French. They dress themselves with the same good taste (*recherche*) as the latter."

It appears he has even taken note of the fashions in Canada, and feels it incumbent on him to explain to his French relatives that the people in Canada follow the fashions quite as closely as the people who live in Paris ! He continues :

"They especially hail Frenchmen with great kindness, beg them to settle in their midst, and if our compatriots are not married, offer them immediately the hand of a Canadian girl without dower (*sans dot*)."

This is a hospitable custom of the people of Canada with which we have not yet become acquainted. I am not aware that it is the invariable habit to offer to young Frenchmen who settle in Canada the hand of a Canadian girl, without dower, as he says, although the offering of that hand, even *sans dot*, should be sufficient inducement for any young Frenchman to settle amongst us. He goes on to speak further of the intense French patriotism which exists in Canada. He says :

"If the French flag floats no longer in Canada our national spirit still reigns there very forcibly. The English flag for more than a century has replaced ours there, but England exercises over Canada only an apparent sovereignty. In reality Canada is absolutely independent; her Parliament, her functionaries are independent. * * * By force of tenacity Canadians have conquered their complete liberty."

Well, these statements are probably not very far from expressing the real state of things, but at a time when hon. gentlemen opposite make it a grievance against some of us on this side to assert that Canada is practically independent in her actions, or that she should have a greater measure of independence in some respects than she now has—at such a time I think it proper to call the attention of the Government to the fact that their agent in Paris is practically preaching the independence of Canada. He goes on to say :

"Thanks to its fecundity the Canadian population has doubled during the last 28 years. The Canadian is honored for having many children. Mr. Fabre even cites the case of a candidate for Parliament who was refused the suffrage of his fellow citizens, because he had no children. 'We wish,' said these latter 'that our representatives should prepare the future of our children, and what care will you have of that future if you have no children yourself?' This candidate only obtained a few votes."

Seeing that such is the disposition of the Canadian people I think it is very strange that the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) ever obtained a seat in this House ! Speaking of the climate he says that :

"The climate of Canada is very cold during the whole season of winter. Eight or ten feet of snow then cover the soil from sight during seven months, and often the temperature descends to 15 degrees below zero."

He also speaks of the ice palace at Montreal, and adds :

"At Montreal one also sees for three or four months in the winter a railway built on the ice for a length of six *kilometres*."

Some of these statements are correct, but others are far from correct. The statement that eight or ten feet of snow covers the ground is so absolutely incorrect that it might have been made by any Cockney Englishman who only knew this country by hearsay, or by any American immigration agent who wished to divert immigration from Canada. It is an absurd and scandalous statement for an agent to make who seeks to attract immigrants to Canada, and I think the Government should see that the man they pay so highly, and from whom they expect so much, should make his statements at least approximately correct in giving an account of our climate. We must recollect that we are paying for the publication of these statements in France. We not only pay for the lectures, but perhaps we pay for the publication of this paper. I do not know whether it is a private speculation of Mr. Fabre's or not, but, at all events, it is a publication avowedly undertaken for the purpose of attracting immigrants to this country; and when we find this paper, published as the official organ of the Canadian Immigration Agent at Paris, stating that our soil is covered with 8 or 10 feet of snow in winter, we cannot help feeling that something is wrong. This paper, which is our official organ, goes on to quote all the compliments which have been paid to Mr. Fabre himself. It says :

"The lecturer is a younger M. De Lesseps. His slightly tinted face is very sympathetic, his glance bright, and under his slightly grey moustache are sculptured *spirituelle* lips."

This is all very nice in the way of compliment, but I do not know that this sort of thing will do very much to attract immigrants to this country. Then in the same lecture he goes on to deal with politics. When urging that France should establish more liberal relations with Canada,

"'Other neighboring people,' said he, 'whom you have obliged, do not keep the same good faith with you,' an allusion perfectly well understood to the disposition of Italy."

Now is it a becoming or a decent thing that our agent in France, representing this neutral country of Canada, should make political allusions "perfectly well understood" to questions of this kind in dispute between France and a neighboring country, and mix himself up with the international politics of Europe? We expect immigrants to come to us from Italy as well as from France, and I think it is the duty of our agent to keep himself free from any such allusions. But this gentleman should have a thorough knowledge of the country and should be a gentleman of intelligence and education, as the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) said. Let us see how clearly and intelligibly he explains the position of Canada. He says :

"Even in the English Province of Ontario, groups of electors—French Canadian electors he speaks of—sometimes hold the balance of power in a constituency. One may estimate at 1,400,000 the number of Canadians speaking French. Towards the North-West, the Province of St. Paul is called Little France."

It appears that Mr. Fabre is not only thoroughly instructed in the geography of this country, but he knows something of the geography of Canada which we do not know ourselves, for I do not think we knew that we had such a Province in the North-West as the Province of St. Paul ! Further, speaking of the progress of Canada, he says that :

"Canada, which is called 'Dominion,' in English, attached to herself in 1867, all British Columbia, that is to say, all that part of North America which does not form part of the United States."

So we have a new definition of British Columbia. If our late friend from that Province, who objected to its being spoken of as a sea of mountains, were amongst us now, he would no doubt be charmed to know that the Canadian agent in Paris represents British Columbia as comprising :

"All that part of North America which does not form part of the United States !"

This is a very amusing statement, and may cause a laugh here, but I do not think it is the sort of statement we should expect from our representative in Europe. Going on to speak of Manitoba, he says :

"Winnipeg and its suburb, St. Boniface, the capital of the new State of Manitoba, is building up, is becoming peopled, and is being illuminated by electricity."

Then he goes on to give a lot of other interesting details as to the hospitality of Canadians:

"One may make alliances there—(marriage alliances). Declarations of love may there be made on the tribune."

He then proceeds to urge:

"That France should interest herself, and make haste to renew the bonds which formerly united Canada to the mother country; she cannot fail in finding by this means glory and profit."

I do not know what Mr. Fabre means by saying that France should try to renew the bonds which formerly united Canada to the mother country—whether he means that Canada should again become a dependency of France, or whether this is a mere figure of speech. I think the latter is probably the case, but he should express himself so that his meaning could not be misunderstood. Then he goes on to speak of the system of jurisprudence and the old seigneurial system established in Canada. In speaking of the seigneurial system, he says:

"This organisation, created by Louis XIV, was a *chef-d'œuvre* of political invention, and has resisted English domination."

Now, I do not think our friends in Lower Canada were so well satisfied with the system established by Louis Quatorze as he imagines; for they abolished it and the country as a whole has had to pay for the demolition of that system which Mr. Fabre lauded so highly before his French audience. I do not intend to trouble the House with any more quotations. The paper is nearly altogether taken up with these reports of lectures, in addition to which it contains some extracts from French papers referring to Canada, something about the inauguration of the statue of Sir George Cartier, and an article on the Bell Farm in the North-West, and that is all. If this paper is to be taken as the official organ of Mr. Fabre, I do not think it does credit to his administration of the office which he holds.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The first part of the observations of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat were not very relevant to the motion before the Chair; but they afforded the keynote to the whole of his speech. It is perfectly evident that the attack just made on Mr. Fabre has originated in the fact that that gentleman, when concerned in Canadian politics, thought fit to change his political allegiance—that, having become disappointed, I presume, with the mal-administration of the former Government, which he had at first supported, he thought fit to withdraw his support from that Government. I do not think there is anything in those extracts which my hon. friend has read, to show any very great ignorance, though there may be one or two exaggerations or trifling errors. The statement that there are seven or eight feet of snow in Canada is unfortunately, as in our present experience, often too true, and I do not think it is likely to have any deterring effect on immigration. But to approach the subject seriously, I do think—and I say this as a representative from an Ontario constituency—that our French fellow-countrymen have a perfect right to have a reasonable portion of the money devoted to inducing immigrants from Europe to come to Canada, expended with the view of procuring settlers from old France. Having a large French population, as we have in Canada, comprising the bulk of the population of one Province, I think it is as little as they can reasonably ask, that some fair portion of the public expenditure on immigration should be devoted to inducing their fellow-countrymen from France, people who speak their own language, to come to Canada; more particularly, as my hon. friend admitted, as there is at present a feeling in old France among those disappointed with the system of political and social affairs in that country, in favor of seeking a new home on this side of the Atlantic. I think it is right and proper that all reasonable encouragement should be given to this movement, and that Mr. Fabre, while in Paris, should be enabled usefully and efficiently to carry on his exertions with the view of securing immigration from France to Canada.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am very much pleased that my friend the hon. mover of this resolution has brought this subject before the House. The Hon. Mr. Fabre, though not the direct representative of Canada in France, was appointed by the Province of Quebec as its agent in Paris; and we thought, as was communicated to Parliament at the time, that we should avail ourselves of his presence there, in order that, when required, he might distribute information about Canada. Mr. Fabre could not, of course, in the beginning be so useful as he is now. He had at first to feel his way. He had to make acquaintances, and become known to the leading men there, the men in power. As we know, unfortunately the men in power change very rapidly in France; and I have no doubt that owing to a change in the Government of the day, he found that he had to make new acqaintances in order that he might obtain certain information that he could not obtain otherwise. However, I must say that for the moderate salary Mr. Fabre has received, he has given good value to the country. He has shown that he understood his position; and notwithstanding the sneers of my hon. friend opposite, I have no doubt that it will be recognised all over the country that Mr. Fabre has given in work and in information dollar for dollar for all that he has received from this Government as well as the Quebec Government. It is as well that I should answer the hon. gentleman opposite on one point. He says that this paper, *Paris-Canada*, shows what Mr. Fabre, representing our interest, is doing over there. Well, I have read that paper perhaps more than the hon. gentleman has been able to do, and I must say that it has done very good service to the country. I must say that all in all that paper has done and is doing very great service to the country. More than that, Mr. Fabre is publishing that paper at his own cost and on his own responsibility. The country is giving no more to that paper than to subscribe for it. For my part, I have subscribed to one copy for my Department and to one copy for myself. The country pays for one and I pay for the other, and I suppose there are a few other copies sold in the Departments. Mr. Fabre has shown great patriotism—I use that word because it has come up just now, and it is in this instance a good word—in risking his money, for I have no doubt he is not well off in that way, and risks the little he has in trying to establish this paper in Paris and giving the benefit of its influence to his native country. I must say, moreover, that Mr. Fabre last year and this year has added largely to his influence and to his value in France by the numerous lectures he has been giving all through France. He has disseminated and is disseminating information, good information and true information, about this country all through France. The hon. gentleman says that Mr. Fabre succeeded in obtaining one immigrant last year or two years ago. That may be a very fine thing to say in order to raise a laugh, and I would be the first to laugh at the joke, but the hon. gentleman knows that the result of the action of Mr. Fabre in Paris should not be valued on the success he may have had a year ago or two years ago. The influence he exercises, the information he disseminates, may have their results later, perhaps this year. This information is given throughout the country. When Mr. Fabre goes through a number of towns and cities in France, he does not reach the *paysan*, the farmer, the uneducated man in the country. No; but he reaches the educated classes in the towns and the educated classes in the country parts also. He reaches the gentlemen farmers, the wealthy men who live in the country and come to town. I am very much pleased

to hear an educated man like Mr. Fabre from Canada giving them information about that Canada of which they have heard something, to which they attach great importance, and in which they interest themselves a great deal more than did France for nearly a century. The hon. gentleman quotes as an instance of the little value of Mr. Fabre's mission, the fact that in his paper, in one of his lectures he speaks of 7 or 8 feet of snow.

Mr. CASEY. Eight or ten feet.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman I am afraid, though he knows French well, has not become such a French scholar yet that he is able to see the drift of the speech. The hon. gentleman may have to look deeper and see what he can find under the 8 or 10 feet, and he will find there a great deal more than he thought there was. The hon. gentleman finds very great fault with Mr. Fabre because he has written in that paper, which belongs to him and which he publishes on his own responsibility, about the relations between France and Italy. It is a great fault, he says, on Mr. Fabre's part that being the agent of the Canadian Government in Paris he should take any interest in party politics.

Mr. CASEY. I did not say party politics.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman will see that Mr. Fabre being the editor of that paper has the responsibility of that paper; and if he writes in it in a way that is not proper, of course those who have influence over him may find fault with him; but I do not see that Mr. Fabre has committed such a crime any more than the hon. gentleman himself would if the hon. gentleman was speaking of politics. But the hon. gentleman has become very particular just now about Mr. Fabre. Why, does he not remember that at one period there was in London a direct agent of Canada, appointed by my hon. friends on the other side whilst they were in office, that that gentleman was Mr. Jenkins, that he was a member of Parliament, and a member of the Imperial Parliament in opposition to the Government of that day, and made speeches and took part in all the debates of the House, hammering, if I may use the word, at the Government of the day? Yet nobody found fault with that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman could not have been here.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman thinks it is a very good thing in the case of Mr. Jenkins, but Mr. Fabre must not say a word, though not the agent of Canada, for he is the agent of the Province of Quebec, and we make use of him for disseminating information through France for us, as a lecturer, or as an immigration agent. The hon. gentleman has not a word to say about the action of Mr. Jenkins at that time, but finds fault with Mr. Fabre, because he is determined to find fault with that gentleman. Mr. Fabre may not be a friend of the hon. gentleman, and I must say that when in this country Mr. Fabre was not for many years my friend. He was my political opponent, and perhaps at the time we were not on speaking terms, but in the position I now occupy I do not mind these things. I have to deal with Mr. Fabre independently and justly, and I say that he has done his duty well. He did his duty two years ago better than he did it three years ago, and he is now doing better than in the two previous years. To-day he has an auxiliary in Paris, Mr. Gerbié, a French gentleman who published here a book, a very good book, in favor of Canada, trying to give information to his countrymen about Canada. Mr. Gerbié received nothing else but the encouragement of the Department of Agriculture for a certain number of copies. The book is a very valuable one, and Mr. Gerbié has gone to France, and has been able to publish another edition to be circulated all through France. That gentleman received the very small sum we could give him by encouraging his book. Mr. Fabre, on the other hand, we thought should be encouraged. Whilst in Paris, we gave him the small sum of $2,500 and the Quebec Government gave him $2,000. The hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) thinks that Mr. Fabre is not paid sufficiently. That may be. All I can say is that that matter has been brought before the attention of the Government and it is now receiving the attention of the Government; and having said so much, I do not intend to follow the hon. gentleman in all the remarks he made about Mr. Fabre and his actions in Parliament. Let me add that if we always had officers who would be as zealous as Mr. Fabre has shown himself to be and is showing himself to be, we should be lucky to have them and to pay them well. There is no objection to the papers coming down.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems evident that the Government have changed their minds since last year as to the services which are rendered by Mr. Fabre in Paris. The hon. the Minister of Public Works has said that the question involved in the motion of my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) is now engaging the attention of the Government. The hon. gentleman did not say whether the Government would grant it, would entertain it favorably or unfavorably, but at all events he said it was now engaging their attention. It is within the recollection of every one of us that last year the Government, by the mouth of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, stated in this House that last year would be the last year that Mr. Fabre would be in the employment of the Government in Paris in his present capacity. We all remember that last year, on a question put by my hon. friend the member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), the hon. the Minister of Public Works distinctly stated that Mr. Fabre would not be continued in his office this year. Now it would appear from the remarks of the Minister of Public Works that the Government in this instance have changed their views, and that, though last year they believed Mr. Fabre's services were not such as that he should be retained in his present position, this year they have changed their minds. It is evident that Mr. Fabre's agency at Paris as an immigration agent has not been a success, and I believe it cannot be a success, because it is my firm conviction that the French people do not emigrate, and that it is useless to attempt to bring anything like a French immigration into Canada. I have followed with some attention the course of Mr. Fabre, in France, and I think his endeavors have not been in the direction of an immigration agency, but that he has endeavored to establish in Paris a Canadian agency after the pattern of the London agency. He has endeavored to play the part of our commissioner in Paris after the manner of Sir Charles Tupper, in London, and I believe he described himself so in one of his lectures. Yes, I see that in this paper he is described as "M. Hector Fabre, Commissaire-Général du Gouvernement du Canada à Paris." As far as I have been able to follow his course, he has always acted in that assumed capacity, but never as an immigration agent. Now, it may be a fair question, and one which I would be ready to debate, whether we should not have a Commissioner-General in Paris, as we have in London, but, if it is the intention of the Government to have one, let them say so. If it is their intention to have Mr. Fabre in Paris, not as an immigration agent but as the representative of the Canadian Government, let them come before the House with a distinct proposition to that effect, let them say that they want him to occupy the same position and act in the same capacity as Sir Charles Tupper does in London. Then it would be a question to be discussed, to be debated, and to be considered, but I object that Mr. Fabre, being simply an immigration agent in Paris, should style himself the Commissioner-General of Canada.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. But Mr. Fabre does not do that. The hon. gentleman should not be so unjust to his friend Mr. Fabre. He should read in the Liberal paper, or in this paper called the *Libéral*, and he will see that it is not Mr. Fabre who says that.

Mr. LAURIER. Perhaps he did not style himself in so many words as the Commissioner of Canada in Paris, but I say the whole course of Mr. Fabre has been in that direction; he has been endeavoring to establish a Canadian agency in Paris. What has he done as immigration agent? Where is his report as immigration agent? What has he done in favor of immigration? I cannot see his work, but, if I am told that he has been endeavoring to open an agency in Paris to give information to Canadians in Paris, and to act in the same capacity as Sir Charles Tupper does in London, I think that has been his aim. He may not have taken the title; I do not say he has; but, if he has not, the people of Paris have understood him to take that title and to have that position, and have so represented him. Now, if it be the intention of the Government, and I believe the intention in Lower Canada has been to represent him not as immigration agent, but as representing the Canadian Government at Paris, if that be the intention of the Government, let them squarely say so, and let them come before the House with a proposition to that effect.

Mr. CASEY. I desire to make an explanation of what I said. The Minister took it that I objected to Mr. Fabre's mixing in party politics. That was not the point; it was his stirring up ill-feeling between the nation of France and the nation of Italy, and it was not a writing in what the hon. gentleman says is his paper that I read, but a lecture he delivered as the immigration agent of Canada, and he quotes that in his own paper as if it were a correct report and quotes the title of Commissioner-General of Canada in his own paper, and therefore I take it he means that to be taken as his designation.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is a pretty lame way of getting out of it. After the hon. gentleman had said Mr. Fabre was styling himself in such a manner, after we have told him that it is not so, but that it was a quotation from another newspaper, he gives an explanation which is no explanation, not of his own speech, but of that of another gentleman. I am very glad to see that this little debate has come before the House. It has shown, it is true, that there is a little bit of animus on the part of our friends on the other side, perhaps on account of the versatility, as he used to call it himself in his witty speeches, the political versatility of Mr. Fabre. He never concealed it, and every one of his friends knew that he was never, in the full sense of the word, a politician. He was a prominent writer, he was a good worker, he was a good Canadian, and he does good work at the present moment, at the post which he occupies with benefit to the country and with glory to himself, I must say. Let Mr. Fabre be called by whatever official name in France, I can say, and I know it, that Mr. Fabre occupies a very high position amongst men with whom it is good and profitable to associate for a representative of this country. It is good for a country to advertise itself, and when for its advertiser it possesses a good writer, an eminent lecturer, a man of great wit and of great knowledge, it is an advantage, and notwithstanding the childish criticism of the hon. gentleman (the member for West Elgin) who has quoted a French paper that he does not even understand, Mr. Fabre occupies that position in France. Governments pay large sums of money to advertise a country. I understand that this year the Canadian Pacific has been spending over $125,000 in press expenses to advertise throughout all Europe their enterprise, and with it the country generally—and we all applaud their efforts. Well, Sir, Mr. Fabre has succeeded, without any assistance from the public Treasury, in establishing a valuable newspaper in Paris, thereby advertising Canadian interests amongst one of the most important nations of Europe. I say it is a profit for us to have that publicity from which Canada cannot suffer; the more we speak of Canada in the old country, the better it will be for us. We have nought to lose by being spoken of a great deal, because our country is not known as well as it should be, as it deserves to be. This debate at all events will bring this before the public. Mr. Fabre in Paris is paid by the Dominion Government so as to render there those services which his position as Agent-General for the Province of Quebec puts him in a position to render to the Dominion of Canada. When I was Premier of Quebec, as my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) has stated, I thought it would be a good thing to establish trade relations between the two countries. In doing so, I did not act from a sectional or a national point of view. Of all those of French origin in this House, I think I am least to be suspected of sectionalism. But, looking at it from a Canadian point of view, is it not important that our country should have trade relations with a country of 36,000,000 inhabitants? Have we not proved it by voting unanimously a subsidy of $50,000 a year for a line of steamers between the two countries? In doing that Parliament has recognised the importance of establishing trade relations between Canada and a great country like France. I may say that some of the negotiations (which I hope will be fruitful) towards establishing a direct line of steamers between France and Canada, were commenced, or, at all events, in a large measure, promoted, by the presence of Mr. Fabre in Paris. I do not, and I did not, intend to speak in detail about Mr. Fabre at the present time, but it was my intention to do so when the item in the estimates providing for that gentleman's salary comes before this House. But I am forced to answer the remarks of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) who tried to put into Mr. Fabre's mouth words which he never used, and who has translated into bad English something which was said in very good French, and which has lost not only its salt, but even its sense, in the mouth of the hon. gentleman. For instance, he has quoted as being said in a serious manner, as if it were a prospectus for immigration purposes, that families in Quebec numbered from 20 to 25 children. Mr. Fabre and the reporter of a newspaper quoted it to make his paper as lively as possible, by adding a little pleasantry, did mention that there was once in the Province of Quebec a Prime Minister who had been given as a tithe to the priest of his parish, and the tithe then was not the twelfth, but the twenty-sixth, and that Prime Minister was the Hon. Gedéon Ouimet. Mr. Fabre gave such an illustration to diversify his lecture, and in order to take away the monotony of long descriptions of the country and its resources. It was in the same spirit that Mr. Fabre remarked that sometimes 8 or 10 feet of snow covered the ground, but that nevertheless Canadians liked the winter, which made them vigorous and robust. But he also spoke of our fine spring, beautiful summer, and large harvests, and though this occurred in the very next line, the hon. gentleman took care not to read it. I do not think there is any great crime in saying that sometimes 8 or 10 feet of snow covered the ground in a winter like the present, but that nevertheless the climate was agreeable, that strangers came in the middle of the winter and enjoyed the Montreal carnival; that notwithstanding these little inconveniences we had most abundant harvests and rich land cultivated with profit. The hon. member has been laughing at the words from Mr. Fabre's lecture that in the Province of St. Paul in the North-West there was a settlement called "la Petite France." Those who know the French language are aware that a province means a region, and it was not Mr. Fabre but the reporter who referred to that region in the North-Western States which we call St. Paul, as New France. Over in the States there

is a region which is called Little France, so M. Fabre is perfectly correct from a geographical and every point of view. The hon. gentleman said that Mr. Fabre spoke of British Columbia as being that part of North America which was not part of the United States. But that is not the case. He said that after 1867, Canada had added to its territory British Columbia, which made the Dominion of Canada comprise the whole of Northern America, which was not included in the United States. That is obvious to any person who knew how to read and understand the French language. Is it by making such quotations as these that the hon. gentleman renders justice to Mr. Fabre? I say no. I say it is beneath the dignity of a member of Parliament to quote these little pleasantries as the serious opinions of Mr. Fabre. It is true that paper is called the *Libéral*, and a paper of that name may always be allowed to exaggerate a little. The hon. gentleman found fault with Mr. Fabre for having, in his lectures, said that the French in Canada have remained French, and he insinuated that Mr. Fabre's language was directed against England. Sir, that is a most unjust attack upon Mr. Fabre, who, in all his lectures, has been careful to dwell upon the loyalty of French Canadians towards England, and who has cited the deeds of our fellow-countrymen in defence of England, in those lines which the hon. gentleman did not quote, but where he said that the loyalty of Canadians of French origin was equal to that of Canadians of English origin. I suppose the hon. gentleman thinks that it would have been a good way of attracting French immigrants to Canada, for Mr. Fabre, in speaking before a French audience, to say that in Canada we hated, detested and abhorred everything that was French. At the same time my hon. friend was obliged to admit that French peasantry would be a good immigration. Everybody knows that the French peasant is very industrious and frugal, and made of France the richest nation in the world, a nation, that, after the Franco-Prussian war, was able to pay five billions of francs to Prussia, and still remain a rich nation, while Prussia has become comparatively an impoverished nation, notwithstanding the millions of money that she exacted from France. When Mr. Fabre speaks to a French audience he is obliged to say what we are proud to say here, what my fellow-countrymen of English origin are proud to say, that in Canada we are descendants of the two greatest nations in the world, and are happy to live together, contented and prosperous. The hon. gentleman has made a most unjust criticism of Mr. Fabre. He ought not to have taken a word here and there, and base upon it a criticism upon Mr. Fabre. I am sure that all those who have read that little paper must have been struck with the amount of labor that Mr. Fabre has put into it. There is not a single number of the paper which has not, at least, two or three articles—upon what? Upon the Province of Quebec? No, Mr. Speaker. The Province of Quebec is tolerably well known in France; but his efforts are directed chiefly to making known the North-West. He explains in his paper that the French farmer cannot get on so well in the forests of the Province of Quebec as can the Canadian born farmer, who is accustomed to the country, and to fight against the wilderness of the forest; and he advises the French farmers, the European farmers, to go to the North-West where the land is already clear and ready for the plough, and where they can reap a harvest the first year. That is the gist of Mr. Fabre's articles, but the hon. gentleman did not read them in that light. And, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman had not criticised Mr. Fabre in the unjust spirit that he has, but if he had fairly quoted from his paper, he would have told us that without Government assistance, Mr. Fabre is publishing a paper which is rendering a most valuable service to the country. I will not refer to the insinuation of the hon. gentleman that this Government is probably paying for that paper. Mr. Fabre is like some members of Parliament whom I know very well—he is not a capitalist. But he had some friends with him at Paris; one, I think, is a relative of a member of this House, who invested a little money on the paper, although I do not think that as a monetary enterprise they will not achieve a success. It is published without any assistance from Canada except a few paltry advertisements about the North-West, part of which are given and paid for by the Canadian Pacific Railway; but that paper, published without any assistance from the Canadian Government, is sent through every part of that great country of 36,000,000 inhabitants. Mr. Fabre has undertaken a series of conferences in those provinces from which we can get immigration to Canada. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) has told us that the mission of Mr. Fabre as an immigration agent in France has not been a success. I may point out this: We have had paid agents all over Europe; we have had a large expenditure for immigrants from different countries who have been sent out by State aid and by organised societies; but in France no expenditure, or comparatively none, has yet been made for immigration purposes. Through the efforts of Mr. Fabre the work has been undertaken. It must be remembered, however, that when means are scarce we cannot expect to have immediately large results. My hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) has said that French immigration had been nothing, and the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) has declared there had been one French immigrant. The hon. member for Quebec East asked, where are the reports of Mr. Fabre upon the success of his mission? At the beginning of this Session the hon. member for l'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) asked if the Government had any reports from Mr. Fabre. I replied that Mr. Fabre made reports from time to time, as he was advised to do, and I told the hon. gentleman whenever they were asked for they would be placed in the hands of hon. members; and I can state here that they have been prepared and copied and are ready to be laid before the House, and it will be interesting to every hon. member to see what care, trouble and labor Mr. Fabre has shown in preparing those reports. A more gratifying fact than that is the success which has crowned his efforts. The list of those who have come is to be found in those reports; not a list of paupers, but of men with means, who will settle in Canada, and who are at the present moment travelling in this country in order to determine the best place where they can establish themselves in business. Look at the registers in the hotels and see the number of people of French origin who are travelling in this Dominion. Go and enquire of those who have had the pleasure of meeting them, and learn how the interests of our country have been advanced by the good work of our agent in Paris. I had the pleasure of meeting not less than a dozen of those gentlemen during the last three or four months; men of wealth; not men who were ready to throw their money into any enterprise with their eyes blinded, but men who were ready to take advantage of the great resources of this country. More than that, if hon. gentlemen opposite will only ask for the reports they will see a list of those who have actually settled in this country, and they will ascertain, as the Minister of Public Works said a moment ago, that we have received more than dollar for dollar, that we have received hundreds of dollars for every dollar we have expended on the Paris agency. It is not my intention to speak as to the immigration policy of the Government; I am not in charge of the Immigration Department, and I have no special power to speak in a matter of this kind. But if the Government had not had this idea, I, as a member of the House, would have urged on the Government that these relations with France should be established. The Paris agency is desirable not alone on account of French immigration. Everybody knows that the port of Havre is more used for continental immigration than any other port

of the continent with the exception of Antwerp. It is through Paris and Havre that a great part of the south German, Swiss and all the Italian immigration is directed to this continent. A good, healthy advertisement has been given to Canada, and he has largely and as publicly as possible presented this country in a fair and proper light. It is not by quotations made from a newspaper, which the hon. member does not understand, and in language which he may be able to read but which he cannot translate, that we can judge of the work of our agent in France. I have probably taken up too much of the time of the House, and I had intended on another occasion to speak more in detail of the practical results of Mr. Fabre's mission in France. I thank the hon. member who has proposed this motion for the kind words he used towards myself, and especially with respect to our agent at Paris. Hon. gentlemen opposite, when they were in power, approved of an agent in Paris. They had a friend of theirs in Paris, and he did a great deal of good, taking into consideration the means at his disposal. I speak of Mr. Decazes, who, at the time he was there, was most active and laborious in the discharge of his duty. No one can say that I am interested in speaking of that gentleman. He was a friend of hon. gentlemen opposite; but I am willing to give to every one his due and I am pleased to give this testimony, as he did a good work, which has been continued by Mr. Fabre in a larger sphere, though not with more means at his disposal; but possessing a wider circle of friends, he has been thereby enabled to extend the beneficial effects of his work over a larger area than was covered before.

Mr. CASGRAIN. From the paper which I hold in my hand I think that the remarks of Mr. Fabre have been well translated by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) as far as I can understand, and I think I will be credited with being able to understand my own language. This paper assumes one thing, and I will leave it to any impartial person whether or not Mr. Fabre does himself assume that he is the French Commissioner for the Dominion of Canada in Paris. It is as plain as A B C to my mind. This paper which is published under his name, and has at its head his name as director, contains a quotation of his lecture which he has been making in the northern part of France and at the beginning of the report he says he has been complimented by Mr. Rigaux. He says:

"M. Hector Fabre, commissaire général du gouvernement canadien à Paris a donné dimanche, dans la salle des cérémonies de l'Hotel-de-Ville, la conférence que nous avions annoncée."

He is supposed to be there accrediting himself and he is exhibited at the meeting as the Commissioner of Canada at Paris.

An hon. MEMBER. He does not refer to himself in the report in those terms.

Mr. CASGRAIN. He quotes that title in his own paper, and it is no use for the Secretary of State to try to deceive the House, for any person who knows the French language reading that paper will come to the conclusion that Mr. Fabre is willing to assume that title, that it is given to him and he accepts it. But to come to the point as to the value of the services of Mr. Fabre. It was understood some three years ago that his mission was only to last three years; that was said in the House in my presence, but now his services are to be continued. They may be very valuable, but for three or four past years I have been trying to ascertain what services he rendered and I never could see any report of those services. The only service which I could see he had rendered—and I referred to it in the House before—was that he had brought one immigrant to Montreal, and how? This man was a Montrealer and he found means to stultify Mr. Fabre and get a free pass to return to Montreal. That is the only service which to my knowledge he has been able to render. I have frequently asked last year and the year before what services he was rendering, and so far as I could discover they were *nil*. Perhaps this year he has been doing something, and perhaps we will see the result of his three years work, and I would be glad to know that the Dominion of Canada will receive even a paltry something for the $2,500 which have been paid to Mr. Fabre since he has been in Paris. For my part I think we might well dispense with his services, and most likely if the Government persisted in their former intention he would not be continued this year as High Commissioner, as he wants to be styled.

Mr. BERGERON. When I moved my motion I thought there would be no opposition to it, and I am sorry to see that the opposition it has met with comes largely from a certain part of the Liberals of the Province of Quebec. The last speaker says that one thing strikes him, and that is the title of Mr. Fabre. Now this is an important matter. It is a large question, and I am sorry to see a man sitting in this House, representing a county in the Province of Quebec or any part of the Dominion, so narrow-minded that he should attempt, upon a trifle like that, to destroy what we are trying to obtain, not only for the Province of Quebec but for the whole Dominion of Canada. I am sorry to find that such expressions should be used in this House. We ought to be above those little party things. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), and the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), alluded to this question from a party standpoint. That is not the way it should be looked upon. These gentlemen say that Mr. Fabre does nothing in Paris, but the Secretary of State tells them what he has done, and at any rate these hon. gentlemen could get the information, they could read the reports of Mr. Fabre if they would ask for them. Mr. Fabre has made Canada known in France. He has lectured in the northern part of that country and is conducting a paper from funds out of his own pocket and those of his friends; he has been working earnestly and patriotically, and I am sorry to see that there are gentlemen in this House who would get up and speak against that work. My motion only tends to ask about his appointment and his work as immigration agent, and the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) says that he does not see why Mr. Fabre should style himself agent of the Dominion of Canada. But if we are to talk on that point, I would ask the House why we should not have an Agent General of the Canadian Government in France? Why should we not have a man there representing the Dominion as we have one in London? Are not we enough in the Province of Quebec—are there not enough members in the Province of Quebec—since you choose to speak of that subject—is that Province not important enough in this Dominion to have an agent in Paris, through whom we can get immigrants from France as well as from other parts of the world? Is there a man here who doubts the loyalty of the French Canadians? If he does let him read the history of Canada and he will find that a few years after we passed under the dominion of England, in 1775, when Montgomery came under the walls of Quebec and asked the Canadians to join the American republic we refused, and remained loyal to the British flag, although we had only been under that flag for a few years. In 1812 the French Canadians were asked under which flag they would live, and on the field of Chateauguay they rallied round and defended the British flag. We are not French, but French Canadians; we are probably more Canadians than anybody in this country, because we have been born here, our interests are here, and if you want to know whether we are Canadians or not, go to France and you will find the same difference between us and the native Frenchmen, that there

is between a man who is born here of English parents and one who is a native-born Englishman. The discussion has tended to show one thing, and that is that some people are afraid of such immigration and do not want it to come. I am sorry to hear the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) say that the French do not emigrate; but even if that were the case, it is the best reason why we should have an agent in France to induce them to come here. We want to have there a man who knows this country well, and who can place its advantages before the people in such a shape that they will wish to come to Canada. That is the reason Mr. Fabre told them that we speak a pure French, a great deal better French than is spoken in many parts of France. That is the reason he told them that we have free institutions—that we are the most free people, probably, under the sun, because they are not so free in France. He has told them that they cannot go upon the new lands of the Province of Quebec, because they are not robust enough; it must be people born here who can open up those lands; at the same time, he tells them that there are fertile lands in the North-West. Mr. Fabre has been doing a great work, a good work and a patriotic work there, and I say that no patriotic member of this House should say one word against him, but on the contrary should join hand in hand with us and ask the Government to grant him the money he needs to continue the work for the benefit, not only of the Province of Quebec, but of the whole Dominion. I hope the motion will pass, and that the Government will see their way to give it effect.

Motion agreed to.

MANUFACTURE, INSPECTION AND SALE OF FERTILISERS.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland), moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to bring in a Bill to regulate the manufacture, inspection and sale of fertilisers.

He said: The right hon. First Minister some weeks ago said it was desirable that all private members introducing public Bills should make some explanation upon their introduction. I desire to make an explanation of this Bill, and in doing so I would ask the indulgence of the House for a few minutes while I endeavor to point out its very great importance. Since I have had the honor of a seat in this House we have spent a great deal of time in regulating trade and commerce; we have built up, I must say, a very handsome superstructure; but in doing this, we appear to have lost sight entirely of the true foundation of all trade and commerce, that is, the subject of agriculture itself. I regret to say that in this House there is no subject that receives so little attention as that of agriculture, an industry, or rather a science, upon which not only is three-fourths of the capital of this and almost every other country invested but upon which three-fourths of all the labor of the country is expended. The importance of the subject I need not point out to the House, as it will be conceded by every hon. member to be one of the most important subjects that can be brought before us. We are seeking new fields for our agriculturists; we are seeking to open up and develop our North-West country; we are spending a vast amount of money in inviting immigration to this country; but we are doing very little to keep the farmers we now have in the country, who are honest, industrious, loyal and patriotic, and to teach them to make agriculture not only profitable, but interesting. In my opinion, the Department of Agriculture ought to be made one in fact as well as in name, and to be so remodeled that it would devote the whole of its time to instructing the farmers and in spreading amongst them useful knowledge, applying science to find out upon what the life and vigor of plants depend, analysing soils to ascertain if they contain these elements of growth and nutrition, and if not how they can be supplied, and generally such information as will enable them to retain our young men who are employed in agriculture, in place of their seeking, as they now too often do, the professions and trades. The Department of Agriculture should be entirely a Department of science. I claim that agriculture is a science, and it ought to be made a science so far as legislation can make it, so as to raise it to the dignity and rank it deserves as the foremost and most respectable calling that men can possibly be engaged in, first in independence and first in point of respectability. It can do this in many ways—by issuing small pamphlets containing scientific informationof every kind as to the nature and constituent elements of soils and fertilisers and spreading them among the farmers, and in various other ways. I say that the Department of Agriculture should be devoted to this work, in place of the duties it is now performing. Until recently science was not necessary in order to the carrying on of agriculture. The native fertility of the soils of this country was sufficient to grow the crops and to withstand all the attacks to which they were subject; but now, in the older portions of the various Provinces of the Dominion, the soil has become well nigh exhausted. I know that in the Province of Quebec, as well as in Ontario, the soils which formerly produced, largely and abundantly, wheat and the stronger grains, now produce very little of anything, except perhaps stunted grasses, small quantities of oats, etc. Now, Sir, this condition of things is due to a cause, and that cause has been ascertained by science to be the exhausting of the soil of those elements which go to produce the plants—wheat, barley, and also the stronger grasses. It is the duty of the Department of Agriculture to ascertain exactly on what this growth depends, and how the different elements can be obtained and given back to the soil, and to distribute that information among the farmers. We all know that if the soil is continually cropped and if these crops grow, the soil will ultimately become exhausted. We know that wheat takes from the soil a very great deal annually; we also know, from the experience of the older countries of Europe, that it is impossible, by the most careful husbanding of barnyard manures, as they are generally called, to keep the soil in the condition necessary to produce these strong grains. Take, for example, an acre of ground that produces 25 bushels of wheat, science tells us that this production takes away from that soil so many pounds of ammonia, potash and phosphoric acid; and it has been ascertained that the quantities taken are 58 lbs. of ammonia, 40 lbs. potash, and 28 lbs. of phosphoric acid. The farmer does not return these to the soil, for the greater bulk of the wheat is sold, and the straw that remains has but a very small portion of these elements in it. It only requires 50 crops of wheat to entirely exhaust the richest land of the elements necessary for the growth of wheat, and these elements cannot be returned to the soil by the returning to it of the barnyard manure. We know that the farmer produces and sells largely of cattle, and we know the amount of phosphate of lime that is carried off the land annually by the bones and the blood and the flesh of animals. These are sold and are never returned to the soil. Science has shown the necessity of returning to the soil the elements that are taken from it annually, and has also told us where these elements can be produced and procured. It is the duty of the Government to take under its wing this subject of agricultural fertilisers, which is of greater importance than the subject of manufactures, or than almost any other subject that can possibly engage its attention. It is the duty of the Department of Agriculture to afford our farmers all the information that can be possibly given by science in order to enable them to carry on their industry as it ought to be carried on. The value of

fertilisers can only be ascertained by science; no farmer can tell, by any knowledge that he can have, what a fertiliser is worth. He has not the knowledge, and if he had he has not the appliances to analyse it; he looks to the state to protect him, as in the detection and punishment of like offences in other things. The adulterations consist of gas lime, that is worth only $4 per ton; gypsum, worth $6 per ton; salt cake that is worth but little, and these are sold to the farmer at from $30 to $40 per ton. In England this subject has received a great deal of attention. In the different States of the Union it has also received a great deal of attention, no less than 19 States having passed laws upon the subject of agricultural fertilisers. The farmer cannot ascertain by contact, or by sight or otherwise, what the value of a fertiliser is; and before the different States passed laws with regard to fertilisers, regulating their manufacture and sale, a vast amount of them were sold at $30, $40 and $50 a ton, which were not worth more than $3, $4 and $5 a ton; and since these laws were passed the manufacture of these fertilisers largely decreased. In North Carolina, for instance, where 130 different fertilisers were manufactured previous to the passing of a law regulating their manufacture, the number became reduced to 30 after the law was passed, and the article had to be submitted to the test of the analyst. Not only was the great good resulting from this ascertained by the analyst himself, but the farmers also bore ample testimony to the beneficial results which followed the prevention of the manufacture of spurious fertilisers; and so far as this country is concerned it is of special importance that we should pass a similar Act; for this reason, that in the different States where these laws exist the analysts only test the fertilisers that are offered for sale in those States, and thus do not prevent the manufacture of spurious articles for sale outside. A vast quantity of these spurious articles have found their way into the Province of Ontario, and I am told also in the Province of Quebec and the other Provinces of this Dominion. What I want to accomplish by this Act is this, that all the fertilisers sent to this country shall be properly analysed, so that the farmer shall know what he is purchasing and what it is worth. To show the value placed upon commercial fertilisers where they have been tried largely, I will mention that in England there are no less than 5,000,000 acres of root crop grown annually with no other fertiliser than what is known as the superphosphate. We all know that the English root crop is unequalled by any root crop grown in any country, and there are 5,000,000 acres of this crop grown annually in England that are manured only by these artificial or what are known as commercial fertilisers. England alone produces and uses annually no less than $30,000,000 worth of these fertilisers, and the United States use not less than about $27,000,000 worth annually. This shows how important it is that this country should have these articles brought under a proper system of analysation and a proper system of protection against fraud to the farmers. We find within a few miles of this city a material out of which to make these fertilisers, in our deposits of phosphate, which are the richest in the world. I have taken the trouble to investigate the subject, and I find the following result: Canadian phosphate contains no less than 77 per cent. phosphate of of lime; French, contains 75 per cent.; Sombrero, contains 73 per cent.; Spanish, 68 per cent.; North Carolina, whose vast possessions of phosphate are known all over the world, gives only 57 per cent.; and Charleston 53 per cent. —so that we have in Canada the richest deposits of phosphate of lime in the known world out of which to make these fertilisers that are of incalculable value to our agriculturists in this country. The Government ought to take this matter into their hands and encourage the manufacture of fertilisers; the Government ought to offer a bonus to these manufactures as they did in the manufacture of iron in order that our farmers may have a good article in abundance. We have in the Capelton mines in the Eastern Townships the very material, the sulphur out of which to manufacture the sulphuric acid, that is used so largely in the manufacture of these fertilisers. The Capelton mines a few years ago were turning out a large amount of native copper ore. I found them roasting this ore on the hill side, draughting off the sulphur in order to get the ore, I suppose, in a condition to smelt. This sulphur requires but a little treatment in order to make the sulphuric acid which is used so largely in the manufacture of these fertilisers. The Capelton mines have ceased to burn and smelt that ore simply because they have no markets for the sulphur here, although in that ore in its unsmelted state there is, I am told, 40 per cent. sulphur, sufficient to pay the cost of transportation of the whole of the raw ore to the United States. It is a pity that that industry in the Eastern Townships should be to a large extent closed up from the very fact that we have no use for the sulphur. We have here phosphate deposits in large quantities, the richest phosphates in the known world, where they can make a fertiliser that the farmer and the agriculturist of this country can use to great advantage in increasing this grain production. I have ascertained also that the superiority of the Manitoba wheat and the wheat of Minnesota, about which we have heard so much recently, is due to the very elements that are contained in these superphosphates. We find that when the land is largely exhausted of potash, when the land is largely exhausted of phosphoric acid, it produces a soft quality of grain, and in the Province of Quebec the older portions of which have been so thoroughly exhausted that they can scarcely grow wheat there at all, and in Ontario, where we used to grow our flinty wheats, out of which the best quality of flour was made, we find the potash and the phosphoric acid is so exhausted that the wheat has assumed a soft quality that will only make a second rate of flour. We find phosphoric acid and potash, about which we heard so much from the hon. member for Leeds last winter, in the North-West, in great abundance in the ground, which gives to the wheat in that country its strong character and makes it worth 10 cents a bushel more than the wheat in the Province of Ontario. We want to utilise these great beds of phosphates which lie within a few miles of this city, and we want to utilise the sulphur which is found in the mines at Capelton, in order to give to our land the same quality as the land in the North-West and Minnesota, to give greater value to our wheat and improve the character and quality of our flour. In view of this, it is very important that an Act of this kind should be passed, and that our farmers should be protected against fraud on the part of manufacturers. It is important to have an Act of the kind I am introducing, in order to secure the investment of capital in an enterprise of this kind. You cannot get capital invested unless you protect the particular industry in which it is to be invested, and I believe it is the policy of the Government to protect industries. It requires all the way from $50,000 to $150,000 to establish a proper manufactory of agricultural fertilisers. I want to know where the capitalist is who would invest his $50,000 or $150,000 in this country if he has no protection. We do not ask for protection in the shape of a duty, but we ask that, if the capitalist invests his money in that enterprise, a man alongside of him shall not be allowed to sell sand while he sells his good article. Such competition would either compel the honest manufacturer to close his factory or sell a spurious article. The only way in which you can get that protection is by providing that the manufacturer's production shall be under an inspector, that samples shall be taken of the article and sent to the public analyst and analysed, and the result published by authority of the Government, in this way fraud can be prevented and in no other. This is the only protection we require and, in

order to secure the investment of capital in an enterprise which can be made so vast and so great in this country, it is necessary that a law of this kind should be passed. This should become a great industry in this country. We should supply England with her agricultural fertilisers which she now gets from abroad. We know that the guano beds of South America are well nigh exhausted; we know that England, that great agricultural country, must look to some other source to procure her fertilisers. Where is she to look but to one of her colonies that has the richest deposit of the phosphate of lime that is known in the world, and this within a few miles of here, while at Capelton is to be found sulphur enough to manufacture all the sulphuric acid that is required to produce the fertilisers needed, not only in England, but in the United States of America. Instead of our exporting this raw deposit from this country, as we do now, we ought to manufacture the article ourselves, we ought to be exporters of these fertilisers, and we ought to furnish them to all the countries in Europe. Now I will not occupy the attention of the House any longer, but before I explain the provisions of the Bill I am introducing, let me say that I hope that, if I am late in bringing it before the House, it is a matter of such vast importance that the Government will be good enough, in the interests of the agriculturists of the country, to take it as a Government measure, and push it through. If there are any of the clauses that do not exactly suit them, let them remove them, but, in the interests of the agriculturists of this country, and I speak of my own county particularly, where they are large importers of this article, it is the duty of the Government to place upon the Statute Book an Act either of this kind or of some other kind that will secure to the farmer a guarantee that the article he purchases from a foreign country, the article that he imports, or the article manufactured in this country is the article that he pays his money for, and the article which will produce some good in the soil in which he puts it. The Bill merely provides for the analysis of those fertilisers, not only those which are produced in our own country, but those which are imported, that they shall be properly analysed by the public analyst of this country. I do not propose to put one new officer upon the list. I propose to utilise the public analyst appointed by the Government under the Adulteration of Food Act. I propose, also, to utilise for the purposes of this Act the officers of the Inland Revenue, of the Customs, and so forth, in order that inspection may be had and samples for analysis procured. The only object of the Bill, on the whole, is that the farmer shall be protected against fraud, not only on the part our own manufacturers, if we have any, but on the part of manufactuerers of foreign countries, who manufacture the article, and when it is analysed by their own analyst and proved and shown to be unfit for use in their own country, and condemned by that analyst as unfit and valueless, send it to Canada and sell it to our farmers at $30 a ton, and this money is carried out of the country. That is the condition of things that has prevailed for some time and that is now prevailing, and it is the duty of the Government to take this matter into their hands, and, if I am not able to reach this Bill at its second reading and get it through this Session, I hope the Government will take charge of it.

Mr. FISHER. I have great pleasure in endorsing the action of my hon friend the member for Welland. I was not aware until a few minutes ago that he contemplated any such action, but I am very glad to see that this Session is not going to pass without some protection being afforded, or without some hopes that it will be afforded, to the farmers from the great impositions from which they have suffered in this respect of agricultural fertilisers. I was somewhat interested three years ago in the action of my hon. friend the member for Richelieu (Mr. Massue), who at that Session introduced a Bill for this purpose,and I regretted very much indeed that that Bill fell to the ground without becoming law. I am well aware of the fact which the hon. member for Welland has so clearly laid before the House. I know well, too, from my own experience and the experience of the people of the Eastern Townships, that the farmers of this country have materially suffered in the past from the want of such a law. A few years ago action of this kind was taken in various States of the Union, and I believe that in consequence thereof we have suffered more than we did before that action was taken. This action protected the farmers of those States, but it has forced the manufacturers of commercial fertilisers in those States to make a slaughter of their unmarketable wares in the Dominion of Canada. I was a little frightened, perhaps, when the hon. gentleman alluded to the necessity of protection in regard to this matter, but when I learned the kind of protection he desired I was glad to be able fully to sympathise with him. I believe it would be a great advantage to us if we were protected from the importation of the wares which I have alluded to, as being sent into this country in consequence of laws of this kind having been passed in various States of the Union. However, if these fertilisers were subject to analysis by our public analysts, and the manufacturers were obliged to put on their packages the same brand which our own manufacturers are obliged to put upon their packages, I do not think there would be any necessity for any further protection on our part. The protection which farmers need in this matter is simply the protection which people need in every case where adulteration is largely practised. We have laws against the adulteration of our food, against the adulteration of our drinks, and it is but right and fair, I think, for the agricultural community, that we should have laws against the adulteration of so important a factor in their business as are commercial fertilisers. They have special need of protection, because a farmer who invests money in an agricultural fertiliser does so trusting to the honesty of the manfacturer; he does so without being able in any way to test the quality of what he buys. He applies it in the spring, and he does not become aware of the quality of the article until his crops begin to grow, or until the fall, and then if the article proves to be bad, it is too late for him to remedy the evil from which he has suffered. The result is that he needs protection more than any other class of the community against the adulteration of an article which he is obliged to buy on trust. I was very glad to hear my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. Ferguson) allude to the phosphate deposits, and to the necessity of encouraging the manufacture of agricultural fertilisers in our own country. We have, as he says, abundance of this important material which is so much needed in all the agricultural operations carried on in a scientific manner; and we have also in this country the article of sulphur for the manufacture of phosphoric acid, a material which has to be applied to the raw phosphate in order to make it available as a fertiliser. I regret indeed that this matter has not been attended to long since; I regret that measures were not sooner taken to utilise the sulphur which was wasted in the copper mines at Capelton, near Sherbrooke. When I was in the neighborhood of those mines a few years ago I remember well seeing the vegetation all along the valley in which they are situated completely destroyed by the sulphur fumes escaping from the mines. Mr. Speaker, this measure comes now at a very opportune time. In times past, in our country, we have been able to avail ourselves of what appeared to be at the time the inexhaustible natural fertility of our soil. To-day our North-West is boasting of its fertility; but we know now that in the eastern parts of the country, and in the North-West too, to a less extent, that virgin fertility of the soil is, after all, but short-lived. In England, and in the

old countries of Europe, the farmers have found that they require to use the best and most scientific methods in order to restore to the soil the nutritive elements which are withdrawn from it by the products that they take away off the soil; and we find too in the older parts of Canada that we must adopt a new system of agriculture, and take advantage of that scientific teaching which such gentlemen as the hon. member for Welland and others, who are well informed in these matters, are able to assist us with. Feeling, as I say, that the time has come when the farmers must trust more to this stock fertiliser, I think it is absolutely necessary for the prosperity of agriculture in our country, that the measure before the House should be made law this Session, if at all possible; and I sincerely trust the Government will take the request of the hon. member for Welland into consideration, and push the matter to a conclusion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As we have a few minutes before six o'clock perhaps, with the consent of the House, we might consider the resolutions in Committee, and have the Bill introduced at once.

Motion agreed to, and resolution considered in Committee and reported.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 122) respecting agricultural fertilisers.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read first time.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 40) further relating to the Central Bank of New Brunswick.—(Mr. Weldon, for Mr. Temple.)

BRITISH MEDICAL ACTS.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to direct the attention of the Government to a return brought down in obedience to an Order of the House, made on the motion of the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin), a few days ago. I have not had an opportunity of conferring with that hon. member, as I have not seen him for some days. I observe him in his place to-night. As I take a deep interest in this matter, I should like to know from the Government the particulars in respect of this return, which I will explain. The return was ordered on February 3rd, 1885, in the following terms:—

"For copies of all correspondence between the Federal and Ontario Governments and the Imperial Government, on the subject of the Imperial Act, 21-22 Victoria, Chapter 90, known as the British Medical Act, 1858; the Imperial Act, 31-32 Victoria, Chapter 29, known as the British Medical Amendment Act, 1868; the Imperial Act 41-42 Victoria, Chapter 33, known as the Dentists' Act, 1878; and the amendments proposed to be made thereto, during the present Session of the Imperial Parliament."

I notice that in the return brought down there is no correspondence between the Federal Government and the Ontario Government. I want to ask the Government if there is no correspondence on the subject between those Governments, and if this is a full return of all matters enquired into by the hon. member for Cornwall. I understand there is correspondence, and I should like to direct the attention of the Government to the matter, because it is very important that our medical men should be placed on an equality with respect to practice, with the medical men of the mother country. While I have the highest respect for the medical men of the old country, I believe our medical men are fully entitled to reciprocity with them in the matter of practice, and I would like to ask the Government if there is no correspondence on this matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot speak on the subject. If the hon. gentleman had mentioned it before, I would have made some enquiry. Was the return brought down lately?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think a day or two ago; but I only got it this morning.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman will put a notice on the paper, I will answer it.

Mr. BLAKE. I have heard from another source that there has been correspondence between the Ontario and the Federal Government; and, indeed, the action of the Government on the motion indicated as much as that correspondence had taken place between those Governments, otherwise they would not have acceded to the motion.

Mr. BERGIN. I may be permitted to say in regard to this matter, without entering into any further discussion upon the question than is absolutely necessary to satisfy the enquiry of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) that the papers were submitted to me as a member of the Printing Committee, and I asked that only that portion should be printed which was necessary to show the House and the country that every necessary step had been taken to secure the object which the medical profession of this country, not of Ontario alone but of the whole Dominion, had in view, and the only correspondence necessary to the public was the later correspondence which shows that the Imperial Government had agreed to the representations of this Government, which, in the first instance, were made several years ago in common, I think, with the Local Governments, for we applied to both Governments at the time, and I have been urging it year after year ever since. I say the Imperial Government had agreed, when the Imperial Medical Act should be brought before the Imperial Parliament, to amend that Act by adding the words "subject to any local law," which, in the opinion of the Minister of Justice here is quite sufficient to answer all the purposes we sought. I asked the opinion of eminent legal men on both sides of the House and out of the House, and they all agreed that the object will be accomplished by the introduction of these words. It is well known to the medical profession that the local Government yielded at once to the arguments adduced, and that they in the pursuit of their duty represented the matter to the Federal Government, who at once entered into correspondence with the Imperial Government. We did not think it was necessary to print everything, and I cannot say at this moment whether all the correspondence with the Local and the Dominion Governments was brought down, but I do not think it was. But there was enough brought down to show that what we desired was agreed to by the Imperial Government, that they felt that that Act was a violation of the principle of constitutional Government which we enjoy under the British North America Act, and that, as we had a right to expect and as we felt they would do, they would amend it in the sense we asked for.

Mr. BLAKE. I looked cursorily at the print sent down to us and if it be correct, from what the hon. gentleman says, that the print is only a portion of the return, I think it should have expressed it, because the print does not appear from my cursory perusal to be a print of the portion brought down, but of the whole return. That is one point. The return purports to be a return of all correspondence between the several governments and it is printed as a complete answer, but the hon. gentleman in the course of his remarks said he did not think it was all brought down, so that there are two points to consider.

Mr. BERGIN. I have not perhaps expressed myself very happily, and possibly I am somewhat to blame in this matter, because I obtained confidentially, in the course of

my negotiations with the Government, the correspondence which I knew had been going on, and the Government very naturally gave me the balance of it. I think the leader of the Opposition, had he scanned that return as closely as usual, would have seen that it did not contain the Bill proposed to be introduced by the Imperial Parliament, but merely I may say, an index of that Bill with the proposed amending clause, which would have shown it was not a full and complete return.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

On the order for resuming adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Bergin, that the Bill (No. 85), an Act respecting factories be read a second time.

Mr. JAMIESON moved:

"That all the words after "that" be left out for the purpose of inserting "order of the day for second reading of Bill (No. 92), an Act further to amend the Canada Temperance Act of 1878 be now read," instead thereof.

He said: In making this motion I have only a remark or two to make. I do not think the hon. gentleman who is in charge of the Factory Bill can very well object, or say that this is an Act of discourtesy on my part, because his Bill was brought before the House in almost a similar manner. I mentioned this matter a few days ago with a view of having this order placed higher on the paper. In fact, I made a motion to that effect, but under the rules I could not well succeed, and I am now pursuing a course which is, I believe, in keeping with the rules of the House and consequently I am now in order. I may say that it is my purpose to press this motion, and I mean no discourtesy whatever to the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin). The fact of the matter is that I was much delighted with the able speech which he delivered the other night in introducing his Bill to the House. In that way he has had his innings, and I think it is now time that I and other hon. gentlemen interested in the legislation which is proposed by the Bill now in question, should have an opportunity. For my part I am much interested in the Factory Bill. My constituents are interested in it, and I wish to make some remarks upon it. But I have not yet been able to digest the able speech he delivered, so as to come to a conclusion as to whether or not it is constitutional, and I think that the House should have more time to deliberate upon that question. One remark as to the measure which is now brought before the House, or which will be before the House in the event of the present motion being adopted. I had the honor the other day of explaining the provisions of the measure, and I do not think it advisable on this motion to go into any general discussion of the merits of the Bill. I will simply confine my remarks to some reasons why I believe the Bill should become law. The Bill was framed by the Legislative Committee of the Dominion Alliance. I suppose it is known to most hon. members that the Dominion Alliance is a body constituted out of and representing the different temperance organisations of the country, and other prominent gentlemen who take part in temperance work and the promotion of prohibitory legislation. After having had an experience of the working of the Canada Temperance Act in many municipalities, they have come to the conclusion that the amendments proposed by this Bill are necessary in the interests of the law, in the interests of the community, and in order that this Act, which has been now adopted I believe in some sixty counties and cities in this Dominion, should have at least fair play. Now I think it is due to that body of temperance men and to the temperance people of this Dominion to say, and I am warranted, I believe, in saying that the majority of the people of this Dominion are in favor of the Canada Temperance Act and in favor of prohibition, and I trust that the House will see its way clear to adopt the motion which I have just placed in your hands, and which will have the effect of bringing up the consideration of this important measure this evening. I fear unless this motion carries, unless we have an opportunity of discussing this measure this evening, unless in fact it receives a second reading this evening, we will not have another opportunity during this Session. Now, Sir, I believe that this is a necessary piece of legislation—perhaps the most important legislation that is now on the motion paper, and I think it ought to be brought up for consideration at once. I may say that we do not propose to interfere with the principles of the Canada Temperance Act at all. There are some Bills, I believe, on the paper that have this object in view, but we propose to leave the general principle of the Canada Temperance Act alone for the present. We simply want a little fixing up in order that the Act, where it has been adopted by the people, may be more properly enforced than it has been in the past.

Mr. BERGIN. I regret very much that my hon. friend has thought proper to introduce this motion. I have no doubt that he has introduced it in perfect good faith, and with the very best possible intention, but I fail to see in what way he is going to benefit the cause of temperance by attacking a Bill which is sought for by so large a portion of the community; a Bill which affects the future of the youth of this country, and more particularly when he must know that by this motion he is placing the best friends of temperance in this House—men who do not yield to him or to any other man living in their devotion to the cause of temperance—in a position which will compel them to vote against a Bill which they believe would be in the interest of temperance, and which, if pressed to a vote, will result in his measure being defeated, and one of the most beneficial additions to the Canada Temperance Act being rejected; and, as a consequence, all he expects to derive from the measure he proposes will be prevented solely by his Act. I shall not detain the House by going into any discussion on the principle of the Bill, but will content myself with pointing out to the hon. gentleman the irreparable injury which is almost certain to ensue from his motion. No friend of temperance who desires to benefit the working classes of this country, who is pledged to support this Bill to regulate factories, or who takes any interest in the measure, can possibly support his motion; and I do not think the hon. gentleman is acting fairly towards the friends of temperance in this House, who support the Factory Bill, by putting them in the position of opposing any amendment to the Canada Temperance Act.

Mr. IVES. I not only think that the hon. member who last spoke has cause to complain, but I think other hon. members in this House whose Bills, many of them of very great importance, occupy a place on the Order paper far above the Bill which the hon. gentleman who proposes this motion is interested in, have cause to complain also. Now, the Order paper in the ordinary course of things should be followed, and I take as a rule of this House that it must be under very extraordinary circumstances that we adopt a motion like that of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), to take an Order from the bottom of the paper and place it at the top, and thus displace the whole order of proceedings. If we encourage that practice, the result will be that one-half of the time of this House which is set apart for the discussion of Public Bills and Orders, will be spent in fighting over motions for precedence. Now, the Bill which the hon. member proposes to displace is a Bill on the subject of factories, which we are all agreed is a matter of very great importance; and although the subject of temperance is also one of very great importance, my hon. friend would not say, I presume, that the substantive question whether we are to have factory legislation or not, is not as important as a small amendment to the Canada Temperance Act. The

question is not between the Canada Temperance Act and the Factory Bill, but between factory legislation this Session and a minor amendment to the Canada Temperance Act, which the hon. gentleman told us the other day was not at all important, which he tells us to-night does not affect the principle of the Canada Temperance Act in any way to make it either better or worse, but is something to help the machinery. Therefore a small piece of legislation to help the machinery of the Canada Temperance Act, he regards as so much more important than the factory legislation, in which the whole country is interested, that he wants to take it from the bottom of the Order paper and place it at the top. I do not agree with that proposition, and I am not prepared to vote for the motion. I think the principle is a vicious one, and if adopted in this case, will lead to other motions for changes in the Order paper, and to the waste of valuable time in discussing matters of precedence in this House.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). There are a great many reasons why I think the motion of my hon. friend from Lanark should not pass. In the first place, this House departed from its ordinary rule in allowing the Factory Bill to have precedence. It was thought that the time set apart for it would have been sufficient to allow it to be disposed of; but last week there was not time for the debate to be concluded. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) raised a very interesting question of constitutional law, as to whether that Bill was within our jurisdiction or not. It was thought desirable that the question should be deferred, in order that the House should have an opportunity of considering the important point raised; and at a late hour of the night, I think well on to twelve o'clock, on the motion of a member of the Government, the debate was adjourned. Now, the House has departed from its ordinary rule, owing to the special urgency and public importance of the Factory Bill, and with the concurrence of the Government, in allowing that Bill to assume the first place among the Public Bills and Orders; and this motion of the hon. member for North Lanark gives the go-by to that decision, and proposes to give what he himself says is an insignificant and unimportant Bill precedence over the Factory Bill. Then my hon. friend says that the hon. member for Cornwall and Stormont (Mr. Bergin) has had his innings, and he wants to have his now. I think that is an undignified and improper way in which to speak of my hon. friend from Cornwall. My hon. friend did not introduce that Bill for any self-glorification, in order to have an opportunity of airing his views, or, as the hon. member for Lanark says, to have his innings. He introduced a measure of great public importance, affecting the lives and interests of the youth of this country, a measure far more important in my opinion than the trifling amendment to the Scott Act, which the hon. gentleman for Lanark proposes. I think my hon. friend should have abstained from using that expression in reference to my hon. friend from Cornwall. His motive in introducing this Bill, and the zeal he has shown for the welfare of the factory operatives of Canada, deserve some other expression than that he has had his innings. But it is the case with my hon. friend from Lanark and those who act with him, that they want to have their innings. They think the Canada Temperance Act is paramount in importance to any other measure that comes before this House. I disagree with them. I expressed my disapprobation of that Act when it came before the House; I repeat that disapprobation; I think it is unconstitutional, and should not be on the Statute Book, and I decline to give precedence to the Bill of the hon. member for Lanark over the other important Bills which precede it on the Order paper. Now, one would suppose it was more important that this Bill of my hon. friend from North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) should be given precedence than that every other Bill on this Order paper should be considered. He says himself it is not one affecting the principle of the Scott Act, that it only affects certain minor details as to the administration of it. But there are a number of Bills on the Order paper which do affect the principle, which will elicit the opinion of this House as to whether in matters of principle it ought not or ought to be amended; there is one Bill in particular, of which I have been asked to take charge, in the absence of my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), also on this paper, and before the Bill of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson). I say that the Bill, of which I am in charge, in the absence of my hon. friend, is of far more importance than the technical amendments of my hon. friend from Lanark, and far more deserving of having precedence. Then there is the Bill of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Small) also affecting the principle of the Act, enunciating the principle that compensation should be given. That question is far more important than the question of the amendment in detail of the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act. When that question of compensation was before the House, it was postponed by a majority in this House on the ground that the time had not arrived for the discussion of it. The time will arrive, when the Bill of my hon. friend from Toronto comes before the House to discuss this question, which, I submit, is infinitely more important than the proposed amendments in detail of the hon. member for Lanark. If I go through this Order paper I find in it questions of great public importance which it is an injustice to the hon. gentlemen who have introduced the Bills to postpone for what my hon. friend in his own contention said, is only a mere matter of detail, not affecting the principle of the Canada Temperance Act. Is a matter of detail in the working of the Canada Temperance Act a matter of such overwhelming importance that we are to violate the rules of the House, that we are to set aside our precedence, and introduce perfect chaos into our proceedings, in order to get these minor amendments put on the Statute Book. What would be the result if this motion were carried? Why, every hon. gentleman who has a Bill, every hon. gentleman who has a fancy, or who has a crotchet about any particular legislation, will think that his particular crotchet, that his particular Bill, is the most important thing on the records of Parliament, and that he must have an opportunity of having his "innings," to use the classical expression of my hon. friend, and of ventilating his particular crotchet or driving his own particular crank. It will be introducing perfect chaos into our proceedings, it will be a violation of all order, it will be a dangerous precedent, one we ought not to follow. For these reasons I will certainly oppose the amendment of my hon. friend. If he had in common fairness worded his resolution so that the whole subject of temperance legislation should come before the House I might be disposed to support his motion on the ground that a question of principle affecting the Temperance Act, and not questions of detail, should be discussed and deserved to have precedence. But, when my hon. friend admits himself that it is only a matter of detail, that there is no question of principle involved, when he seeks to get an advantage for that particular little baby of his own, when he seeks to thrust forward into full growth what is at present a baby, so young that it will stay young until the end of Parliament unless he succeeds in giving premature age to it; when he seeks to give premature and undeserved age and respectability to his own little baby, he is asking what this House ought not to grant. I have understood the reason he gives for claiming this—I think he used this reason when he introduced the Bill—is, that he had been delayed by the action of the Government in introducing it. He did not mention this to-night, but as he, I think, suggested it on a former occasion, I shall venture to answer it. What he did say was, that in order to insure the carrying of this

Bill, he asked the Government to take charge of it and make it a Government measure. He asked the Government to give him an advantage. The Government required time to consider a proposal of that kind, and they kept him, he said, a fortnight without giving him an answer, and that was why he did not introduce the Bill sooner. But it was his own fault. The House was open to him.

Mr. JAMIESON. I did not make any reference to that. I am sorry my hon. friend went into the matter. It was another member of the House made it. It was correct enough, but I did not make it.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I will withdraw the statement as regards my hon. friend from Lanark, but if another member stated it in the course of the discussion, it is quite proper for me now to reply to it. I hope my hon. friend will accept my personal apology to him for having charged him with giving that reason, but as it was stated on the floor as a reason I will answer it. The hon. gentleman might have introduced his Bill early in the Session, but he asked the Government to take charge of it and put it on the Order paper as a Government measure, if they thought it was a matter of such paramount importance that they should do that. But he waited of his own accord a fortnight to get his Bill into that position of seniority; and because he chose to delay a fortnight he asks the House to relieve him from the consequence of his long delay and dilatoriness. The fact that he asked the Government to take charge of it was no reason for not introducing it sooner. His hands were not tied, he could have introduced it the first day of the Session if he thought fit, but he did not introduce it, and not having thought fit to introduce it at a sufficiently early period to enable it to be discussed, he now asks the House to depart from its rule and to give his Bill an unmerited precedence; he asks the House to have it considered out of its turn and thereby postpone the consideration of other Bills. With all respect to him and his Bill, there are far more important measures than that with which he is charged to be considered by this House.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There are some members, I dare say, who have reason to complain of the motion of my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), who asks that this Bill be given precedence over other legislation, but amongst those are certainly not the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron), nor the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin. The Bill of the hon. member for Cornwall would not have its present position on the Order paper, except by the favor and good will of the House, who gave it a precedence to which it was not entitled. I am not aware that the hon. member for North Victoria was then of the opinion that to give that Bill precedence over other Bills would reduce the proceedings of Parliament to a chaotic state. I am not aware that he protested strongly against the Bill of the hon. member for Cornwall and Stormont getting precedence over other Bills. Hon. gentlemen who had Bills on the Order paper the second day of the Session, and over whose Bills this measure of my hon. friend from Lanark is now asked to be given precedence, might have some grounds of complaint, but certainly the hon. member for North Victoria has not.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I was not there at the time that motion was passed.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). To say this Bill is not entitled to precedence because it is a question of detail is entirely beside the question. The hon. gentleman knows quite well that, if my hon. friend's motion succeeds now, as I trust it will succeed, he can move that the clauses of the McCarthy Bill which has been introduced this Session be added to this Bill and so with the clauses of the other Bills, so that there is no injustice in that respect in consequence of the Bill of my hon. friend taking precedence. Of course it is a departure from the usual practice. There are 37 Bills on the Order paper before the Bill of the hon. member. Some of them of the greatest possible importance affecting the whole Dominion. I have two Bills, perhaps two of the most important Bills upon the Order paper, one respecting the representation of the people of the North-West Territories in this Parliament, and the other respecting the election of members of Parliament, both of which I look upon as Bills of the greatest possible consequence. If the motion of my hon. friend carries, those Bills will not be disposed of this Session, and no other Bills will be disposed of this Session, because I observe that the First Minister has given notice that every hour at the disposal of private members in dealing with public Bills shall be assumed by the Government, so that no other Bill can be proceeded with this Session, if the hon. gentleman succeeds in his motion, as I suppose he will. It is only because this Bill is of the first possible importance to the interests of the whole country that Parliament would be justified in the slightest degree in relaxing the ordinary rule that every Bill should be taken up and discussed in its proper place upon the Order paper. It is entirely beside the question what the hon. gentleman's views are as to the constitutionality or the propriety of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878. That law is in force. It is the law of the land to-day, and under that law a large number of counties in the Province of Ontario and other Provinces, in fact in the whole Dominion, have seen fit to adopt the provisions of that Act, and to adopt them not by bare majorities but by overwhelming majorities. I say that, while we have that law upon the Statute Book, it is the bounden duty of Parliament to see that it is carried out in the strictest possible way, in order that those people who are in favor of the temperance movement and who sustain the temperance cause shall not be checked in their movements by technical defects in the Canada Temperance Act of 1878. The hon. gentleman belittles the provisions of this Bill. The Bill is short.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I quoted the introducer.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The Bill is short and simple, but the provisions are not insignificant. I am not aware that my hon. friend from North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) justified his position on the ground that these amendments were insignificant. I understand that they are few in number, and, although they affect very important issues, still they can be very easily dealt with and can be summarily and speedily disposed of by Parliament. It appears to me that, if other members are willing to waive their rights—and I for one, in the interests of the temperance cause, am willing to waive my right to proceed with my Bills—there is no reason for the hon. member for North Victoria to complain. Although the Bill is not all I would like it to be, although it does not go far enough, although its provisions are not stringent enough, although, in counties where the Scott Act has been adopted and is in force, there are ways by which it may be evaded which Parliament ought to rectify, still I am prepared to support the motion of my hon. friend upon the ground, upon the sole ground, that it is an important Bill, and that the people of this country have, to a large extent, approved of the Temperance Act, and have carried it in many counties. I am prepared to support it in order that, in counties where the Scott Act prevails and in counties where it will prevail very shortly, the principle of temperance may have fair play and may have justice, and that people shall not escape the violation of the law upon purely technical grounds. It is to cover these defects that my hon. friend moves his Bill, and I shall give it my cheerful support, whatever my views may be as to the effect of the Temperance Act ultimately upon this country. In order that the people of the country may have an opportunity of testing the Temperance Act in its integrity, I am willing to support the motion of my hon. friend.

Mr. SCRIVER. I must say I was a little surprised at the warmth displayed by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) in discussing this question. As my hon. friend who has just taken his seat says, I do not know that he, personally, has any special right to complain that an attempt is made to give precedence to this Bill. That attempt can only be justified on the ground of the great importance of the Bill itself. The hon. member for North Victoria, I think unintentionally, somewhat misrepresented what the mover of the motion said on this subject. He did say that the amendments did not affect the principle of the Act, but he did not say they were not of great importance. I may tell the hon. member for North Victoria that not only the experience of representatives of counties where the Scott Act has been passed, but the deliberate, careful opinion of the legal adviser of the Dominion Alliance is to the effect that these proposed amendments are absolutely essential to the successful working of the Act in counties where it has been passed. We know, those of us who have had parliamentary experience here, that, in the present situation of things, and in view of the motion the Premier has made, if this proposed Bill is not given the position which this motion proposes to give it to-night, it will be practically impossible to pass it this Session. I may remind my hon. friend from Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) and those who feel special interest in his Bill, that his attempt to get legislation on this subject this Session is by no means his first attempt. If it possessed the importance which he and the member for North Victoria seek to give it now, I wonder he has allowed it to remain in abeyance so long as he has. I remember very well that three or four Sessions ago the hon. gentleman introduced a Bill similar in its provisions to the one now before the House, that he supported it in an eloquent speech, that he gave reasons as strong as those he has given now for passing the Bill forthwith, that the interests of the operatives, especially the youthful operatives, would be seriously prejudiced if the Bill were not passed then, and that, after making that speech, at the request of the leader of the House, he withdrew his motion and suffered the matter to lie over for a Session.

Mr. BERGIN. Would the hon. gentleman inform the House when I made that speech? I should like to know.

Mr. SCRIVER. I cannot state the exact time, but it was several Sessions ago.

Mr. BERGIN. I must inform my hon. friend that I never made a speech on the factory question in this House until I made it last Wednesday night.

Mr. SCRIVER. Perhaps my memory is at fault as to that, but it is not at fault as to his moving the second reading, and I must be strangely mistaken in the remarks.

Mr. BERGIN. I must again remind my hon. friend that he is mistaken. I never moved the second reading.

Mr. SCRIVER. The hon. gentleman will not deny that he introduced the Bill, and that, at the request of the Government, he suffered it to lie over.

Mr. BERGIN. I told the House that a week ago.

Mr. SCRIVER. Of course I will not persist in a statement which has been contradicted by the hon. gentleman, but I am sure my memory is not at fault in so far as stating that he introduced the Bill at that time and did not press it, but allowed it to lie over for another Session, and that was some three Sessions ago. So I do not see that he can complain of the course taken by my hon. friend who has moved this motion to-night. I would appeal strongly to all the members of this House who are desirous that the Scott Act should have a fair trial in those counties which have recently passed it by such triumphant majorities, I would appeal to them now earnestly to vote in favor of the motion of my hon. friend from Lanark.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I certainly do not see any very powerful arguments in the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has moved this amendment or of those who have supported it. I do not understand that there is such great urgency that the rules of the House should be put aside for the purpose of discussing this measure; there are half a dozen Bills on the paper before this one of greater public importance; and I submit that there is perhaps no Bill in the hands of a private member of more importance than the Bill in the hands of the hon. member for Cornwall and Stormont (Mr. Bergin). The question involved in the Factories Bill has been agitating the public mind for a number of years, and those who have any knowledge of, or connection with, the manufacturing districts of this country, know perfectly well that that measure is eagerly looked for by the operatives in all the manufacturing centres in the Dominion. Therefore, if the argument is good that the Bill of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) should have precedence because, if it is not read now, it cannot be read this Session, it means just this, that if the other Bills are not read now, they cannot be read this Session either; and so it becomes a question as to whether this Bill of the hon. member for Lanark is of more importance than all the other Bills. I submit that is not the case. We have had the Scott Act in force now for seven years. It has been working well, although the machinery, perhaps, might be made to run a little more smoothly by the amendments now proposed; yet I cannot see that that is evidence of such urgency as to induce the House to break through its rules merely for the purpose of accommodating the hon. member for Lanark and those who are in favor of his measure. I believe there is only one precedent in the Parliament of England which could be cited in favor of this proposition, and in that case the matter was of the most urgent necessity. Now it cannot be said that this matter is of such urgency that it should take precedence of other Bills that are certainly of as great importance, if not greater, and especially the Factories Bill. I happen to be the promoter of a Bill myself, which I think is of very great importance. It has been before the House for two or three Sessions, and has been referred to a Special Committee, which has reported in favor of it, and under these circumstances I do not see why my Bill should be cut out and left aside merely to give an opportunity to my hon. friend to discuss his Bill to-night. I agree with the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) in his remarks as to the desirability of discussing the whole question involved in the Scott Act. There are two or three Bills on the paper, one by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), another by the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Small), in which the question of temperance is involved, and I think they should all be considered together if the Bill of the hon. member for Lanark is to come up at all; and at all events that it should not have precedence over other Bills. If it is to be allowed in this case, why should not any other member, who has a Bill which he considers of great importance, take up the time of the House by making a motion similar to that of the hon. gentleman, and so keep up the discussion from hour to hour, frittering away the valuable time of the House and the country, in order to gratify the ambition of the hon. gentleman who may have such a Bill in charge?

Mr. CASEY. It is contended that this Bill should have no precedence over others which deal with the question of temperance, because it is a question of detail, as it is called. Now, I think that is just a reason why it should have precedence—because it does not involve the principle of temperance. It is simply a measure to make a law, which has been for years in operation, workable, for it is maintained by the supporters of this Bill that the law in its present shape is not workable, and that contention seems to be supported by the best authorities, that, as a matter of fact

the Scott Act, without the amendments proposed in this Bill, is unworkable, at all events, and it cannot be carried out in its entirety. Now, I think, seeing what large portions of the Dominion have decided to try the experiment of the Scott Act, and that other large portions are likely to follow their example, it appears to me that they should not be left any longer in uncertainty, and that if this experiment is to be fairly and properly tried, the Act must be made workable. For that very reason, because it is intended to give effect to legislation which we have already supposed we had given effect to, I think this Bill should have precedence over the Bills relating to new matters, such as total prohibition, or compensation, and for that reason I shall support the amendment.

Mr. BERGIN. I rise to a point of order. I think the amendment is one which cannot be considered by the House, because it is contrary to every rule of order. It is a rule of the House always to discuss the principles of a Bill at its second reading, and the vote taken on the second reading decides whether the House approves or disapproves of the principle of the Bill; and the rule is, that in case of an amendment, the amendment must strictly relate to the Bill which the House, by this order, has resolved upon considering. Now, the amendment of the hon. member for Lanark is, that all the words after "that" at the foot of the motion be left out in order to add—what, Sir? An amendment to the principle of the Bill? No; but that the order be that "Bill No. 92, an Act further to amend the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, be now read instead thereof." The rule of the House is that where an amendment is made it shall be that the word "now," for the second reading, be struck out, and the words "this day" three, four or six months be added. Now my hon. friend has moved, not that this Bill be not now read a second time, but that Bill No. 92, to amend the Canada Temperance Act, which has no relation whatever to the Factory Act now before the House, be read the second time. Therefore, I say the amendment is out of order, and I ask for your ruling upon this point.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is laid down by May and other authorities, that the House may proceed to the other Orders of the Day when engaged in discussing an Order; or a particular Order may be superseded by the House agreeing to an amendment that the House do proceed to another Order of the Day. It is laid down in the last edition of May, p. 302:

"And on the 19th May, 1852, on resuming an adjourned debate on the Colonial Bishoprics Bill, an amendment was made to the question for the second reading, by leaving out all the words after "that the," and adding "other Orders of the Day be now read." A question has also been superseded by an amendment for reading a particular Order of the Day."

This is equivalent to the previous question, and no amendment to this amendment can be allowed. It is a mode which the House has adopted for giving the preference to a particular Order of the Day.

Mr. MACDONALD (Kings, P.E.I.) I do not intend to delay the House with any lengthy remarks on this matter, but I wish to say that the Scott Act has been in force for some time; that many counties have adopted it, and that in my Province it has been adopted in all the counties. It appears to be necessary, in the view of temperance people, that certain amendments should be made in the Act in order to make it workable. If those amendments are not made, the Act will get into disrepute, and the delay that is occasioned by not getting those amendments inserted in the Act will have the effect to which I have referred. It appears, moreover, to be necessary that these amendments should be introduced to-night, in order that they may go forward this Session, and therefore I think it is the duty of the temperance men in the House to support the motion.

No doubt, the Factory Bill and other Bills on the Order paper are important measures. But I do not think they are more generally important than the Canada Temperance Act. The Factory Bill, of course, affects a certain class of the population; but I consider the Scott Act and the amendments required, affect a larger number of the people even than the Factory Bill, important as it is. I trust, therefore, that the temperance men in the House, while considering the importance of other measures, will see the necessity of supporting this measure. If the Factory Bill is of the importance that several hon. gentlemen state it to be, and which the House generally believes it to be, I think it is the duty of the Government to take hold of such an important measure and see that it has precedence over other measures.

Mr. SCRIVER. With the permission of the House I should like to say a word or two by way of personal explanation. I stated that the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) moved the second reading of the Factory Bill several years ago and made a speech. His recollection is evidently at fault, as he denied having ever moved the second reading of the Bill or made a speech thereon. I refer to *Hansard* of 1881, page 1099, which has the following:

"Mr. BERGIN moved second reading of Bill (No. 6), to regulate the hours of labor in workshops, mills and factories in the Dominion of Canada."

Remarks were made by several members, and while the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergin) did not make the elaborate speech for which I gave him credit, he spoke and concluded his speech, as follows:—

"I concur entirely with the Government in the suggestion"—

The suggestion was to withdraw the Bill.—

"And under all the circumstances, I consent to withdraw the Bill."

Mr. BERGIN. I suppose I may also be allowed to make a personal explanation. I was not aware that when an hon. member rose to his feet and accepted the suggestion of the Government to withdraw a Bill upon the understanding that the Government would themselves introduce a measure, that he was making a speech. Although it thus appears in *Hansard*, I think the hon. the Minister of Public Works will remember that when I rose to my feet with the intention of moving the second reading of the Bill, he stood up and before I had time to say anything, he said he hoped the hon. member would withdraw the Bill and leave the matter in the hands of the Government, to which I consented. If that was moving the second reading, and making a speech in support of it, then I was not aware that it was so regarded.

Mr. SCRIVER. *Hansard* says you moved the second reading.

Mr. FOSTER. I intend to make a few remarks as to why precedence has been asked for this Bill. I think the House may congratulate itself on the good natured discussion which has taken place, and which has not been marred by any introduction of acerbity, unless it was a little thrown in by way of spice, by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron). I had to admire the skilfulness with which the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) rose to defend an imaginary attack upon the Factory Bill. I beg to assure him, and I think I can in the name of the hon. member who moved this Bill and in the name of all who have this legislation at heart, that they had no intention at all of attacking the hon. gentleman's Factory Bill. A great many of us, I can only now speak for myself, have as much at heart the interests of factory labor as has that hon. gentleman himself. It must not be supposed, if this motion passes, that it will entirely take away the possibility of that hon. gentleman arriving at his Bill, because discussion on it stands first on the Order paper, and when this is disposed of his motion can be taken up. There are grounds

why it is asked that precedence be given to this Bill. They are these. It is quite true, as the hon. gentleman says, that there is no intention of raising a discussion upon or initiating legislation with respect to the principle of the Canada Temperance Act; but it does not at all follow from that, that what is proposed in this Bill is not of importance and not strictly necessary. We believe that it is. It is not simply some little trifling amendments to be made to the Bill in order to render it more workable than at present, but it is intended to do away with difficulty which stands directly in front of the working of the Bill. There happened to be in the legislation of 1883, a clause which, according to the interpretation of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, entirely takes away the procedure and penalties of the Canada Temperance Act. If that be a good rendering of the law, as we must take it to be now, if there is no appeal from it, it is in the opinion of the temperance people of very great importance that the difficulty should be removed; and when I speak of the temperance people I do not speak simply of the mover of the Bill and myself, but of those many thousands and hundreds of thousands in this country who have so far liked the Canada Temperance Act as to adopt it and endeavor to have it carried out in their counties and cities. It is chiefly to remove that difficulty and to make the Act workable, which under the decision of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick would not be workable, that this Bill is introduced. Of course I well know, that it requires a good reason to disturb the course of the Order paper. But the Order paper is not like the laws of the Medes and Persians, and any hon. member has a perfect right to move that precedence be given to a measure, and it is then for the House to decide as to whether he is right in his contention or not. That can be done, and it certainly is not an arbitrary proceeding. Some think this is not a Bill which ought to have precedence over others that are on the Order paper. While not belittling the importance of other Bills upon the Order paper, we believe there are reasons which can be given to show that this Bill is one as important as any, and more important than most that are there. In the first place it is necessary, in order to carry out the good faith of Parliament, which was shown first in the enactment passed in 1878, and which was equally shown by making the law stronger in 1883, under which two pledges the people on 71 different occasions have come up to vote on this Act and carried it in 59 by large majorities. Of those counties and cities which have adopted the Act—over 40 will be under its operation from 1st May this year—and are looking to this Parliament, and a population of one million and a half of people are asking this Parliament, to do its simple duty in the premises—keep its faith and take away obstructions, not which the people placed in the way, but which Parliament placed in the way of the Act, and undesignedly too. If it was unfortunate that Parliament so acted, if it appears from the promises given and the discussion in Parliament that the Canada Temperance Act should not be interfered with, that there should be no retrograde legislation, that the Act should not be impaired but strengthened by the legislation of 1883; then, if Parliament made a blunder, as in the opinion of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick it did, and unwittingly cut away the machinery and the power from under that Act, it is in the carrying out of the good faith which should subsist between Parliament and the people, that they should remedy that evil, that they should remedy that mistake, and should give to the people what was asked for and what was supposed to be given—a fairly workable Act. That is all we ask for, and we appeal to those present, on fair and equitable grounds to give us an hour of their time, and we will have the matter remedied as the people wish it to be remedied. There is another consideration which should be taken into account. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) catches up the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), and in a very dignified way, takes him to task for saying that, after the Factory Bill had been discussed for a night, it was only fair that the Temperance Bill should have its "innings." In doing this he so far forgets his assumption of dignity and parliamentary decorum as to speak of the proposed Bill as my hon. friend's "little baby," and of his "driving cranks," and so on. How are the mighty fallen! And in five minutes afterwards, he raises his opinion against the judicial opinion of the Privy Council of Great Britain, against the opinion of our own Supreme Court, against the highest legal opinion in the Empire, and he declares that in his opinion this law is unconstitutional, and that we should not meddle with it. I think Parliament will take the opinion of the law Lords and the opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada, and will rest upon it the question of the constitutionality of the Act and will not be deterred from making these changes in the Act until the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) comes to the belief that they will be constitutional. More than that, there is another fact which it is well to bear in mind. My hon. friend says that there is a Bill by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) which is of equal importance with this, and that it should be put to the front. I use his own argument. The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) had that Bill, as a private Bill, in his charge. He was here at the beginning of Parliament, or shortly afterwards, and why did not he have his Bill introduced and put forward on the notice paper into a position where it could be taken up earlier? My hon. friend used that argument against us, and we can use it against him, that he should not come here and ask Parliament, under his own argument, to give the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) a lift towards the top of the Order paper. That Bill interferes with the Canada Temperance Act, and within the last few weeks there have been laid on the table of Parliament nearly 100,000 names signed to petitions asking that the Canada Temperance Act should not be weakened, but rather that a prohibitory law be passed by this Parliament—asking in direct contravention of the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) which would decidedly weaken that measure—asking by implication as well as explicitly for the very legislation which is embodied in the Bill of the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson). I have no more to say in the matter. I am not here to discuss the principle of the Bill, but I am here to see this measure judged in a fair and equitable way, as a measure which Parliament might well put to the head of the Order paper, and to which it might devote an hour or two of time in order to give to a million and a-half of people, who have adopted the Act in good faith, an Act which will prove workable in their hands. And it is in the interest of law and order. It is not a contest between the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) as a temperance man, and the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) as a champion of the other side. It is the people's wish, the people's interest, the people's law. On the very next discussion which comes up, what will the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) say? He will say, look at the Scott Act; it does not work; and yet he stands here and obstructs every motion which is made towards rendering that Act more workable. He endeavors in the first place to take every bit of ground from under the Act, and then he turns around and taunts the friends of temperance with the statement that the Act does not work well. All we ask for, all the temperance people ask for, is that Parliament should carry out its pledged faith with a view of giving them a Canada Temperance Act with its difficulties moved out of the way, an Act which is made workable, and if under those conditions

it proves a failure the temperance people will be the first to move for the abolition of that law. All we ask for is fair play and no favor, and let us see whether or not the Act will be workable. I trust Parliament will, and I think I can trust the members present that they will, give the request of the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) a fair consideration and will deal justly—not by him or by me, but by the people of this country, and in the interests of good law and order.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I protest very strongly against even the suggestion that the refusal to take an order out of its place without notice is in any way an indication of unwillingness to pass a Bill to which the Order relates. That is not the question we have before us at this moment. It is not a question of whether we should amend the Scott Act or not amend it. The simple question we have to deal with is whether it is desirable to establish—because it is really establishing a precedent—whether we are to establish a precedent by which any person having a great interest in a measure, and having considerable public opinion at his back, may come to this House and move as an amendment to a motion for a second reading of the first order to take up an Order a long way down on the paper and thus give his measure precedence.

Mr. FOSTER. The precedent has been set already.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Where?

Mr. FOSTER. In the Factory Bill.

M. WHITE (Cardwell). I was just going to say that the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Scriver) and other hon. members have referred to the Factory Bill. Now, the difference between the action of this hon. House in relation to the Factory Bill, and the action proposed to be taken here is this: the Factory Bill was not taken out of its order, or taken up for discussion at that time. The House took it out of its order and ordered that it should be the first Order for a subsequent day, thereby giving to members notice that on that subsequent day that subject would be taken up as the first order, so that every one coming here came with the knowledge of what the proceedings were to be. This is an entirely different case. This is a case in which we came in after dinner with an Order paper before us, prepared to discuss the questions that were upon that Order paper, in the order in which they are placed, with a motion—not to give this precedence on a subsequent day, not to ask Parliament in view of its great importance to fix it as the first Order on a particular day, when we could all come here and discuss it—but it is a proposal that we should take it out of its place and go on with the discussion now without any notice whatever to the House that any such intention existed, or that any such proceeding would be taken. I venture to say that you will scarcely find a predecent for that. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that you have decided, and decided quite correctly, that the motion is in order. But the cases to which you refer, I venture to say, or the use which has been made of this power, has not been so much for the purpose of taking up another question as for the purpose of getting rid of the questions first on the Order paper. You have just described the motion as practically a motion for the previous question, which is simply a question of whether the question on the Orders shall now be taken up, and the House, under these circumstances, may have taken it up, not with a view of giving precedence to the particular order which was not on the Order paper in that place, but with a view of getting rid, without a direct vote, of the question which was the question properly first on the Order paper. Now, I do not understand that any one in this House is anxious to get rid of the discussion on the Factory Act. I venture to say that whatever our opinions may be as to the power of Parliament to deal with that question at all—and I suppose the only difference of opinion among us may be said to be on that point—no one objects to the discussion of the question, and all would be glad to see such an Act passed, either by this Parliament if it is within its competence, or by the Local Legislatures. So we are not here discussing a question raised, as these precedents which may be cited were raised, for the purpose of getting rid of a question by not having a direct vote upon it, but we are here for the purpose of taking up a question which no one when he came into the House, except those who are interested in the question, and arranged for this method of bringing it up—excepting those, we have not had the slightest intimation that we were to discuss this question. Now, I have no hesitation in saying for one that I should be very glad indeed to assist in any legislation which would give the Scott Act effect. I have no hesitation in saying that I have grave doubts as to whether the Scott Act, in its ultimate results, will prove as satisfactory as its best friends hope; but I have no doubt whatever of the propriety or the wisdom of taking away from them the opportunity of saying that it would have succeeded if Parliament had given the necessary machinery to enable it to succeed; and I should have no hesitation whatever in giving the necessary machinery that may be required for the purpose of effecting the success of the Scott Act. But in this particular case what have these hon. gentlemen been doing? The only clause in this Bill which I regard as important, which I think justifies an interference with the ordinary rules of Parliament, although not such an interference as we are asked to-day, is the sixth clause, which is made necessary by the decision of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick. It is really the only clause which may be said to be a new feature. All the rest of the amendments were just as much required from the day the Act began to be put in force in the counties where it was adopted, as they are at the present day. That cannot, of course, be said in reference to the sixth clause, which is occasioned by a difficulty that has arisen in consequence of the interpretation by the courts of the Act passed by this Parliament commonly known as the License Act of 1883. But that decision was given before the House met. We have passed some public Bills in the hands of private members. It was competent for hon. gentlemen to have brought in the Act immediately after the House met, if they thought proper. They were not moved to do it until the organisation—a very respectable and creditable organisation, and one entitled to the very greatest consideration—the Dominion Alliance, met here, and determined what was to be done in this matter. But any hon. gentleman, feeling strongly on the subject, and knowing what had occurred in New Brunswick, could have introduced his Bill on the very first day of the Session. It was not done for some time afterwards, however, and now, because the Bill was late in being introduced, we are asked to adopt the precedent—because it is a precedent of a very serious character—of taking the measure out of its order, and, without notice, of proceeding immediately with the discussion of a question which the House could not have had any idea was going to be discussed at this time at all. For that reason, I shall vote against the motion.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent, N.B.) I consider this question one of very great importance indeed—of such importance as to induce me to offer a few observations upon it, even at this late hour, and after so much discussion. I am surprised at the arguments made use of by the hon. gentlemen who are opposed to the present motion, and more particularly at the remarks made by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White); for, as a rule, that hon. gentleman is very logical, and to my mind he has always been very convincing. But this evening, whether or not it was that he could not use logic on that question, his arguments have struck me as being very illogical indeed. He says we shall be establish-

ing a precedent. I think, from your ruling, Mr. Speaker, it is evident that the precedent has long been established; and the hon. gentleman who makes the motion is acting, not by the courtesy of this House, but in the full exercice of his rights as a member of this House, in making this motion and getting the views of this House upon it, whether they may be adverse or favorable to him. Therefore, on that point my hon. friend is not very logical. What does he say? He says we are establishing a precedent if we vote favorably to the motion, and he does not deprecate the precedent that was established the other day when the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) managed to get his Bill at the top of the Order paper by a motion which was at that time entirely irregular and out of order, and which, if any hon. member of this House had taken objection to it, would not have been entertained by this House or by you; you would at once have ruled it out of order. And yet we did not hear the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) or the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) say a word about that motion, or suggest that we were establishing a wrong precedent or that it was unfair to the other measures standing higher on the motion paper. It is not parliamentary to attribute motives, and therefore I am not going to do so; but the effect of the hon. gentleman's argument is to kill this amendment. It is not for fear of establishing a precedent; or, rather, I should say, the effect will not be to prevent a precedent being established, but to kill the amendment. And I do not complain of that; I do not say that it is an unfair way of acting. If I were opposed to temperance legislation, and to legislation which would render workable this Act which has been adopted in some 59 constituencies in this Dominion, I dare say I would take the same course, and attempt to kill the Act by any means I could; but it seems to me that I would use the argument frankly and honestly, and would say: I am opposed to the passing of the Act, and will throw any obstacle in its way that I can; I will try to kill it in any way I can. But that is not the argument the hon. gentleman used. His argument is that we are establishing a precedent, which I am pointing out is not a precedent at all. According to my view, it is not at all the question as to whether this Bill is more important than the Factory Bill or not. The question is simply this: Is it of sufficient importance that this House should consider whether it should become law this Session or not? If it is, and if we should not allow another year to pass by, with a law on the Statute Book which has been adopted by so many constituencies who are desirous of working it out, and are not able to do so on account of some defects in its working, this is the only time it can be put before the House with the hope of its becoming law. Put it off to-night and you kill it until another Session comes along. Therefore, if we desire to see the Canada Temperance Act enforced where the people have adopted it, and where it cannot be worked out efficiently without this amendment, then it seems to me that it is the duty of this Parliament, which has made this law, to see that it works properly; and it appears to me it is their duty to do so this Session, and not to put it off to another time. If I understand the routine of this House, the passing of this motion will not remove the Bill of the hon. member for Cornwall from the position it occupies on the Order paper, for it will come next, and therefore will not be delayed very much. The only question is, shall this amendment be made law this Session? If it is to be, this is the proper time to vote for the amendment, and if not, to vote against it. I, myself, believe the amendment to be opportune; I believe it to be important. In the Province of New Brunswick I think I am safe in saying, there were upwards of two dozen cases before the Supreme Court, and simply because of the absence of this amendment, all the convictions for selling illegally were quashed, and the people concerned have been so emboldened, where the Canada Temperance Act has been adopted, simply because there is no machinery to carry out the Act, that they are selling as much as before. Now, it is not in the interest of the Province nor of the Dominion that that state of things should exist. It is not a state of affairs that should exist. Either that law is correct or it is not. If I were of the opinion of some hon. gentlemen, I would move to have the law repealed at once, for that would be better than to have it in an unintelligible state in the Statutes; and believing it to be the duty of Parliament, when a law is on the Statute Book, to make it as nearly perfect as possible, I think it my duty to vote for the amendment of my hon. friend.

Mr. FISHER. I do not intend to enter at any length into this question, because the opposition aroused on the part of some of the opponents of temperance, has been effectually met by my hon. friend from King's, N. B. (Mr. Foster), and other hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this subject; but I cannot let pass one or two incorrect assertions which were made by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) a few minutes ago. That hon. gentleman implied that this question had been sprung on the House to-night without notice. In that he stated what was absolutely incorrect. A fortnight ago it was asked that this Bill should be given precedence by placing it second on the Orders in the notice paper. Objection was taken to this by the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron), and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives). You, Mr. Speaker, ruled that the Bill should not be given precedence on the Order paper as objection was taken, but you advised my hon. friend for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), to take the course he has to-night taken, and it was well understood that when the debate on the Factory Bill was concluded, this measure would be brought up. I hold, therefore, that the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), cast an insinuation against the temperance people who have brought up this question to-night, which has no foundation whatever. The hon. gentleman also asked why it was that this clause was not brought up the very first day of the Session, since, he said, the decision of the New Brunswick Supreme Court had been known a week previous. In that, again, the hon. member for Cardwell was incorrect, because the decision of the New Brunswick Supreme Court was only given three weeks after the Session opened; and as soon as that decision was given the council of the Dominion Alliance introduced into their amendments this additional amendment, required in consequence of that decision. It is most important for the efficient working of the Scott Act that the confusion which might arise between the McCarthy Act and the Scott Act should be effectually and forever set at rest. I may add that a somewhat similar confusion existed in regard to the Dunkin Act, in consequence of which, in my own county, it was found absolutely impossible to enforce that Act; and it is therefore of the greatest importance that any doubt in the working of the Scott Act should be settled once for all. I speak feelingly on this question, because a few months ago my own county adopted the Scott Act, believing the procedure under it was absolutely clear and decided, in substitution for the Dunkin Act which was faulty in this respect, and now I think it is important the Scott Act should be amended in such a way that doubt should no longer exist. I wish also to refer to another point. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) credited to my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) some words that fell from myself the other evening when this question was up for discussion. I then said one reason why this Bill should be given precedence was, that it had been before the Government for no less than a fortnight awaiting their decision. As the hon.

member for King's, N. B. (Mr. Foster) said very well, the other Bills which related to the Scott Act are in the hands of private members, and it is their fault if they were not pushed, but this Bill being in the hands of the Committee of the Dominion Alliance, the Dominion Alliance, desirous of getting the support of the Government to insure the passage of this measure, decided to ask the Government to take it in charge. It was not the place therefore of the hon. member for Lanark to proceed until the Government had given their decision, so that he might not, by any action of his, prejudice the passing of the Bill or the Government's decision in the matter. It was on that account alone the delay occurred in the introduction of the Bill. The hon. member for North Victoria inveighed in most eloquent terms against the horrible innovation to be made in our procedure should this measure be given precedence. One would suppose, on hearing the first part of his speech, that this was the sole reason for his opposition, but a little later it leaked out that he had a little Bill of his own which he did not wish to have interfered with. Nor in that do we find the only true ground for his opposition, for the hon. gentleman has always been noted for his opposition to temperance legislation; and it is curious to see how jealous to-night about the procedure of the House are those hon. gentlemen who are decidedly opposed to temperance. I cannot help thinking it is their opposition to temperance rather than their zeal for the privileges of the House which actuates them in their opposition to this motion.

Mr. McNEILL. I have but a few words to say on this question. For my own part, I am not personally in favor of such legislation as the Scott Act. I have not been able to satisfy myself that those who support such legislation will derive from it the beneficial results that they expect, nor have I been able to discover that such results have accrued in places where similar legislation has been in force. But, while I hold that view, I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that by the law of the land legislation has been practically taken out of the hands of the representatives of the people on this question, and handed over directly to the people themselves, and that it is for the people themselves directly to say, yes or no, whether or not the Scott Act is to be put in force in any part of the country. It is not for us to interfere in that respect at all. Under those circumstances, and knowing that a majority of the constituencies in this Province have pronounced in favor of the Scott Act, it does seem to me it would be a very great pity if the representatives of the people in this House were to adopt any course which would in any way obstruct the wishes of the people in connection with such legislation. It seems to me it would be a very great pity if we did not, in every way we could, facilitate the carrying out by the people of their desire in this respect. I think that few questions which could be brought before the notice of this House are of greater importance than this which is now occupying our attention. The fact is, that a very large body of the people, almost everywhere that the question has been submitted, have expressed their desire for legislation of this kind; that these people should be prevented—after we have given them power under the law to have such legislation—from having the benefit of this Act, if there be any benefit in it—the fact that they should be prevented from giving it a fair trial, owing to some technicalities in the provisions of the law, is a sufficient reason why we should at once step in and give them relief. Believing, as I do, that we are simply giving effect to the wishes and desires of a large majority of the people of my own constituency with reference to this matter, I will strongly support the amendment proposed.

Mr. FAIRBANK. As one of the representatives of a county which has recently passed the Scott Act by the largest majority by which it has been passed in any county, a majority of some 3,000, I should be remiss in my duty, I think, if I did not ask this House to give my constituents a fair opportunity of carrying out the Scott Act, particularly as the difficulty which has arisen is the result largely of an Act of this Parliament, the result of an Act which was hastily passed by this Parliament. I remember very distinctly the way in which the so-called McCarthy Act was passed. I was one of the few who were sitting here between three and four o'clock in the morning when that Act was going hastily through. It is a matter of record that it passed the other branch of the Legislature before the amendments made in this House were printed. It is not to be wondered at, under such circumstances, that some things appeared in that Act which it was not intended should be there, and that is one of the difficulties in the way of carrying out the Scott Act. It is not the principle of the Act that we are to discuss to-night. It has stood upon the Statute Book for seven years. The people supposed it was workable, but it is found that it is not workable in some particulars. We are now asked to remedy those defects, and on the part of my constituents I should not discharge my duty if I did not ask the House to enable them to carry out the Act, not to leave them in the position of having the fiddle without the bow, give them the whole instrument, see the tune they will play, and, if you do not like it, change it afterwards.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Jamieson, p. 940.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Dundas,	Macdonald (King's),
Allison,	Fairbank,	McCraney,
Armstrong,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	McLelan,
Auger,	Fisher,	McMullen,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fleming,	McNeill,
Beaty,	Forbes,	Mills,
Béchard,	Fortin,	Paint,
Bell,	Foster,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Blake,	Gordon,	Reid,
Bourassa,	Gunn,	Rinfret,
Bourbeau,	Hackett,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Bowell,	Harley,	Scriver,
Bryson,	Hay,	Shakespeare,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Hickey,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Hilliard,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Inverness),	Holton,	Springer,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Innes,	Taylor,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Irvine,	Temple,
Cartwright,	Jackson,	Thompson,
Casey,	Jamieson,	Trow,
Catudal,	Jenkins,	Vail,
Cochrane,	Kaulbach,	Wallace (York),
Cockburn,	King,	Watson,
Colby,	Kirk,	White (Renfrew),
Cook,	Landry (Kent),	Wilson,
Davies,	Langelier,	Wood (W'tm'land),
De St. Georges,	Laurier,	Wright.—86.
Dickinson,	Livingstone,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Dugas,	Massue,
Bain (Soulanges),	Dupont,	Mitchell,
Baker (Victoria),	Ferguson (Welland),	Montplaisir,
Benoit,	Gagné,	Patterson (Essex),
Benson,	Gault,	Pope,
Bergeron,	Geoffrion,	Pruyn,
Blondeau,	Girouard,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Cameron (Victoria),	Grandbois,	Small,
Carling,	Hall,	Sproule,
Caron,	Hesson,	Stairs,
Casgrain,	Hurteau,	Tassé,
Chapleau,	Ives,	Tupper,
Costigan,	Kilvert,	Valin,
Coughlin,	Kranz,	Vanasse
Coursol,	Langevin,	Weldon,
Curran,	Macdonald (sir John),	Wells,
Daly,	Macmaster,	White (Cardwell),
Dawson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	McCallum,	Wood (Brockville),
Desjardins,	McDougald (Pictou),	Woodworth.—62.
Dodd,	McGreevy,	

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. JAMIESON moved second reading of Bill (No. 92) further to amend the Canada Temperance Act, 1878.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Of course, after the decision of the House as to the question of giving precedence to this Bill, I do not purpose resisting the consideration of the measure any further than in what I think is a legitimate and proper manner in accordance with the merits of the question. The Bill before the House proposes a number of amendments, some of them of trifling importance, others of them of more serious importance. The principal question under the Bill, I think, is that which has been rendered necessary, as it is stated, by the decision of the courts in the Lower Provinces. If I am correctly informed, the decision of the Supreme Court of the Province of New Brunswick was to the effect that the clauses of the Scott Act were in fact superseded, so far as the question was before the court, by the License Act, passed two years ago. Now, I understand that a decision to the contrary effect has been given in the Island of Prince Edward by a court of competent jurisdiction there, and that the question is under appeal from one or other of those decisions. If that be so, I think that, as a matter of principle, we ought not now to interfere with the decision of the ultimate Court of Appeal, and that more particularly we should not do it in a way which declares that the intention of the Act was different to that which the courts have decided that it is. I had hoped that my hon. friend who has charge of the Bill would have given some statement of the different provisions of it, because it is very difficult to understand it without examining it clause by clause with the original Act, inasmuch as it proposes, in what I think a rather objectionable form, certain verbal amendments referring to particular clauses and particular lines of the Act proposed to be amended, and it requires some time and attention to understand in reality the scope of the Bill. I should be glad if my hon. friend in charge of the Bill would before the discussion closes favor the House with some general statement.

Mr. JAMIESON. I will do that in Committee.

Mr. CAMERON. I think it is desirable that, before the House votes on the principle of the Bill, it should know what principle is involved in it.

Mr. JAMIESON. I explained the Bill on the first reading.

Mr. CAMERON. I was about to say that I heard my hon. friend give a very short and cursory explanation on the introduction of the Bill which was quite unintelligible to members of the House because they had not the Bill before them, and, without the Bill before them, it was impossible to understand the explanation he them gave. I should be glad if, before the motion for the second reading is put, he would give a more extended and intelligible explanation of the clauses contained in the Bill. The only clause I have specially considered is that which proposes to deal with the decisions of the courts in the Lower Provinces. That, I think, is a matter of principle and one upon which we ought not now to interfere with the decision of the courts, until it has been actually and finally determined what the true interpretation of the Act is, and I am not aware that it is a matter of such urgency that we should immediately dispose of it. My principle reason, however, in rising to speak on the present occasion, was in consequence of the remarks which my hon. friend from King's, N. B. (Mr. Foster) and some other members of the House, made during the discussion on the motion which has just been carried, in reference to my personal position in this matter. I was spoken of as being, as it were, the head and front of the opposition to temperance; I think the hon. gentleman from Brome (Mr. Fisher) spoke of me as the leading opponent of temperance. Now I totally disclaim any such position. I shall not yield to any gentleman in this House in his desire to see temperance enforced and the temperance cause strengthened in this House and in the country; but we differ about the means by which it is to be attained. My hon. friends opposite think it can only be done by a system of total or partial prohibition. Now, upon that point we join issue. I think that total or partial prohibition is, if I may use the term that was employed to-night, unconstitutional. I do not mean to say that it is not within the constitutional power of Parliament to pass such an enactment if it sees fit, but that it is legislation of a kind which no Parliament ought to pass, that it is social tyranny, party tyranny, that it is carrying the principle of government by majority into a matter in which government by majority ought not to be enforced. I think that the majority of the people in any constituency have no right to dictate whether the minority shall, if they choose, drink spirits, or beer, or wine whether they shall smoke, whether they shall play cards, or do anything else that many people think very wrong, very immoral, and very improper things, but which are not in themselves offences against society. I think, it is not within the proper powers of a majority to dictate a rule to the minority on those points. I think, however, that the cause of temperance and sobriety amongst the people should be enforced in all possible ways by legitimate and proper legislation. I think if the gentlemen who are so devoted to the cause of temperance, were a little more judicious in the means they employ to promote that cause greater public advantage would result. I think that a stringent license law well administered is quite within the functions of any legislature having jurisdiction over the subject, and that it would be infinitely more effective in promoting the cause of temperance than this kind of prohibitory legislation, which I think is tyrannical and improper. I think that in our experience in the Province of Ontario, the License Act which was in force there many years did a great deal of good. I think the habits of the people were improving. I am quite sure that it is within the knowledge of all of us who are old enough to carry their memories back 20 or 30 years, that there is far more sobriety, far less intoxication, far less drinking going on in the country now than formerly. People have come to look upon drinking from a very different point of view. They look upon it now as being derogatory to a man to indulge excessively in drink. Formerly it was considered no discredit to a man, now it is considered a disgrace and disparagement to be addicted to drinking, or to be seen in public in a state of intoxication. I believe public opinion, and a judicious license law, properly administered, would do far more to benefit the cause, the cause of temperance, than all this prohibitory legislation against which there is a large minority, at least, of the people arrayed, who feel that they are tyrannised over, who yield an unwilling consent to the law, who have no respect for it, and violate it without scruple on every occasion when they can do so without being punished. I do not think it is desirable that a law which has not the good will of the majority of the people, should be attempted to be enforced and thrust down the throats of people when there is a large majority protesting against it, and depend upon it, it will not succeed in its operation. I know that is the opinion, and we have heard it expressed in this House, of many of the most consistent temperance men and total abstainers in this House and elsewhere in public. The question will probably come up—I am afraid that this Session is too far advanced for it to come up at present—but it will come up on some other occasion—whether it is right and proper that the Canada Temperance Act should be brought into force where there is a bare majority of the people in favor of it. I do not think it is right that any law such as this should be enforced until it has such a large

majority of the people in favor of it that it can be effectively carried out. The number of people who have voted in favor of the Scott Act in every constituency in which it has been carried, has been a small minority of the electors. I think my hon. friends opposite cannot point to a single county in which the Scott Act has been carried by a majority of the electors. They cannot even point to a single county in which, I believe, it has been carried by two-fifths of the electors; they cannot point to a single county in which it has been carried by such a majority as to indicate that there is a strong current of opinion in favor of it. It is carried by the apathy and abstinence from voting of the opponents of it, and by the active energy of its advocates, more particularly of the clergy in many districts, and persons put in action by the Dominion Alliance and other associations who make it their business to try to bring it into force wherever it is proposed. I have looked at the statistics of the number of voters in many counties where it has been carried, and I have found that a very small number of the qualified electors vote upon it, a number far less than the number who vote at any parliamentary election. I looked the other day at the statistics of the united counties of Northumberland and Durham, with which I am somewhat acquainted. The total electorate in those two counties is 22,000, and the total number of persons who voted on the question was only 9,000, and only 5,500, or less than one-quarter of the qualified electors, voted in favor of the Act. That, I believe, is a fair sample of the numbers who vote for the Act. I think I am correct in the statement that it is the abstinence of the opponents, and the energies of the supporters of the Act, which have led to its being adopted by a bare majority, and that legislation carried by a bare majority will necessarily remain a dead letter, and cannot and will not be effectually carried out. I think that the discussion which we have had on other occasions in this House and elsewhere has shown that the Scott Act is not, and has not been, enforced where it has been adopted. I think that the hon. members from Prince Edward Island will bear testimony upon that point. If there is any part of the country in which the Act can have a fair trial it is Prince Edward Island, because it is in force throughout the island. The island is an isolated territory; it can only be reached by water; it is in fact a Province by itself. Yet I think the members from that island will bear testimony to the fact that, practically and substantially, the Canada Temperance Act in that island is a dead letter; that it is not, and cannot, be enforced; that there is more drinking and worse liquor drank now than there was before the Act was in force; and that a License Act rigorously administered would do infinitely more to prevent the evils of intemperance than the Canada Temperance Act has done in that island. I think the same applies elsewhere. That, however, is a subject that, at this hour of the night, I do not propose reopening. I have made these remarks for the purpose of putting myself right and disclaiming the position which has been thrust upon me without any justification, of being an opponent of temperance. It is true that I opposed the passing of the Scott Act when it was introduced in 1878 in this House. As I opposed it then I oppose it now, upon the principle that I think it is improper legislation; that I think it is not properly within our functions; while I do think it is within our functions to pass a rigid License Act that can be properly administered, and that some of the evils which flow from intoxication might properly be legislated upon. Every kind of legislation which can be adopted which will have the effect of repressing the evils of intemperance I will heartily support. But upon principle I am opposed to this kind of legislation, and therefore I am opposed to the principle of this Bill; and I thought it better on the motion for the second reading to state my opinions and to enter my protest against an amendment to the Act, as I did against the original Act. I think there are many amendments which might be raised of far more importance than the amendments as to details which the hon. gentleman proposes. I think, for instance, that the Bill which I was asked by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) to take charge of, is one which should be passed. It is a monstrous wrong and a parliamentary wrong done by the provisions of the Scott Act, which is sought to be remedied in that case. To provide that a manufacturing distiller or brewer should not be allowed to sell in the county in which he resides and where the Scott Act may be in force, when all manufacturers outside can sell to persons there, is a wrong to him and to all of that class. At present this provision is working absolute ruin to many men. I know cases where men have invested $50,000, $60,000 or $70,000 in breweries in counties where the Scott Act is now in force,—small breweries which do only a local trade, and the effect of the existing state of the law is that these men have been hopelessly ruined and their property forfeited. I say that kind of legislation is a parliamentary wrong which ought to be remedied. I also think that in order to be consistent, in order to do justice and right, if we do carry either total prohibition, or partial prohibition, such as is covered by the Scott Act, we ought to provide compensation. Parliament should not take away property and rights which are acquired under the law as it existed, and not give compensation. It is a parliamentary wrong. That is a question, too, which will arise under a measure which will come before the House if we have time to reach it, which I am afraid we shall not have. However, so far as the details of this Bill are concerned, I shall be glad to have them explained more at length, especially that part of the Bill which proposes to interfere with pending litigation by an *ex post facto* definition of clauses in the Act. For the reasons I have stated I am opposed to the principle of this Bill, which I think should not be read the second time.

Mr. JAMIESON. I do not propose, and I trust no friends of the Scott Act propose, to discuss the general principle of the Act and its operation in the counties and cities where it has been adopted. We have had enough of that in the country during the contests that have taken place recently, and I shall not introduce that question into the discussion of this Bill. So far as the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) is concerned, he will at all events, on this occasion, have to submit to the tyranny of the majority. I do not think it is necessary for me to go into a lengthy explanation of the provisions of this Bill. I do not know that I can improve the explanations I made at the time I introduced the Bill some weeks ago. The first clause provides simply that the court and judicial officers and others connected with the enforcing of the law shall be bound to take notice of the Act being in force on the fact being published in the official *Gazette*. That is a very reasonable provision, and one which I am sure will meet with the assent of the House. It is quite evident the hon. member (Mr. Cameron) does not want to be enlightened as to the Bill, or he would have remained in the House. The second clause of the Bill has already been explained, and I will explain it further in Committee. The third and fourth are similar provisions, and the fifth, sixth and seventh do not need explanation. I propose that we now proceed to read the Bill the second time.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I do not propose to discuss the general principles of the Scott Act, and I entirely concur with the hon. gentleman that it is not desirable on this Bill to discuss it. We are dealing simply with a measure for the purpose of giving effect to that Act, for the purpose of providing such legislation as may be necessary to secure its being carried out. I have only one suggestion to offer, and I think it is one of considerable importance. This Act is

one of general interest to the mass of the people. All want to know what the Scott Act contains. I get letters, and no doubt every hon. gentleman gets letters, from different quarters, asking what the Scott Act is, and what are its particular features. In a measure of this kind, which may be said to be a popular measure, the operation of which is assumed to be largely within the power of the masses of the people, it is not desirable to enact amendments in the form in which the amendments are proposed to be enacted here. The first section is perfectly clear. Anyone can quite understand it, and everyone will say it is perfectly reasonable. The second, third, and other clauses provide that certain words shall be struck out and certain other words inserted. The clauses give no intelligent idea of what is meant. If every hon. member had the original Act before him, to make a comparison and to annotate, and in that way ascertain precisely what the clause means, that is all right; but in an Act of this kind amending an Act which is designed to give power for the enforcement of that Act, and as everyone desires to know particularly what their rights are under the Act, it would be very much better if the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill would, in Committee of the Whole, introduce a repealing clause as to the clauses to be repealed and insert new clauses, so that they could be fully understood by any person who read them, and thus make it a complete Act in itself. For the convenience of the House, italics might be used to indicate what the changes made were, and hon. members would then know exactly what they were doing. No one can intelligently deal with the Bill unless he has a copy of the Canada Temperance Act before him, and although the member for King's carries the Temperance Act about him all the time, and no doubt sleeps with it under his pillow, in order that he may be thoroughly imbued with its importance at all times, still we are not all so fortunate. An hon. member asked me only yesterday where he could obtain a copy of the Canada Temperance Act. He went to the Distribution Office but found no copies there, and he afterwards learned it could be obtained from the Queen's Printer at 10 cents a copy. We ought to have for the convenience of the public, for whose benefit this Act was passed, a clause repealing those clauses desired to be amended, and new clauses inserted, so that everyone obtaining a copy of the new Act will know what his rights are.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I entirely concur in the opinions expressed by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) on this point. I believe that, as a general rule, we have adopted the system that where a clause is amended the original clause is repealed, and the amendment made the subject of re-enactment. If the hon. gentleman will prepare his amendment in that direction, I am sure it would be much more satisfactory to the House in dealing with it in Committee of the Whole, and much more satisfactory to the public at large. It cannot take but a short time, for the amendments, although important in one sense, are very few, and they cover a few words in each case.

Mr. IVES. I rise to propose an amendment. My amendment embodies a proposition which this House has already affirmatively declared, and it is in accordance with the publicly expressed opinion of a gentleman who holds a very important position in this House, namely, the Finance Minister. It is an amendment calculated to affirm the principle that the Act, before it goes into force, should be supported by an actual majority of the voters in a county. Now, there is a great deal said about temperance in this House. There are certain members of this House who find it necessary, not only to assert their own temperance principles, but also to throw some doubt on the motives and principles of others, and we have heard a speech to-night which contained some allusions of that nature. I think as long as we keep within the lines laid down by the Finance Minister, who is recognised to be the leader of the temperance party in the House and country, we are perfectly safe, particularly as the principle he has enunciated on this point have been proved by actual experience to be sound. Now, it is quite evident, not only in Canada, but from the experience of our neighbors to the south, that in order to enforce this law it is necessary that the public sentiment of the locality in which it is adopted, should support it, and support it strongly. It is true that the temperance people are zealous and active, but I am sorry to see that their zeal and activity are, as a rule, displayed in a more remarkable degree in obtaining the passing of Acts than in seeing them enforced afterwards. They seem to satisfy themselves in the majority of cases when they cause the Act to be adopted in a county, but their zeal very often cools and their subscriptions fall off afterwards, and it frequently happens that they leave the law entirely in the hands of the authorities to enforce. On the other hand, those who are interested in the liquor traffic, have a constant money interest in violating the Act, and the result is that on the one hand the Act is supported by sentiment only, without a money interest, and on the other hand the violation of the Act is supported by a direct money interest, and unless a large majority of the people within the county are in favor of the enforcement of the Act, it has been in all cases that I have observed, a perfectly dead letter. Now, I must give the hon. gentleman who moved the Bill, the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster), the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher), and other hon. gentlemen who are most prominent in advocating temperance legislation in this House, the credit of being sincere and of intending exactly what they ask. But there is this matter which is worthy of their consideration: Is it going to further the temperance cause in this country to cause the adoption of the Scott Act on the wave of the present excitement, in such a large number of counties, without, at the same time, making provision for its enforcement. Is it not possible that the temperance people in passing, or procuring the passage, of the Scott Act in so large a number of the counties, in the past few months, have undertaken a larger task than they will be able to perform, and that the reaction which must follow from the fact that the Act will not be enforced in many counties, will operate against the Scott Act, against the cause of temperance, and will actually retard instead of advancing the interests which we must suppose these hon. gentlemen have in view. I believe that such will be the case. I believe the Scott Act, now that this contagion is passing over the country like a prairie fire, has been adopted in counties where not only the majority of the people do not support it, but where a large majority of the people are opposed to it, and that for that reason I think it will be found that it will be a dead letter in many counties where it is adopted, and the result will be a reaction such as has occurred in many of the United States, and the cause of temperance instead of being advanced will be retarded by the course which has been adopted. I propose an amendment which is simply a second affirmation of a principle which has already been adopted by a large majority in this House—not of this Parliament, but of last Parliament—a principle which I heard the present Finance Minister declare that he fully concurred in and approved. I move in amendment to the second reading:

That all the words after "that," to the end of the question, be struck out, in order to add the following: "In the opinion of this House the Canada Temperance Act should not go into operation except in such counties as have adopted it by an actual majority of the votes upon the voters' lists of such counties."

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I would like to ask if the amendment is in order. The motion is for the second reading of the Bill. The principle involved if we pass the second reading, is that it is expedient to amend the Canada Tem-

perance Act. That is the purpose of the Bill—we affirm the principle of amending that Act. Now, if this amendment passes, it is a mere expression of opinion by this House. It is not even a declaration that it shall form part of the Bill; it is not even a proposal to introduce a Bill to that effect. The mere declaration by this House would not affect the Bill. If that resolution were passed, we should have to introduce a Bill—because I think we cannot destroy the motion for the second reading at any rate—we should have to introduce a Bill for the purpose of putting this particular provision in the Act, in order that it might be an amendment to the Act. An expression of opinion by this House is of no avail in altering an Act of Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it is very questionable whether the motion is in order. I was not at all aware that it was to be moved and I have not recently looked at the rulings, but if I recollect the principle aright, a motion in amendment to the second reading of a Bill should be made in the shape of a substantive resolution, which shall establish a different principle of legislation as the proper principle of legislation from that which is proposed in the Bill itself. You do not move a negative to the Bill in the shape of a resolution, but you propose affirmatively some other principle as an appropriate principle of legislation over that proposed in the Bill. Now, the hon. gentleman's amendment, it seems to me, might be an appropriate one, possibly, to the Canada Temperance Act when it was before the House in the shape of a Bill to be read the second time, as indicating a principle of legislation different from that proposed in the Bill. But the Bill before us to-night is a Bill to amend the Canada Temperance Act in some particulars, not one which has anything to do with the question of the numbers whose votes shall be necessary to bring that Act into operation. That is the law as it stands. It is untouched by the proposal before us; and the amendment the hon. gentleman proposes is an amendment directed to the establishment of a different principle of legislation from that of the Canada Temperance Act, and I doubt very much whether it is in order to the second reading of the Bill. Of course, after the hon. gentleman's affirmation in favor of temperance, really his object is merely to strengthen the laws in favor of temperance, but that object will be very far from being accomplished by this amendment being carried, because the result will be that he will not have the amendments to the Canada Temperance Act carried. He will practically defeat this measure, which is, I am sure, the farthest from his thoughts.

Mr. IVES. I wish merely to reply to the question raised by the hon. member for Cardwell and supported by the hon. leader of the Opposition. I have abstained from insinuating any hon. gentleman's motives, and I will not now insinuate that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has more in view the votes of the supporters of the Scott Act on some other question than on the question of temperance. I will not insinuate that, although he has insinuated that my object was not to support the principle of temperance. I quite agree that upon the second reading of a Bill, a motion like the one I have had the honor to move, to be in order, must attack the principle of the Bill, unless that Bill is an amendment to another Bill when the motion made will be in order if it attacks the principle of either the amending Bill or the Bill proposed to be amended. That is the exception to that rule, and in this case, under the exception to the rule, my amendment is clearly in order, as attacking the principle of the Bill proposed to be amended. But it also attacks the principle of the Bill now before the House. That Bill proposes amendments in a certain line. This amendment proposes the substitution of another amendment to the Bill proposed to be amended, in the place of those proposed in the Bill which the hon. member for Lanark asks should be read the second time. What the result may be does not affect the question at all. There is no relevency in the argument that the amendment would have the effect of defeating the second reading of the Bill. The question is, does the amendment attack the principle of the Bill now before the House, or of the Act which the Bill now before the House seeks to amend? If it does, as I understand the leader of th Opposition to admit, so far as the Bill to be amended is concerned, then I maintain that the amendment is in order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think, on looking at the authorities, that the amendment is in order, as it contradicts the principle of the Bill which is now before the House. It is stated in May:

"It is also competent to a member to move as an amendment to a question, a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy, or provisions of the Bill."

I think this amendment is in order.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Then it is a negative to the motion for the second reading.

Mr. BLAKE. Under these circumstances, after the ruling you have made, this is a proposal to negative the second reading of this Bill. Now, if we were engaged in the discussion of the second reading of the principal measure of which this is an amendment, the question the hon. gentleman proposes to raise, not indeed in the form he raises it, but in some form or other—might be open to very serious consideration. The question of the degree of public support in any locality, which is essential to the real vitality and to the effective operation of a measure of this description, is one carefully to be considered on all occasions. I entirely agree, and have heretofore in this House expressed my agreement, with those who say that unless there is a very considerable preponderance of public opinion in a locality, it is extremely unlikely that a measure of this description will be effectually supported. But we are not now considering the second reading of the Canada Temperance Act at all. It was passed, it appears, from a statement made, not in this Chamber, but in the Opera House in Ottawa, with the consent of both parties sometime ago. I perceive that the leader of the Government, who is not in his seat to-night, stated before a large body of people, who do not entertain the most friendly feelings towards the Canada Temperance Act, that he supported it; it was passed under the Administration of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie); so that we have the best assurances that the leaders of both political parties at that time sustained the measure. It has been on the Statute Book for some years. My opinion with reference to that measure is, that it is the duty of the Parliament of this country to give it a fair and reasonable trial—to give it the opportunity of being put in operation, according to its terms, in the counties in which the voice of those who the Legislature so unanimously, with the assent of the leaders of both political parties, agreed should be adequate in order to its being put in operation, and to give that opportunity for the period which the Legislature provided it should be enforced in order that it might be fairly tested. My hon. friend's proposed amendments are amendments directed to the discharge, I will hardly say of the discretion, but of the duty of the legislature which brings such an Act as this upon the Statute Book. In every great piece of legislation of this description there are necessarily some amendments to be made, because it is almost impossible to frame a Bill, involving so many details of execution, so perfectly as to foresee and outwit the difficulties which are sure to be occasioned by the obscurities of verbiage or the subtleties of interpretation or the contradictions of the different courts. Now, without pledging ourselves to every word and sentence of these proposed amendments, as I understand their general scope, they are designed to carry out the obvious and plain intent of the

Legislature when it passed the Act in question. They are amendments necessary to have that fair trial which I bespeak for it, which I think it is entitled to have; and it was in that view that some time ago, when the hon. member for North Lanark proposed the introduction of the Bill, that I suggested that the Government should facilitate its consideration: and it was in that view that I was amongst those who voted that it should be read the second time to-night. I say it is important that the Temperance Act should have a fair trial. If you find after that fair trial that the voice of a larger majority than those who vote for it in the different counties is essential to its practical operation—if such is the result of such practical experience as we have agreed to give, unless, of course, we recall our agreement which we are entitled to do—then it will be time enough after that for the hon. gentleman to propose his change. But, as I said on the question of order, the present proposal is one which prevents us from remedying these admitted defects, it prevents us from giving it the fair trial to which any legislation of this kind is entitled, and at the same time it does not accomplish the object of the hon. gentleman, because it is not even the first step towards the introduction of an amendatory measure in the direction he wants. You pass the resolution, and the second reading of the Bill is defeated; the resolution stands there and no Bill is introduced to give effect to it; so that you leave the Scott Act defective in the parts in which it naturally requires to be amended, and defective in the part in which the hon. gentleman says it requires amendment. There is difficulty with reference to the hon. gentleman's proposal besides that. I will ask hon. gentlemen who are sitting here, whether on the side of the minority or majority, I would ask particularly those who say they represent an overwhelming preponderance of the popular vote of this country, to sum up the vote and to ascertain how many of them would fulfil the conditions which the hon. gentleman proposes for the expression of popular will in this particular case. How many of them would undertake to poll an absolute majority of the votes on the voters lists of the counties they represent? Is that which is deemed amply sufficient to direct the public affairs of this country not to be deemed sufficient in this case? What becomes of the boasts of hon. gentlemen opposite that they represent the overwhelming force of public opinion? Are these boasts to be held good in the case of all political questions, all parliamentary questions, and all governmental questions; but in this particular case that test would break down. You hear boasts of a great political victory when there is a majority of 50 or 60 or 70, as there was the other day in the county of Northumberland, because a majority of 38 or 39 became a majority of 80. Hon. gentlemen opposite say in that there was a plain indication of the public sense and feeling of this country. Is it so? Hon. gentlemen opposite say yes, but they object to anything less than an absolute majority of the whole of the electors of the West Riding of Northumberland being sufficient to decide whether the Scott Temperance Act should be put in force or not. They have one law and one measure. We hear a great deal about a majority of 70 in the one case, but that majority would be considered of no account in the other. This proposal I believe to be in substance if not in form, in practice if not in words, a proposal to render the operation of the Scott Act impossible. Such are the difficulties to get the electors to the poll; it would be practically impossible for any person to poll an absolute majority of all the registered electors in any district in favor of the question. You compare the majorities with the minorities, that is the ordinary test you apply to matters of popular election. We are engaged to-night in a business which it is the duty of Parliament, that has passed by unanimous consent an important piece of legislation, to undertake, namely to remove difficulties in the way of that Act being carried into practical execution. For my part, I would give my support to any measure essential to give the Canada Temperance Act a fair trial in this country, and I heartily oppose this amendment, the result of which would be not merely to defeat the Bill, but to establish a principle of legislation which I conceive would be utterly unworkable.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Having twice in this House voted in favor of the principle of this amendment, when moved in amendment to the Bill before the House, I desire to say a word or two to explain the reason why I intend to vote against it to-night. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) who has just spoken commenced by declaring that this is a peculiar kind of legislation, that it is a law which requires for its successful operation that there should be a large preponderating public opinion in its favor in the localities where adopted, and he admitted at the start it was a fair question whether there should not be something more than the mere majority of votes cast, whether there should not be something to indicate that preponderating sentiment in order to justify the Act going into operation. If that is the case, I do not see where comes in the argument based upon the election of members of Parliament. Members of Parliament must be elected, and it does not require a preponderating sentiment in a county in order to justify the election of a member to Parliament or to carry out the ordinary operations of constitutional Government, in so far as those depend upon the election of members to the House. Having admitted in the first instance that this is a peculiar law, a law requiring a large preponderance of public sentiment, I cannot see how the hon. gentleman can object to the principle of the amendment on the grounds that members of Parliament could not be elected in this way. It seems to me that if we were dealing with the question of amending the Act itself or the enactment of the Act itself, apart from the particular amendments in the Bill now before the House, it might be a question whether the majority of the whole of the votes on the voters' lists should be required to put into operation the Act, or whether three-fifths of the actual votes should be the majority required for the adoption of the Act. I entirely agree in what the hon. gentleman has said in regard to the amendment, that its effect would be to negative the motion for the second reading of the bill. This bill is to provide the machinery necessary to give effect to the Scott Act. That Act is a law of the country, which some 50 counties in Canada have already adopted, and which from the point of view even of those who are opposed to the Act or who have doubts of its successful operation, should have the opportunity of having such a fair trial as will enable the people to determine by actual experience whether the law is to have permanent application in the country. For that reason we ought not to negative the bill, and although it may appear inconsistent on my part, I propose to vote against the amendment, reserving the right to discuss all amendments as they are proposed when they come up in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MILLS. It seems to me that whether we approve of the principle of a simple majority or of the principle requiring something more than a simple majority before putting this Act into operation, it is clear that the House, unless it desires to defeat the measure altogether, should not pass the amendment put into your hands. Now, take an ordinary voting list; if this amendment is carried there will be no necessity of voting against the proposition to adopt the principle of the Temperance Act in any constituency. All that it would be necessary to do would be for those who were opposed to the Act to remain at home, and, unless there was an actual majority of all the names upon the voters' list recorded it would not come into operation; there would be no object in taking a negative vote at all.

If you look at any voters' list you will see that almost every property owner has his name entered for every separate and distinct piece of property. I took up the other day a voters' list for a town in the west, and I found that some property owners were on it as many as thirteen times. I was told in one town where the Act was adopted that, if they were to take the name of every property owner upon a petition in favor of the Scott Act there would still be an apparent majority in the constituency against the Act, because the names of the parties appeared so often upon the voters' list on account of the number of different pieces of property for which they were assessed, so that a man who might be the most ardent supporter of the Act, not being able to record his vote in favor of the Act for every piece of property he owned, would appear to be fourteen or fifteen times against the proposition which he supported. That would be the effect of the proposition the hon. gentleman has submitted to this House. You carry it, and, unless you had an overwhelming majority of the votes recorded in favor of the Act, those who would fail to vote and those whose names were on the voters' list more than once would be always sufficient to defeat the measure. Then, supposing this amendment carried and a real majority of the voters supported the Act, how are you to determine whether there has been a real majority or not? You look at the voters' list, how are you to know, without a scrutiny of some sort and an investigation, whether the name of John Brown or Thomas Jones that appears half a dozen times represents different parties or the same party. It seems to me that it is perfectly preposterous to think that such an amendment, if adopted and made a part of the Canada Temperance Act, could be put into practical operation. It would require an extraordinary investigation in every case to determine whether there had been an actual majority of votes polled or whether there had not.

Mr. WATSON. If this amendment passed, it would effectually kill the Canada Temperance Act in Manitoba, because probably not one-third of the names that appear on the voters' list represent actual residents in the Province, and it would be impossible to pass the Act. Changes are required to make the Act more workable. It was passed in the county of Marquette four years ago, it was declared to be in force, but some hotel-keepers thought they could sell liquor independently of the Canada Temperance Act. They attempted to do so, they were brought before a justice of the peace who convicted them, but it was found that the Act was unworkable there; and the justice of the peace had to pay heavy costs for convicting parties illegally under the Canada Temperance Act. It is of the utmost importance that, if it remains on the Statute Book, legislation should be passed by this House to make it workable.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Ives, p. 951.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges)	Dodd,	Patterson (Essex),
Baker (Victoria),	Dupont,	Pruyn,
Bergeron,	Hall,	Small,
Cameron (Victoria),	Ives,	Tassé,
Carling,	Kranz,	Weldon.—17.
Desjardins,	McGreevy,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Dickinson,	Macmaster,
Allison,	Dundas,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Armstrong,	Fairbank,	McCraney,
Auger,	Farrow,	McDougald (Pictou),
Bain (Wentworth),	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	McLelan,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Fisher,	McNeill,
Béchard,	Fleming,	Massue,
Bell,	Forbes,	Mills,
Benoit,	Foster,	Montplaisir,
Bernier,	Gault,	Paint,
Blake,	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Blondeau,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Gordon,	Pope,
Bourbeau,	Grandbois,	Reid,
Bowell,	Hackett,	Rinfret,
Bryson,	Harley,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Burpee,	Hay,	Scriver,
Cameron (Huron),	Hesson,	Shakespeare,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hickey,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Hilliard,	Somerville (Bruce),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Holton,	Springer,
Caron,	Homer,	Sproule,
Cartwright,	Hurteau,	Stairs,
Casey,	Innes,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casgrain,	Irvine,	Taylor,
Catudal,	Jackson,	Trow,
Cochrane,	Jamieson,	Vail,
Cockburn,	Jenkins,	Vanasse,
Colby,	Kaulbach,	Wallace (York),
Cook,	Kilvert,	Watson,
Costigan,	King,	White (Cardwell),
Cuthbert,	Kirk,	White (Hastings),
Daly,	Landry (Kent),	Wilson,
Davies,	Langelier,	Wood (Brockville),
De St. Georges,	Langevin,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Macdonald (King's),	Woodworth.—109.
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),		

Amendment negatived.

House divided on motion of Mr. Jamieson for the second reading, p. 949.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Dickinson,	Macdonald (King's),
Allison,	Dundas,	Macmaster,
Armstrong,	Dupont,	McCraney,
Auger,	Fairbank,	McDougald (Pictou),
Bain (Soulanges),	Farrow,	McLelan,
Bain (Wentworth),	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	McMullen,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Ferguson (Welland),	McNeil
Baker (Victoria),	Fisher,	Mills,
Béchard,	Fleming,	Montplaisir,
Bell,	Forbes,	Paint,
Benoit,	Foster,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Gault,	Platt,
Blake,	Geoffrion,	Pruyn,
Bourassa,	Gillmor,	Reid,
Bourbeau,	Gordon,	Rinfret,
Bowell,	Grandbois,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Bryson,	Hall,	Scriver,
Burpee,	Harley,	Shakespeare,
Cameron (Huron),	Hay,	Somerville (Brant)
Cameron (Inverness),	Hesson,	Somerville (Bruce)
Cameron (Middlesex),	Hickey,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Hilliard,	Sproule,
Cartwright,	Holton,	Stairs,
Casey,	Homer,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casgrain,	Innes,	Taylor,
Catudal,	Irvine,	Trow,
Cochrane,	Ives,	Vail,
Cockburn,	Jackson,	Vanasse,
Colby,	Jamieson,	Wallace (York),
Cook,	Kaulbach,	Watson,
Costigan,	Kilvert,	White (Cardwell),
Cuthbert,	King,	White (Hastings),
Daly,	Kirk,	Wilson,
Davies,	Langelier,	Wood (Brockville),
De St. Georges,	Langevin,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	Lesage,	Woodworth.—108.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bergeron,	Dodd,	Paterson (Essex),
Blondeau,	Hurteau,	Pope,
Cameron (Victoria),	Kranz,	Small,
Carling,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Tassé,
Desaulniers (Maski'ngé)	Massue,	Weldon.—15.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I wish to repeat the objection which my hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. White) raised to the form of the Bill, and which I had previously pointed

out. I have been trying in vain, after some minute careful attention, to understand what the effect of this second clause is. I have had a copy of the original Bill before me, and even with it, without the whole being written out consecutively, it is impossible to understand the true scope of the second clause. I think my hon. friend really ought to have the Bill recast—at any rate, that section of it—that it may be made intelligible. I would like my hon. friend to state, now that we are in committee, the meaning of the Bill, which he declined to do on the second reading.

Mr. JAMIESON. It seems to me that no confusion can arise by allowing the Bill to stand in its present shape. I do not propose at present to make any change in it. Any person taking the original Act and the amendment and reading them over together, can readily understand the change proposed, in fact it is very simple. I have it here on a copy of the Canada Temperance Act, and I do not see any difficulty in connection with the matter at all. The change is simply this, that we leave the quantity to be prescribed by the medical man at his own discretion, simply striking out the words "to be in quantities of not less than one pint;" and that necessitated a change of two or three other words in order to make the sentence grammatical. That is the whole change in that section, with the addition of a clause prescribing a penalty for every medical man who gives a certificate colorably. It is simply adopting the law as it stands at present in the Province of Ontario, and it may be the law, also, in some of the other Provinces.

Mr. HICKEY. I would like to move an amendment to section 2, in line 15, by adding after the words "incorporated village," after the word "township" in the 6th line. I do this because a judge in the county of Dundas held that he did not think they had power, under the Act, to give a license in an incorporated village for the township in which the village was situated, or for a village separate by itself.

Mr. FISHER. I think we had better not allow this amendment to pass—not that I have any objection at all to the amendment in its form or substance, but we have been contending this evening for the privilege of carrying this Bill as far as possible with the object of getting it through all its stages this evening, so that it may have a chance of becoming law this Session. I believe by the rules of the House, if any amendments are made to the Bill to-night in Committee, they cannot be read a second time and concurred in to-night, whereas, if the Bill passes through Committee without amendment, we can read it the third time and pass it to the Senate. I think the amendment now proposed is really of little consequence, in a large majority of cases, although in one or two constituencies it may perhaps involve a little difficulty. But if it is really thought to be absolutely necessary, could we not make the amendment on the third reading?

Mr. HICKEY. I have no objection to hold the amendment over, providing I have an opportunity to move it at a future time. Besides, this is not the only amendment I would like to move. I think we ought to have a fair opportunity to discuss the matter. I do not wish to block the Bill, by any means; I want it to go through.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I think it is an extraordinary proposition that the Committee should abrogate its powers and pass this Bill through the House without one simple word of alteration, although the Bill may require amendment in its phraseology and in its substance; because its friends tell us plainly that they do not want the Bill delayed for its third reading; that we are not to alter one small letter of this sacred Bill that has been introduced, and that it was so perfect that all our legislative talent cannot improve upon it. When the hon. member, who sits besides me, points out that a great injustice and wrong is done by the former Act, I submit that this Committee should certainly not abrogate its functions at the modest request of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher).

Mr. BOWELL. With reference to the remarks made by the hon. member for Brome, I am of opinion that he is not strictly correct in his rendering of what are the rules of order with respect to amendments. My impression is that concurrence to any amendments which may be made in Committee can take place, and the third reading immediately follow. The word "stages" means the first, second and third readings, and they cannot be taken on the same day except by a unanimous concurrence of the House. But an amendment can be moved to-night in Committee, concurred in to-morrow or the next day, and the third reading take place immediately afterwards.

Mr. BLAKE. I think we can concur at once if we please. The Minister of Customs is quite correct in saying our rule is that no more than one stage can be taken in one day, except by general consent, it being understood that a stage means a reading. But all the immediate proceedings can be taken if we please at one sitting, on one day, or the same day.

Mr. BOWELL. That is what I intended to convey. Amendments are made, and when they are concurred in the third reading can immediately take place; so the objection taken by the hon. member for Brome to the amendment would have no effect.

Mr. FISHER. If that is the case, I withdraw all opposition to the amendment. It was offered only in consequence of my desire to hurry the Bill through without loss of time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The rule is as follows:—

"All amendments made in Committee shall be reported by the Chairman to the House, which shall receive the same forthwith."

So there is no difficulty about the matter.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It must be remembered that throughout the Lower Provinces most of the villages are not incorporated.

Mr. McNEILL. The inhabitants of a village, which did not happen to be incorporated, might run the risk of dying of Canadian cholera for want of a little brandy.

Mr. COLBY. They would fall within a township or parish.

Mr. FISHER. The only difficulty is where a village exists in a township, and by the terms of the original Act it was supposed that the licenses to sell for medicinal purposes would not be given to a village but be given outside a village, in the township. Generally one license will be sufficient for both the township and village, but it is more convenient to have it in an incorporated village rather than outside in the township. I believe that is the reason the word "incorporated village" was inserted. We know the commissioners are not obliged to give licenses to every incorporated village or parish, but only where they deem it necessary in view of the public interest.

Section as amended, agreed to.

On section 3,

Mr. BOURBEAU. I had intended to propose an amendment to the second clause of the Bill in these terms:

That the priest or minister of any religious denomination in any city, town, or parish, be allowed to grant certificates for medical purposes.

We know that in some places and parishes there is no medical man, and it is very unpleasant for persons who desire to obtain some liquor for the sick to be compelled to travel a great distance to a medical man in order to procure his certificate.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Ministers are liable to do wrong as well as doctors. It would be unfair to ask them to perform this duty.

Mr. FISHER. There is a slight danger in the amendment proposed. The hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Bourbeau) has in his mind solely the priests of his religion, and in their case I believe no difficulty would occur. And in that case I believe as a rule there would be no difficulty at all, because it is clearly understood at all times and in all cases who those priests are. But I am aware that there are some sects in some sections of the country in which it is difficult to define who are the ministers, priests, or clergymen, and if you adopt such a principle as the one proposed it would be difficult to say where we should stop. It is possible, too, that ministers of the Church of England are easily enough found, and are well known, and no doubt the same is true with regard to the Methodists and some other denominations, but there are others——

An hon. MEMBER. The Plymouth Brethren, for instance.

Mr. FISHER. There are others such as the Plymouth Brethren and other sects, which will occur to the minds of hon. gentlemen, in which it would be difficult to say who would come under the category and who would not. I think as a rule where a medical certificate is really required, it is required after and in consequence of consultation with a medical man, and when a medical man considers it in the light of a prescription.

Mr. HICKEY moved that the following words be added to the third section of the Bill:—

Nothing in this Act shall apply to all medicines held, prescribed, or administered by physicians of regular standing in counties in which such license is granted.

It is well known that a great many physicians have to make up their own medicines, and sometimes it might be a question whether they should have a right to buy wines or liquors in quantity to make up their tinctures, etc., and I move this amendment in order to put any doubt in the matter aside. For instance, we make our wine of colchicum, and we must have quantities of wine for that purpose, and my object is to make it clear that nothing shall interfere with our being able to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the amendment is a very important one when we remember the great differences which exist in reference to the interpretation of the Bill. It would be impossible for medical men to get along in many parts of the country without having the power to keep those wines for the purpose of making up their tinctures and various wines, such as pepsine wine, wine of ipecac, or any of those drugs which are usually manufactured from sherry wine or dilute alcohol. Now the amendment does not touch the principle of the Bill in any respect. It only says that it shall not apply to regularly qualified medical men. If we have the power under the Bill at present, the amendment will do no harm, and if we have not, this will give us the power.

Mr. BLAKE. Is there any particular instance of inconvenience which has arisen? Has any medical man been prosecuted, or found himself obstructed in any way, or is it only a case of tender conscience?

Mr. SPROULE. I think we have the same right to exercise our conscience as the hon. the leader of the Opposition has, and I think we have the right to make the language so plain that it will not be misunderstood. I say that although cases have not arisen out of which lawsuits have grown, still, differences of opinion have been expressed by men who believe they are intelligent enough to interpret the law. We have the power to remove this doubt, and I think we should do so.

Mr. IVES. I believe that doctors of Halton county have found fault that they have been so restricted in the matter of prescribing liquor.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Why does the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill propose to strike out the last clause of the present Act? Surely, if the thing is so dangerous and improper, if a conviction for improperly keeping it for sale has been obtained, the forfeiture clause should remain in. Then I understand that the other amendment is on the side of mercy. The present Act provides that the fine shall not be less than $50, or more than $100, whereas the amendment takes away the discretion of the magistrate in the matter. I move in amendment that it be "not exceeding $50 or $100."

Mr. JAMIESON. The reason for striking out the words in the last section is in order to avoid confusion. Of course legal gentlemen would not fall into any difficulty in construing the law, but a magistrate who is not skilled in law might come to the conclusion that simply because the words "not less than" were in, he would be justified in exceeding that sum. As to striking out the latter clause it seems to me it should never have been in. There is already a searching clause giving power to officers, after certain steps are taken, to seize and destroy any liquors sold, but really the latter part of this 100th section is very indefinite. It might mean, for instance, that a bottle of liquor from which liquor had been sold should be destroyed, or it might mean that the whole stock of liquor on hand in the place should be destroyed. We wish to strike it out to avoid that difficulty. It is a matter of fairness on our part to our opponents. We think it should be out, and there is certainly a good deal of nonsense in it.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I agree with you there.

Mr. JAMIESON. As a matter of fact, perhaps, the whole liquor has been drunk in reference to which the offence was committed, and we think it would be better and clearer if the clause were struck out.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Who is to take the liquor in respect to which the offence has been committed, when it has been drunk? Who is to get it, and how is it to be abstracted from the person who drank it?

An hon. MEMBER. It will be abstracted by natural process.

Mr. JAMIESON. We cannot consent to the amendment of the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey). I never heard of any difficulty of the kind, and I do not think any real difficulty would arise. If there was a necessity for an amendment of this kind we should have heard something about it. I have no doubt that the medical gentlemen do not like to be fettered in a matter of this kind, but still we must preserve the Act in such a way as to prevent abuses from arising.

Mr. HICKEY. There is some doubt about the matter as it stands, and if this law contravenes the law under which medical men are practising I think it would be an injustice, and that all doubts should be removed in reference to the matter. It would simply be absurd that physicians should not have the right to make use of such liquors and wines as they require in their preparations, and in such quantities as they may think fit. As the member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) remarked, physicians practising in the country are obliged to have a large stock. Those physicians who live in the country are obliged to have large stocks, to keep

wine and brandy, and to prescribe them, and it is just as well to have the matter settled so that there will be no fear of any difficulty.

Mr. McCRANEY. In reference to the remark that dropped from the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), in regard to the county of Halton, I wish to say that I have never heard a physician complain that he has not had all the liquor required to compound his medicines, and I do not think the clause the hon. gentleman proposes is necessary at all.

Mr. WILSON. I cannot conceive that any difficulty can arise such as the hon. gentleman mentions in reference to the use of liquor in a physician's ordinary practice, at present there are very few physicians who keep either brandy, wine or other liquors in their offices as ordinary medicines. I think very few physicians, in fact, make up their tinctures and own prescriptions. They are generally prepared by druggists, and I do not see any reason or justification for placing the physician in this position, or for allowing to him the free distribution of liquors, which would, in some sections, cause a great deal of difficulty, and to a great extent, prevent the good effects which the Act is intended to have. Therefore, as a physician, I can see no necessity for the amendment, and I think we had better allow the Bill to go through as it was originally introduced.

Mr. SPROULE. I must say that my experience differs entirely from Dr. Wilson's in this respect. I have been a practising physician for nearly 17 years, and for 12 or 14 years I made my own tinctures and wines, and a very large majority of the medical men in my county do it at present. It is not the custom for medical men living in large towns or in cities to make them up, but those who have to bring them 20 or 25 miles do. Another reason why they do it is that when they make them themselves, they know what they are using; but when the medicines are imported from a drug store, they are not always of high strength or of high quality. Most medical men in my section of the country at any rate make their own wines and tinctures, such as ipecac and pepsine wine, and they are obliged to keep diluted alcohol, sherry, port, and other wines, and they usually keep brandy. They are kept by medical men who are strictly temperate as well as by those who do not profess the same principles.

Mr. FOSTER. These amendments became necessary chiefly from difficulties that arose in actual experience in the working of the Act. No doctor has stated to-night that any actual difficulty has arisen in this regard, and so I think we had better wait until some practical difficulty arises before we pass this proposed legislation. We have just been obliged to put in certain amendments to meet the case of some doctors who might not have professional honesty enough to be proper in their prescriptions. If to obviate a difficulty that has not arisen we open a door by which these same doctors can dispense liquor *ad libitum*, we create an evil greater than the one we are trying to prevent.

Mr. IRVINE. Although the Act has been four years in operation in my county, I am quite sure, from the experience we have had of some of the physicians there, we should not give them any larger power. Of course it would not do to give any more particulars, because I see the hon. Minister of Customs is there, and he might publish them; but I would advise him to take some advice from persons acquainted with the working of the Act, and I would not give the physicians more liberty or power than they have now.

Mr. BOWELL. It is quite evident that the hon. gentleman has as poor an opinion of the physicians of his county as of the merchants who do the smuggling.

Mr. IRVINE. It is not of the merchants who do the smuggling, but of the gentlemen who are paid large salaries to prevent them doing the smuggling.

Mr. SPROULE. I must say that the arguments of the hon. member for King's, New Brunswick (Mr. Foster) do not appeal to me with great force. He says we are to make only such amendments as are fonnd to be essentially necessary. In my county, where the Act is expected to be in force next year, under this provision the medical men would be unable to carry on their business as they have been in the past.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, nonsense.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. leader of the Opposition may be able to argue a question of law, but he is not possessed of all the knowledge in this House, and we have as good a right to know what we are speaking about in our own professional line as the hon. gentleman has in his; and I say, that if the amendment appeals to our intelligence as an improvement in the working of this Act, we have the same right to make the amendment before the Act comes into force as after it is brought into force and the difficulty is discovered.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken as to the person who used the phrase. I will not say what I think of his remarks, but it was not I who said, "Oh, nonsense." I admit that he has quite as good a right to his opinion, and to express it just as freely and fully as any one; but I have not been able myself to understand how any practical difficulty can arise in this contingency. I cannot understand how a medical man is placed in any position of embarrassment; it may be so, but I do not see it. Then I asked if during the years of our experience of the Act any difficulty has arisen, but I cannot get an answer. I do not say that a difficulty may not arise; but if no one can point out how a difficulty can arise, I am afraid we are making difficulties instead of preventing them, and that there may be more wine and alcohol and less drugs dispensed, than if the amendment was not introduced.

Mr. HICKEY. That is the very reason, I think, why this measure ought to carry. This is to say that the physician can prescribe what he thinks proper, and as unfortunately there are temperance people so fanatical that they would object to a physician prescribing a small quantity of brandy, it is necessary that some amendment of this kind should be passed.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The words of the clause contains no exception for medical men, and in the absence of any exception the clause would apply to medical men. I understand the amendment of my friend to declare that this clause shall not apply to cases of medical men keeping liquor for purely medicinal purposes.

Mr. BLAKE. As the Committee now understand from the hon. member for Dundas, that the purpose of this amendment is to permit the medical fraternity to keep liquor not medicated and prescribed for medical purposes, I have no objection to their prescribing brandy, or port or other liquor, but the liquor should be bought from licensed persons.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand the change is simply to allow medical men to purchase alcohol for the purpose of medicinal preparation.

Mr. BLAKE. There is nothing to prevent that.

Mr. FURGUSON. No hon. gentleman will pretend that any medical man in this country of any standing will keep brandy and wine for the sake of retailing it to his customers.

Mr. HICKEY. There are medical men in the country who live 25 miles away from any place where liquor is

sold. They have no object in retailing liquor, but there should be nothing in this Act to interfere with the advantages physicians require.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). If we give this privilege to the medical men, the Scott Act will not work as many wish it to work. Physicians are no better than other men, and they require to be restricted as well as others. They must have some object in this amendment or they would not press it so strongly.

Mr. SPROULE. It is quite evident that the hon. member never practised medicine and never had to find a remedy at a very out of the way place. I could point out to him in the counties of Grey and Bruce places where, if he were located there as a medical man, he would have to travel eighteen or twenty miles to get what he wants for medicinal purposes. Would it be reasonable to restrict the power of a medical man to prescribe for his patient. It may be all very well in towns, but when you come to the back country where there are no drug stores and where you are several miles away from any liquor store, it would not be reasonable to prevent medical men from keeping such liquor as was necessary to the carrying on of their profession.

Mr. McCRANEY. No doubt the hon. member for Dundas is quite sincere, but I am perfectly satisfied if he had the experience we have had in the county of Halton, he would not move his amendment. No doubt, most of our physicians are honorable men, but I could take him to a place not a thousand miles away where, if that amendment should pass, there would be open shops set up in opposition to every drug store in the town. I feel it to be my duty to oppose that amendment.

Mr. FISHER. I think I have a point which, if fairly considered, will dispose of the right of medical men in this matter. If you will consult the fourth sub-section of section 99, you will find that, where a medical practitioner gives a certificate to obtain liquor as a medicine, he has to have no interest in the sale thereof. That is considered to be the safeguard, that he shall not be interested pecuniarily in the sale. If the proposition of the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey) were carried, that would be of no effect, because then the medical practitioner would be materially interested in the sale of the liquor. He would be giving a certificate to his own patient to buy the liquor from himself, and would make his own profit. I have no idea that the hon. member for Dundas, or any man of his standing in his profession, would do such a thing, but we know that there are a number of practitioners in the country who are influenced by pecuniary considerations, and who have deliberately set to work to make the Scott Act inoperative.

Mr. SPROULE. I look upon the remarks made by the hon. member for Brome as a direct insult to the medical profession. This Act is hedged around enough with restrictions to prevent medical men giving certificates improperly. This does not say they are to expose it for sale or to sell it, but to use it for medicinal purposes. If they use the liquor for any other than medicinal purposes, the temperance people should show it, and then there is a direct violation of the law, and there is nothing to prevent a medical man being called to account any more than any one else. Why there should be a clause to prevent medical men using what they consider essentially necessary for the restoration of health seems to me very extraordinary.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There is another class of professional men in the country of whose interest in this measure I have heard lately in consequence of letters I have received from my own constituency, that is, the veterinary surgeons. There is no provision by which a veterinary surgeon can give a certificate to obtain liquor for use in the practice of his profession. When I got the letter, and I may say it came from two veterinary surgeons in a county in which the Scott Act is not in force, I wrote to Dr. McEachren of Montreal, who is known to be an exceedingly good authority on subjects of that kind. He wrote to the effect that, in the practice of veterinary surgery, very often they had to use beer and spirits with cattle, as an absolute necessity. Under the law, a veterinary surgeon could not give a certificate to obtain that liquor, and therefore he could not get it in that way. If power were given to him to give a certificate, the difficulty would arise as to the cost of the liquor at these ordinary places, where everybody knows that the liquor sold, if it be honestly sold, under the conditions of the Scott Act, is sold at a price much higher than in ordinary trade when sold for beverage purposes, and, as the use of it for cattle can hardly be said to be the use as a beverage, and there is not much risk, if it is confined to that, of its being used as a beverage, I propose to add the following as the fourth section :—

It shall be lawful for duly licensed veterinary surgeons to have in their possession, for use exclusively in the practice of their profession, spirits and beer, not exceeding five gallons of each at any one time, provided that the said veterinary surgeons shall be subject to the penalties prescribed in the Canada Temperance Act of 1878 for selling or otherwise disposing of such spirits or beer, except as a medicine in the practice of their profession.

Mr. JAMIESON. I will certainly not consent to the amendment in the shape in which it is. I think that, if any permission or authority is given to a veterinary surgeon, it should not be in excess of the authority given to a medical man, and certainly that is much more extensive than the authority which medical men have. It has been suggested by some hon. gentleman behind me that, if that passed here, every old horse and cow in the country would be sick. As far as I am concerned as having charge of the Bill, I am decidedly opposed to any wholesale amendment such as that is.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I am quite aware that there is a disposition to put down any amendment moved to this Bill. The hon. gentlemen who have charge of it, and who are acting in the interest of their own views, and who are, as they have admitted themselves, not ordinary members of Parliament, but acting for a committee outside of Parliament, have taken control of the House. I am making no charge, they have admitted it in the House. My hon. friend from Brome (Mr. Fisher) openly stated that, though other Bills were in the hands of private members, this was the Bill of a committee of gentlemen outside of Parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. They are all members of Parliament.

Mr. FISHER. The Legislative committee of the Dominion Alliance are all members of Parliament.

Mr. WHITE. It makes no difference. They are a body of gentlemen not known to Parliament, whether they are members of Parliament or not, and there seems to be a disposition to reject any amendment that does not come from that committee. I would suggest to these hon. gentlemen that they cannot complain, at all events since the first vote on the question of precedence, of any want of fairness in dealing with this measure to-night. I think the House has shown a disposition to assist them in every possible way to get an Act on the Statute Book which will give full effect to the Canada Temperance Act. But here is a case in which there is no provision made. Hon. gentlemen here may laugh at the idea of all the horses and cows getting sick, but the farmers in the country, when they send for the veterinary surgeons, find it a serious matter. If we amended that and gave power to the veterinary surgeons to prescribe and give a certificate, the farmers would find that they would have to pay three or four times the price for what they have to get in larger quantities than are necessary when it is given as ordinary medicine. If I had known that this would have come up to-night, I would have

had Dr. McEachren's letter here. This liquor has to be taken in much larger quantities for cattle than for individuals.

Mr. MILLS. Oh, no.

Mr. WHITE. I admit that the hon. gentleman's capacity may be such that he can contradict me. But I am speaking of medical prescriptions ordinarily given to an individual as compared with the quantity of liquor that is usually stuffed down the throat of an animal. Now, I propose that the veterinary surgeon may have this liquor by him when the animal is brought to him, and if he is found disposing of it otherwise than in the practice of his profession, then he is to be subject to all the penalties of the Act. I think the hon. gentlemen will find there is more feeling in the country on the subject than they have any idea of. The amendment does not in the slightest degree interfere with the Canada Temperance Act in so far as the use of liquor by individuals is concerned.

Mr. FISHER. I think the hon. gentleman attaches more importance to this matter than the public do. I do not think his contention is correct in principle or practice. It is not at all reasonable that a veterinary surgeon should be placed in a superior position to that of the ordinary physician in respect to this matter. The hon. member for Cardwell said that prescriptions for animals would be so much larger that probably the ordinary druggist would not be able to supply them.

Mr. WHITE. No; I said they would charge such a price as would make it a serious matter for farmers.

Mr. FISHER. As a matter of fact I think the druggists who hold these licenses would supply the liquors at the ordinary profits. They are under the same rules as the veterinary surgeons would be, and would have the same competition. In the country parts veterinary surgeons are few and far between.

Mr. WHITE. In Ontario they are rather numerous. In my constituency there are at least four, which is equal to one in each township.

Mr. FISHER. At all events, I do not think there is a veterinary surgeon for every township and incorporated village in the Province of Ontario where, under this Act, a man may be licensed to sell. There would be just as much competition amongst the druggists for the sale of liquor for the use of cattle as there would be among the veterinary surgeons, and I do not think they would charge any higher than the surgeons. For myself, I would be disposed to give veterinary surgeons the right to issue certificates to parties to obtain liquor for sick animals, but I do not think the veterinary surgeons should be allowed to keep the liquor themselves. It would be giving them a greater privilege than we give physicians, and I do not think they hold a higher position in society than the ordinary physicians.

Mr. WHITE. I do not propose to continue the discussion. We have seen enough to know that the hon. gentlemen command the House on this subject. If they will consider that notice has been given, and if they will not take the technical objection which they might take on the third reading of the Bill—because we agree in the general principle—I shall withdraw the amendment with the view of moving it on the third reading, having first agreed with the hon. gentlemen opposite as to the form in which it shall be put.

Mr. BLAKE. There is no such rule as the hon. gentleman supposes, that applies only to private Bills. The hon. gentleman has a right to move his amendment on the third reading.

On section 5,

Mr. HICKEY. I would like to have the producer of cider, in sub-section 5, section 99, put under a different heading than he is here, and I intend to move an amendment to that effect.

On section 6,

Mr. WELDON. I think a vicious principle is involved here, which is making *ex post facto* legislation. It is setting aside the decision of the courts, a practice which is entirely prohibited in the United States. I doubt whether, after this Parliament has given civil rights and privileges to persons, we have any right by legislation to destroy them. Under the 92nd section certain rights are given to parties by Act of Parliament. Parliament may take away those rights, but whether Parliament can give rights to parties and subsequently take them away by retroactive legislation is a matter of considerable doubt. Now there are many matters connected with the Scott Act which come under this category, the Supreme Court of New Brunswick decided that the 145th section entirely repealed certain portions of the Scott Act. Now, all we have got to do is to repeal that section. The 141st section provided that nothing should impair the provisions of the Scott Act, in general terms; but when the 145th section came in, it specifically provided in regard to penalties and prosecutions, and that offences under the Canada Temperance Act should be offences against the Liquor License Act, and should be prosecuted under that Act. The result was that the New Brunswick court held that the 145th section, being an express section, cut down the general provisions of the 141st section. If you eliminate section 145 out of the Liquor License Act you have section 141 of the Scott Act in full force. That was quite right and proper, but the Act went on to declare what was intended by section 141, stating that it did not mean what the words express. First it is *ex-post facto* legislation, and a very serious constitutional question might arise with respect to it; and, second, such legislation embodies a vicious principle, as it interferes with cases before the courts. The object of the mover of the Bill would be carried out by repealing section 145, and reserving the rights of parties now before the courts. I move in amendment:

That section 6 be struck out, and the following inserted in its place: Section 145 of the Liquor License Act, 1883, is hereby repealed, and provided that this Act shall not apply to any prosecution commenced, and now pending.

Mr. JAMIESON. Of course there may be, perhaps, other parties in addition to myself who will have something to say in respect to this amendment; but as the amendment affects the Liquor License Act 1883, in respect to which there is some litigation pending as to the constitutionality of the Act, I may say that the question was considered by the committee, and they thought proper to frame the 6th section in order to avoid any difficulty about repealing any part of the Act. So far as regards the hon. gentleman's contention in respect of *ex post facto* legislation, I agree with him in the main, if there is any question of property involved in it. But it seems to me that the question involved is quite distinct from the question of property, and there is nothing wrong in allowing this section to remain as framed at present. Unless a man has committed a violation of the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act he would not be convicted, and the question is whether it is right for this House to permit a party to escape punishment, when he has been guilty of an offence under the provisions of the law, simply on a legal technicality. I believe it was thoroughly understood at the time the amendment to the Liquor License Act was passed that

none of the provisions of that Act should in any way impair the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act, and if a different construction has been placed upon that Act by the courts, they are not interpreting the Act in accordance with the intention of Parliament.

Mr. WELDON. There are certain measures framed for the protection of the public. Every man should be protected in his full rights; but it is attempted, by this Act, to declare that for offences committed before the passing of it, parties shall be liable to fine and imprisonment. *Ex post facto* legislation is not applied to cases pending before the courts, except in very extreme cases. The most famous case is that connected with the publicacion of the *Hansard* Debates, and the right to pass it was very strongly questioned, not only by the judges, but by the press of England at the time. That was a very peculiar case, in which the publishers of *Hansard* were sued for libel for reports of the proceedings of the House of Commons that were published, and it was discovered that the publishers could not shield themselves under the authority of Parliament. It was in the public interest that *ex post facto* legislation in that case was passed, and it is the only case within my recollection in which pending litigation has been interfered with.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have great respect for the hon. gentleman, the member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson), but I suppose he did not intend that, because his committee met and framed a bill, this House should take that Bill word for word. In this case the motion of the honorable member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) would not destroy the object which the promoter of the Bill has in view, that is to say to punish, according to the law of the day, transgressors of the law. But it would have the result of not giving a retroactive effect to the law. Why should the hon. member for Lanark and his committee try and secure a retroactive effect for the Bill in regard to cases in which the courts of law have decided that certain parties in question have not transgressed the law, and yet under the section as proposed they would be made liable to fine and imprisonment? I do not think the House would agree to that, and I hope my hon. friend will consent to the amendment.

Mr. JAMIESON. The hon. the Minister of Public Works has quite misunderstood my remarks with reference to this question. It was out of consideration to the Government that we framed the clause in this way, as it was thought that the Government possibly would not consent that any part of The Liquor License Act of 1883 would be repealed, pending subsequent litigation in reference to the question.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. But you are repealing it.

Mr. JAMIESON. I think not.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). Certainly you are.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It says:

"Section one hundred and forty-five of 'The Liquor License Act, 1883,' is hereby repealed, and it is hereby declared that the true intent and meaning of the said Act was and is that the provisions of 'The Canada Temperance Act, 1878,' relating to offences, penalties and punishments and the procedure relating thereto, were not and are not affected or impaired by any provisions of 'The Liquor License Act, 1883,' or any Act amending the same."

Therefore, I think, the hon. gentleman in saying that he did this in deference to the Government has mistaken the mark in showing that deference.

Mr. FISHER. I think the object which the Minister of Public Works has explained is the object of the framers of the Bill. As I remember when discussing the question the object in putting in the rest of this clause further than the simple repealing of the section was this: As that section stands to-day it practically repeals all the clause of the Act which relates to the prosecutions and penalties under the Act, and substitutes a clause with regard to penalties under the McCarthy Act. If we repeal that 145th clause I think it is understood that there would be no provision for the prosecution and the enforcement of penalties under the Scott Act, and it was so that there might be resinstated the clause which that 145th section practically repealed that we added these words. If the hon. gentleman's amendment is such that in the minds of the legal gentlemen of the House it will not have the effect of doing away with the clauses of the Scott Act which relate to the prosecution and the penalties under the Scott Act. I think there will be no great objections to according it. Our only object was and is that the mode of procedure in prosecutions under the Scott Act and the obtaining of penalties, should remain as they were originally in the Scott Act and should not be changed as I believe they were under the McCarthy Act.

Mr. IRVINE. I wish to say that the Canada Temperance Act, as passed by the Parliament of 1878, was, perhaps, as perfect a piece of legislation as was ever enacted by any Parliament. It stood the assaults of its enemies in every direction; it stood all attacks on the ground of constitutionality; it stood a fusilade of attacks from the Bench and the Bar of New Brunswick, and the only ground upon which it was ever found fault with, was in the case of some counties, which were not under a License Law, and that was a condition of things which no legislature could foresee. In every other instance it was not assailed successfully, until the lawyers of this legislature undertook, in 1883, by its deliberate act, to destroy that Bill by adopting the McCarthy Act, and the Supreme Court of New Brunswick has decided as we have heard. How has it operated upon us? From that time until now, the liquor vendors, after a short interval, have been selling liquor right along. In the first place the Supreme Court ordered a stay of proceedings in eleven cases. They were kept pending in the court for 15 months, and the Supreme Court refused, or neglected, or purposely delayed giving a decision and in the meantime the liquor vendors were pursuing their righteous or unrighteous calling for months. The temperance people were disappointed by the deliberate action of the lawyers of this House, by the consent of this Government. I have no objection to the amendment carrying, but I think in fairness and in equity that the loss which the country has sustained in that direction should be saddled on the lawyers of the House, or on the Government if they please, and I hope as honest men they will pay it.

Mr. BLAKE. I understood from the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) when the subject was alluded to, that this addition was inserted by him, at the instance of the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), who was afraid that dreadful consequences would befall the Scott Act if something was not done to keep that Act all right, and this was done *ex majore cautione* as we lawyers say.

Mr. FOSTER. Give it to us in English.

Mr. BLAKE. "For greater caution," I tell the Professor—so that no ill consequences might follow, and we see what good consequences have followed it.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the hon. gentleman is quite correct. I do not think the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) stated that I suggested the clause, but he stated it was put in, in order to make sure—a thing which I was anxious to make sure—that the clauses of the Scott Act should not be impaired. I am sorry I was not so able and astute a lawyer as the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), I could then have had a legal appreciation of it, and probably would have been able to judge as to what would have been its bearing. As I did not I had to depend on those who had. That clause

came before the House; the leader of the Opposition was in the House when it was put there, and with his legal acumen and desire to see the Scott Act kept intact it was his business to see that it was not interfered with.

Mr. BLAKE. I made several efforts to keep the hon. gentleman right; and if my efforts had succeeded he would not have had a McCarthy Act, and he would not have had this blemish in the Scott Act at all.

Mr. WELDON. As I stated before, the object is to prevent the Scott Act being interfered with; and I am perfectly willing to put in a proviso that the provisions of that Act shall not be interfered with.

Mr. BLAKE. It is quite certain that the Scott Act answers its purpose; and all we want to do is to make sure that its original provisions are in full force and vigor.

Mr. WELDON. The interpretation Statute provides: That when an Act is repealed by a subsequent Act, and the subsequent Act is repealed, the repeal of the subsequent Act does not revive the former statute. If that were held it might impair the Scott Act, or questions might arise with regard to it, and I propose to change the amendment.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) will see that this amendment is all right.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not profess to be able to see that it is all right at a moment's notice. The hon. gentleman and his friends passed through the McCarthy Act, the provisions of which we are now engaged in discussing, "in the wee sma' hours ayont the twal'." It was something like 4 o'clock in the morning when they forced the McCarthy Act through, and it was impossible to deal with that clause. But I will do my best to keep the hon. gentleman right; I am sorry his guide and mentor is not there; I will do my best to keep him right; but I will not be responsible.

Mr. FOSTER. Another little inaccuracy. This amendment was not made in the "wee sma' hours," but at an afternoon Session.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). While this amendment is being prepared, I should like my hon. friend from North Lanark to give us a statement of the constitution, history, and procedure of the mysterious body called the committee that seems to be answerable for this legislation. I have heard it mysteriously referred to as having been in secret conclave either inside or outside of this House. My hon. friend beside me says they are all members of the House. Then they had the benefit of the higher wisdom, and more experienced knowledge of some distinguished members of the Upper House who were on this committee. There is such an air of mystery surrounding it that I think the time might be profitably occupied by the hon. member for Lanark giving us its history.

Mr. JAMIESON. I have one reply to the hon. member for North Victoria, although I shall not do as he asks me. I see he is a little "riled," and I can understand the reason. He was quite indignant at the breach of privilege attempted here to-night, and at the unconstitutional manner in which we were proceeding; but it occurs to me that if he had looked in his desk he would have found a motion similar to the one I made, by which he was going to place that little Bill of which he was the foster-father instead of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), at the head of the paper, when I happened to catch the eye of the Speaker first; and my hon. friend's little game was up, and of course he had then to turn his speech upside down.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). My hon. friend is entirely mistaken. If I had looked in my desk I would have found no such paper, and it was not my intention to make a motion to put the Bill of the hon. member for North Simcoe at the head of the paper. I did, however, understand from my hon. friend that he proposed to let the Bill of the hon. member for Cornwall be disposed of before the temperance matter was discussed, and I thought it was hardly proper that he should have forced that discussion on, and therefore defeated the Factory Bill. But in order that we may profitably occupy the time, I shall move that the following section be added to the Bill now before the House:—

Sub-section five of section ninety-nine of "The Canada Temperance Act, 1878," is hereby repealed and the following is substituted therefor:

5. Provided also, that any producer of cider in the county or city, or any licensed distiller or brewer having his distillery or brewery within such county or city, may thereat expose and keep for sale such liquor as he may have manufactured at such distillery or brewery as aforesaid, and no other; and may sell the same at such distillery or brewery, but in quantities of not less than ten gallons, or in case of ale or beer, of not less than eight gallons, at any one time, the same to be wholly removed and taken away in quantities of not less than ten gallons, or in the case of ale or beer, not less than eight gallons at a time.

The object of that amendment is to remove the gross injustice which the distilling and brewing interests are subject to in counties in which the Scott Act has been brought into force. Any outside brewer can sell in quantities of 10 gallons and upwards, while those living in the county and buying barley from the farmers of the county, cannot sell a drop. The result is that the smaller brewers have been absolutely ruined in those counties in which the Act has been passed, because, if they cannot sell in their own county, they find it impossible to sell at all. If the advocates of the Scott Act, inside or outside of Parliament, wish it to be enforced and to command the respect of the people, they should endeavor to see that it is placed on a foundation of equity and justice, and fairness to all. The present provision of the Act is most unfair to a large class of the community. It is working ruin to a number of most respectable men who have invested their money in these smaller breweries, and I ask the advocates of the Act to remove that gross injustice under which these men are laboring.

Mr. WELDON. I propose to amend this clause by adding the following:—

Section 145 of the License Act of 1883 is hereby repealed, provided, however, that this Act shall not apply to any transactions heretofore commenced and not pending, and provided that notwithstanding the repeal of the said section, the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878 are hereby revived and declared to be in full force, and as valid and effectual as they were prior to the passing of the License Act of 1883.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). It requires a little time to appreciate the force and effect of that amendment, and I would suggest that my hon. friend should bring it up on the third reading. I do not want to be reproached hereafter, as some have been with having been here when improper legislation was passed and with not having corrected it, though a lawyer.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think this goes much further than the hon. gentleman said in the first instance. If the hon. gentleman stated that after the repeal of this clause, the premises of the Act of 1878 were revived in so far as they related to this clause, I would understand that, but he takes advantage of the amendment to declare that the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878 are hereby revived and declared in full force and are as effective as they were previous to the passing of the Liquor License Act of 1883, so that by this amendment he repeals the provisions of the Act of 1883. I do not say that is his intention, but I must say this goes much further than he explained to the Committee. This is an important amendment and it would be better if the hon. gentleman would keep it for the third reading, and put it on the Notice paper so that we may see the effect of it on the Act of 1883.

Mr. WELDON. My feeling would be to continue the amendment as I first proposed, because I am satisfied that the 141st section keeps the Scott Act in force, but I do not wish to do anything to interfere with the Canada Temperance Act of 1878.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman stated to the Committee that this clause was a repeal pure and simple, and had no retroactive effect, but it goes much further and I would ask the hon. gentleman to give notice of it.

Mr. WELDON. I will adopt the suggestion of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). This clause should not be accepted in full. We ought not to legislate as to the practical intent and meaning of the Act contrary to what the courts have said is the true intent and meaning, and as the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) is going to propose an amendment, I submit that the words after the word "repeal" be struck out.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The clause might be adopted by leaving out all after the word "repealed."

Mr. FISHER. If that is done on the understanding that the amendment will be moved, I have no objection to it.

Section agreed to as amended by striking out all after the word "repealed."

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I renew the motion I made that sub-section 5 of section 77 be repealed. The clause I read is the first clause of the Bill introduced by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and my object is to formulate the principle that these distillers and brewers, more particularly the brewers in counties where the Scott Act is in force, should not be placed at the disadvantage under which they now labor. I see that my hon. friend (Mr. Fisher) is shaking his head. I suppose he is the mouthpiece of the wisdom of this secret tribunal, which dictates to this House what shall and shall not be passed, and I presume decided against this unfortunate clause. But in the name of what is fair and right, in the name of legislation which is worthy of this House, I ask this Committee to seriously consider this question, and not refuse to do justice to a large class of the community. I know of two cases—one that of a gentleman who invested $55,000, and another that of a gentleman who invested over $65,000 in breweries near Barrie and Port Hope, both of which passed the Scott Act. The breweries did a local business, and every dollar invested will be lost and destroyed by the passage of the Act. Yet there is no compensation to them, while brewers in the adjoining county, where the Scott Act is not in force, can come in and sell liquor in these counties in which the Scott Act is in force. What sense, what right is there in allowing a brewer in the town of Belleville or Whitby, in which the Scott Act is not in force, to sell his beer to be used in Northumberland and Durham, the adjoining two counties, where the Act is in force, and in which the brewers there cannot sell their liquor. You take away the trade and business and property of the brewers in the counties in which the Scott Act is in force, and give it to the brewers in other counties, in which the Act is not in force.

Mr. JAMIESON. The hon. gentleman might as well at the outset ask us to repeal the whole Canada Temperance Act as to consent to this amendment. It is not necessary to go into an elaborate argument again to-night. I would say although it is an apparent anomaly in the law.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). It is a real anomaly.

Mr. JAMIESON. It is not a real anomaly. The framers of the Canada Temperance Act knew what they were doing. It is a proposition laid down by prohibition and temperance men that drunkenness prevails in proportion to the facilities for getting the drink. If men have to go outside for liquor, they will not likely get it so often as if they got it at home, and to open the door that the hon. gentleman asks would entirely destroy the efficiency of the law.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. BOURBEAU. I think this is the time for me to move the following amendment:—

That in addition to the persons mentioned in sub-section 4 of section 99 of the above recited act, the following persons may grant certificates for medical purposes:—The priest or minister ministering to or in charge of the city, town, village or parish in which the person to whom the certificate is to be granted resides.

As I said awhile ago, in many parishes, especially in the county of Arthabaska and Drummond, where the Temperance Act has been adopted, there is no medical man, and it would only be doing justice if this amendment should be adopted. We know the clergymen are surely the persons that will see that the certificate is given only to those who require the liquors for medical purposes. I think they will take care that no certificates are granted for the bad use of liquors. They have charge of their community, they preach against intemperance, and I think there is no fear that they would grant certificates to persons who would make a bad use of them; so I do not expect that there will be much opposition to this proposition, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). I think this proposition contains in itself a good reason why it should not be adopted. It imposes new functions on the clergyman. It authorises him to grant a medical certificate, which he is incompetent to do in his capacity as a clergyman, and it should not be adopted. I can understand that, in some isolated districts where there are no villages and few doctors, priests and clergymen might be useful in that capacity, but to make it general, to apply it to the more thickly settled districts of the older Provinces would practically vitiate the whole Act.

Mr. BOURBEAU. I would have no objection that it should apply to parishes where there are no doctors.

Mr. McNEILL. I think it would be very advisable to have some amendment such as that proposed in country places where there are no medical men. In my own riding, I can think of a very thriving village which is removed some 22 miles from any place where there is a medical man, and people in that neighborhood are entirely without the means of getting certificates. I think this is only reasonable and right.

Mr. BLAKE. Would not my hon. friend consider that the reason why the village is thriving is that it is 22 miles from a doctor?

Mr. McNEILL. I will not pronounce an opinion upon that. I must leave the hon. gentleman to form his own opinion.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is one reason why I especially object to this clause. It is contended even by many medical men that alcohol in its various forms is a poison, and I think that placing the power and the right of prescribing in the hands of an unskilled person as to the nature and character of the disease and the remedy, is an unsafe proceeding.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). I would favor this amendment if the wording of it covers the idea that has been expressed. Perhaps there may be something in the objection of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. That clergymen as a rule may not have the medical skill and knowledge necessary to be able to prescribe at all times what may be exactly required, but the House might rely upon this, that they would never prescribe unless they *bonâ fide* believed it was necessary. They might also rely upon this,

that a clergyman would be the last person to whom an individual would apply unless he really required the certificate, because he would know that he would get a refusal. The hon. gentleman has said they might not know the exact quantity to prescribe. I have known a case where a medical man prescribed, and I had my doubts as to the quantity. A gentleman in good health came from a county where the Scott Act was not in force, into one where it was in force, he came there to practise his profession, in fact, he came before the courts. When he was in the city, he remembered that the Scott Act was in force, and that he had forgotten to bring something with him. He met a doctor and told him he had forgotten to bring what he was in the habit of taking, and asked him to give him a certificate, and he called a boy to take it to the place where it was dispensed. "I think I can prescribe for you," said the doctor, "let me see your tongue, all right, go to your lodgings and I will send you what is required." In a short time, the boy came to his lodgings with a gallon jug, and, to the man's utter astonishment he had to pay for it, and he said he did not think he was so bad as that. That shows, I think, that medical men also may prescribe a little more than is necessary.

Mr. FERGUSON. I see through the difficulty, he had a bad tongue—he was a lawyer.

Mr. LANDRY. The tongue was no better the next morning. I think it was a little worse.

Mr. HICKEY. I think this would be a very strange amendment to insert in this Bill, which says that medical men who have studied their profession shall not prescribe unless for medicinal purposes. I think it would be very strange to allow any person else, no matter how good he might be, to give prescriptions. No doubt there are many good persons besides clergymen who might prescribe.

An hon. MEMBER. Lawyers.

Mr. HICKEY. Yes, even lawyers. But, if it is limited at all, it should be confined as narrowly as possible; and, if the gate is to be opened at all, why not give the power to every good and sincere person in the community?

Amendment negatived.

On section 7,

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I wish to move an amendment to this clause by which persons in British Columbia may avail themselves of the Canada Temperance Act whenever they may desire; I have been asked to move this amendment to allow them to do so, so that no legal technicality may stand in the way. As we have decided that the Canada Temperance Act discussion shall have priority over all other legislation this evening, and inasmuch as my Bill claims priority of attention on the notice paper to that of the hon. member for Lanark, I think my amendment cannot be objected to. I voted against the amendment of the hon. member for Lanark, it is true, but I did so, not because I was averse to temperance legislation, but because I was opposed to giving it precedence over all the other Bills on the paper. I move this amendment:

Wherever in the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, and the Acts amending the same, the word "county" is used, such word shall, when applied to the Province of British Columbia, be regarded as meaning an electoral district therein, in accordance with the divisions of the said Province for elections, members of the House of Commons of Canada; and for the purposes of the said Canada Temperance Act, 1878, and amending Acts, each electoral district within the said Province of British Columbia shall include every town, township, parish and other division or municipality, except a city, within the territorial limits of such electoral district, and also within a union of electoral districts where united for municipal purposes; Provided always, that whenever the said Province shall have been divided into counties, and a regular municipal organization established in each of such counties, the said Act, as amended, shall apply to the said counties; And, the notice provided for in section six of the said Act shall, so far as it relates to British Columbia, be deposited in the registry offices in the respective electoral districts, or in the sheriffs' offices in such districts.

It does not affect in any particular the Canada Temperance Act; it simply opens the door to British Columbia to adopt that Act.

Mr. FOSTER. If I remember rightly that is similar legislation to that granted by this Parliament to Manitoba.

Mr. BAKER. Nearly word for word.

Mr. HICKEY. I beg leave to move:

That section 5 of section 99 of the Act first above cited is hereby amended by striking out the words "introducing cider into the county or"

If the Act covers it, I am satisfied, but as it seems to me doubtful, I would like to have the matter settled. I think it is too bad that a person manufacturing cider cannot sell to a neighbor.

Mr. COLBY. The object of the hon. gentleman's amendment is to remove the supposed penalty clause for the sale of unfermented cider. If I rightly understand the Act there is no penalty for the sale of unfermented cider. The Act simply prohibits the sale under penalties, of intoxicating liquors. It is a question of fact for the court to decide, in a given case, whether the liquor sold is intoxicating or not. If it is proved to be unfermented liquor, if the alcoholic fermentation has not commenced, then I think there is no penalty whatever under the Act; and if that be the object of the hon. gentleman's amendment, I think it is wholly unnecessary.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). In the county of Stanstead, when this matter was discussed, I think my hon. friend stood alone among legal men as to the interpretation of this clause. There were documents circulated in that county by legal gentlemen of his own and adjoining counties, declaring a different interpretation of the Act. As I understand it, it is simply to remove all doubts on the subject. I have no doubt whatever that my hon. friend's legal opinion upon that question carried the Act in Stanstead county.

Mr. FISHER. There is this objection to the proposition, that if this change is made in that section, fermented cider could be sold in counties under the Scott Act. The object is to prevent cider of an intoxicating quality from being sold in those counties. I think the opinion of the hon. member for Stanstead is probably a correct one, as it is at least in accordance with common sense. If so, the object of the hon. member for Dundas is obtained under the Act as it stands, while if the proposed changes were made, I think there would be serious danger of intoxicating liquors being sold under the name and in the shape of cider.

Amendment negatived.

On section 8,

Mr. WELDON. I would call attention to the general form by which any person can lay an information. At present, under the Act, information can be laid by the collector of Inland Revenue or by any person. I have no objection to the information being laid in a general form when it is laid by the collector, but it is giving too much power to any other person to lay information in a general form. I think any other person than a collector should be required to lay information under oath. As it stands any person could make information and put a party to a great deal of expense, and he could not be indicted for doing so.

Mr. JAMIESON. I cannot see the necessity for the change suggested. It is admitted as a general principle of law that, when a man is to be deprived of his liberty, information must be laid on oath; but in cases under the License Act or the Canada Temperance Act the first process is to

ssue a summons. The same reason as has been urged might be applied to other kinds of litigation.

Mr. WELDON. The Act very properly provides that information may be laid by a collector of Inland Revenue, but where it is laid by any other person the protection should be given of a statement made on oath.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As it is very late I would suggest that the hon. gentleman give notice of his amendment for the third reading of the Bill. There is a good deal of force in the remarks he has made, and it is hardly fair that a respectable person, perhaps a leading man in the place, should be taken before a magistrate on a warrant because some one says he has been selling liquor against the law. This statement should be made under oath, so that if it is not true the party may be prosecuted for his acts. I think it is a protection that should be given to the citizens, because the individual may be a mere informer without possessing any reason for filing the information against the person in question. A man does not like to be dragged in that way before a magistrate, and be told that it is an error and you can go home. There is a good deal of force, I repeat, in the remarks made by the hon. member for St. John, but I think he had better give notice of his amendment and bring it up on the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. JAMIESON. This form is taken from the McCarthy Act.

Section agreed to.

Committee rose and reported.

Mr. JAMIESON. I desire to enquire whether the Government will not afford facilities for the third reading of the Bill ere long.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I suppose the third reading can take place on Monday.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return giving the names of all persons to whom round net fishing licenses were granted during 1884 to fish in that portion of Lake Erie under the supervision of William Prosser, Fishery Warden; also a statement in detail of the amount received for each of such licenses with the name of the person from whom received and the total amount received during the said time.—(*Mr. Lister.*)

Copies of all correspondence and contracts entered into relative to the purchases of Tug-barges, Dredge and machinery used on Red River, a detailed statement of the cost of the same, the time when the work of dredging was commenced and discontinued, the quantity of dredging completed, and the depth of water drawn by the Government Tug *Sir Hector.*—(*Mr. Watson.*)

Return showing the date of completion of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Winnipeg to Brandon, from Brandon to Moose Jaw, from Moose Jaw to Calgary, the dates on which each section was opened for traffic, the dates on which such section was inspected by the Government engineer, with all Orders in Council, papers and correspondence affecting the tariff rates for passengers and freight upon such line, not already brought down.—(Mr. Watson.)

Statement of all sums entered in the public accounts of Canada as having been expended for railways, canals and navigation in British Columbia, the North-West Territories, Keewatin, Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia proper, and Cape Breton Island up to the 1st January, 1885; also, the superficies and population of each of the said divisions of Canada respectively.—(Mr. Vanasse.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 2:25 a.m., Thursday.

Mr. JAMIESON.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 9th April, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I rise to state that there is no information received by the Government at all confirmatory of the sensational reports about the advance of the Indians north of the international boundary. I have a message from a reliable source at Calgary, a gentleman who has a great deal of information, and he does not believe in these reports, and thinks they are got up by interested parties.

ENQUIRY FOR A RETURN.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to ask whether the Government, as they stated yesterday that they had the subject of the return from the Grand Trunk Company under consideration, are in a position to state now whether they have arrived at any conclusion, and what that conclusion is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We had other matters before us to-day, and I think my hon. friend must allow that to stand over till Monday, as Saturday is a *dies non* in the House, to give us an opportunity of taking the matter into consideration.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 113) respecting proofs of entries and books of accounts kept by officers of the Crown—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. Chapleau.)

FURNISHING OF MAIL BAGS.

Mr. JACKSON asked, Are the mail bags used for carrying mails furnished by contract or otherwise? If by contract, when will the present contract expire, and what is the contractor's name, and where his residence or post office address?

Mr. CARLING. The mail bags were let by contract, based upon the lowest tender, to S. & H. Borbridge, Ottawa, terminable at the will of the Postmaster-General.

PATENTS ISSUED AT PRINCE ALBERT.

Mr. BLAKE asked, What is the number of patents issued to settlers in Prince Albert, North-West Territory, and the neighborhood, in each of the years 1882, 1883 and 1884?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. During 1882, 10 patents were issued, covering land in Prince Albert and district; in 1883, 75; in 1884, 161.

MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the present Minister of the Interior was absent from Canada in the year 1883, or in the year 1884, and if so, for what period of time? And what Minister discharged the duties of Minister of the Interior during such absence?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The present Minister of the Interior was not absent from Canada after he became Minister in 1883. In the year 1884 he was absent from the 24th May to the 16th August, and during his absence the Prime Minister discharged the duties of Minister of the Interior.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has not answered all my question. I asked whether the present Minister of the Interior was absent during the year 1883. I did not say after he became Minister of the Interior, because it is well known that the hon. gentleman was discharging the duties of Minister of the Interior before he became Minister; and my question generally was, whether he was absent in 1883, and for how long?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know, I have not got the answer. I have given the answer that was furnished to me, and I will get further information if the hon. gentleman requires.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—LAND REJECTED IN RAILWAY BELT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. leader of the Opposition, yesterday, asked a question which I can answer to-day. It was:

"Has the Canadian Pacific Railway Company rejected any lands outside the railway belt? If so, how many acres in southern Manitoba, and how many elsewhere?"

My answer is: The area of land rejected outside the railway belt in southern Manitoba is 40,960 acres; elsewhere, 110,080; altogether, 151,040.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that for the remainder of the Session Government measures should take precedence, after Routine, of all other business on Wednesday.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, if Government decides to present this motion, there is no use in resisting it; but it seems to me that, having regard to the quantity of business in the hands of private members, and the character of some of it, it is unfortunate the hon. gentleman should propose that Government business, which has been so much delayed up to this time, should take possession of all the days, practically, for the consideration of Bills. When Thursday was taken some time ago the hon. gentleman promised that there would be a fair opportunity for the disposition of public Bills in the hands of private members, but the assumption of Wednesday as well does not lead one to the conclusion that that opportunity will occur this Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says Government business was delayed. It has not been delayed this Session longer than usual for many previous Sessions. But while the Government business is delayed, independent members who are not members of the Government, have been pressing their measures. I think, if you look back, you will find that public measures have been disposed of very fairly from time to time, at the instance of members themselves. However, Government will give every opportunity, as we have given on previous occasions after taking possession of most of the working days of the week, to members to press their measures.

Mr. MITCHELL. I agree with the leader of the Opposition for once in my life. I have always opposed the Government taking almost the entire time of the Session at the latter part of it. I think they should not have taken Wednesday so soon, because there may be important questions that private members may have to bring up. I have one myself that I propose to bring up, if the action of the Government is not satisfactory. I am pleased to hear the Premier say that he will give an opportunity to private members to bring up important matters; and, of course, I have to be satisfied with that pledge. The Government is so strong that I shall have to be satisfied in any case. But I would like to see one additional day kept for the use of private members.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Does my hon. friend speak for his whole party?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes. I will say that my party is unlike any other party in the House—they do not differ among themselves.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). On this matter my allegiance is somewhat divided, because I agree with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). I have a qualified, divided allegiance. Of course my primary allegiance is to the leader of the Government, but I have a secondary allegiance to the leader of the Independent party; and in this matter I must say that I sympathise with the remarks of my leader in front of me (Mr. Mitchell). Of course it is usual at this period of the Session that Wednesdays are taken from private members, but this Session I think it is very desirable that further time should be allowed for the disposal of public Bills and Orders. The character of the business of that class is such that I think insufficient time is given to the discussion of it in this House. A great many of the most important questions affecting the good government of the country are brought before the House under that class of business. I grant that there is some foundation for the statement that members in charge of Bills of that kind do not press them with sufficient energy during the earlier period of the Session. But that is unavoidable from the character of the business. Business of that kind requires that public opinion should be passed upon it; members require an opportunity of consulting their constituents, as well as other parties, on these measures; and it is quite impossible for a member who has charge of a Bill of that kind, satisfactorily to himself or his fellow members, to bring it up at an earlier period of the Session. For these reasons I think that on the whole the public advantage would be better secured if the Government were able, consistently with the proper despatch of the business of Parliament, to leave to the private members Wednesdays untouched, for the disposal of public Bills and Orders to the end of the Session.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It is not the fault of private members that this kind of business does not make greater progress. A good deal of the fault lies on the shoulders of hon. gentlemen opposite and the officials. For instance, on the 5th February last I introduced a very important Bill, in the passage of which I was sure to have the sympathy of many members on the other side of the House, and it was only printed in French the day before the Easter recess—nearly two months after. Now, it is utterly impossible for me to reach that Bill, and move its second reading this Session. And so with one or two other very important Bills; they have been delayed so long in the printers' hands that it is utterly impossible to dispose of them during this Session of Parliament. If the hon. gentlemen take the following Wednesdays we shall have no time at all to dispose of public Bills. The fault does not lie with private members but with the Government.

Mr. IVES. The hon. gentleman might have had his Bill disposed of last night.

Mr. MILLS. If the observations of the First Minister are fair to the House, he ought to propose a change in the rules of the House. We ought to know that every day of the week for the first five or six weeks belongs to private members, and every day of the week for the remainder of the Session belongs to the Government. That, however, is not in accordance with the rules of the House for the conduct of public business. There are certain days that belong to the Government. It is no part of the duty of private members to find work for the House during those days; that is the duty of the Administration which has called us together. It is not for private members to determine when the House shall meet. They have no opportunity of deter

mining the particular time; the Government decides that matter. The Government calls us together at its own convenience, and it announces to us a certain legislative policy for the Session. We suppose when it puts certain words in the mouth of His Excellency, indicating what measures the Government intend to propose, they have deliberated on those measures and are prepared to submit them to the House for its consideration. We have been here several weeks. On those days allotted to the Government for the discharge of their business, the Government brought nothing before us. And now, when the Session is drawing near the close, when private members have voted for certain papers, the submission of which alone will enable the members to proceed with the business in their hands, then the Government propose to take possession of the whole time, so that the business which private members are competent to discharge, when the material is placed in their possession, cannot be discharged, because they are not given an opportunity of doing so. That is the course the Government has taken. The First Minister announced very early in the Session that the Government intended to exhibit certain propositions for the consideration of the House, which up to this moment have not been laid before it; and members have had no opportunity of consulting their constituents upon those questions, and the views of the public, which would enable the House to discharge its duties more efficiently, cannot be obtained in consequence of the course that has been pursued.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman has not looked at the rules of Parliament lately. Formerly, it is true, Tuesdays and Fridays were reserved for Government measures, and if there were not sufficient Government measures on the paper to occupy the time, the House adjourned. But when the hon. gentleman's leader (Mr. Blake) was in the Government he had the rules revised, and admirably revised, if I may use the expression, and it is provided that after the Government business on Government days has been transacted, or if there is no Government business on the paper, then Notices of Motion and public Bills and Orders are taken up as on other days. That fact is known to every hon. member, and the paper will show whether there was much or little business. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) complained of the delay in printing Bills. The Government have no control over the printing; that is under the control of the House. I really think the delay in the printing of the Bills has got to be a crying nuisance. Perhaps it may be said there has been delay in the translating office. I believe there is a very efficient staff of translators, and that the work is done thoroughly and well. But the hon. gentleman knows that occasionally some hon. members who have charge of Bills are absent on business, in some cases on public business, and in other cases on private business, and naturally their Bills are postponed till their return. Sometimes they make an arrangement with the good-natured leader of the House to allow their Bills to be postponed.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was in error when he said we should understand that the first five or six weeks of the Session are to be taken up with private Bills and after that the Government takes the whole of the rest of the time; that this is the tenth week of the Session, and if that is the principle to be followed it is better we should understand it. I think this principle has obtained ever since I entered the House seven years ago. The fault does not lie in the Government taking the days too early, but with members having private Bills in charge. It is unfair to the large majority of members who remain here to attend to their legislative duties to find that other members in charge of Bills are absent from the House and their Bills are allowed to stand from day to day until the Session is nearly drawing to a close, when they grumble that they are unable to get their Bills through. If they deem it more important to attend to professional duties elsewhere than to their legislative duties here, and in consequence they find themselves unable to get their Bills through the House, they have no reason to complain. In the interest of those members who remain constantly in attendance on their legislative duties, and who wish to see the Session carried through, I hold that the business should be taken up at the proper time.

Motion agreed to, on a division.

ENQUIRIES RESPECTING RETURNS.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called I desire to call once more the attention of the House to the fact that numerous papers moved for and promised have not been brought down. It is useless giving a list of them. I have called the First Minister's attention not less than twelve or fifteen times to the papers connected with the railway aid grants, and with that *aplomb* and pleasant manner which he meets, and sometimes evades, enquiries, he promised they would come down immediately; but immediately has not yet arrived, although he has had for a long time a proposition with respect to this matter on the paper. Our experience is that frequently papers come down incomplete and we have to call for further papers. I have two or three times called attention to an Order made on March 7th, 1883, with respect to the claims of settlers in Prince Albert and neighboring territory, to which no response has as yet been vouchsafed. The hon. gentleman promised a considerable time ago to bring down papers in connection with the claims of settlers in that territory. There are more recent papers than those covered by the Order of March, 1883, and the hon. gentleman promised on the occasion of the serious character of the North-West troubles becoming known that they would be brought down. We certainly had reason to expect them earlier than this day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I must acknowledge that there are a great many returns which have not yet been brought down. One great difficulty is this: Officers of the Government have no right to, and do not, exercise their own discretion as to the comparative importance of the returns asked for, and they go to work and prepare those returns in the order of their receipt. There is only a certain staff—which is considerably increased during the Session—but they take up the Orders according to their dates—according to the date on the paper, and as I understand it is only when special attention is called to a particular return that that order is departed from. Several times, as the hon. gentleman truly says, particular returns have been asked for, and whenever I am so asked I immediately write a note to the Department in which that matter rests to expedite the return. During the Easter recess I got from the Clerk of the House a statement of every return asked for up to that time, and the time when the return was ordered. I also got from the Secretary of State a statement of the different Departments which have been called upon to furnish returns, and it often happens that several Departments have to be called upon to furnish information covered by one motion. I have gone over them myself during the last few days, and I have again called the attention of the different Departments to these returns.

DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. CARON. Before the Orders of the Day are called I claim the indulgence of the House for a few moments with reference to a matter personal to myself. Mr. Speaker, I have had the honor of occupying a seat in this House since

1873, and during the whole of that period I am safe in saying I have never taken up the time of the House with any matter personal to myself. I should still have adhered to that rule, which I have laid down for myself as a public man if I had not to bring under your notice an article which has been published in a newspaper called the *Electeur*, published in the city of Quebec, where I was brought up and where I have lived for so many years—an article in which personal allusions are made to myself and attacks of the grossest possible nature made against me. I would not have noticed the article—I should have followed, as I stated, the rule I have observed up to the present time—but the *Electeur*, scurrilous as that sheet may be, is the reputed organ of the Liberal party in the city of Quebec, and as such I consider it my duty to make a few remarks in reference to the charges which have been levelled against me. The article is headed "The Minister of Militia at the Bar of Public Opinion." It begins by making the grossest possible attacks against me personally. It reflects upon the incapacity displayed by the Minister of Militia in the management of the Department during the trying time through which we are now passing. These remarks I do not intend to notice, as I am perfectly willing to leave to a fair and impartial public opinion; to leave to Parliament and the country, the manner in which, during these eventful days, the business of the Department has been administered, through the skilful officers under my control. But, Sir, the articles goes on to state that I inspired an article which has already come before this House at a previous period, the article, reference to which has been made by my hon. friend the member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry), who is now absent from his seat, and also my hon. friend the member for Montreal East (Mr. Coursol). It was an article which appeared, Mr. Speaker, in another newspaper published in the city of Quebec, called the *Nouvelliste*. I am charged in this article of *L'Electeur* as having inspired that article, which, as has already been stated to the House by my two hon. friends to whom I have referred, remarked that the volunteer force of Canada should not have gone out to take part in the troubles which are now agitating an important portion of this Dominion. That article also made some injudicious and reprehensible remarks against two hon. members of this House, Col. Ouimet—because I speak of him now as the commandant of the battalion which was one of the first to go to the front, one of the first to be ready to take the part which it was entitled to take, and which it knew it should take in repressing any disorder which existed within the territory of Canada; and also to my hon. friend Lieut.-Col. Amyot, who was one of the first to come into my office, after returning from Quebec, where he had been conducting his business as a professional man, and to tell me: If you require the 9th we are ready, and we will be ready within 48 hours to go to the front, and I can take this occasion to say that what Col. Amyot stated he carried out. He was very quick and expeditious in preparing his battalion, and I am glad to say that I have heard to-day the best possible news of him and his men. I wish to take this opportunity of stating that I knew nothing whatever about the article which was published in the *Nouvelliste*, that I heard of it merely when it came up here and was read by my hon. friend, who took the first possible opportunity of disavowing it, because he had been supposed to have such a connection with the paper, that he—the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry)—might have been supposed, if he had not taken the first opportunity of disavowing it, to have written that article. I can say that I disapproved of it, and every friend to whom I have had an opportunity of mentioning the matter must be prepared to state what expressions I used in qualifying that article. However, the article to which I refer, after making this allusion to my having inspired that article in the *Nouvelliste*, goes on to make charges so serious in their character that it is impossible for me, considering my own personal honor, considering my position as a public man—and I believe the reputation of every public man must be of importance to the country—it is impossible for me to allow any such charges to pass without expressing my complete denial of the charges which have been made against me. Sir, the charge is made against me that when the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada sold to the Government of Canada that portion of its line between Rivière du Loup and Point Lévis, that, at that time, acting professionally as the legal adviser of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, I received a very large consideration from the company to use my influence on behalf of that company to secure the purchase of that line by the Government of Canada. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state most emphatically that never from the Grank Trunk Railway Company or from any other company have I received a single farthing, except that when acting professionally I received what every professional man is entitled by law to charge for his services. At no time have I ever received any other consideration than I was fairly entitled to charge as a member of a large legal firm in Quebec, for the services which that firm was rendering But, Sir, the article goes on to say that not satisfied with receiving that large amount of money from the Grand Trunk Railway Company, I kept for myself a sum of $10,000 which had been destined by the Grand Trunk Railway Compay for another member of Parliament who had also undertaken to use his influence on behalf of that company. Well, Sir, the charge is really so ridiculous and absurd that I would not have noticed it had it not been published in the Liberal organ of the city of Quebec. The article goes on to state that since I have occupied the position of Minister of Militia and Defence, the contractors who were furnishing provisions to the batteries stationed at the Citadel in Quebec, also furnished for my own private use and for the use of my family, beef and other provisions intended for the batteries, without charging me for such. Mr. Speaker, I can state to you that I have never to my personal knowledge in any way had one single transaction with any person who has been a contractor under the Department of Militia and Defence for providing beef or any other article to the batteries or any other corps. I may say that ever since I have been Minister of Militia and Defence I have been living in Ottawa, and it would be very hard to suppose that the most accommodating contractor would consent to send those provisions up to me here, over and above giving them to me without any charge. But I am also charged with having rented a store in Quebec belonging to the Department of Militia and Defence, to the Electric Light Company, in which I hold stock. In that case, as in very many others, we had an unoccupied store in Quebec, which was not a residence or a place in which a person could live. There were no windows in it; it consisted merely of four stone walls; and several gentlemen in Quebec called upon me to ask me to allow the Electric Light Company to occupy that building for a certain time at a nominal price, as the company were merely making an experiment as to how the light would work in Quebec. In the usual way of business and through the ordinary channel of the Department I consented to let the Electric Light Company have the use of that store at a nominal rental, I believe, $10 or $20 a year, resumable at notice given by the Department. The matter was transacted through a regular lease which passed through the Department like every other lease connected with military property in Quebec. Now, knowing my responsibility in the position I occupy here, I beg most emphatically to state that these charges are absolutely and teetotally untrue and false, and that they are a most infamous slander and a gross lie against my character. I know these words are very strong, but I wish to apply all the strength of their

meaning to the article which has just been published. I am perfectly willing to stand by the statement which I have just made to the House, and which I know will go to the country; and if any gentleman in this House chooses to take the responsibility of these charges, I am perfectly willing to stand any investigation that may be ordered by the House to establish their truth or untruth. I beg to apologise to the House for having detained it so long.

DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST—TRANSMISSION OF SUPPLIES.

Mr. MULOCK. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would take the liberty of calling the attention of the Minister of Militia to a matter to which he will perhaps give some attention. I have just returned from the West, and I have learned that a great many of the friends of the volunteers who have gone to the North-West are extremely anxious to forward to them articles that would add to their health and comfort. But a practical difficulty is in the way; they do not know how to send the articles. The volunteers are of course on the wing, and there is no one to whom ordinary people can send any articles; and I have been asked on behalf of the Mayor of Toronto to see if the Government would make arrangements to appoint some person at the most convenient point in the North-West to receive articles and have them sent to the proper persons. I am satisfied that such an arrangement would promote the liberality of our people, and add to the comfort and health of our soldiers.

Mr. CARON. This matter has already been brought under the consideration of the Department. We have had several most liberal offers from well disposed people to send up articles to add to the comfort of the militia force during the campaign; and we are just preparing a scheme which I think will save a great deal of bother to those who wish to send those articles to our volunteer force, and which will make them absolutely sure of being conveyed to them, and their receiving them.

Mr. MULOCK. I would suggest that when the scheme is perfected the utmost publicity should be given to it.

Mr. CARON. Yes, it will.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Civil Government.

Department of the Interior..... $110,705 00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is an increase in the Department of the Interior of $3,621. The deputy head has the same salary as last year and the secretary of the Department has a statutory increase of $50. As regards item 3, Mr. Lindsay Russell, surveyor general, with the salary of $3,200, was superannuated at the close of the fiscal year 1873-74. He was appointed as deputy head at a salary of $3,200, but it was thought better, and on account of his extensive knowledge of the North-West, to return him to the office of surveyor general, and he retained the salary of deputy head. He has been replaced by Mr. Edouard Deville, as surveyor general, with the rank of chief clerk, and whose salary at present is $2,250; that is to say, $100 more than previous to his promotion. Mr. Deville will rise to the maximum salary of a chief clerk but not to the maximum of a deputy head.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it necessary that he should retain the title of surveyor general?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; because he is the head of the body of surveyors.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In that case the hon. gentleman will find that the rank will involve increased expense to meet the dignity of the office.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, because Mr. Russell did not draw the salary of surveyor general, but of deputy head, the office to which he has been appointed. With reference to the third item, Mr. Goodeve, who has been acting as chief clerk of the patenting branch since the superannuation of Mr. Andrew Russell on the 1st of January, 1883, was confirmed in that position on the 1st of January last, his salary being the minimum of a chief clerk, $1,800. The estimates of 1885-86 provide for the statutory increase of salary for the half year from January to July. Mr Goodeve has been in the service of the Department since it was created in 1873, and for three years previously was in the Department of Secretary of State for the Provinces. He is an excellent and experienced officer, and successfully passed the promotion examination prescribed by the Civil Service Act. As regards item 5, on the reorganisation of the Department of the Interior in July, 1883, Mr. William Mills, then Accountant of the Department, was placed in charge of the ordnance and admiralty lands, with which branch of the service he had been long connected, and Mr. J. A. Pinard, his assistant, was made accountant of the Department. Mr. Pinard has proved himself a very skilful accountant, has devised a scheme of keeping the books and the accounts which has been eminently satisfactory to the Minister of the Interior, and in view of the importance of his branch of the work and of the efficiency with which it is conducted, it has been decided, if he qualifies by passing the examination required by the law, to promote him to a chief clerkship. It may be added that the accountants of all the other Departments of the public service having large monetary transactions occupy a similar grade. With reference to item 6, Mr. C. H. Beddoe, the assistant accountant, will at the same time be promoted to a first-class clerkship *vice* Pinard. As regards, item 7, during the past season Mr. P. B. Douglas has been promoted to a first-class clerkship in the Department with the title of assistant secretary; and Mr. Henry Kinloch has also been made a first-class clerk. These gentlemen both attained the maximum of the second grade some years ago; and, both on account of their efficiency, and the importance of the duties with which they are charged, the Minister of the Interior thought it expedient to promote them. These promotions were provided for in the estimates of last year. Item 8. During the past year there were several promotions from the third to the second class, all in the usual course and after the clerks promoted had passed the examination provided for in the Civil Service Act. The names of the gentlemen promoted are Mr. F. S. Checkley, who is in charge of the school lands, Mr. N. O. Coté, who is the assistant of the registrar of correspondence, and Mr. A. L. Jarvis, who is acting for the present as private secretary to the Postmaster General. Mr. T. G. Rothwell, a barrister, who has been employed temporarily in connection with the granting of titles by homestead, preemption or purchase, and who has been paid for this work at the rate of $1,100 a year, has been put upon the permanent staff at the salary he was then receiving. It is not improbable that the gentleman in charge of the ordnance and admiralty lands, who has seen long public service, may be placed upon the retired list very shortly, in which case his assistant, a young gentleman from western Canada, Mr. Keyes, who was appointed by Mr. Mills, will be promoted to the grade of second-class, provided he passes the requisite examination. Mr. Keyes is an excellent and trustworthy clerk, who has made himself acquainted with the ordnance and admiralty lands. An assistant clerk at $1,100 has been placed in the estimates to provide for this contingency. The Minister of the Interior did not avail himself of all

clerkships of the third-class provided for in the estimates of last year. Many of those who are engaged in work which would fall to officers of this grade are only temporarily employed, and, as the business of the Department has increased so rapidly within the last few years, the Government has thought it desirable, in case the increase should not be maintained, to have as much of the clerical work as possible performed by temporary clerks. There were 11 third-class clerkships, in addition to the existing staff, provided for in the estimates for the current year. Two of these clerkships were filled up by a transfer from the Secretary of States Department of two clerks who, while in that Department, had been engaged in preparing Dominion lands patents, and their transfer became necessary on account of that part of the work of the Department of the Secretary of State having by the Dominion Lands Act of 1883 devolved upon the Department of the Interior. Four temporary clerks (P. T. Buchanan, H. A. Turner, F. C. Capréol and O. H. Lambert), all of whom had qualified under the Civil Service Act, were placed upon the permanent list; and the Minister of the Interior merely asks that the remaining four clerkships be allowed to stand as in the estimates of last year. It will be observed that by the changes which have been made in the higher offices of the Department, and after making the accountant a chief clerk, there is a decrease of $1,150 in the estimates for 1885-86 as compared with the estimates of 1884-85 in respect of all the officers above the grade of first-class. In the first-class there is an increase of $300, which is made up entirely of the statutory increment. In the second-class there is an increase of $1,750, $1,100 of which is caused by the provision already referred to for promotion in the Ordnance Lands Branch, and the remainder by statutory increases. In the third-class there is an increase of $1,025, all of which is made up of statutory increments and the difference between the salaries estimated for the clerks transferred from the Department of the Secretary of State, who were put down at the minimum of their class, and their actual salaries, which were well on to the maximum, on account of their length of service in the other Department. An additional messenger at the minimum salary of $300 is provided for; and one statutory increase of $30 for a messenger already on the permanent list who has not yet reached the maximum.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to what the hon. gentleman has said, we shall all be glad to hear that the doctrine of employing parties who are occupied in merely clerical labor is making its way into the Department of the Interior as well as elsewhere, but here we have, deducting the messengers, about 58 gentlemen employed at a salary of about $67,000. That would give not very far short of $1,200 apiece for each of the 58 men employed in this Department, and it is quite clear that, when these gentlemen grow to the head of their classes that expenditure will be very largely increased. Making a rough estimate, I should say that, according to the ordinary rule of statutory increases, we would have ultimately to provide $80,000 or more for these 58 parties. Now, there is no doubt in my mind that, although it is quite right that the superior officers should be highly paid, here is a very pertinent illustration of the enormous expense at which we are conducting our Government departments. In an ordinary bank employing that number of hands, I venture to say you would find that the total averages would in all probability not exced $700 or $800 all round. There would be a large number employed at very small salaries, and a few of the superior officers would be, no doubt, as they ought to be, well paid. It is not so much what is being done here as what will be done. For instance, these 30 clerks will undoubtedly advance to $30,000, the next will advance to $18,000, and the next to $18,000 also, and so on. I am not sufficiently conversant with the details of the Department—hon. gentlemen behind me are more conversant with them than I am—but I think it will be found that the very great number of chief clerks and first-class clerks employed here, and the very great number of third-class clerks, are going to inflict upon us a total expense for this branch which is considerably out of proportion to what private parties or private corporations would be called upon to pay for anything like the same service.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is quite true, and it is quite open to the Government and to the House to consider an alteration in the system, but the system has been deliberately provided for by Parliament. I do not think that the statutory increase will have an effect to such an extent as the hon. gentleman apprehends, because, in the first place, a good many drop out, and the new ones that come in come in at the minimum salary. Then again, whenever any of these men prove themselves specially qualified, they are sent on to the North-West, where, after being trained here, after gaining a knowledge of the system of the land granting department and all in connection with the business of the Department, they are employed as agents or other officers, so that there is a continual or a steady drain from the head office here, and it is filled in from below with clerks at the minimum salary. The subject of the amount of the salaries of the civil service has often been discussed in Parliament; it has been discussed ever since I have been a member of Parliament. We have always heard a great deal of the high salaries paid in comparison with those paid to clerks in private establishments. That is true, but it is to be also remembered that the service in the public service is peculiar in itself, that it does not qualify any of the gentlemen who go in there for general business, to be employed if they leave the Department, it does not qualify them as a general rule; on the contrary, it rather disqualifies them for general business. They are attending to one branch, very many of them all their lives, like the pin-makers making the head of the pin, and they grow old in the habits of the office without acquiring any additional knowledge which will give them a fair chance to enter into competition with young men who have been brought up in mercantile or financial or banking institutions to be generally useful, and are employed either in the institutions in which they commenced their education or in other public services. The whole aim of the civil service system, from the examination upwards, is to make it a profession, that, when a man enters into the civil service, he may expect to live in it, to get his living there, to be promoted there, and to look altogether to the public service as the means of supporting his family. It is only by having that system that you will have good and efficient officers. When a young man enters into the civil service here he may look forward, if he does his duty, if he shows himself a competent and good and honest officer, to get on by degrees and to retire when his usefulness is gone on a reasonable pension. That is the system adopted deliberately by Parliament. Of course, it is open to attacks. We may do away with the superannuation system, we may lower the salaries, and we may say we will employ you as long as you are good for anything, and, when you get old, we will do as a bank might do—but the banks do not do it—as a merchant or a shopkeeper might do, we will get rid of you by paying you up to the last day of service. That is one way, but I do not think it is a way that would promote the respectability or the efficiency of the civil service.

Mr. CASEY. I am afraid the hon. gentleman draws an ideal picture of the civil service when he says young men enter it knowing that, if they are industrious and attend to business, they will get on and attain to higher positions, and will retire on a good pension. I do not think that has been the experience of the service. I do

not think young men are impressed with the idea that they can rise in the service by industry and attention to business. I am strengthened in this belief by the experience of several deputy heads of Departments—in fact by nearly all who were examined before a committee on this question of which I was chairman in 1877, and also before the Civil Service Commission appointed by the right hon. gentleman himself. I remember one case in particular where the deputy head of the Post Office Department, being examined by myself, was asked why banks and other private institutions were able to get a better class of young men at a lower salary than those who could be obtained for the country's service at a higher salary. He said it was a fact that the banks could obtain a higher class of young men for a lower salary than the public service could obtain, and the reason was, in his opinion, that young men entering the civil service could not count upon promotion for merit, that they must wait, at all events, for promotion by seniority, under the very best arrangement; and that in most cases promotion was due rather to political favor than to the merit of the individual. He gave an instance, the case of an hon. gentleman who is now a member of this House, who had entered his own Department, and had been a most active and useful member of the civil service; but finding that he had no prospect of early promotion, that he would have to remain a number of years at a small salary, getting only the increment of $50 a year, he resigned and went into a profession, and has since made himself a position in the country, and in this House, infinitely better than he could have made, probably, during the whole course of his life in the civil service. The deputy said that the reason why young men preferred taking a lower initial salary in the bank was that they had a prospect of promotion by merit, knowing that if they kept to work and showed business capacity, they would rise strictly according to merit, and not by mere seniority or favoritism; and it was for that reason the public service could not obtain an equally enterprising, business-like, and industrious class of young men, as those obtained by the banks and other institutions of the country. I have no doubt at all, from my own observations, that his remarks, the result of long experience in the service, are correct; and that as long as the present system of appointment and promotion for political reasons, or even by seniority alone, exists, the same grievance will continue; and that we cannot get as active and efficient men in the civil service, even for larger salaries, as those obtained by private institutions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman speaks about political favoritism. Well, I suppose that all Governments, as long as they are Governments, are charged with political favoritism. So far as I know, I think our skirts are just as clear of that as any Government I ever knew. I will mention just one instance in the Department of which I am the head. I took a gentleman who was a very considerable junior to the other officer. He was well known to me, and all his antecedents were Liberal—were British, if I may use the expression without offence. But he was recommended to me as a first rate officer, and he is now deputy head of the Department of the Interior—I mean Mr. Burgess.

Mr. MULOCK. He changed his politics, did he not?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Not that I am aware of. I consulted two gentlemen, that is, Colonel Dennis, in the first place, and Mr. Lindsay Russell in the next, and they both declared him to be one of the best officers in the Department. I consulted them as to who should be their successor, and they both recommended Mr. Burgess, and he was appointed accordingly. and without the most distant reference to his politics. I do not know what his politics are; I never asked what his politics are. I do not know whether he has found out the early error of his ways, or whether he adheres blindly to those errors. At all events he is not blind in any way as an officer; he is not blind to the exigencies of the Department, and he does his work faithfully and well.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My object in calling attention to the matter was partly this: The only way in which we can, by any possibility, prove the present system, is by testing it, and it is in a case like this that the test occurs. The hon. gentleman knows that this Department, being comparatively newly organised, affords a better test of the practical working of our present system. He did not gainsay the correctness of my position as to the expenses of the Department. I think he will find in the course of two or three years that the figures will approximate very closely to the sum I named.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It may be.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to ask him another thing. I have seen it stated that a considerable number of appointments have been made in this Department from persons not natives of this country. Is the hon. gentleman aware how far that is the case?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, I cannot speak of that. The only one that I know myself, as Minister of the Interior, and speaking from recollection, is a gentleman who would be called English—or an Irishman, rather; he was born in Ireland, and that is Mr. Lambert. After he came out here he married a good Canadian, a neice of Chief Justice Walbridge. He has been in the country a long time, and I think he fairly earned his footing, and is a very good officer. Whether there have been others since last year, I cannot say. I can ascertain if need be.

Mr. MITCHELL. I feel, in justice to myself, that I cannot allow this vote to pass in silence, while I feel that I have great personal grievances against the Department—and I have heard it reported, publicly and privately, that a great many grievances exist against the administration of the Department, and I believe, myself, it is not very well administered—yet, as it is the Department that may possibly be charged with some responsibility in connection with the troubles in the North-West, I must say that in the presence of a great uprising such as is taking place, and of the great efforts made by the country to put that down, it would be out of place for me to criticise the Department just now. I shall reserve any criticism I may have upon the past conduct of the Department for a future occasion when that trouble is over.

Mr. MILLS. I do not at all agree with the observation the hon. gentleman has just made. On the contrary, I think that when there are difficulties existing in the North-West Territories, when there is an Indian uprising, and when a considerable portion of the population have taken up arms against the Government, and when the press which supports the Administration are undertaking to excuse that revolt against the Government; while others say that the Government itself is at fault, that it has not done justice to these people, that it has disregarded their representations—I say when all that is the case it does appear to me that the House would be derelict in its duty if it did not carefully consider the matter now before it. It is certainly an extraordinary position to take to say that because there is an appearance of a very serious defect in the administration of the affairs of a particular Department, and when that defect is so serious that a portion of the population have taken up arms in consequence of it—to say that we should not enquire into such a condition of things, is a doctrine to which I cannot give my consent. I think it is the bounden duty of the House carefully to consider everthing relating to this matter. I am not going to discuss, at this moment, the condition of things in the North-West. What we have

before us are the estimates for this particular Department of the Interior, and I think, looking at the condition of things, that in the estimation of the country, at all events, and in the estimation of that portion of the country the people of which are specially interested, the affairs of the Department have not been satisfactorily administered. I am not finding any fault with the officers of that Department. This House does not hold the officers of the Department responsible for the defects of the Administration; this House holds the Government of the day responsible. An attempt is, however, made to shift the responsibility from the shoulders of the Administration to the particular officers in charge. It is the business of the officers, no doubt, to attend to their administrative duties; but the policy of the Department, the promptness or delay, the complaints of injustice or of unsatisfactory action in the administration of the affairs of the Department rest with the Administration. It is the Government that is responsible. The hon. gentleman may speak in high terms of the officers of the Department. I am not going to dissent from the opinion he has expressed. But I say, here are facts we see before us, that the expenses of the Department have enormously increased, and that the affairs that come properly under its attention are not satisfactorily administered by it. I look at the vote which the hon. gentleman asks, and I find 64 clerks and messengers. When the hon. gentleman came into power in 1878 there were 21 clerks and 4 messengers in this particular branch. The hon. gentleman tells the House there has been enormous increase in the work of the Department. There has been some increase, I admit, and the extent of it is shown in the reports brought down. I call attention to this fact: that the estimates we have now before us are wholly misleading with respect to the expenditure incurred in carrying on the affairs of that Department. The hon. gentleman proposes to take a large vote on capital account. He asks for a large sum for making surveys and for the administration of Dominion lands, which was formerly included in the ordinary departmental expenditure. What do I observe in the appropriation which the hon. gentleman asks? That $30,000 of that sum which he asks to have voted on capital account is to be expended in conducting the ordinary affairs of the Department. The hon. gentleman asks for $69,305; but besides that he wants $30,000 more. He proposes to take out of the vote for Dominion lands $30,000 to pay clerks and for other expenditures connected with the inside service. If the hon. gentleman claims there has been an increase in the work of the Department—and I am not disputing it—I say it is covered by this amount of $30,000. He proposes to take that sum for the additional expense and the additional work. He proposes to pay more out of this than for the additional work. He proposes to pay for that portion of the work formeriy charged to the ordinary management of the Department; and I say there is nothing in the business of this country to warrant this very extraordinary growth in the expenditure. I take the hon. gentleman's report or the report of his colleague the Minister of the Interior. I look to the number of homesteads, the number of patents issued, and I turn to the report of the territory of Dakota, and what do I find? Six times the number of homesteads, six times the number of patents issued, more than six times the addition to the population every year; and yet we do not find the cost of the administration of the lands in that territory one-fifth of the expenditure of this Department. I ask how does it happen that we expend here $20 for the same amount of work which on the other side is done for $1? That is the condition of things. The hon. gentleman has referred to the extraordinary growth of the Department. I can turn to the reports of a certain railway in Illinois and show him that the railway company located a larger number of men on the lands appropriated for the construction of that railway, issued a larger number of patents in one year, and did it at one-fortieth of the expense incurred in connection with this Department. Yet we are told, with an Indian war upon our hands, with the population taking up arms against the Government, because they are not satisfied with the administration of affairs; when we see this condition of things, that people of the North-West are not allowed in some places to cut a stick of firewood with the thermometer at 30 degrees below zero, without permission from the Department that we ought not to criticise these proceedings. It is not extraordinary that you should have such a state of affairs, but it would be extraordinary if this committee were to act on the principle mentioned by the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) and allow the vote for this Department to pass without discussion and consideration—because such a state of things has been produced by the mismanagement of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. gentleman promised us a few years ago to accomplish most extraordinary things when he took charge of this Department. He told us that hundreds of thousands of people would settle in the North-West, that millions of revenue would be derived from the settlement of the country and that the people would be relieved from the extraordinary taxation which had been incurred. Our taxes were to be reduced, our expenditures were to be lessened, our population was to increase and the wealth of the country was to be enhanced. We were to expend a large sum of money in the construction of the railway, but that would be returned to us by the large population that would flow into the country and the revenue which the railway would derive owing to that settlement. And now what have we as the result of those extraordinary promises? Have we a large population? Have we the country settled? Have we that condition of things which the hon. gentleman promised would be the result of his policy in the North-West. The only thing at all corresponding with his promises is the extraordinary growth in the expenditure of the Interior Department. The number of clerks has been increased from 21 to 58; in the police branch from 2 to 6; in the Indian branch from 13 to 33; yet when it is remembered that the police branch and the Indian branch were parts of the Department of the Interior a few years ago, the Department has no more to do to-day than it had seven or eight years ago. In fact, there is less to do because there are no Indian treaties to negotiate and no special compensation for that service required. There are, moreover, none of the extraordinary difficulties of transportation to-day there were seven years ago. Yet in every case the hon. gentleman has increased the public expenditure, and there has been no corresponding amount of work to justify that increase. I do not complain, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. gentleman proposes to pay those who are in the Department well; I believe that is the cheapest way of doing—to employ competent, industrious young men and pay them fairly for their services. I believe the country is better served in that way than in any other way. But here you have a Department crammed to repletion, overflowing with men. Why, Sir, he has not begun to account for all those employed in the Department. You have twenty odd thousand dollars for contingencies, against six thousand eight years ago. You have $68,000, against something over $28,000 eight years ago, and in addition to all this you have $30,000 taken out of a fund charged to capital account to pay for the extra clerks employed in connection with the management of Dominion lands. Now I say that is an extraordinary condition of things. The hon. gentleman has not explained to the House how many he proposes to pay out of the sum which he charged to capital account. He has shown here thirty thousand dollars to be taken out of that sum. Here are sixty-four clerks and messengers, but how many more are there? Are there sixty-four more? Have we 128 or

130 engaged in this particular service? The work has increased, but the work shown by the hon. gentleman does not warrant this extraordinary expenditure. I say, Sir, that the expenditure is far beyond what it ought to be, and that the condition of things in that Department is extremely unsatisfactory.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has evidently favored us with an undress rehearsal of what he is going to favor us with by-and-bye, against the sins of the Department of the Interior and the sins of the Government. I am glad to hear that the hon. gentleman is in good wind for that laudable purpose. However, I shall not be drawn away from this vote by entering into any discussion on that point; we will hear enough of it no doubt, and at full length and with all the hon. gentleman's usual vigor and candor. The matter I am trying to account for is the increase since the vote of last year, and I have explained the items which increase it to a small amount, and I daresay the committee will except the explanation.

Mr. CASEY. The right hon. gentleman has not answered that part of my hon. friend's remarks that related more particularly to the expenses of the Department. To be sure he has pooh-poohed in a very clever way that part of my hon. friend's speech which referred to the general policy of the Department, and under cover of that little attack he has slipped out of explaining the tremendous increases which my hon. friend pointed out have really taken place in conducting the headquarters staff which we are now discussing. It has been pointed out that the increase of the cost of the staff is not shown by the estimates before us, that a large number of clerks, I suppose extra or temporary clerks, have been paid, or are to be paid, out of moneys voted nominally for another purpose—for Dominion lands. No doubt, out of contingencies, that particularly elastic reservoir of funds, other clerks will be paid. Now the right hon. gentleman owes to the committee an explanation of how much is going to be paid out of these two other sources for clerks employed in the Department of the Interior, whether permanent, extra, or temporary. And I think not only he but all other heads of Departments owe it to the House to put the estimates in such a shape that the real increases from year to year, and the real cost from year to year, can be seen at a glance; that they should take each estimate under its proper head instead of under contingencies or somewhere else. They should take the estimate for temporary clerks, as many as they expect to require during the year separately, and they should be held responsible for that estimate in the same way as for other estimates, and should not be allowed to greatly increase the real cost of the headquarters staff of their Departments without that increased cost appearing on the face of the estimate. I hope the right hon. gentleman will reconsider his determination to give no information on the subject, and will explain to my hon. friend who asked the question the point as to which he sought information. It can scarcely be claimed that this information as to the employment of clerks is like some other information lately asked for and refused, of such a confidential nature that the Government is justified in refusing it at the present difficult crisis.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I was not in when the items were discussed; was there an explanation with reference to the Geological Survey?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is a difference of $966, altogether statutory increases. I did not, however, call attention to the mounted police. You will find the details on page 12, and although it is under my charge, as President of the Council, the account is kept in the Interior. The comptroller gets the same salary; a first-class clerk has a statutory increase of $50, a second-class clerk the same, and there is a messenger $300. The latter is merely a nominal increase as a matter of account. Formerly there was a man employed for the police, called a messenger, and he was paid as such.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How are you in the habit of employing the comptroller now?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. White, the comptroller, is specially employed by myself in all communications connected with Indian events in the North-West, and matters of that kind. We treat him as a confidential officer. He communicates with me on all such subjects.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman gave us to understand in another place that Mr. White had other duties.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What I wanted to know particularly was whether any arrangement was made under which Mr. White spends a certain definite time in the North-West, or is he regarded as having his principal place of residence here?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. His principal place of residence is here; but for the past three years he has made a tour every year in the North-West, to the great advantage of the force and the promotion of economy. There has been a very large decrease in the cost of supplies, showing his judicious management.

Mr. MILLS. With which Department is the government of the North-West Territories now connected—with the hon. gentleman's own Department or the Department of the Interior? Of course, communications are had with the Secretary of State, but the general supervision of the government of the North-West Territories is, I suppose, in some Department.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman knows that Mr. Dewdney holds the appointment of Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories, and as such I suppose like other Lieutenant Governors he has to do with the Prime Minister. As Superintendent of Indian Affairs he communicates with my Department.

Mr. BLAKE. I should suppose that as Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories he would be under the departmental control of the Minister of the Interior. That would be my notion of the case. If not, there is no particular Department in Ottawa that is really responsible for the management of affairs in the North-West Territories. If that is the state of things, it would be important to know it. I fancy there must be some Minister who is responsible for the administration of affairs in the North-West Territories. Of course, the relation of the North-West Territories to this Government is entirely different from that of the different Provinces. The Provinces are not under the control of any Department in any sense as to their policy; and the Lieutenant Governor of a Province, I presume, communicating formally to the Secretary of State, really communicates to the Government as a whole. But I should be suprised to learn, in reference to the North-West Territories—the settlement of which, the policy as to which, the payment for the maintenance of the Government of which, are all with this Government—that some Minister or other was not actually or practically responsible. The hon. gentleman says that Mr. White visits the North-West yearly; therefore he visited it last year; may I ask at what period last year he visited it, and about what time he spent there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot say, but I will get the information. I consider that as Lieutenant Governor of the North-West and Keewatin, Mr. Dewdney is under the direct charge of the First Minister, who is responsible to the House and the country in that regard.

Mr. MILLS. May I ask whether the Lieutentant-Governor of the North-West Territories sends the First Minister the estimates for local improvements or other expenditures? The hon. gentleman knows that they have no sources of revenue in the North-West Territories, and I would ask whether it is directly with him or with the Minister of the Interior that such communications are had; and also, whether any arrangement exists to show what liabilities the Dominion is incurring on behalf of the Territories? Because it seems to me they would become a debt of any Province that might be formed out of the Territories.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The estimates, if connected with land, are forwarded, I take it to the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. MILLS. Are those for roads and bridges?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Anything of the kind would come to the First Minister. But, as the hon. gentleman well understands, the relations of all such persons with the Department of the Interior are so intimate that I may say the Minister of the Interior and myself consult and act together before taking any important steps.

Department of Railways and Canals $46,500 00

Mr. POPE. Questions were asked about two items. One had reference to Mr. Dixon. He was promoted last year from a second to a first-class clerk, and in accordance with that promotion his salary has been increased from $1,375 to $1,550. With regard to the law clerk, there was undoubtedly a mistake made in calling him the law clerk; but he is so called in the Department, and he is the lawyer of the Department. He looks up all the leases as far back as 30 or 40 years, and draws up all agreements which are submitted to the Minister of Justice. As first-class clerk he has received $1,800. I was asked the other night how long he had been in the Department. He was appointed a first-class clerk, at $1,000 a year, on the 15th of June, 1860. His salary was increased in October, 1860, to $1,200, and in January, 1862, to $1,400. Under the Civil Service Act of 1868, his salary was increased by yearly instalments of $50 up to the 1st of July, 1876, when it reached the maximum of $1,800, and since 1876 there has been no increase in his salary, although he is one of the most important and hard-worked men in the Department. It is now proposed to ask the House to vote to increase that salary to $2,000 for the present fiscal year, with $50 increase for the following year. These are the only changes except the statutory increases. With reference to the objection of the hon. member for West Elgin, it is well taken, and I propose to alter the item to chief clerk.

Amount required for salaries for Board of Examiners and other expenses connected with the Civil Service Act $6,000 00

Mr. LANDERKIN. Who are the examiners under the Act? Are they appointed from the civil service or outside? and what are the salaries?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The examiners are Mr. DeCelles, Dr. Thorburn and Mr. LeSueur. The two former are in the service, the latter has been superannuated.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is the hon. gentleman doing right to the educational interests of the country in not selecting from the educationalists of the country examiners? Is it fair to select men who are receiving high salaries in the service and neglect the teaching interests of the country?

Mr. IVES. School marms?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes, and they could teach you for a long time. I think there ought to be a change in this direction. There are many teachers in the country high schools teachers and others who are well qualified to do this work.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This question was discussed the other day. My hon. friend will have an opportunity of discussing this question, which has already been discussed, when the Bill of the civil service comes before the House. It was discussed also the other day. As to the salaries the resolutions passed the other day provided that each examiner shall receive $600 each per year instead of $300 as formerly. There is also $500 to pay to the clerk whom the Government have appointed in conformity with the Act of last Session. That increase with the increased cost in advertising and sub-examiners makes up the additional amount required.

Mr. IVES. If the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) had been here when this matter was discussed instead of being in West Northumberland he would know more about it than he appears to know. He would know that another hon. gentleman on this side has taken all the care necessary of the school marms.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This item was not before the House when I went away. It is before the House now, we are considering it, and I do not want any suggestion made from the hon. gentleman who holds a highly dignified position in this House by reason of his connection with the Minister of Railways, and on this account presumes to dictate to us.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman has no right to dictate to me when I speak, I am speaking to the item before the House, and I will not allow him or any other hon. member to dictate to me. I am not discussing any item not before the House, in Northumberland or any other place.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have not complained of the hon. gentleman's question. My hon. friend was absent the other day, doing, I suppose, public service in West Northumberland; and if he was poorly paid there, he was paid as the examiners are under this Act.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. Minister thinks to be witty. Decidedly he looks like a witty gentleman; he had better try it on. I did not ask him in the way of banter, but for information. I do not desire any banter, I know he is a clever man, he was once Premier of Quebec; I believe he held a distinguished position there, but I am not asking him to display any wit or ability here. I am simply asking him for information.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman is ungrateful; I was just defending him from my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The tender mercies of the wicked are cruel sometimes. The Committee ought to know what salaries these gentlemen have. When we are asked to give an additional sum of money we ought to know what the salaries of these gentlemen, with the additional $600, are.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman, I hope, was not also absent the other day. I have said the salaries of the examiners were previously $300, now they are $600, which makes an increase on the two examiners of $600. Last year we had by statute authority to appoint a clerk. He has only been appointed two months ago at $500, which makes a total increase of $1,100, and the remainder of the difference between the estimate of last year and the estimate of this year is explained by the increase in advertising and in sub-examiners.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I asked for the sums total that were paid to these three gentlemen.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Mr. LeSueur $1,000, Mr. DeCelles $300, and Mr. Thorburn $300.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What salaries had they already?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. In their official capacity?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not know exactly. Mr. Thorburn has about $600, I think, and the Acting Librarian, Mr. DeCelles, has, I suppose, $2,400.

Mr. MULOCK. I understand the Secretary of State is asking the House for a vote of $6,000 for the purpose of carrying on the civil service examinations of this Dominion. I am still of the opinion that I expressed on a former occasion that the system he is adopting is an unsound one, and that further as a matter of expense the amount here asked is far in excess of what it should be. Last year there were about 1000 candidates examined for the civil service, which is the highest number we have had for the last three years. I did not direct my researches further back than that. I had the exact statistics on this subject here a little while ago, but in a moment of confidence I went away and left them on the desk, and, when I came back, all my statistics were gone. It shows me the danger of coming down into the dangerous proximity of my friends here from the other side of the House. However, the particulars that I did once possess, showed that the total number of candidates examined in the civil service last year was 1,000, and I did also have amongst other collections at that time a list of the subjects on which these young men were examined, and they were as elementary subjects as it is possible for any person to be examined in—the three R's in fact—and nothing more. For that work, it is proposed to ask the country to pay $6,000 the coming year, and we may be perfectly sure that, if there should be any increase or the slightest apparent excuse for it, next year we shall be asked for something further, and we shall be told that this year we voted $6,000 to examine a certain number, and that number has increased or is likely to be increased, and we shall be asked to vote more. To consider how much it costs to carry on the civil service examinations, I will trouble the House while I give some particulars in that respect. In the Province of Ontario there are conducted the intermediate examination, which are of a higher order than the examinations here, the subjects are more advanced and the examinations are more thorough. These examinations are conducted in the Province of Ontario only by competent examiners, and the paper I have before me gives me what I am told is the number and the cost of these examinations. There were examined during the year 1884, 6,075 candidates. These were examined somewhat in a manner according with the system which I foreshadowed when the resolutions were being considered. No person in that Province has ventured, no matter what his political views were, to criticise the scheme in force in that Province. Occasionally there have been errors in the practical working out of that scheme, but that the scheme itself is a sound one and is capable of being properly worked out in the best interests of the country has been admitted by the friends of my hon. friend the Secretary of State in the Province of Ontario, as well as by all on the side of the Government. Now, the scheme so approved of and now being worked out costs what? Last year they examined 6,075 candidates, and the gross cost to the Province for that examination was the sum of $6,079.17, or an average of about a dollar per head. That includes salaries, expenses and printing and all other incidental expenses.

Mr. BOWELL. By whom were these examinations made? By the Inspectors?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. MULOCK. No. The system, as I understand it, that prevails in Ontario is this: There is a central committee who are called the examiners; they are five in number, and they are persons of education, persons who have had practical experience as teachers, and perhaps have been promoted to this position.

Mr. RYKERT. The municipal councils pay part of that.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The municipal councils pay the examiners.

Mr. MULOCK. The statement I have includes the gross amount.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Including the amount paid by the municipal councils?

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, the amount paid by the whole country. When it is paid by the people by their municipal council, that is paid by the country. I have this given to me as a correct statement of the gross cost.

Mr. RYKERT. Where did you get it from?

Mr. MULOCK. I got it from the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills.)

Mr. RYKERT. That does not prove it.

Mr. MULOCK. He told me he got it from the Minister of Education.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If my hon. friend would allow me, I would suggest that we are going to discuss that question when the Bill on the civil service comes up, and the system of examination might be discussed then. There is a fair opening for a difference of opinion as to the system, but at the present moment we are only comparing the estimates of last year with the estimates of this year. I am in a position a little like that of my hon. friend. He says he has left his bill of particulars in another place, and I have also some little particulars which I have not before me at the present moment. I intend to give my friend the full opportunity of discussing it when the Bill comes up in a day or two, when the whole system of civil service examiners will come up. At all events, if we are not now going to change the system, and, if the Bill remains as it is, we have to provide for this expenditure.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps, then, the Secretary of State would allow the item to stand over until the scheme is provided for. We are rather putting the cart before the horse now.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If we are to change the system, we will discuss it. If not, we must pay, and the expenditure put there is the lowest figure at which it can be put. My hon. friend has stated that in the Province of Ontario 6,000 students have been examined for $6,000. I dare say that, if all the examinations for the Dominion were in the same Province our examiners would examine 6,000 candidates for entrance into the civil service for the sum of $6,000 or thereabout. The cost is great because the examinations have to be carried on over seven different Provinces, and, as you will see in the report of the Auditor General, part second, page 40, the cost is in a great measure for the different examinations in different parts of the Dominion. I can say no more. The salaries have been discussed. They are as low as they can be, and, unless we change the system, and that is what my friend was discussing, we cannot make the items different or the figures lower than they are.

Mr. MULOCK. Do I understand that the item itself stands over?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did not say that.

Mr. MULOCK. Then we must discuss the item. It is clear that, if the system is not approved of on which this

estimate is based, the work we are doing to-day will all be rendered nugatory. Would it not be the more logical way to proceed first by debating the system, and then provide the cost to carry out that scheme ?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It makes no difference. If the Bill did not pass, the money voted would not be expended.

Mr. MULOCK. We must go on with the item then. On what principles are we asked to day to spend $6,000 to conduct a work that can be as well conducted, and I submit much more efficiently conducted, by a different scheme and at a very much less cost? If I were asked to supply evidence I could give you the evidence of the cost of conducting other examinations, and it is perfectly clear that, if the matter of expense is considered at all by the House, the present scheme, on which the House is asked to vote this money is, as a mere matter of expense, a totally unnecessary scheme. The Secretary of State says the Auditor General reports that a large portion of this expense is occasioned by reason of these examinations being conducted in seven different Provinces, and I suppose he means to say the examiners are obliged to travel and have expenses in connection therewith. Now the scheme that has been foreshadowed here will save all such expense. The Post Office is the only medium of communication, and a most efficient one, and it costs no more to send documents from one end of the Dominion to the other than from one town to another.

Mr. BOWELL. Does the hon. gentleman refer to the expense of the Central Board in Toronto, or does he include in that $6,000 to which he has referred, all the expenses attending the examinations in each city, town and county in the Province?

Mr. MULOCK. No, nothing except what is in this paper.

Mr. BOWELL. I could not understand the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MULOCK. I have here the questions and answers which were submitted to the Minister of Education for the Province of Ontario. My hon. friend, the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) handed me the paper a few moments ago. The first question is this:

"How many teachers are up for examination in a year?
"A. In 1884 there were in all, for intermediate, second and third class standing, 6,075,——"

That word "teachers," I think, should mean candidates.

"And for first-class, 100; total, 6,184.
"Q. Who examined the papers?
"A. The central committee of examiners, five in number, prepare the questions and have oversight of this work. They examine the first-class answer papers; but have under them sub-examiners. In 1884 there were 55 sub-examiners, who examined the answers of the 6,075 candidates named above."

The next question, "How long does it take?" is not material, but the last question is:

"What does it cost?
"A. The central committee for these and other duties "——

What they are I do not know——

"Received, in 1884, a total salary for the five members, of $1,550. The three presiding examiners, in 1884, received for their services a total of $100. The 55 sub-examiners were paid, in 1884, at the rate of 68½ cents per hour for examining and valuing the 68,039 papers of the 6,075 candidates; total, $6,079.17."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is only for the sub-examiners.

Mr. JAMIESON. And not for the local authorities.

Mr. MULOCK. If you take the number of hours you can work that out.

Mr. BOWELL. Does not that mean the amounts paid by the Local Government simply?

Mr. McMULLEN. There were no other items of expenditure connected with the examination.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is laboring under a misapprehension.

Mr. MULOCK. If the Secretary of State will allow this matter to remain over until after six o'clock, I think I can get more information on this point.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We will have that for concurrence.

Mr. MULOCK. I think we had better have it now. I think the Minister of Education is in Ottawa. I will assume, however, that this report is correct.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I assume it, too.

Mr. MULOCK. And being so, I would like to know on what principle the Dominion should have to pay six times more than the Province has to pay? The Province can examine their candidates for about $1 per head, and you propose here to charge the Dominion $6 per head. As a matter of expense, I think it is quite in order to compare the costs. As a matter of schemes, since the Secretary of State desires the scheme to be considered at a later date, I will not make any more observations now.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has read the actual cost of the examination of upwards of 6,000 persons who were applicants or candidates for teachers' certificates. When the hon. gentleman, the other day, made an estimate of the expenditure necessary for these examinations, I stated that it was an extravagant estimate, that I had had myself many years experience in examining teachers, as a member of the Board of Public Instruction, and I was satisfied that the length of time that the hon. gentleman stated was taken for this purpose, and devoted to the examination of papers, was altogether beyond the time actually required. I, therefore, addressed a note to the Minister of Education, at Toronto, to know how many candidates appeared during the year for examination for teachers' certificates, what length of time it took, and what was the actual cost; and I received this paper which my hon. friend has read to the committee, as a statement on those various points. Now there is another cost incurred in the matter. A notice is given that the examination of teachers will take place at a particular place.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman does not agree with the hon. gentleman who preceded him. I understood the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) was discussing the relative cost of this system and the other, but in the figures he produced, he stated that it included all the examinations for the high schools, that is, passing from the common schools to the high schools.

Mr. MILLS. The Minister of Customs is mistaken. My hon. friend did not say that.

Mr. BOWELL. That is the way I understood him.

Mr. MILLS. Here is a single examination for a teacher's certificate, and the number of papers upon which each candidate is examined is far greater than the number the Secretary of State proposes to submit to each candidate who seeks a certificate as a member of the civil service. The examination is far more intricate, and the amount of work required in the examination of the papers of each candidate is greater than it is in this particular case. Now, the hon. gentleman informed us a few days ago that about a thousand candidates appeared during the year, and he proposes to take $6,000 as a basis for the examination of this thousand candidates, that is $6 a head. Now, in Ontario there is a very much more intricate examination, an examination in which there are a greater number of papers submitted, an examination which must occupy the attention of the examiners a longer time in examining the papers than in the civil service examination for Canada. That teachers' examination, as my hon. friend has shown, costs $1 a head, and the Minister proposes this examination shall cost $6 a head. Now I say that is

wholly unnecessary. I say the examination here can be conducted at about the same cost as in the other instance. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) shakes his head, but I am satisfied it can be done. There is no difficulty about the matter at all, as concerns the examination of the papers and the time. Of course, in the printing of the examination papers, the cost of printing papers for the examination of 1,000 will be nearly as great as for 6,000. But the amount of cost for the preparation of the examination papers, is very trifling; it is not a very large fraction of the expense. It is the system that is adopted by which the cost is incurred. Here you have competent persons acting as sub-examiners. The papers are all sent to the central board for examination. But what do you propose to do here? You propose to send particular examiners to various points, and to incur the expense necessary to send those parties from Halifax to Vancouver, and having incurred a large expense in that way, of course you require a large appropriation. But I say that is an unnecessary expense. It is not necessary that the principal examiners should leave the Capital. They can examine the papers here as well as elsewhere. There are, no doubt, advantages in having all the papers examined by the same parties, because two examiners might not place the same value on an imperfect answer. It is important, therefore, that the central examiners, whoever they may be, should examine all the papers; but I say the appropriation asked for this service is altogether beyond what is actually required, and I am perfectly satisfied that men thoroughly competent to do the work can be found to examine all the papers for one-third of the amount the hon. gentleman asks in this vote.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I would defy the hon. gentleman if he were at the head of this Department, to make any reduction in the cost of conducting the examinations. I am satisfied it has been brought to the lowest possible figure, and if he will look at the detailed statement in the Auditor General's report I think he will be satisfied on this point. It is a very easy matter to say that the work could be performed at a cheaper price. It is true we have examinations of thousands of pupils in universities and colleges in Quebec, and that they cost nothing. But we cannot do that here. We have examinations in all the Provinces. We are obliged, for example, to advertise that examinations will take place at certain dates. If we did not do so the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) would be the first to ask why these examinations had not been advertised to take place. The cost of the advertising, moreover, has been reduced to the lowest figure. I need not mention that hundreds of accounts have been refused because the cost of advertising has been cut to the lowest figure, as I have stated; nevertheless it amounts to $1,100. The sub-examiners have not charged exorbitant prices. In Ontario the cost was $418; Quebec, $136; Nova Scotia, $61; New Brunswick, $139; British Columbia, $71; Manitoba, $71; Prince Edward Island, $69; making a total of $967. All the travelling expenses, of which the hon. gentleman has attempted to make so much, amounted together to only $394. The salaries are, as I have said, exceedingly low. The necessary expenditure for printing reaches $498, which brings the amount up to $1,661.84. Unless the system is entirely changed from that which exists at the present time—and I do not suppose Parliament is disposed to change the system—and examinations are placed on some other basis, the expenditure necessary to conduct the examinations for the public service in a manner satisfactory to all the Provinces in the Dominion cannot be cut lower than the present figure, unless examiners can be got to do the work for nothing.

Mr. VAIL. It must be remembered that this amount is liable to be increased from time to time. The hon. gentleman the other day had a certain amount for travelling expenses in the scheme. There is no reason why anyone should be allowed travelling expenses in connection with this business. There are sub-examiners who are quite competent to do all the work that is necessary outside headquarters. I do not understand why the examinations cannot be conducted in a manner like that followed at the universities. There the persons in charge merely superintend the work and see there is no unfairness, and the papers are afterwards submitted to the examiners. I submit there should be no travelling expenses allowed, because, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has stated, all the work connected with examining the papers can be done at headquarters. It can be done for a lower sum than that named. I am willing to trust the Secretary of State and depend on his assurance that he will not spend any more money than is absolutely necessary. The safer system, however, is not to vote more money than is necessary.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. At the beginning we were obliged to send the central examiners to different points to get the system in working order.

Mr. VAIL. There was no necessity to do that, because it was a very simple matter in all the Provinces. I know all about the system of examinations for the Gilchrist Scholarship, which have been conducted for a long time. The examiners are paid $5 per day; there are two of them and they occupy from two to three days. That is the whole expenditure, and there is no reason why a similar economical plan could not be introduced in connection with examinations now under discussion.

Committee rose; and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BOWELL. When the House rose the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) had read a statement of expenditures connected with the examinations of teachers in the Province of Ontario, and from that he argued that the cost which was being incurred in the civil service examinations is altogether out of proportion. It was quite evident, however, after he had been speaking a few moments that he was confusing what are called the promotion examinations for the high schools with the examinations for teachers, and it was not until the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) rose that we ascertained exactly what the hon. gentleman meant. But when he informed the House the source from which he obtained his information, it appeared to me that it was highly proper we should have the official documents by which to verify those statements. I wish the House to understand distinctly that I have no reference to the hon. member for Bothwell, who furnished the hon. gentleman with that statement. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the Public Accounts of Ontario, from which the figures he gave to the House were obtained, he will find that the total expenditure connected with the examinations to which he referred amounted to nearly $12,000 instead of $6,000. Under the heading of what are termed departmental examinations for 1884, the year to which the hon. gentleman referred—the head office in Toronto cost $2,900, and for sub-examinations to which the attention of the House was called by the hon. gentleman, was $6,979.93. Then, if the hon. gentleman had gone just a little further and added to these sums, as they have done in the Public Accounts, the contingencies attending the departmental examinations, he would have found that the total sum was $11,946. It will be observed that whoever furnished the hon. gentleman with his figures, only

took from these Public Accounts the amounts which were paid to the different sub-examinors throughout the Provinces, for giving the papers to the teachers attending the examinations during the time the teachers were employed, and transmitting the same to the city of Toronto. That is all they do. But he might as well have gone further, and told the House that the whole machinery is prepared by the educational department in Toronto, and that in every county, and almost in every riding, there are inspectors who act for them and are paid by the Ontario Government for the work they perform; and that these same gentlemen receive salaries paid by the county councils, or the city or town councils in the various municipalities. I find here the name of the gentleman occupying the position of inspectors in the city and county in which I reside—Mr. Mackintosh for the county, and Mr. Johnson, who is the city inspector. These are the gentlemen who constitute the board, and, as I said a moment ago, receive the papers from Toronto and hand them to those who are seeking to be school-masters and mistresses; and after the examinations they are transmitted for final adjustment to the city of Toronto. Those who have been connected with the educational system of Ontario know that formerly they did not receive even that much. The boards of examiners were composed of the inspectors of the different cities, the chairman of the common school board, and the chairman of the gram. mar or high school boards, with one or two others selected for that purpose in the different counties.

Mr. MILLS. The grammar school boards.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, the grammar school boards; but in our town we had a joint grammar and common school board, hence I was confounding it, because being a member of both the school boards myself, I was a member of the board of examiners. At one time it cost comparatively little. All they were paid was a small amount per diem to cover necessary expenses. It must be borne in mind that while the Secretary of State is asking for $6,000 for the present year, he has to organise a system to carry on these examinations, while in Ontario they have their system perfected for them throughout the whole school system, and the school inspectors of the different sections of the Province. If you turn to the Public Accounts you will find that the total expenses connected with the board of civil service examiners in Ottawa did not amount to the sum asked for this year but amounted to between $4,000 and $5,000. I do not say the hon. gentleman misstated the figures designedly, because it was evident that he was reading a paper furnished to him, and that he had not thoroughly investigated the question, or I certainly believe he never would have made the statement he did, with reference to the expenditure connected with the educational system of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. MILLS. What does the hon. gentleman say the expenditure is?

Mr. BOWELL. The total expenditure of the departmental examinions in Toronto—that is the board in Toronto—was $2,900, and the amount which was paid to the different inspectors throughout the Province was $6,979·63. The contingencies are composed of printing, stationery, books, maps and an amount for type, type for printing the examination papers, etc., making the total amount, adding these departmental contingencies, to $11,946.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman say that that is the cost of the examination of teachers alone, not including the cost of the examination of the students of the high schools?

Mr. BOWELL. I will again read the statement. It says departmental examinations, services of the chairman of the board of examiners, etc., $2,900. Then under the head of services as sub-examiners the amount is $6,976.63; and the balance is contingencies, attending the office, travelling expenses, etc., in connection with the examinations, making a total of 11,946, instead of $6,000 as stated by the member for North York.

Mr. McMULLEN. There is another point in connection with the matter which has not been touched upon. We find that the pupils, those applying for examination as civil servants, have to pay a fee of $2 a piece. Now, in connection with the matter, there were something like 1,000 examined this year, which would amount to $2,000, added to the amount here set down as the sum spent in connection with the examination of civil service officers. The hon. gentleman states, that in Ontario they have spent in all $12,000 for the examination of pupils—those applying to be examined.

Mr. BOWELL. I said nothing about pupils.

Mr. McMULLEN. You said there were $12,000 spent by the educational department under this head. Now, taking that as a fact, it has already been stated there were 6,000 examined, which would be an average of $2 a piece altogether. Now, under the examination of civil servants, there has not been quite 1,000 examined, and they have got to pay a fee of $2 a piece for the privilege of being examined, and, in addition, we have $4,900 spent. That is, in all, about $7 a piece for the examinations they have undergone, while the pupils under the school system of Ontario are examined for $2 a piece. I think it is unreasonable, and unfair, and unnecessary that such an amount should be spent, and if a proper course was adopted whereby the sum expended in this way could be restricted, there is nothing the prevent the high school teachers in the Dominion being employed in the discharge of this duty and the sum thereby largely cut down. If the papers were prepared in Ottawa, under the guidance of a board here chosen for the purpose, and these papers were sent out to those appointed to carry out the examinations there is nothing to prevent teachers of a certain grade throughout the Dominion discharging the duty of examiners, and then the papers could be returned to Ottawa and investigated just as they are now when they are returned to Toronto. We contend that it is highly important in the initiation of a system like this, that a proper basis should be arranged, whereby money should not be frittered away and expended uselessly. We believe that before this item passes we should have had before us the Bill which the hon. gentleman has introduced for the purpose of arranging the civil service examinations, so that we might see whether the House was prepared to say that this Bill proposed the best, cheapest, and most convenient way of carrying on the examinations before we went on with the item. But under the circumstances we are pressed to consent to the passage of this item before we have discussed the question of whether it is the best and most economical mode of proceeding with the matter. I contend that it is highly desirable in the initiation of this system that we should carefully criticise the whole operation of the system, and decide whether it would not be more in the interest of the country that another system should be adopted, and that those teachers throughout the Dominion, whose services can be easily secured for this purpose, could not be secured and a less expensive mode of conducting the business inaugurated.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman says that the $2 a head that is paid by the applicants for examination is in addition to the $6,000 now asked for the purposes of that Department. Now, the hon. gentleman ought to know better. The matter has been discussed here before; the whole question was debated long ago, and at one time it was expected that the examinations would be self-sustaining; but, after a trial, the gentlemen engaged in that work ascertained that it was very heavy and that they were inade-

quately paid. I remember that the hon. Secretary of State stated in the House last year that in all probability the Government would loose the best men on the board, as they could not afford to give their time to it. Now, my hon. friend has stated over and over again that the work cannot be done for less. I am satisfied that he does his best to keep the cost down to such a figure as not to be a serious charge on the resources of the Government. The hon. gentleman opposite made the mistake of supposing that the $2 are in addition. They go into the Consolidated Fund, and the whole cost is $6,000. Now, what the Minister of Customs disputed was the statement made by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), that it had cost only $1 per head to examine 6,000 in Toronto. Now, it turns out that he just stated about half the cost; it turns out that he did not include all the expenses connected with that examination. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) knows that over and above the charge made to the Ontario House, the inspector of a county is paid to a considerable extent out of the county funds; he knows that the towns throughout Ontario also contribute; and knowing all this, I think it is a pity that the hon. gentleman should be so much in the dark in reference to this whole question. If hon. gentlemen opposite can show that the work can be done any cheaper than it is, I think they will deserve the thanks of the House and the country.

Mr. McMULLEN. The inspector of the county of Wellington gets a yearly salary from the county for the duties devolving upon him, and amongst them he is supposed to discharge the duties of examiner when the examinations take place at the different grammar schools throughout the county.

Mr. RYKERT. What is the name of your inspector?

Mr. McMULLEN. I think there are three inspectors for the county. Mr. Clapp is the inspector of the north riding, and he gets $1,200 altogether for his services as inspector. If he is not able to attend the examinations, he has the power to appoint substitutes, and the county has to pay them, but the inspector is supposed to perform the duties himself.

Mr. BOWELL. Does he get any remuneration from the Ontario Government?

Mr. McMULLEN. I do not know of any remuneration that he gets from the Ontario Government. I am not certain of that; I only state what I know. Now, even admitting that the $2 per head goes into the Consolidated Revenue Fund, after all, the cost of the civil service examinations is very much in excess of the cost of the examinations in Ontario. If the examinations in Ontario are conducted for $2 a head, on the Minister of Customs own figures, the Government ought to be able to conduct the examinations here at very little more. I also notice that a very large amount is expended for advertising; very nearly $1,000 was expended last year, of which I think about $450 was expended in Ontario. I cannot understand why such a large amount should be required for that purpose.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would just say, in reference to the examination of public school teachers, that the inspectors are paid so much per register. The hon. gentleman should have known that. They are paid $5 a register by the county and $5 a register by the Government as inspectors of schools, and for any other services they render, they are paid $3 a day and travelling expenses; and very often they do not attend the examinations at all. For instance, in the county I represent there are three examinations going on at the same time. The inspector attends one, and he appoints substitutes for the others, who get $3 a day and so much per mile for travelling expenses.

Mr. HESSON.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice that hon. gentlemen opposite are making free use of the comparison *per capita*. Because there is a certain number of candidates in Ontario, and a less number in the civil service examinations, they make a comparison of the costs *per capita*, as if that was a fair method. Does it not strike these hon. gentlemen that if only one-half the number came up in Ontario to be examined, the very same machinery would be necessary, but the *per capita* charge would be doubled, or very nearly so, unless the examiners are paid by the paper? I understand they are not paid by the paper, but by the day. if an examiner is paid $3 a day for superintending an examination he can just as well superintend fifty as twenty-five, but the number will make a great difference in the *per capita* cost. Therefore I say the *per capita* method of comparison is not a fair one. In this matter, it seems to me there are just three considerations. In the first place, who shall be the examining board? Do you propose to have as an examining board a set of men who shall be changed from time to time? Do you propose to have one board in one Province and a different board in another Province? Or is it not a better system that we should have a permanent board for the whole of the Dominion and not one for each Province? No doubt the one uniform board is the proper examining body if you are to have a uniform set of questions put to all candidates in all parts of the Dominion. The next consideration is as to who shall examine the answers sent in. Hon. gentlemen will, I think, agree with me that the men who ought to examine the answers sent in, should be the men who have set the questions and who therefore, understand best the drift and purport of the questions. For this reason, I believe we cannot do better than to have one board of examiners, who, in the first place, will set the questions, and in the second place examine and adjudicate on the answers sent in; and that, I understand, is what we have, namely, one board of civil service examiners. The next question is, can you get the same machinery as that which hon. gentlemen say they have in Ontario; can you get that as a uniform machinery throughout all the Provinces, and can you get it at as cheap a rate and as efficient as the present system? You may have a very good system in Ontario, and a system which provides for these intermediary examinations, and it may be possible to attach the civil service examinations to some of the boards comprised in that system, but the question arises, are these boards uniform throughout the Dominion? I think they are not, and you will come across a difficulty the very moment you go from one board of examiners to another. The question next arises, who shall be sub examiners, or shall we have any? I hold we should not; I believe that what we want is sub-inspectors, who, after the board prepares the uniform questions and sends them out to all parts of the Dominion, will see that the papers are properly guarded, and that the candidates are properly looked after while they are answering the questions, and who will return the papers to the central board. The only real question, therefore, seems to be as to who shall be the sub-inspectors, as to whether they shall be the teachers of high schools, or teachers of other schools; or as to who are most available for the work. Will you get a high school teacher or college instructor to do the work for less pay than the sub-inspector you have now, and can you rely on getting either at the time and in the place you want him for the two examinations per year or the extra examinations. My opinion, is that there is no better or cheaper method than that of having one board of examiners who shall prepare the questions and send them out, and then having sub-inspectors to look after the examination of candidates in each place and see that the papers are sent back to the central board; and I hold that central board ought to be permanent, because the longer they engage in these ex-

aminations the better they will know the wants of the departments and the best mode of getting at the comparative merits of the applicants. Every year they will come to a better standard of judgment and set more suitable questions, so that we may get what is the best set of questions to test what we want for the service. Until hon. gentlemen opposite can show that they can get a uniform and constant, and at the same time cheaper machinery than the one we have, I cannot see that we can better things by changing.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). In reference to the school examinations that are held in Ontario, and which have been so frequently referred to, it is evident from the discussion that has taken place that two different examinations have been very sadly confused. There is, in the first place, the entrance examinations to high schools, which take place at the different high schools; then there is the intermediate and the teachers examinations which proceed consecutively once a year, and which are held under the auspices of the Educational Department in Toronto. It is to the latter that the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) addressed himself, and in dealing with that I have this to say, that I take it—and the Minister of Customs has established it as correct—that the figures given were really what the cost of these examinations is, and it will need but a slight tracing of the mode of procedure to establish that. In the first place, the advisory board at Toronto prepares the questions. The questions are then distributed over the Province to the different high schools and collegiate institutes. Local inspectors of examinations are appointed, and the papers are returned after the examinations are held. The forty-five or more gentlemen, whose names appear on the list and are included in the $6,000 of expenditure, are, in many cases, the school inspectors in the different municipalities. From their capabilities in that direction they are called upon to examine these papers, and the result is that the cost of these examinations and the amount paid to these gentlemen appears in the public accounts of the Province of Ontario in their name, and is included in the $6,000, which is the estimated cost of these examinations. Now, in addition to that, as I have stated, there is an entrance examination.

Mr. BOWELL. What did the hon. gentleman say is included in the $6,000

Mr. CAMERON. The amount paid to the different inspectors of schools throughout Ontario, whose services are called for the purpose of examining all these papers.

Mr. RYKERT. No.

Mr. CAMERON. I am speaking of a fact that is within my knowledge. I say again that the amounts that appear in the Public Accounts of Ontario as having been paid for these examinations—the amounts that are embraced in this $6,000, as paid to these inspectors of schools—are paid to them for the examination of those who present themselves at what is termed the intermediate examinations and for teachers' certificates. These gentlemen are called in to aid the board in Toronto on account of the number of papers, and the number of candidates that present themselves for examination. The number of candidates was given earlier in the debate, but I may state besides that last year the number of papers that each candidate had to handle was fourteen; and consequently the total number last year must have been something in the neighborhood of 100,000. It took these forty-five extra inspectors something like thirty days to go over them, showing the vast amount of work that was done for this $6,000. I may state an additional fact in connection with this matter. There is an entrance examination to high schools in Ontario, and that examination is a more rigid one than the first examination under the Civil Service Act, and is, I believe, equally rigid with the preliminary examination for the Civil Service. That examination takes place at the high schools, and is the one which is paid for by the different counties in Ontario. It has nothing to do with this expenditure. It has nothing whatever to do with the examination of the teachers.

Mr. BOWELL. That is just what we say.

Mr. CAMERON. The examination of teachers appeared in the Public Accounts, and is, I presume, the amount that was given by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), but the examination for entrance into the high schools is paid by the counties. Each county is required to pay the cost of that examination, and this fact is made particularly prominent in my mind, because the counties in the Province of Ontario have been endeavoring to establish a different system of payment within the last year; and if the educational department in Toronto has not consented to a change, it has the matter under consideration, the change being in the direction of allowing 75 cents for each candidate examined for admission to the high schools. I know from personal knowledge that this 75 cents means the cost of examining the pupil who presents himself as a candidate for promotion from the public schools to the high schools, and if it be the case that the preliminary examination before the civil service examiners is only equal to that for entrance to the high schools, it is scandalous that $6,000 should be expended by the civil service examiners, or equal to $6 a head, when the Province of Ontario is able to obtain the same service at the rate of 75 cts. a head. Gentlemen will ask: How does it happen that the examination for school teachers is more expensive? It is readily understood. There are some sixteen papers—fourteen at least—that have to be examined for every candidate that presents himself for a teacher's certificate. The hon. the Minister of Customs was prepared to say that the entire cost of examiners was much more than $6,000 a year. I am prepared to admit that, but he neglected to state that the second class, and the third class and intermediate certificates are not by any means the only certificates which these examiners are charged with the examination of. We know that the first class examination, which is entirely different, which embraces a smaller number of candidates though a much greater number of questions, is included in the cost which he has given, and I have no doubt that the statement from the Department, giving $6,000 as the cost for the intermediate and third class examinations, representing 6,000 candidates, is practically the amount which it costs to the Province of Ontario. That being the case, it occurs to me that it would be by no means an impropriety if the board of civil service examiners or the Government admitted the intermediate examination from Ontario, or that for third class certificated teachers as equal to that before the civil service board. If the Government is desirous of economy in this matter, there would be perfect propriety in doing that. There is no question that the examination is equally rigid; it must be more so when we recognise that the examination for entrance to the high school is equal to the preliminary before the civil service board; so, if the Government is disposed to husband the public resources in this particular, they have every opportunity, because the people of Ontario, offer them the facilities without any expense whatever. There is another matter to which I would like to draw the attention of the Committee. At one of the examinations which took place in Ontario during last May, there were very serious protests made by those who presented themselves. Some of the candidates said, practically, that the examination was a farce; that really, if the honor of the candidates did not stand in the way of it, there was no difficulty in copying to the full extent from the papers of those who were disposed to allow the use of them. If that state of

affairs exists, and I have it from a candidate who passed the examination——

Mr. BOWELL. Is not that a complaint that is made even in the university?

Mr. CAMERON. It may be; I cannot say as to that; but one of the gentlemen who complained of this laxity had passed his examination for the intermediate before the board of examiners appointed for that purpose, and had taken a certificate, and was prepared to show the difference between the examination as conducted for a teacher's certificate and that for the Civil Service, and he said that, comparing them together, the one was a perfect farce compared with the other. That is his statement; I do not give that by any means on my own authority; but if we are expending so much money for such an expensive farce as that man represents it to be, it is time that a closer examination was had into it. There is still another fact. We know that a number of gentlemen have taken certificates throughout Ontario before the different boards. We know, besides, that a number have failed, even with the examination as light as it was. I know of instances where those who presented themselves failed to pass even the preliminary examination, but it was a fact which was within the cognisance of everyone who passed it, at any rate, and which necessarily made them considerably chagrined over the matter, that, while some of those who failed to pass received appointments from the Government, those who did pass received none. It certainly is a grave censure of the administration of the Civil Service Act if that is the case. Gentlemen will say it is impossible to get into the Civil Service without passing the examination; but there are a lot of appointments in the gift of the Government outside of the civil service, and it happens in this particular instance that this was the case. But the fact remains that the man who failed in his examination received an appointment which the very best among those who passed would have been glad to have accepted after having passed the examination.

Mr. BOWELL. Does the hon. gentleman speak from his own personal knowledge?

Mr. CAMERON. I speak from the knowledge that that man's name does not appear among those who passed that examination, and he appears in the Public Accounts to-day as a public servant.

Mr. FOSTER. As a member of the Civil Service?

Mr. CAMERON. He is in the employment of the Government. I gave the Committee definitely to understand that I reserved that statement; I did not make it appear that he was a member of the Civil Service, but it was an appointment in the gift of the Government, and he is to-day in the employment of the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman would not surely, because a man failed to pass in the examination for the Civil Service disqualify him for every position outside of the Civil Service.

Mr. CAMERON. If it amounts to anything, it ought first to be for those who passed the examination.

Mr. FOSTER. So it was.

Mr. CAMERON. How does he get the position?

Mr. BOWELL. We do not know. If you will tell us who he is, we may be able to tell.

Mr. CAMERON. At all events, his friends will not claim any special qualification for him. The fact remains that for 75 cents per head we are obtaining equal value to what is costing us here $6 per head, and it is a fact, on the authority of those who have undergone the examination, that the local inspectors are derelict in their duties so far as securing the result of merit to those who passed the examinations creditably, and I should be very glad, indeed, if I saw any indication on the part of the Government of changing a system which gives very little public satisfaction, and looks as if it were an expenditure of money solely because friends are to be benefited.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman understands the question of the examinations, evidently, by what he has said. Will he outline to the House how he would propose to conduct the Civil Service examinations on his plan? We are discussing generalities entirely, and, if he would state something definite to the House as to how he proposes to do it we should have something before us to consider.

Mr. CAMERON. I had no idea of being called on thus early in my legislative career to assume the duties of Secretary of State, and, until I feel I have greater responsibilities in that direction, I think I may safely leave it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BOWELL. I wish to correct the references of the hon. gentleman to what I stated. I made no reference whatever to any particular class of examination. I simply read the amount that is paid by the Ontario Government for this service, which I think I explained, as I understood it, to include them all, and I simply read it because I found the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) in his statement included only one branch of it, and that was just about half.

Mr. CAMERON. Then, of course, the hon. gentleman will notice that there is no difficulty—his contention and mine tallying. I have merely gone into details to show—

Mr. BOWELL. I have no objection to his doing that, but I do not wish to have him putting it into my mouth.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentlemen in Opposition in drawing a comparison between this examination and the examination of teachers in Ontario, are most unfair, because the items which go to make up the expense there are not included in their calculation at all. What are the items of cost in reference to the examination here which the Province of Ontario has not to bear, as shown in the report of the Minister of Education? They are, first, the buildings that are used. These have to be hired by the civil service board for that purpose. These buildings in Ontario are at the disposal of the Minister of Education for holding this examination, so there is no cost there. The next item of expense is advertising. Now I may say with reference to that point that it was brought to my attention by a friend of the hon. gentleman opposite who claimed that it was unfair that these examinations should be held in different parts of the country without being extensively advertised so that their friends could have an equal opportunity, with the friends of the Government, in going up for examination. For that reason I urged upon the Secretary of State the importance of advertising all over the country so as to give all classes fair play, and then no objection could be taken to the system. I am sure that had any other system been adopted, the hon. gentlemen who are now opposing this expenditure would have been the first to condemn it and say it was done for a political purpose. The next item of expense is for travelling. They seem to overlook the fact that in every county there are three inspectors who remain at their homes and have only a few miles to travel to the county town for the purpose of holding these examinations, and their travelling expenses are very little; whereas in this case the civil service board have to send their men over a country extending 4,000 miles, to visit several different Provinces, and to rent buildings in which to hold the examinations. Now these are expenses in connection with the civil service examination which are not taken into account in the comparison with the Province of Ontario. There they have a class of

men who are employed for another purpose, and the Minister of Education avails himself of their services for a short time and pays them a trifling amount for it. They are competent men who are always ready to do their work, and this is a part of their duty; whereas the civil service board are obliged to employ men for this special work; and it is well known that if you employ men for a short time who require special fitness, you have to pay them a higher price than to men who are engaged in what you may call their life work. Now the hon. gentleman says that this examination costs $6 a head as compared with 75 cents a head for the school teachers in Ontario. I am sure that the hon. gentleman must know better, because if he was fair in his calculation —and it should be his duty, both to this House and to the country, to make a fair comparison—he should take into account the items of expense that are incurred in the examination for teachers which are not included in the report of the Minister of Education; and if he had done this he must see that it costs more than the sum he has given to this House. It represents only a fraction of the expense; whereas the Civil Service examination represents all the expense, and it represents special expenses that must be met that are not at all chargeable to the Ontario Government. Now I say that, considering the large amount of territory gone over, the number of pupils examined, the classes of men that are employed, the wages that must be paid, the expense for advertising, for rent, and other necessaries to carry on this examination over the whole country, a very large sum is required, and it should not be at all compared to the expenses incurred in the examination for teachers in the Province of Ontario. There is no fairness in the comparison, and no possibility of showing the direct expenses incurred in the teachers' examination. If a fair comparison were made, and all the expense taken into account, I think we would find that the examination under the civil service board is equally as cheap, and equally as efficient, as the examination of teachers in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, has told the Committee that the civil service examination is necessarily more expensive than the examination for teachers in the Province of Ontario; that the Government have not the necessary machinery, nor the local appliances, that they have in Ontario. The hon. gentleman reminded me of a story that is told by Dean Ramsay, of an old Scotch clergyman who said that he saw a procession coming towards him with flags and a band of music. He was on horseback, and as his horse was very wild, he rode rapidly forward until he saw a soft place in the road, where he waited for the procession as he knew his horse would throw him, and he wanted a soft place to fall in. "Well," said his friend, "why did you not get off your horse, when you were so certain that if you remained on the horse he would throw you?" He said the reason was; he never thought of it it never occurred to him. And it does not seem to have occurred to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that if there is an advantage in using local appliances, this Administration may use them as well as the Local Government. There is no difficulty whatever. Surely the hon gentleman, in advising the Government with regard to the number of appointments in his own county, and pressing upon the Government to find places for a great number of his friends, could certainly recommend to the Government some party who would be competent to act as sub-examiner in his constituency; and if he declined to do so, probably the gentleman who opposed the hon. gentleman at the last election, might be willing to give the information. There is no difficulty in finding local parties who are competent, and there is, therefore, no necessity for the Government to incur these large travelling expenses in sending parties from Ottawa to distant portions of the Dominion. Then, the hon. gentleman read from the public accounts of Ontario, various sums which, he says, were all expended in connection with these examinations, amounting to nearly $12,000.

Mr. BOWELL. I said in connection with the board.

Mr. MILLS. Yes, for the purpose of examination, because if it is not connected with this board for the purpose of this examination, then it has no relevancy. I find here amongst the items that the hon. gentleman read, one of $750 for printing. I apprehend that is simply to cover the expense of printing the papers that are used. It is a liberal sum, no doubt, and in all probability includes the cost of printing for the Normal School and the Model School examinations as well. But if the hon. gentleman had looked into these papers he would have seen, besides the sums he mentioned, one of $383.52 to Blackett Robinson for printing. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that this $750 was expended in the printing of examination papers alone? Then, there is a sum paid to Warnock & Co., for bookbinding. Does he suppose that bookbinding is a necessary part of the examination? He will see sums paid for maps, for furnishing, for plumbing. Does he suppose that is a necessary part of the examination? Then, there are certain sums paid for lumber, for coal, for a caligraph and various other purposes.

Mr. BOWELL. I suppose that was to furnish the rooms that the gentlemen occupied for examination purposes. That item may stand against the rooms rented for examination of the candidates here.

Mr. MILLS. I have here the charges for the Normal School examination and the Model School examination, which are included, and I have no doubt that the statement which I read to the House, and which the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) read to the House, fairly represents the actual cost of the examination of these candidates, separate from those other expenses that are mentioned in the Public Accounts. The hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), said it would cost just as much to conduct examinations for 2,000 students as it would for three times that number; in fact it would cost no more to examine a large number than a small number. I do not agree with the observations made by that hon. gentleman. No doubt so far as the chairman of the board is concerned it matters not to him whether 50 or 100 candidates present themselves for examination; but that forms a very small item of the expense. The principal expense incurred is in examining the papers after the work of the candidates is over. I find there were 68,039 papers put in by 6,075 candidates, something over 11 papers per candidate. It is the examination of those papers that takes up the time and forms the principal part of the expense. It was the statement made by the Secretary of State during the discussion of this matter in the House previously, that induced me to make enquiries into the matter, because the time mentioned by the hon. gentleman was so utterly at variance with my own experience in examinations. I made enquiries of persons connected with the Education Department in Ontario in order to know whether so great an amount of time was consumed in the examination of papers as the hon. gentleman had stated to have been consumed by the Civil Service Board of Examiners. I found that the impressions which I had formed were borne out by the facts. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman made a perfectly candid statement to the House, and I would not for a moment wish anything else to be inferred from what I say; but he was misled, and the parties could not take the time mentioned by him to do this work, if the parties charged with the examination devoted themselves to this particular

work. You have only to examine the blue books laid on the Table of this House containing the examination papers in order to perceive the elementary character of the questions submitted and the necessarily brief answers required to be made, and to show that the examination of a single paper connected with the examination of candidates for second class certificates would equal, in many cases, the examination of the whole series of papers put in by a candidate who submitted himself to the Board of Civil Service Examiners. I say that being the case, the labor is very much lightened. They would get through with the papers of the candidates in the same period of time. What the Minister has to consider in presenting to the House a scheme of Civil Service examinations, and what the House has to consider in examining the scheme the Minister may present, is as to what machinery should be employed for the purpose of conducting those examinations and how to give candidates the least possible inconvenience and involve the public in the least possible expense. I say it is by utilising the examiners, as far as Ontario is concerned—and I have no doubt it is the same elsewhere—already engaged in the work. What do we do as regards the voters' lists, or the qualification of voters? We avail ourselves of the provincial machinery and of the appliances which the Provinces possess. We believe that to be the best course and we have acted on it. We can pursue a similar plan with respect to Civil Service examiners. We can do that in Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces. There are persons appointed to examine teachers, and they could examine the Civil Service candidates. If the Government do not choose to employ them, others can be obtained, and at all events there is no necessity of making a large expense in connection with the examination papers. Those papers can be returned to Ottawa, and be examined here by those who have prepared them and who are best qualified to decide the value of the answers given. If this is done I am satisfied that it will be unnecessary to provide a large expenditure such as that which the hon. gentleman proposes.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman is continually directing attention to the fact that the expenditure in one city in our Province in connection with a similar matter, is less than the expenditure in twelve different cities extending throughout the entire Dominion.

Mr. MILLS. Do not the examinations to which I refer extend throughout Ontario?

Mr. HESSON. The Civil Service examinations have been held at Charlottetown, Montreal, London, St. John, Halifax, Winnipeg, Victoria and other places, and the examination to which the hon. member for Bothwell has referred, is simply an examination for one Province only, and occurs only once in a year; whereas here, there are no less than two examinations and two special examinations. But the Civil Service examinations, as I have pointed out, are held in twelve different places throughout Canada, and it is therefore unfair to compare the cost of conducting them with an examination held in one city in Ontario. The hon. gentleman evidently did not take into consideration the expense of conducting examinations at the different places to which I have referred. The hon. gentleman simply took into consideration the expense of holding an examination in one Province, though he ought to have known that it is provided that examinations should take place at twelve different points. Attention has also been called to the fact that all the examination papers have to be sent here. The hon. gentleman is unfair in considering the number of candidates who have presented themselves. Hon. gentlemen opposite have stated that the number was less than 1,000. Here is the report of the Civil Service examinations. At the May examinations 594 candidates presented themselves, and their papers had to be examined, whether the candidates qualified or not. At the fall examination there were 545 candidates, making a total of 1,139. Here again we see how hon. gentlemen opposite have used figures in order, if possible, to make out a strong case against the Government. They have declared that the expense was $6,000. I do not know what the estimate was, but the expenditure last year was $4,000, and the number of candidates was 1,139, and a special promotion examination brought the number up to 1,147. The hon. gentleman was therefore not fair in his statements. Now the hon. gentlemen are not fair; in the course of this debate they have been unfair in every case, because on the one hand they deal with the actual expenditure, while in the other they take the estimate which may not be spent, which was not spent last year, the sum expended being only $4,600. I think hon. gentlemen should at least place the case honestly and fairly before the House when they undertake to make complaints.

Mr. TROW. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the examinations in Ontario were confined to Toronto alone—that that is the only examination? Does he not know that the examinations are held in over forty different places?

Mr. HESSON. Not for teachers.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, for teachers.

Mr. HESSON. I speak subject to correction, but my recollection is that they are examined but once a year, and that they are examined in Toronto.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HESSON. I speak subject to correction, but I believe I am stating what is absolutely true. My recollection is that formerly there were two examinations held in a year, but now there is but one, and that the candidates present themselves in Toronto.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). From what the hon. gentleman has just stated, it is quite evident that he does not know what he is talking about. Anyone who knows anything whatever of the subject, anyone who has the most rudimentary knowledge of the system of examining teachers in Ontario, knows that the examinations for third-class candidates, and the intermediate examinations, which are the examinations which have been in question, take place in every high school in the Province, and there are some 105 or 106 in the Province of Ontario; and that, in addition to that, the Government of Ontario have allowed, under special circumstances, facilities for holding them outside the different high school districts, consequently the comparison tells very largely against the Civil Service examinations, and shows that they are much more expensive than they ought to be in comparison with the examination of teachers in Ontario.

Mr. RYKERT. The point in dispute before recess, which was raised by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), was the accuracy of a statement furnished to him by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). By that statement he endeavored to show that the Ontario system of examination is not so expensive as that of the Dominion. I understand that during the recess that statement was to be revised by the Minister of Education, who was in the city. I take it for granted that the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) were wrong, because they now admit that instead of the expenditure being $6,000, as shown by that statement, it is upwards of $11,000. The hon. member for North York has evidently satisfied himself that he is mistaken. I find, in following up the expenditure of the Province of Ontario, that the amount, as reported last year, was something like the amount stated by the Minister of Customs for the preceding year. I find that the expenditure in Ontario last

year was $10,198, while the expenditure in the Dominion was $4,661. The expenditure for the examiners themselves in the Dominion was $1,625, as against $2,300 in the Province of Ontario; and the sub-examiners received from the Dominion $967, while those in the Province of Ontario received $6,193. The travelling expenses in the Dominion were $394, and in Ontario $198. Advertising in the Dominion was $1,153, and in Ontario $637. The cost of stationery in the Dominion was $498, and for the Province of Ontario $880. But hon. gentlemen will recollect that although the expenditure for the Dominion was $4,661, the amount received from fees was $2,052, so that the actual expenditure in the Dominion was $2,609. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has stated that the inspectors were not paid by the Province of Ontario, and he gives the name of Mr. G. B. Platt. Now, I find by the report of the Province of Ontario that Mr. G. B. Platt received $102.75, so that the hon. gentleman will see that he was again mistaken. In fact, whenever quotations are made by hon. gentlemen they are always reckless and random statements, and when they are confronted by the public documents they seek to cover themselves by some other means. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has found great fault with the system of examinations proposed by the Dominion Government, and he thinks that the system in the Province of Ontario is far superior. Well, it may be a question, Mr. Chairman, which is the better mode of examining teachers and examining these civil servants, but still at the same time the course adopted by the Dominion Government is on the whole the less expensive. If the hon. gentleman will look at the expenditure in the Province of Ontario he will see that it is not only confined to what is in the Public Accounts, but they must recollect that there is a machinery behind all this which costs a large sum of money. Special examiners are paid. These men are employed by the year as examiners for that very service, and they receive extra sums from the Ontario Government for that special purpose, and so when you come to consider that the whole plan of the Dominion Goverment will only cost $6,000 that is, for examiners, secretaries, clerks, and all other expenses and compare that with Ontario they will see that it is far more economical, because all these papers which are provided for the examination in the Province of Ontario have to go from the educational department through the hands of many selected officers, and that has not been taken into account by the hon. gentleman. If you come to consider the actual expenditure on the part of the Dominion Government and make a comparison with the expenses in Ontario, you will find that the former is the less expensive. If hon. gentlemen would endeavor to separate the two questions, that is the system of examination and the cost of the same, they will find that it is will be far better in discussing the matter in the Committee. In the discussion which took place a few nights ago on the resolutions of the Secretary of State, the whole matter was discussed by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), who offered some valuable suggestions to the Government. Whether they will be adopted or not I do not know, but that question was different from the one which is before us to-night. The question is whether the money shall be voted, having already, by the resolutions, adopted the principle. The greater part of the discussion to-night has been entirely foreign to the question. But when the hon. gentleman seeks to compare the expenditures in the Dominion with those of the Province of Ontario, it is always one of the best arguments in support of our view of the question, because in every instance an examination of the documents shows that the Province of Ontario is far more reckless than the Dominion in these matters of expenditure.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Will the Secretary of State inform us how long it took the examiners to get through the examinations last season?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not know how many days they were engaged for the examinations we are now discussing, that is the entrance examinations. I only want to say that this discussion has been carried to a great extent, and I do not and cannot object to it. Enquiry was made how much was spent on sub-examinations; and the suggestion was put forward that those sub-examinations—that is, the examinations of candidates entering the service—might as well be made according to the system which prevails in Ontario, and that that system was cheaper. Well, Mr. Chairman, the system in Ontario may be very cheap. I do not object to their system; but I say it is not cheaper than the one we have here. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) always compared the $6,000 we spent here, with what has been spent for the greater number of teachers examined in Ontario. This is not fair and it cannot be the question. The question of examining only the young men who are entering the service is not the whole of the Civil Service system here. Those hon. gentlemen have forgotten that the Board of CivilS ervice examiners comprise all examinations for promotion in the different departments; and these are as important and cost as much money as the others, for they have taken at least one-half of our expenditure here. That expenditure after all is only $4,000, if you take into account the $2,000 paid by the candidates; and out of this $4,000 at least $2,000 is expended for promotion examinations, leaving about $2,000 in all for the examination of candidates. I am at a loss to know the meaning of hon. gentlemen opposite, or what they want to arrive at. Do they want the board of examiners to be differently constituted? Do they want the system to be applied here that prevails for the examination of teachers in Ontario? It cannot be so. The hon. gentleman for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said it would not be right that the papers should be examined in any other manner than by the central board; and this Board has to do with all the examinations in the Civil Service, including those for promotion. If those hon. gentlemen were in my place they would have the same system; they would have this board as we have it; and the only question that may reasonably be raised is this: Who should be chosen as sub-examiners? After all, the cost of the sub-examiners has not been so great as my hon. friends have said. The entire cost for the sub-examiners in the whole seven Provinces of the Dominion, including the cost of the rooms they occupy and their travelling expenses, is only $934. Surely, in the face of that statement, if we are told that the board of examiners here have been extravagant, it is a calumny upon those gentlemen. The hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Cameron) made a suggestion that we should accept the certificates which are given at the intermediate examinations as qualifying young men to be candidates for the Civil Service. I cannot agree with him. The certificates of colleges and even of universities cannot be accepted, because a young man may have taken his degree in a college, and still may not be qualified to be a good civil servant, for he must necessarily be acquainted with certain subjects which are not always taught in these institutions. For instance, arithmetic is not sufficiently taught in a great many of the higher institutions of the Province of Quebec; and young men must have a training in arithmetic before they can be examined for entrance to the Civil Service. Another point raised by the hon. member for Bothwell, was that the papers published as being the examination papers of last year, contained questions so insignificant, so easy and plain, that it should not have taken all the time said to have been taken to correct them. Last year we heard a great deal to the effect that these examinations were too difficult, that the papers should not be tolerated, and that young men might deserve to enter the Civil Service for other qualifications than the ability to decipher all these problems. Well, these are the papers which my hon. friend finds too simple. In conclusion I would say

that the members of the board of examiners we have are perfectly qualified. One of them has just given me a note in answer to the statement made by the hon. member for North York. That gentleman, Dr. Thorburn, has been twenty years principal of the Collegiate Institute in Ottawa; he understands the position perfectly well, and he says it is preposterous to say that we could for the money we spend adopt the system of examination in Ontario and apply it to the Civil Service. It would not work, and it would certainly cost double the amount of money of the system we have adopted. Certainly, nobody will say that $5 a day for sub-examiners for a couple of days' work is too much; and we say it is not extravagant, since the entire expenditure for the whole of the year throughout the whole Dominion has amounted to only $934 in all. The suggestion which I told the hon. member for North York might perhaps be adopted was the appointment of teachers as sub-examiners to reward them in the not very remunerative profession they have embraced. We have done that to a certain extent in the past, and the board may perhaps continue the practice in a still larger measure in the future. But we cannot reduce the expenditure to a lower point than it is at now.

Mr. VAIL. This discussion has taken a wide range, for which the Secretary of State is somewhat to blame, because if he had contented himself with the amount taken last year, the discussion would have been confined to a very narrow limit. But in consequence of his statement the other day, when he moved the resolution on which to introduce his Bill, that it would be necessary to provide a certain amount for the travelling expenses of the central board, he has led us to believe he contemplated a change in the present system. Now, I admit that you must have a central board. You must have men to prepare the papers and to examine them when they come in; but it is not necessary that these men should travel at all. The papers, when prepared, can be sent out to the several districts by mail. The gentlemen whom the Secretary of State calls sub-examiners are nothing more than inspectors. They are merely required to be present during the writing out of the papers, to see that no unfair means are used, and that the questions are properly worked out. The expenditure for that outside service need not be large. The hon. Secretary of State says that it is $934, which I think is large enough. It is quite right that a person who acts as inspector should be paid a reasonable amount; I do not say that $5 a day is too much, because it is some inconvenience to these people to attend, and it is right that they should be paid a little more for two days' services than a man who is regularly employed. The business of the central board is to make out the papers and to examine them after they come in, and there is no necessity for incurring any additional expense over the amount that has been provided heretofore. Had my hon. friend confined himself to that amount, I would have found no fault; but as he has asked over a thousand dollars increase, we are bound to enquire into the reasons of the increase. This year we are asked to vote $6,000, next year another $500 or $1,000 will be added, and so it will go on until this service will become a considerable tax upon the country.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Perhaps my hon. friend is not aware of one fact, that the great expenditure to which he objects is reduced for the examiners and the secretary. For the whole year, for two examinations, the whole travelling expenses amount to the enormous sum of $300.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. the Secretary of State has given up in hopeless despair the attempt to understand what we are driving at on this side of the House in reference to this question. If that be the case with him after the long discussion we have had, a discussion which has seemed to those of us who have heard it, in so far as we have heard it, to be a clear and logical discussion, we will have to give up the attempt to make the hon. gentleman understand what we mean, and I therefore will not attempt to explain further our views on this matter. But the hon. gentleman in his last remarks brought up a new point which I must notice. He noted the suggestion made to accept school teachers' certificates and college degrees instead of the ordinary qualifying certificate of the board of examiners, but said it was found to be impossible to do so, because questions had to be asked for admission into the service about matters which were not taught in the colleges and were not required from candidates for teachers certificates. He gave us no hint as to what those mysterious questions were.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did not say that; I said that we found in many instances candidates for examination for admission to the Civil Service who had certificates in high institutions in the Province of Quebec who had hardly, for instance, any notion of arithmetic, and I said we could not take certificates of high colleges and universities because sometimes they had not given the necessary teaching to some of these branches, such as arithmetic.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman did make the remark I refer to as well as that he has just quoted, and I took down his words at the time.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman did not take down my words for he could not remember them.

Mr. CASEY. I was very particular to note his words at the time but may not have understood exactly what the hon. gentleman meant. Perhaps I was not able to translate exactly his sentiments into my language, but will try in future to reproduce them more accurately.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The next time I will speak in French and the hon. gentleman may then understand me.

Mr. CASEY. Probably I should understand him better then. He admits that he stated, or at all events he says he meant, that college graduates were often deficient in a knowledge of arithmetic, that arithmetic, as I understand him, was not taught in the higher colleges and schools. Well, I suppose it is not taught in the higher colleges because one is supposed to know arithmetic before one goes there, but I can assure the hon. gentleman that whether college graduates always know arithmetic or not, he may take it for granted that any one who obtains a teacher's certificate in the Province of Ontario, and no doubt also in the Province of Quebec, must know arithmetic much more thoroughly than can be ascertained by the test of the Civil Service examinations. I will not say so much for the college graduates, for I do not know that I am prepared to face a very severe examination in arithmetic myself, but I can speak for the common school teachers as being uniformly very fair proficients in that branch. Let us see what are the papers which impose a higher test upon the candidates for the Civil Service than is required to obtain a teacher's certificate. I have here the papers for preliminary examination for admission to the service. They contain five tests. The first is to copy a little extract one and a half inch long, as a test of penmanship. The next is the test of orthography, giving an extract in which a number of words are purposely misspelt for the candidate to correct; the third is penmanship again for a higher grade of candidates; the fourth is orthography for a higher grade of candidates. Now, we come to the paper on arithmetic, about as hard a paper as would be put at the examination for entrance to one of the higher classes of our common schools. There is one question in addition, a number of pretty long sums to be added together; there is another question in subtraction, another in simple multiplication, and one in the multiplication of two large numbers together, and the fifth and last question is to take the product of both multiplications, multiply it by 2, and divide it by

10,864. Even a college graduate, it seems to me, ought to be able to work out that paper with some degree of credit to himself. Then follows a test of reading. For the qualifying examination, the final and highest required, we have a paper on English grammar. The first question requires the plural of certain words and so on, seven very easy questions, such as would be very naturally put to the higher pupils in a common school. Then there is an exercise of transcription, then a paper on arithmetic, and a paper on geography consisting of 8 questions, and then there is a paper on history.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). Is there anything about the Province of St. Paul?

Mr. CASEY. No; that is only put in the edition of Canadian geography intended for publication in France by M. Fabre! There is also a paper on composition, and that is all required for the qualifying examination.

Mr. FARROW. That is not the qualifying paper.

Mr. CASEY. Probably the hon. gentleman knows better than the Civil Service Examiners who have made out these papers. The paper I have is headed: "Qualifying Examinations, Civil Service of Canada." I have given you a cursory idea of the test required for the candidates for admission to the Civil Service. Probably it is high enough; probably you do not require a test of very high education as a preliminary for admission into the Civil Service; but I think it is absurd to assert, on looking over these papers, that a teacher's certificate or a college degree, is not as good a test of ordinary education as that furnished by answering these questions. The promotion examinations, of course, are different. They are, and must continue to be, principally compiled by the departmental officers; they cannot be compiled, as a general rule, by the board of examiners, for these gentlemen have not the special knowledge necessary for what is required by each Department. The heads of the Departments must assist in preparing those papers. While I am speaking of promotion examinations, I would like to ask a question which may come in here as well as anywhere else; that is, whether the examinations which have existed for some time, in the Inland Revenue Department at least—I do not know whether they did in any other—for promotion within the Department, are continued? I mean special promotion examinations conducted by the head of the Department.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. In the newspapers my hon. friend may have seen an advertisement for a technical examination in the month of August in the Inland Revenue Department.

Mr. FARROW. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken said that the examiners ought to know whether the paper was a qualifying examination paper or a preliminary examination paper. The hon. gentleman was reading from the preliminary. It is No. 3 of the Civil Service of Canada, preliminary examination in arithmetic, page 7.

Mr. CASEY. I read all these preliminary papers before the hon. gentleman paid any attention to what I had said.

Mr. FARROW. The hon. gentleman said it was a qualifying paper, when he read a preliminary paper. You said that one amount should be multiplied and divided by another and that that was a qualifying paper. It was a preliminary paper.

Mr. CASEY. I did not say that paper was a "qualifying" paper, but the last one I read was such, and not a "preliminary" one. I read the paper the hon. gentleman is now quoting some time, I suppose, before he was paying any attention to what I said.

Mr. FARROW. I was paying attention all the time.

Mr. CASEY. Then I read the second arithmetic paper also, with the statement that it was for the qualifying examination.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman has passed through the preliminary and the qualifying examination.

Administration of Justice $41,320 00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The only alterations in this vote from the vote of last year are two statutory increases of $50 each to two clerks, and two statutory increases of $30 each to two messengers, and $150, which is the rental for a room for the judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court of St. John. Judge Watter shas for a long time been complaining that he has no room in his capacity as judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court, and on enquiry it was thought by the Minister of Justice that he ought to have this room. This makes $310 in all.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is only one point I would ask the hon. gentleman, that is as to the sum for allowances in British Columbia and elsewhere. Once or twice he intimated, I think, that he hoped to reduce those, but they remain at the same figure. Was the money all spent, does he know?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The order which was adopted, I think by the hon. gentlemen opposite, in the early times has not been altered. The vote of last year, I believe, has not been all spent. It is hoped that, when the railway is finished, and other railways are being established through that country, the cost of travelling will not be so great as it is represented to be.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know at one time the expenditure was very heavy, necessarily. They had to carry all kinds of things with them. But year after year we have been hearing that it was going to be reduced, and there is no visible sign or symptom of it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I fancy there will not be any material decrease as yet.

Dominion Police $16,500 00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is an increase of $1,500 there. The chief cause of the increase is the fact that the Government has increased the pay of the majority of the force by 25 cents *per diem*, thereby placing all the constables on the same footing, $1.50 per day after six months' service. Before this, there were two constables at $1.50, one at $1.40, and the remainder at only $1.25, though they were performing the same duties. I have a table here showing the rates of pay to the principal police forces in the country, from which it will be seen that the pay of the Dominion police is the same as that at Ottawa, Hamilton and London, and less than Chatham by 10 cents, Toronto by 40 cents, and the Ontario police at Niagara Falls by 50 cents a day. The duties of the force have been added to greatly during the past two years, owing to the removal of some of the Departments outside.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is their present number?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Twenty-five; it is increased by five men.

Penitentiaries.

Kingston Penitentiary ..... $98,570.17.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that in the Kingston penitentiary a new appointment in the shape of an engineer was made. What is that for?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has been long represented by the late warden, and I presume by the present one, that an engineer was wanted for the purpose of attending to the heating and the engines, and the steam machinery

at the penitentiary. From time to time, they employed convicts, but it was considered that it was not at all safe—and one can well understand it—that that practice should be continued, and so an engineer was appointed for the purpose of attending to everything of that kind in the penitentiary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you recollect the name of the party who has got this position?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He has not been appointed. This is the salary for next year, in order to make the appointment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that to supply power to any parties who are employed there, is it for carrying on any works in the penitentiary, or what is it for? I do not recollect at the moment seeing any engine room there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That I cannot speak of. There is the ordinary heating apparatus, and I fancy all the machinery run there is run by steam power. I remember the carpenter's shop used to be when I visited it some time ago, and there was also the machinery in the cook shop and the furniture shop. I think they all had steam power from the engine rooms.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friends both forget the grist mill that the House decided to establish in order to save the expense of having flour for the penitentiary ground by the mills of the country. Probably he is to run the grist mill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I know that was a favorite crotchet, if I may use the expression, of the late lamented warden, and he told me with a good deal of satisfaction that it was very successful and had saved money.

Mr. BLAKE. Another plan he had, which I do not suppose the hon. gentleman has yet adopted, was to have a printing press there to do the printing for the Departments.

Mr. BOWELL. There were no printers there.

Mr. BLAKE. He had several crotchets of that kind which were resisted for many years, but this one of the grist mill——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend says there were no printers there. They were in the penitentiary, and that was the reason.

Mr. BLAKE. I must say, with reference to the hon. gentleman's old craft, that the warden did not intimate to me that there would be any difficulty in finding the necessary assistance.

Mr. BOWELL. I understand that, because I know there were a number of lawyers there.

Mr. BLAKE. I was anxious to know what the position of contract labor was in this penitentiary. Are the locks still being made by contract labor?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The contract continues to 1886.

Mr. BLAKE. Last Session I understood it was about expiring.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, it is not expiring.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that the only one now in operation?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think so.

Mr. BLAKE. Are the convicts suffering much under the operation of this vicious contract system?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are suffering, perhaps, from the strength of the locks.

Mr. BLAKE. I was going to ask whether they made their own locks.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, I think they do.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not see any statement, that was to have been given, as to the supplies afforded by the farm. I notice, under the heading of receipts, that the convict and farm labor are given in detail. About what amount was received from the farm?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On page 10 there is an account. There is a charge for seed, manure, labor, and other things, $4,756.62; receipts $5,883 77, leaving a balance of receipts over expenditure of $1,127.15—not a very great product, certainly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. About how many are employed? Does it state there?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, I think not. I see the hon. gentleman has not read the report, and I have not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is your officers who have put it there, though.

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary..... .....$81,721.40

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The First Minister might state to us the position in which affairs are there. I would like to know how far the buildings can be regarded as completed, whether everything that is required for the proper supply and guarding of the prisoners is now complete. I remember last year there was a certain portion of the works that were to have been completed, and a good deal of expense was incurred on account of the difficulty of guarding properly.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The report says:

"The works which are carried on under the supervision of the Department of Public Works, specially those of the excavations into the quick rocks of the main sewer, have been pushed on with vigor, and the laying of the pipes will be terminated, in all probability, towards the next spring.

"The rotunda could then be built, and the setting down of the steam boiler take place, so that the system of heating will be apt to become much more economical, and, at the same time, greatly more commodious.

"The works of the splendid building intended, in the first place, for the use of a dining hall, and to satisfy to other wants, have progressed slowly since last fall; and although, in consequence of the adoption of the system of serving meals in the cells, the edifice is not likely to preserve its former distinction, and that modifications have thereby become unavoidable in the distribution of its inside, and that the windows be of too small dimensions and too few in number, particularly in case that the construction was eventually put to the use of shops—the need of which, in every one's opinion, as well as your own, Mr. Inspector, I believe, is so imperiously felt. However, the works have been carried on in accordance with the plans first adopted."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the surrounding wall completed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. BLAKE. With reference to this penitentiary, so far as I can judge from the public press, the principal criminal in it is the warden—at least, he is under a constant examination and interrogation and other inquisitorial tortures. With reference to the penitentiary, the administration seems to be in a condition of chronic disorganisation, and the accounts we have are that it is impossible to restore proper order and discipline in it. It does seem to me that before we are asked to vote the salaries of the officers of the penitentiary, some statement should be made as to what its condition really is. I conceive it to be, so far as I can judge from the news we have been able to get from outside, and the various statements in the papers, neither more nor less than a disgrace to Canada that that penitentiary should be for so long a time in such an almost hopeless condition of disorganisation, and as I judge to have been, and to be.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I find there is no charge against the present warden, but that there was, on his report, an enquiry instituted by the Minister of Justice into

the conduct of some of the subordinates under the warden. That report, I understand, has just been laid before the Minister of Justice.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman judge, from the report of the inspector of penitentiaries, that the administration of the penitentiary by its head is satisfactory? I do not draw that inference from the report.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. BLAKE. I draw quite a contrary inference. It seems to me that this place is cursed by the quarrels of rival politicians very largely, and by the introduction of politics into the question of appointments, the contracts, and so forth. I rather think the rival factions both unite in one thing, that is in supporting the hon. gentleman, but the rival local factions in the county of Laval, have their faction fights very largely with reference to this penitentiary and its administration; and those conflicts which sometimes happen between representative bodies, as a whole, are emphasised between the individual members of the upper and lower chamber of Canada in reference to the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary. It is a question as to who should be uppermost with respect to the appointments and administration. There has been a lack of power on the part of those in office to keep harmonious and under proper discipline and subordination the general administration of the institution, and there has been a condition of insubordination or something approaching to *espionage* and want of fidelity to the interests of the institution, which is pretty wide-spread. That is the general idea, which may, however, be wrong, because we do not know the facts. This investigation seems to have proceeded for months and months, and a report has been laid before the Minister of Justice. I really think before the Committee is asked to vote this salary, we ought to have, in view of what has been made public, in view of the report of the inspector himself, some statement of what the condition of the penitentiary really is. If it is satisfactory, well and good. Let us see the report. If it is unsatisfactory, what steps are going to be taken to remedy it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We must have a warden and he must have a salary, and therefore I fancy we shall have to vote the salary. The inspector in his last report says that the state of the institution is not satisfactory. It is quite true, as the hon. gentleman says, that the officials seem to have been at cross purposes ever since the death of the late warden, Dr. Duchesneau. How that came about, whether it arose from rival politicians or from rival sections of the same party, I am not sufficiently educated on the point to state. The report of the inspector is certainly not very satisfactory. It states:

"Certain difficulties represented by the warden to exist between himself, the deputy warden, chief keeper, and other officers of the staff, and employés of the Department of Public Works, led to so much trouble and unpleasantness as to call for departmental action. Accordingly, in June last, you deemed it necessary to order an investigation to be made into the state and management of this penitentiary, and, for this purpose, G. F. Baillargé, Esq., Deputy Minister of Public Works, and the Inspector of Penitentiaries, were appointed, by you, commissioners. The enquiry opened on the 23rd June, and was being continued at the end of the year, over which this report extends. The evidence promises to be very voluminous, and the proceedings are likely to last for several weeks Pending the close of the investigation and the preparation of the report upon the evidence, which will be taken and submitted to you, it appears to me inopportune to make any reference, in this document, to the administration or affairs of this penitentiary. It may be stated, in general terms, that the administration is by no means satisfactory."

Upon that report I have no doubt the Minister of Justice will act on his responsibility, and if it is found that either the chief or any of his officers has been guilty of dereliction of duty, it will devolve upon the Minister of Justice to replace them by other and more efficient officers. This report, I understand, is now before the Minister of Justice. As soon as he deals with it, we shall be ready to lay it on the Table so that the hon. gentlemen can see it.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman lay it on the Table before concurrence is asked?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know that I can do so. I do not think I can bring it down before the Minister of Justice deals with it. I shall, however, endeavor to get it down before concurrence.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. While trouble exists in regard to certain matters, it is not of such an extent as may appear to the public. There has been, no doubt, some interference from outside which has caused trouble between the two officers, whom I know personally, the warden and his deputy, who are men quite capable, with a little amount of mutual forbearance, of fulfilling their duty in an efficient manner, with credit to themselves and satisfaction to the public. I am afraid some local influence or some influence from outside has been the cause of the trouble. If there has not been insubordination there has been some misunderstanding between those two officers, and it is to be hoped that the enquiry which has been made will at least have this good effect, that the misunderstanding which has existed between them will cease, and that the same lack of discipline will not prevail in future. The investigation in that case will have had a good effect, for I repeat, the warden and the deputy warden are quite able to fill most efficiently and for the benefit of the public their respective duties at this establishment.

Mr. LANGELIER. I cannot speak as to the origin of the difficulties, but judging from something I read the other day in a paper supporting the Government—and no doubt the Secretary of State read the same correspondence—it is due to outside influence. That paper contained a very fierce article against a certain member of the other House. According to the statement contained in that correspondence the cause of the trouble is this: That the appointment of subordinates is more or less controlled by the Senator in question, and those subordinates, knowing they would be supported against the warden or the deputy warden if any difficulty arose between them, have become insubordinate. They do not seem to be afraid of being reported to the deputy warden, because the power behind the throne is supposed to have more weight than those officers who should have full and complete control over their subordinates. I only repeat what I have seen in that correspondence. I saw an answer made by the member of the other House referred to, saying that the statements were wrong. But, judging from the tone of the correspondence, I am inclined to believe that the statements made in the correspondence against the Senator in question are pretty well founded. The statements seem to be supported by the report before the House. In fact, it cannot be denied that ever since the removal of Dr. Duchesneau, St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary has been in a state of complete disorganisation. We have seen escapes, revolts; and every year there is talk of an investigation. The same system, nevertheless, goes on. I do not know the cause. They may be due to the incompetence of the officers employed—I do not say they are, for I do not know the officers—but there is something radically wrong in the way in which the establishment has been managed ever since Dr. Duchesneau left it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The real difficulty is outside of the penitentiary rather than inside. The hon. gentleman is mistaken when he states that the management of the penitentiary has been very defective since Dr. Duchesneau left it. I have for it the testimony of the chief officers of the best managed establishments in the United States—and they are not behind us in this respect—in which they gave the highest praise for the manner in which the penitentiary was generally conducted. I can add the testimony of an officer who was well able to judge of such matters, the late warden of the Kingston penitentiary, the late Mr. Creigh-

ton, who, after a thorough examination, gave the greatest praise to the general administration of the institution. I thing Mr. Creighton was a man who perfectly well understood the subject. As I have stated, the hon. gentleman spoke truly when he said there have been most unhappy difficulties, but I am confident they are more outside of the penitentiary than inside.

Mr. BLAKE. If it be true that persons outside the penitentiary are interfering with the appointments, it is quite easy to understand how it is perfectly impossible to preserve discipline in the penitentiary. I think the law was very wise which prescribed, as to certain higher officers in the penitentiary, that they should be in the nomination of the Minister of Justice, but as to the rank and file of the officers —if I may so term them—the guards, etc., they should be appointed by the warden. I think it was a wise provision, because the warden is responsible and must be responsible for the discipline, and in order to a proper responsibility these officers must be appointed by him. When I had the honor of filling the office of Minister of Justice, I received—as I dare say my predecessors and successors received—applications to forward the interests of those who desired to be appointed guards and those other officers in the penitentiary. I invariably declined to communicate to the warden on the subject of such nominations, but I gave him this general instruction: the law vests in you the appointment of these officers, and I shall not, therefore, make any communication to you as to whom you shall appoint, but I hold you responsible that you shall appoint good, efficient men; I do not care what their politics are—but I hold you responsible for their being good officers, and in order that you may be so responsible I shall have nothing to say to you as to the men whom you shall put in. That is the position as I conceive that the Minister ought to take, because if the Minister exercises that control, which if he chooses to exercise he can exercise, over an officer in the position of a warden, with reference to those appointments which nominally are in the warden's gift, it is worse than useless to put them in the warden's gift. The public does not know that they are in the gift of the Minister, but believes that they are in the warden's gift, and so in that case the warden acts as a sort of screen or buffer between the Minister and the public, and there is no real or proper responsibility. Now, if that should be the position with referenne to the Minister, *a fortiori* should the warden be free from any interference by political personages however exalted locally or generally they may be, as to the persons named for these offices. He should be made to understand that he is responsible for having efficient men there and keeping them there, and he cannot be responsible if he is to be controlled in any way or sense as to those whom he names or whom he keeps, by outsiders—even by his Minister—but still more by outsiders. With reference to the statement of the hon. gentleman as to the efficiency of the gentleman now in control, I have not analysed, though I looked at, the report of last year. I looked at the report of last year, and although I quite admit that there may be an efficient officer who may not be able to give a good account of the way in which he administers the institution, I must say that I was not very favorably impressed with the manner in which the warden described the mode in which he administered the affairs of the institution last year. However, it was then a tolerably fresh appointment, and I thought that owing to that circumstance he might be somewhat inexperienced in the art of composing a document of that kind; but unless there is a very considerable improvement in his method of reporting upon his work, I could hardly have expected so flattering a certificate of character from the hon. gentleman as he has just given that officer. The hon. gentleman observes that he hopes a good result will take place from this investigation, and that the harmony which ought never to have been disturbed will be restored, that the misunderstanding which ought never to have existed will now disappear. I hope so. They have been eight months in investigating it. The investigation began on the 21st of June, and it seems that the report has just got before the Minister. Some eight or nine months have been consumed in that process of examination which is necessarily itself a disorganising process—a necessary process sometimes, but a necessary evil; for we can understand that while these different officers are being examined as to the conduct of the warden, the deputy, and some others, and as to their mutual relations—that all that is calculated to destroy lawful authority, and the influence and discipline of those who should preserve the discipline of the institution. I hope that further results than the restoration of the harmony, which the hon. gentleman rejoices himself over, will take place within the walls of the penitentiary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know how it comes that the sum of $2,712 is required for uniforms this year. If you look at the Kingston penitentiary, where the number of guards and officers is very considerably larger, you will find that the sum for both years is precisely the same, namely, $1,249.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am told that there are a larger number entitled to uniforms than in 1884-85. One class of uniforms is required every four years, others every two years, and another every year, and sometimes it so happens that they require more in one year of a particular class, than of another. At all events that is the statement from the Department, and that this sum is wanted for next year.

Mr. LANGELIER. How is it that the maintenance of 325 convicts, in the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, costs $30,550, while in Kingston the maintenance of 500 convicts costs only $33,181, the cost being in one case only $66 *per capita*, and in the other about $94?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has always been the case that there has been a difference in the cost of maintenance. Whether it is from the cheapness of supplies in Kingston, or some other cause, the cost has always been greater in St. Vincent de Paul. Possibly the cause may be the more skilful system which the late warden introduced. But I know personally that the cost of supplies has always been lower at Kingston than at any other penitentiary, and that the tenders have been lower. This same question is asked and properly asked every Session, and the answer has always been the same, that is, that the maintenance depends on the cost of the supplies and the articles furnished, and that the tenders, the lowest of which is always accepted, are lower in Kingston than in other places.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is true, but there were some other reasons assigned, I think. Some statements were made to the effect that owing to the buildings not being completed, the cost of maintenance was greater for fuel, etc. But the hon. gentleman has just stated that the buildings are in a state of forwardness, and will shortly be completed. However, I call the hon. gentleman's attention to this, that the same thing is found with reference to Dorchester penitentiary, where the maintenance of 155 convicts is estimated to cost $9,800, which is as near as possible what the maintenance of 500 convicts costs at Kingston.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When the hon. gentleman says that the cost of maintenance was increased from the unfinished state of the buildings, I think that was for an increased number of guards who were required to keep the prisoners under lock and key, and to supply the want of walls.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was not only that, but that there was not proper facilities for cooking, etc., something more was required. I do not see how now-a-days, when the tendency is to equalise prices all over, at Kingston they can obtain the sort of supplies usually given to these convicts materially cheaper than at St. Vincent de Paul. It appears to me that the cost of the food ought to be the same at both places.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It ought to be certainly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the same scale were applied to Kingston, the cost of the convicts there would be about $50,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All these supplies are put up to competition and the contract is given to the lowest tenderer; and one cannot understand why the contractors at Kingston, if they find it profitable to get the lower prices there, do not tender for the other penitentiaries. But it so happens that they do not.

Dorchester Penitentiary.....$43,605 00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The keeping of female convicts at this penitentiary has been stopped and they have been sent to Kingston. Therefore the matron and the deputy matron were both paid off; and on the report of the warden, and I suppose the inspector as well, it having been found that the mason instructor had little or nothing to do, he was also paid off. These changes have caused an increase of $500 in the retiring gratuities. There is a decrease of $1,357 for officers' uniforms, as winter and full dress uniforms are not required for 1885-8. The cost of maintenance is the same as in 1884-8; the removal of the female convicts leaves the population the same as last year, namely, 140. In working expenses there is a saving of $500 owing to the reduced cost of fuel. In industries there is an increase of $1,500, which is to provide material for starting pail, tub and mat-making.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As I understand, the lock contract terminates in a year, and I would like to know what the hon. gentleman's idea is about employing these people. They cannot be employed either on the quarry or the farm, they cannot be kept idle, and the policy of the Government, judging from the tariff resolution passed the other night, is not to allow them to come into competition with free labor. How are you to employ them?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A good many are employed on the farm and in the quarries; at present a good many are employed on the lock contract; and they make clothing, I believe, for the different officers employed in other Departments. I am not able to say how they will be employed when the contract is ended, but they must be employed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is a question of some considerable practical moment to the House, and I think people outside the House would like to know what the idea of the Government is about it. I know it is a very troublesome and difficult question, I am not blaming the hon. gentleman, but I would like to know.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The policy of Parliament has certainly been not to allow convict labor to come into competition with the honest workman, and that is also, I believe, the feeling of the country generally. The tariff amendment which was introduced the other day is to keep out the products of foreign penitentiaries.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are the convicts making clothing for the Indians as they did at one time?

Mr. BLAKE. In the report last year, I do not know whether it is in the report of this year, there was a sort of wail of the warden that the policy that had been vigorously adopted some time ago of employing convict labor as much as possible to supply articles to the Department had been altered to such an extent that much less goods had been ordered by the Government itself than had been ordered formerly, so that the supply of articles in the labor department has greatly diminished.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe, in some of the articles of clothing for the Mounted Police, it was found the convicts did not make them sufficiently well for the purposes of the force, but they are employed as much as possible in making those different articles. I have a statement showing the several industries carried on in the penitentiary in Kingston and in the other penitentiaries. There are 27 quarryists, 34 stone-cutters, 23 carpenters, 22 blacksmiths, 52 tailors, 20 shoe-makers, 84 lock makers on contract, and 15 masons, making a total of 280.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The proceeds for quarries are as low as $700; that seems a small figure for 27 men to produce.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They quarry for the purpose of adding to the penitentiary, so that a good deal of the work is put into the building.

Mr. BLAKE. How many are employed on the farm.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no fixed number; they are employed from time to time, as they are wanted, according to the different seasons and the work required.

Mr. BLAKE. I merely repeat a suggestion which seems a reasonable one. It was a part of the view I had in securing the purchase of the addidional farm, that a great deal of spade husbandry should be done. I do not believe in farm work according to the most modern methods of saving labor by the use of all sorts of machines; what I wanted, was to keep the convicts as much employed as possible. There is always a supply of convict labor, and there will be a still greater supply to be kept busy now that this lock work is about at an end. In the spade husbandry, as shown in those countries where portions of the ground are cultivated very closely and a great deal made out of them, I should expect more profitable results than from most other employments, and the work would give good healthy employment in the open air for a considerable portion of the year. It requires of course a few more guards where there are a large number of people out, but by working them in gangs, that difficulty might be overcome.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know exactly whether they are employed in spade labor.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not believe any of them are so employed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It would be a very good opportunity to make market gardeners, but we would probably hear from the market gardener, that we were interfering with honest labor if we were to put into the market convict cabbages.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You must do something with them.

Manitoba Penitentiary.....$47,515 96

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is an increase in salaries of $360, as the warden was obliged to employ an additional guard in consequence of the increased population. The blacksmith's salary was reduced from $900 to $660; there is an increase in the maintenance of $832 on account of the increase in the rations, and there was also a large quantity of convict clothing required in 1884 and 1885. The working expenses have increased $767 25, as the officers received fuel and light in addition to their salaries. Miscellaneous sums remain the same. In industry the increase is $840 to provide for broom-making or some such industry.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course in the former years the very heavy expenditure for maintenance was accounted for in consequence of the enormous prices of many articles at that time in Manitoba, but even in Winnipeg itself, the price of everything has been reduced to a great degree within the last year or so, and it does appear that a charge of nearly $16,000 for the maintenance of a 100 convicts is far too great. What is the cost of the fuel? Is that included in maintenance?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, the cost of fuel is the chief expenditure; I do not know what the amount is. That will be coming down now very rapidly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That has been very much reduced and I do not think the building has been extended within the last two or three years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, it has not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know that the cost to people outside the penitentiary, in Winnipeg and vicinity, has been enormously decreased within the last two years. I am informed by a gentleman whom I saw the other day from Winnipeg that he was able to obtain very comfortable quarters there quite as cheaply as in the town of Kingston.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is a marvellous change and for the better.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, I always held it to be a great drawback to the prosperity of the city of Winnipeg that living was so high. Unless the expenditure for fuel be a very enormous part of this charge for maintenance, we have hardly benefited in the penitentiary in the same proportion as the surrounding country. I think three or four years ago the charge for maintenance was very much the same per head as it is now, and it seems to me there ought to be a very considerable reduction there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly one would say so. Before concurrence I shall get a full statement of the cost of the maintenance and the comparative prices of last year and the next year as estimated, so that the House can judge of the reasonableness of the charges made.

Mr. WATSON. Coal, and flour, and pork, and beef, and everything else of that description are fully one-third less than they were two or three years ago.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Working expenses seem to be very heavy. What does that practically represent? They are three-fold those at Dorchester with its larger convict population, and in fact they are almost as large as at Kingston with its population of 500 convicts.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I suppose, from the position of the penitentiary, the travelling expenses must be considerable between it and Winnipeg. I suppose that is one cause.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there not a railway? I think there is a railway from it to Winnipeg.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Here is the account of the working expenses of last year. Heating, $10,543.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that come under the head of maintenance?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Working expenses.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, if that be the case, if there is $10,000 for heating under working expenses, of course the question of the maintenance of the convicts assumes a much more serious aspect.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Looking over the Public Accounts and the report of the Minister of Justice, I see that the maintenance stands thus:—Rations, $9,334; clothing, $2,290; travelling allowance and gratuity, $245; discharge clothing, $399; bedding, $173; interments, $36; chapels, $35; library, $114; school, $29; escapes, $262; hospital, $1,059; making altogether, $13,982.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is that the estimate for 1886 or the detailed account of 1884?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The detailed account of 1884.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How many convicts would that be for?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the same number. I think the estimate is for the same.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was there the same number in 1883-4?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The estimate is for the maintenance of 100 convicts, the same number as in 1884-8. There is an increase of $832.45.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then, if I understand the Minister correctly, the rations are expected to cost about $10,000, or nearly so, the food alone.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I should presume so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, that is enormously high in comparison with other places.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; but I fancy food is still high. I think it is considerably higher at Winnipeg yet than it would be at Ottawa or at Kingston.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then the working expenses, what were they?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Heating, $10,543; lights, $1,011; repairs to buildings, $336; maintenance of machinery, $30; armory, $112; kitchen, $376; stationery, $162; stationery office, $141; Queen's printer, $199; stables, $1,877; farm, $927.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there any wall around that as yet?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, not yet.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose they propose to build one?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, some time. It will be a rather expensive operation.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, there is a quarry immediately beside it.

British Columbia Penitentiary.....$34,620 70

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Here there is a pretty heavy additional demand.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The estimate in 1884-85 was for 90 convicts; the present estimate is for 115 convicts. There is a large population going in there, brought in by the railway. Of course, 25 additional convicts is a very considerable increase. There is an increased estimate for clothing, bedding and so on under the head of maintenance of $2,394; working expenses, $556, a larger amount required for light and repairs to buildings; new kitchen utensils wanted. There is an increase of $1,500 for industries, merely to buy materials to be worked by the convicts, principally in the tailoring and shoe departments; and miscellaneous, $100, to pay postage, freight charges, etc.

LEGISLATION.

Salaries and contingent expenses of the Senate....$57,288 00

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no change in that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Make them adjourn *en permanence* and come together the last day, when you want them.

House of Commons—Salaries $63,050 00

Mr. DESJARDINS. I desire to know why the salary of the assistant-French translator has been reduced from $1,700, which it was last year, to $1,400, which it is this year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Committee on internal economy intend to make a report to the House immediately with respect to the expenditure of the House of Commons, the classification of the officers, and the readjustment of salaries, so that we will not ask for votes to-night on items 34, 35, 36 and 38.

Publishing Debates..... $47,100 00

Mr. MILLS. Would the hon. gentleman tell us why this additional, nearly $11,000, is required for this service—so much more than last year?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I suppose it is on the requisition of the *Hansard* Committee.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Last year it was decided to increase the salaries of the reporters and the translators, and the number of the translating staff has also been increased, and that causes the increase in this item.

Mr. BLAKE. Has it improved the quality of the speeches?

Mr. DESJARDINS. I do not know.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has the quantity, anyway.

Mr. DESJARDINS. The character of the report has improved, and that was the object.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is becoming a very formidable item—$47,100. I strongly suspect, particularly as we are not likely to have any very great surplus at our disposal this year, that strong objection will be taken to this item, and that those members of the House in particular who desire to retain the *Hansard*, may find that this will have to be, notwithstanding the report of the Committee, very carefully considered. I am quite sure that a good deal of objection will be taken, and rightly taken, to a charge amounting to nearly $50,000 on this account.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is certainly large.

Mr. BLAKE. It has swollen so much that I fear it will burst.

Mr. McMULLEN. It appears there is something like $6,000 for the speeches of Senators. I think that is rather high. I do not believe 25 per cent. of the people of this country read them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. To do them justice, apparently the Senate debates and shorthand reports are improved by a charge of $6,000.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Well, it is done by the contract system.

Mr. MILLS. I believe, however, that the Senate Sessions do not average more than one hour a day.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh yes, they do.

Mr. MITCHELL. They have some very stirring debates in the Senate at times.

Mr. McMULLEN. One stirring gentleman has left the Senate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you going to do anything with this very large staff of reporters? how are they going to be employed during the recess? Something was said about that; I do not see that anything has been done. Now, apparently, we have got some 16 or 17 gentlemen employed in connection with publishing the debates, and the reporters are reasonably well paid. What are they supposed to do with themselves during the nine months that we do not employ them?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sorry the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) is not here. He would be able to explain this item.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps Mr. Speaker can explain it.

Mr. BLAKE. I saw a statement made awhile ago, that there was a proposal to employ these gentlemen during recess in connection with the Supreme Court; that there had been some request by the judges of that tribunal for the assistance of shorthand writers in connection with the discharge of some part of their exalted functions, and that it was thought that their services could be utilised in that way.

Sir. JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope it will not have the same effect—of increasing the length of their judgments—that it has here.

Mr. BLAKE. I must say that, when we consider that this expenditure involves something equivalent to an increase of a little over a million dollars in the capital debt of the country, I do not think that we can stand it very long at this rate. I have always, myself, averred that if we have reports, we ought to take every means to make them efficient; but if it turns out that such a report involves the expenditure of a sum which, if capitalised, would amount to over a million dollars, I am afraid that it is hardly worth the money.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who has charge, practically, of these parties during recess?

Mr. SPEAKER. They are only employed during the Session, finishing their work at its close. They do no work during recess for the Government. Last Session the Debates Committee recommended the manner in which they should be employed, and the House adopted their report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I know that; but my recollection of the matter is, that one of the arguments used for giving the gentlemen $2,000 a year was that it was intended to employ them in some way or other during recess. I cannot say from recollection what the intention was, but it was thought that some reasonable additional allowance might be made them during the recess. But, I think, it was intended that they should be utilised in some way. The argument, as well as I remember, that was used with respect to making this allowance to them, was that our employing them during these three months practically prevented them from doing other work, and that they could not employ themselves elsewhere if we employed them during 3 or 4 months here.

Mr. BLAKE. In the first place it was acknowledged on all hands that we required first-class men. In the second place, the work was arduous during a great portion of the Session, and it was impossible to expect that they should do nine months work after three months work in Parliament. It seemed to me that that was quite reasonable, and that after working here at very high pressure for three months, they must have some rest subsequently. In the third place it appeared to be impossible to get regular employment for the fraction of the year that remained.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That was the argument used.

Mr. BLAKE. Speaking from memory, I think there were two suggestions. One was that they should be employed at

a salary of $2,500 a year, it being understood that their services should be at the disposal of the Government for the remainder of the year. The alternative suggestion was, that they should be employed at a salary of $2,000, and be free to make what they could during the recess. It did not appear that there was any suggestion by the Government that they would make an arrangement to utilise their services during the recess, and it, therefore, seemed to be more economical to give them $2,000 and let them be free. But if there does turn out to be permanent occupation of the character to which I have referred, and which is mentioned in the newspapers, this would be the best way of supplying that demand. I do not know whether the demand is a reasonable one or not. If service of that kind is wanted in one of the courts I fancy the services for the remaining period of the year of those gentlemen could be procured, from the statement they made themselves, at much more moderate terms than we could employ any such officials for all the year round. I am not supposed to be myself complaining that this expenditure is too large, because we debated it, it was the free view of the House, and as far as we could judge the salary for the services of first-class men was not unreasonable. My difficulty is, not based on extravagance in the details of the vote, but upon the circumstance which now appears to be clear that in order to procure a satisfactory report an expenditure of $47,000 seems to be required for the service.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It seems to be a very large sum, and I believe, with the hon. gentleman, that there will be a rebellion against this sum being expended for reporting. However, we now have this vote before us. I understand that the arrangement is that the services of these gentlemen are at the disposal of the Government during the recess.

Mr. DESJARDINS. On very moderate terms.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then I see a great deal in the suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) that if we are to furnish shorthand reporters to the Supreme Court we should utilise them in that way. I will take an opportunity of speaking to the Minister of Justice on this matter. I will see to that.

Printing, printing paper and book-binding.....$80,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe there is an increase of $10,000 in this item.

Mr. BOWELL. That is the estimate sent in by the accountant of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice that the amount paid by Mr. Hartney was $68,480, in 1884. There must be some unexplained cause for such a large increase being required. I cannot see why the expenditure under this head, for 1886, should be 20 per cent. more than in 1884.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Let the item stand.

To meet probable amount required for pensions to veterans of war of 1812 .....$13,950 00

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How many of these old pensioners are alive and how many died last year?

Mr. CARON. The number calculated for, is 465 pensioners at $30 a year.

Mr. VAIL. When was the amount increased to $30?

Mr. CARON. Last year. The hon. gentleman must remember the discussion for I believe he himself asked that the pension be increased, and it was decided to limit the amount to $30 hereafter.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What was the amount actually paid last year?

Mr. BLAKE.

Mr. CARON. $17,500.

Mr. VAIL. I think the hon. gentleman must be dreaming when he says that I suggested the increase.

Mr. CARON. I am quite certain that I was not dreaming, because I believe the hon. gentleman spoke upon this question and asked that the whole amount should be redistributed over the pensioners who were alive, and I believe a question was put on the paper at that time.

Mr. VAIL. I do not see at any rate that the head of the Department was authorised to increase the amount, simply on the authority of a suggestion made in this House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I remember that a great deal of pressure was brought by hon. members in the course of the debate, and that remonstrances were made at the pitiable sum of $20 being given to these people. Some hon. members stated it should be at least $50. It was raised to $25 by Order in Council and afterwards $30 was fixed as a maximum. The intention was that the amount should be divided amongst the surviving pensioners, and as each would drop off it would increase the sum to the survivors. It was contended very strongly by some hon. members that $20 would not enable these veterans to live, and the maximum was finally settled at $30.

Mr. BLAKE. How many were paid last year?

Mr. CARON. I have not got that information here.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the number is estimated this year by an actual calculation on their lives.

Mr. CARON. No, it is merely upon the number who have died during the past year, and allowing for the probability of the number surviving.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, the expectation is based on the idea that some would pass away, and that they would pass away at an accelerated ratio each year after they had reached so advanced a term of life.

Mr. VAIL. Have any been added this year?

Mr. CARON. I believe a few additions have been made. When applications are made they are judged by the regulations which are laid down, and if the claims of these applicants are established, of course they are entitled to be placed on the list. I believe there were a few additions—possibly three or four, last year.

Mr. VAIL. Does my hon. friend suppose that with these amounts granted for the last ten years that there are really any of these veterans who have not applied before now? The great trouble I found was, that there were too many applying, and we had to scrutinise very closely the papers to ascertain who were entitled to the pensions. Now, after these pensions have been granted for about ten years it seems to me that they should be stopped. I do not think anybody susposed that they would go on until the present time.

Mr. CARON. I think I can answer my hon. friend by reminding him that he himself came to my office and asked me to place one veteran or two upon that list. The hon. gentleman acquired experience in that Department which he conducted so very well; and benefiting from his experience I am not quite sure that I did not accede to his request and put one of the veterans whom he recommended upon the list.

Mr. VAIL. My hon. friend will perhaps remember that this application was made nine years ago, before I went out of office. This is the third time, I think, that my hon. friend has mentioned it, and I hope he will not forget it next year. But when he does mention it, I hope he will tell the House that fact.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It only shows that my hon. friend has observed that strict supervision which the hon. gentleman has pressed upon him.

Mr. VAIL. He has observed it with regard to those who applied eight or nine years ago, but not with regard to those who have applied within the last three years.

Mr. HICKEY. I can testify that the hon. Minister of Militia observes it strictly now. I applied to him to have one or two names put on the list, and he wrote to me saying that it could not be done.

Mr. VAIL. I think it is quite time the hon. Minister of Militia should stop putting any on. I am quite sure some have been paid who never rendered any service in 1812, and I am quite sure that anybody who had any shadow of a claim would have applied many years ago.

Mr. MILLS. It will be observed that seventy years have gone by since the war of 1812 came to an end, and those persons would be, I suppose, at least eighteen years of age when they entered the service, so that they would be at least eighty-six years of age at the present time. Now, there were quite a large number of these people in the county of Kent when this pension was first granted; I do not know of a single one who is now living, and it does seem to me that the hon. gentleman must be asking for a very much larger sum than is really needed to pay the pensions to parties entitled to receive them. If he goes on adding to the list it will never come to an end. I believe that at the last session of the American Congress the number of persons on the pension list as those who had served during the American civil war, was larger than it was twenty years ago. The hon. gentleman has been keeping this list alive for a very long time, and at a very much greater strength than we had a right to expect.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course, my hon. friend was carrying out the intention of Parliament, which was to grant a gratuity to those persons who had served their country in the last war. It was my hon. friend's duty to exercise supervision, but if a man has earned the pension at any time, he ought to be given it. My hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Vail) says it ought to be put an end to. I know that there have been applications from people who have said: I was a soldier, and during most of my life I never thought of applying, but now I am old and unable to work, and I want the pension. That man should not be punished because he remained independent as long as he was able, and only applied when he became old. It is simply a question of evidence, as to who is entitled to the pension. I am sure my hon. friend has no desire to do anything but justice to these men.

Mr. TROW. I think it is quite commendable in the Government that they are taking up claims, if they are legitimate. I have no doubt they are thoroughly investi- by the hon. Minister of Militia, and if they are authentic, it is perfectly right that these people should be granted the pension, which is only a paltry pittance. But I am surprised that there are so many. These men must be upwards of 90 years of age; and it is certainly an excellent standing advertisement of the healthiness of this great country that there are 500 veterans over 90 years of age still living out of the small number engaged on that occasion. It is something very remarkable.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I am quite sure the remarks of the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) will be regarded by both sides of the House as being in the interest of justice and fair play. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia has been attacked by the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail), for lavish expenditure, and for paying persons who may be imposters; but I am quite sure that if he knew the hon. Minister as well as I know him, he would not make any such charge against him. I have been in the Department of that hon. Minister over and over again in the hope of getting payments made to deserving persons; and while I always found the hon. Minister of Militia anxious to meet my views, he guarded every cent belonging to the Treasury with the most scrupulous tenacity. Everybody who knows him, knows that there is no more economical Minister in the Cabinet than he is—so much so, that I have known him to employ his days and nights in writing courteous letters to parties instead of giving them gratuities. I urged upon him over and over again the claims of one man in Halifax, Major Guy, and at first he told me that he was anxious to meet my views; and when I met him again he said he had spent nearly the whole day in writing the gentleman in question a letter—and he writes a very interesting and courteous letter. Major Guy has that letter yet, which he intends to have framed; and he believes to day, from that letter, that he has got that gratuity. So much for the economy of the Department. My remarks are almost unneccessary after the eulogium pronounced by the hon. member for South Perth upon the hon. Minister of Militia, and I do not think the hon. member for Digby will get any sympathy from this side of the House when he attacks the estimates of the hon. Minister of Militia.

Mr. VAIL. I am not attacking any body, but last year I took the trouble to go to the census and I found that there were only about the same number in the whole of Canada, who were of the proper age to be entitled to this money which we are now paying to a certain number who are supposed to have performed service in 1812. I have not the figures here, but had them last Session in my desk intending to put them before the Minister of Militia on concurrence, but at that particular time I happened to be out of the House.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman looked at the census too late; he should have done so when he was Minister of Militia.

Mr. MILLS. When the ages of those parties were first reported to Parliament they ranged from 76 to 102. Ten years have gone by; whether the younger or older have died we know not, but if the Minister of Militia were to get out a book giving the portraits of the oldest pensioners and their ages, many old men in other countries who are not prepared to die would come here to live.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Pensioners always live long.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If the hon. gentleman were to cause a paper to be prepared giving the number of pensioners in each county, we could form an accurate idea whether the list was correct or not. Everyone sympathises with the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) as to the advisability of dealing generously with these men, but the question comes up whether some parties may not have, by persistency or otherwise, caused themselves to be put on the list though not entitled to a pension. The statement of the hon. the First Minister was very plausible, but it looses some of its plausibility when we remember that those pensioners are not necessarily poor men. I remember when the officer of the Department, Capt. McPherson, came around in order to get the names of those entitled to the pension, he found the names included those of some of our wealthiest men. It was not, however, through a desire to make money that they wished to be put on the list, but because they looked upon it as a roll of honor, as a record of what they had done in days gone bye, and pressed their claims to have their names entered, in order to show that in their younger days they had fought for their country. Capt. McPherson attempted to do his

duty well, and did it as thoroughly as he could. Taking into account the ages of some of the applicants and their inability to give the vouchers of their commanding officers, as the latter had died, their claims had to be rejected; and it looks strange that if they were unable to make good their claims then, they should be able to do so now. We should see that this roll is really kept an honor roll, by not having names added to it unjustly. Was there any expense connected with the paying of this money?

Mr. CARON. No expense whatever.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There must have been some expense, because on dividing the amount, $17,852.50 by 30, it leaves an odd amount of dollars and cents.

Mr. CARON. Last year, I believe, was leap year, and this difference in cents was caused by the fact that those pensions were paid in advance, and the reduction which had occurred, owing to the number of days, appears in the estimates of this year.

Mr. VAIL. It does not seem to me that because last year was leap year a man who was entitled to $30 is entitled to a less amount.

Mr. CARON. I am speaking of the decrease for this year.

Mr. BLAKE. Are they paid by the day or by the year?

Mr. CARON. They are paid by the year, but they are paid in advance, and the odd number of cents is in consequence of the reduction which was made on account of last year having the 366 days.

Mr. EDGAR. Does the hon. Minister's salary vary in leap year from other years?

Mr. STAIRS. Taking the figures and dividing them by 365 and 366, you will find the explanation as the pensions must be paid by the day.

Mr. BLAKE. I understood the Minister to say they were paid by the year.

Mr. CARON. This explanation applies not to the pensioners of 1812, but to the other pensioners.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. Minister will bring down a table showing the number of persons paid each year since the grant began, and the number of persons who died since the grant began.

Mr. VAIL. My hon. friend from Halifax had better look over his figures again. Last year the amount paid was $17,852.50.

Mr. PATERSON. Dividing this payment of $17,852.50 by 30 leaves an odd amount, so that there must have been something paid for postage or other expenses. I would ask the hon. gentleman if, in the case of a veteran who was alive last year, and is being provided for this year, should die a few days before, would his widow receive the full amount for the year?

Mr. CARON. The pension ceases when he dies.

Mr. MILLS. There are not many widows left of these men.

Committee rose and reported.

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

CORRECTION OF A DIVISION LIST.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Our proceedings are generally reported so correctly that I do not as a rule take the trouble to look over them, but one of my fellow members has called my attention to an error in the Votes and Proceedings, and I find on looking at the *Hansard*, that the same mistake occurs there. On the last vote of last night, I am put down as voting "nay" when I voted "yea." The hon. member for Essex, who has the same name as myself, is put down with the "yeas" instead of with the "nays," and I think he voted the other way, and he would probably desire to be put right. However, I cannot speak for him, but for myself I would like to be put right. I voted "yea" and I am recorded as voting "nay."

Mr. SPEAKER. It will be corrected.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is recorded right in the daily papers, but I suppose the *Hansard* has fallen into the mistake from having the division list sent in.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12 o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 10th April, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST—MASSACRE AT FROG LAKE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I regret to have to announce to the House, what I believe is known already, however, that there has been a massacre, I may say, at Frog Lake, which is a lake 40 miles north of Fort Pitt. A telegram has been received from Mr. Dickens, who commands the Mounted Police at Fort Pitt. He says:

"There was a massacre at Frog Lake. The following were killed: T. T. Quinn, Indian Agent, a half-breed; James Delaney, farm instructor; Mr. Gowanlock and wife; Rev. Father Forfar, a Priest; Father Lemarchand, a Priest, and two other men—I believe they were lay brethren. Mrs. Delaney is a prisoner. H. Quinn, nephew of the Quinn who was murdered, escaped and arrived here yesterday. The fate of Mr. Cameron, of the Hudson Bay Company, is unknown. Under Inspector Dickens there is, at Fort Pitt, 25 Mounted Police."

That is the news which I have received.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Are there any refugees at Fort Pitt? Did any escape?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not aware. There are very few people at Fort Pitt. It is merely a police station between Battleford and Edmonton, as the hon. gentleman knows. I believe there are very few people there. This is all I know about it. Whether they will hold their own at Fort Pitt or move eastward towards Battleford, which is nearer Edmonton, I do not know. I expect to hear every moment, or very shortly what further has happened, and I shall communicate it from time to time to the House, without delay.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House, on Friday next, resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient that the Governor in Council should be empowered to authorise from time to time the Commissioner of the North-West Mounted Police to increase the present number of constables to one thousand men, and to appoint from among them non-commissioned officers of different grades, and to appoint supernumerary constables not to exceed in the whole twenty men, and to employ, not to exceed in the whole, fifty men as scouts; and that such constables and scouts should be paid the same rates of pay as now authorised by law for the present force.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. DAVIES. Before you, Mr. Speaker, leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply, I desire to call the attention of the House for a short time to the question which I had the honor of submitting for its consideration last Session, and which I hope I will have better success with this time—I mean the question of bringing about free trade relations between this country and the United States. I had the honor of moving last year, that, in the opinion of this House, it was desirable that negotiations should be opened between Canada and the United States with a view to bringing about reciprocity. At that time the fishery clauses of the Washington treaty had still to remain in operation for about eighteen months, and I thought it very desirable, eminently desirable, that the Government should take time by the forelock and utilise those eighteen months before the treaty expired, so that by the time it had expired they would have negotiated some new treaty or laid the basis of some new arrangement whereby the complications, which necessarily must ensue if we have no understanding with our American neighbors on the question, might be prevented. At that time I called the attention of the House to the fact that the President of the United States, in his Message to Congress, had made a suggestion which seemed to be in the nature of an overture to the Canadian Government, a suggestion to Congress that it was desirable to appoint a commission with a view, if possible, to secure the opening to Americans of the richly stocked fishing waters of British North America. I thought that would be held to be an offer, or at all events, a means of opening the way for this Government, if it desired so to do, to open up negotiations with our neighbors to the south. The right hon. gentleman did not consider it advisable that Canada should move in this matter. His policy was a policy of do-nothing, a fly-on-the-wheel policy, so far as trade relations between this country and the United States are concerned. The right hon. gentleman took the ground that because some years ago a commissioner had been appointed by the Canadian Government to negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States, or to consider the question with commissioners appointed by the United States, and because our commissioner was not successful in his mission, it would be humiliating on the part of Canada again to take the initiative in this matter. That, I think, was almost the sole ground the hon. gentleman took. It was, however, pointed out by him that this Government, some years ago, did all they intended to do; that they placed an offer on the Statute Book of this Dominion to the effect that so soon as the United States Government choose to take the duties off certain articles therein specified, the Canadian Government would follow suit; in other words, they were willing to have reciprocity on a certain number of specified articles. That resolution has been referred to more than once in this House as a resolution which justified the do-nothing policy of the existing Government. I submit that no one who has any acquaintance with the trade relations existing between Canada and the United States can suppose for a moment that that resolution contains the basis on which a fair treaty can be negotiated. I submit that in the position of trade now and what it was twenty-five years ago a change has taken place that, if we desire a reciprocity treaty with our neighbors, we must offer something different. The fact is this: The articles specified in that resolution are articles we do not purchase from the United States. We have more than sufficient of them ourselves; they are articles which form the subject of export from this country and not the subject of import into it, and therefore to say to our neighbors we are willing to allow those articles which we do not in the ordinary course of trade buy from them to come in duty free, is simply to say that we will not trade with them at all. I want to emphasise this subject in this House, which does not take that interest in the subject which I think it should do, but I want also to emphasise it in the country at large, and in the Maritime Provinces of this Dominion, which take very great interest in this question, and I desire them to clearly understand that the policy of this Government is a do-nothing policy, and that the proposition which they placed on our Statute Book in 1879 contains an offer which they know now, and which they must have known then, never would be accepted as the basis of a reciprocity treaty. I submit, therefore, we must have something different. The requirements of the country demand it. The condition in which we shall be placed after the expiration of the fishery treaty articles demands it, and I shall show before I sit down that the strong common sense of the people is speaking out with power in favor of such a treaty. The time is not distant when the Government will have to listen to it. When we had the discussion last year we had not the advantage of knowing what views the British Government held on the question. We know the British Government are very much interested, because when these fishery articles of the treaty of Washington expire, upon that Government very largely will devolve the expense and responsibility of protecting our fisheries. We know that Canada has no navy at present. We know that we have relied in the past, and must rely in the future, largely upon the naval assistance we can obtain from the mother land for the protection of our fisheries. And we know that if the policy which has been foreshadowed by some hon. gentlemen is carried out, what I would call the vigorous policy, the jingo policy, we must have the assistance of the mother country, because we have not the vessels of war to carry it out ourselves. Since the debate took place last Session a return has been brought down, in answer to a motion moved by an hon. member on this side of the House, for all despatches and correspondence upon the subject of the expiration of the fishery articles of the Washington treaty; and I desire to call the attention of the House to those despatches for a moment. I find that as early as March 28th, 1883, a despatch was sent by Earl Derby to the Governor General of Canada, the Marquis of Lorne, in the following words:—

"MY LORD,—I have the honor to transmit to you, for communication to your Government, a copy of a letter from the Foreign Office, forwarding a copy of a despatch from Her Majesty's Minister at Washington, reporting that a joint resolution for the termination of the fishery clauses of the treaty of Washington, has passed the Senate.

"I shall, no doubt, receive an expression of the views and wishes of the Dominion Government in regard to the matter.

"I have, etc.,
"DERBY."

This was a despatch forwarding the notice given by the United States Government of the termination of the fishery articles of the treaty, and his lordship was not content simply with forwarding to this Government that official notice, but he went further, and feeling the importance of the subject, and believing that this Government of Canada would also feel its importance, he remarks:

"I shall no doubt in due course receive an expression of the views and wishes of the Dominion Government in regard to this matter."

Well, Sir, so far as I can understand from the correspondence which passed down to the time that the return was made to the House, which was thirteen months after Lord Derby penned that despatch, no expression of the wishes or views of this Government had been given. His belief that he would receive such an expression from the Dominion Government was not justified by the subsequent facts. In the following month, in the month of May, Lord Derby again writes to the Marquis of Lorne, and he encloses a despatch

received by him from Earl Granville, of the Foreign Office. In this despatch he calls the attention of the Government more distinctly and definitely to the matter, and asks more strongly for an expression of their views. He says:

"Although the articles in question will remain in force for two years after the notice is given, your Government, no doubt, agree with me in the opinion that it is desirable that no time should be lost in taking into consideration the course which it will be best to adopt in regard to the fisheries question, on the termination of the articles of the treaty relating thereto.

"Her Majesty's Government will be glad if your Ministers will favor them with their views in the matter, as soon as they may be in a position to do so."

Well, Sir, Lord Derby appears to have taken the same view of the case which was taken by the Opposition in this House last Session. We did not doubt that the Government would agree with us at that time, that it was desirable that no time should be lost in taking the question into consideration; but it appears that Lord Derby's views, which we had the honor to share, were not shared by hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, the enclosure in that despatch contained the views of the Foreign Office upon this question, and it is clear that there was no small anxiety on the part of the Foreign Secretary, Earl Granville, as to the condition of matters which would follow upon the abrogation of these fishery articles. He says:

"I am to request that in laying this paper before the Earl of Derby you will state that although, after notice is given, two years must still elapse before these articles cease to have effect it appears to Lord Granville expedient to take into consideration without delay, what course it will be best to adopt, with the view if possible, to avoid a recurrence of irritating disputes in connection with the fisheries question, and I am to suggest that in the first place it might be well to communicate a copy of Mr. Lowell's note to the Canadian Government, and to ascertain what views they entertain upon the subject."

Well, this enclosure, which is a despatch from the Foreign Office to the Colonial Office, enclosed in a despatch from Lord Derby to the Marquis of Lorne, was received here in the month of May, and nothing was done, no reply was vouchsafed, and the irritating disputes which it was suggested might recur did not seem to be of any importance to hon. gentlemen opposite, and, at any rate, they did not communicate their views, if they had formed any, to the home Government. And so the matter remained for some time, until the month of January last, when Earl Derby again communicates to the Governor General, the Marquis of Lorne, his views on the subject, and calls his special attention to it. This despatch is dated the 30th of January. It says:

"MY LORD,—With reference to my despatches of the 3rd of May and of the 28th of December last, I have the honor to request that you will move your Government to take an early opportunity of placing me in possession of their views as to the course to be pursued in consequence of the approaching termination of the fishery articles of the treaty of Washington."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What date is that?

Mr. DAVIES. The 30th January, 1884.

Sir. JOHN A. MACDONALD. You said last January.

Mr. DAVIES. It was January twelve month. The despatch goes on:

"In connection with this subject, you will no doubt have observed the suggestion contained in an early part of the Message of the President of the United States, communicated to the two Houses of Congress on the 4th of December last."

Now that is the last despatch on the subject of any importance of those which have been brought down here; at any rate it is the third despatch calling upon this Government to give the home Government their views upon the question. And I find this return which was brought down in the month of April containing nothing further, so that at any rate, up the time the return was brought down, which was just before the House was prorogued, no answer was sent by the Government to these despatches. Now, it is quite clear from that despatch, and the House must recognise the fact, that the English Government are fully aware of the possible consequences of allowing that treaty to expire without taking steps to negotiate a new one. They are aware of the responsibility which will follow, and they feel perfectly aware of the irritating disputes—to use the language of the Foreign Office, which arose before that treaty came in operation, and are sure to arise when these fishery articles are abrogated. Hon. gentlemen know—it is a matter of public notoriety; it is a matter of history; we need not try to keep it quiet here; every hon. member of the Maritime Provinces knows—that as soon as the treaty expires, and the Americans have not by law or treaty the right to fish within the three mile limit, large numbers of them in following their prey will force themselves within that limit; nothing will restrain them, and the result will be that they will either be allowed to take our fish under the noses of our own fishermen or we will have to drive them out by force, and the consequence of driving them out by force will simply be a repetition of the disputes which existed from 1866 down to 1871, when the new treaty came into operation—such matters as I am sure no lover of his country desires to see renewed. Now we have a little more as to the policy of the Government upon this question. I find that the right hon. gentleman himself—and I dare say we may have the pleasure of hearing some expression of views from him before the debate closes—after he returned from his visit to England last year—and I think he returned in the month of December—was interviewed in the city of New York by the ubiquitous reporters, and he gave an expression of his views on this subject. He was asked by the reporter:

"Has anything been done towards a new reciprocity treaty with the United States?"

Mark, we are now down to the end of the year 1884—only four months ago. The right hon. gentleman replies:

"No. Canada has already made several overtures on the subject which have not met with a favorable response; now the initiative rests with the United States. While Canada would like a renewal of the Treaty of 1854 she must wait for her neighbor to move."

Well, the right hon. gentleman, if he is correctly reported, has laid down the policy he intends to follow—that he intends to do nothing; that nothing has been done, that the initiation of the matter must come from our neighbors, but that so far as we are concerned we wash our hands of the whole matter. He was further asked the question:

"Has anything been done towards replacing the fishery clauses of the Washington treaty?"

And the hon. gentleman is reported to have said:

"No; the Government of the United States has given notice under the terms of the treaty of a desire not to continue the operation of these clauses. They will therefore expire on 1st July next, having been in operation for 12 years. I am not aware, however, that anything is being done on the subject."

Such was the language used by the hon. gentleman in the month of December last, some 12 months after his attention was called to the importance of forming some views on the subject, and six months after Earl Derby's opinion had been reiterated twice over as to the importance of his forming some views on the subject. Now, it will not do for the Government to lie by and to follow out this fly-on-the-wheel policy. We are now in the month of April. In three months more the treaty will have expired. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman proposes to negotiate a new treaty during these three months; I do not suppose he intends to change his

policy; I suppose he intends to let the matter drift. However, I will not express myself too strongly until I hear from him whether he has changed his views since December last or not. But I would remind the House that there are many circumstances which indicate that this is a favorable time for entering upon negotiations for a renewal of that treaty. I think the feeling in the United States, the strong common sense of the vast mass of the commercial community of that country is not averse to opening up freer trade relations between the United States and Canada. It has been said time and again that the Gloucester fishermen, who are of course directly interested in this fishery question, directly interested in keeping our fish out of the United States markets, and in obtaining for themselves a monopoly of the fishing business, have expressed a strong opinion against a renewal of reciprocal trade relations, or against a renewal of the fishery clauses of the treaty. So they have; but they form a very small proportion of the people of the United States, and they are merely looking after their own private interests. They do not represent the sober feeling of the vast mass of the people of the United States. Even in the centre of the manufacturing interest of New England, Boston, I find that a strong feeling exists that it would be for the commercial advantage of both countries that freer trade relations should exist between them. The manufacturers, merchants, shopkeepers, shipowners and others, who in times past felt the benefits of the reciprocity treaty with Canada, are desirous that the old times should return again, and that they should again enjoy those benefits. At a large and influential meeting held in that city in the month of November last, the following resolution was adopted:—

"Resolved,—That this meeting through its officers address a petition to the Massachusetts senators and representatives to Congress urging the adoption of a treaty for the promotion of reciprocal trade with the Dominion of Canada."

Nothing could be more satisfactory than that. There was no single dissenting voice against that resolution. It seemed to be the opinion of those gentlemen that negotiations, if once opened, could be successfully concluded, and that a fair basis for a treaty could be arrived at between sensible men—that there was no necessity of either party sacrificing its dignity and refusing to negotiate, but that it was desirable in the interest of the trade of both countries that freer trade relations should prevail. Not only was that resolution adopted at that meeting, but to show the House that no strong feeling exists on the part of a large portion of our American friends against free trade relations with us, I would just read from the last report of the Boston Fish Bureau, a very important society, composed of the leading fish merchants of Boston. In the report, which was issued in January, 1885, they say:

"The Washington ten years fishing treaty expires on July 1st, 1885. We hope that some arrangement will be made by Congress if possible which will be agreeable to all parties interested and affected. The duty on imported fish products from July 1st, at least until some action is taken upon the same, will be as follows."

And then follows a list of the duties for the information of those engaged in the trade. So, you have here in the first place the express resolution of the Boston merchants, manufacturers, and shipowners, calling upon their representatives in Congress to do what they can to bring about freer trade relations between the two countries, and you find that the fish trade of that city itself is not adverse to a renewal of the fishery clauses of the Washington treaty. Therefore I say that these are indications showing that we need not despair if we desire to bring about freer trade relations, and that we need not hesitate about opening up negotiations at all. There seems to be a disposition on the part of our neighbors to deal with the question frankly, and to treat us on fair and square basis. But I find that in Congress itself there is a large and very respectable body of gentlemen, thoroughly conversant with the trade relations of the two countries, who desire that those relations should be freer and less trammelled than at present. I would call the attention of the House to the important fact that in the month of December, 1883, Mr. Maybury, of Michigan, introduced into the American Congress a joint resolution requesting the President to negotiate with Great Britain for a renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854. That resolution was read the first and the second time, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Upon examining the records of that session of Congress, I find that on the 5th of July, 1884, some months after this Parliament had risen, and some months after our debate had taken place on this subject, the Committee on Foreign Affairs reported that resolution. The extract I take from the Journals is as follows:—

"Mr. Hitt, of Illinois, on behalf of Mr. Belmont, New York, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, reported back the above resolution, requesting the President to negotiate with Great Britain for a renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854, which was referred to the House calendar."

I find also that the language of the sub-committee, to which that resolution proposed by Mr. Maybury was referred, was as follows:

"That should the Executive see fit to entertain propositions for freer commercial intercourse with Canada such negotiations would be received with favor."

Now, I do not think that any state of mind could be desired more satisfactory than would appear from the resolution I have read to exist on the part of our neighbors for entering upon negotiations for a new treaty. Though I frankly admit that there are large sections and large interests in the United States that would strenuously oppose free trade relations with Canada, because such would be against their special interests, and the special trade monopolies they desire to perpetuate, still the great mass of the consumers and the majority of the people of that great country believe that benefits would accrue to themselves as well as to Canada from the bringing about of freer trade relations than now exists, and are prepared to give their votes in that direction. I know that under the old Republican Administration which has now passed away and been succeeded by the present Democratic Government, there was not such a chance as there is now of bringing about this reciprocal trade.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. Well, I suppose from the cheer with which the hon. gentleman greets that remark he now intends to announce his intention of opening up negotiation with the new President.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will see.

Mr. DAVIES. I shall be very glad to hear the hon. gentleman state that he intends to open up negotiations and to open them at once. Having shown by these resolutions and these facts which I have given what, at any rate, is the attitude of a certain portion of Congress and a certain portion of the American people on this subject, I would like to draw the attention of the Government to the state of feeling which exists in Canada itself. Are the people satisfied, which is perhaps the most important point that the Government should go on pursuing the policy they have followed in the past on this question? Are they satisfied that nothing should be done? I think those who have followed the history of the past 12 months, those who have watched the course taken by the boards of trade of the several cities of the Dominion, can come to but one conclusion, that the statements made in this House last Session, and the fact that the people of the Maritime Provinces,

at any rate, look at this question as one of vast importance, as one which ought not to be dallied with or trifled with, and shall not, so far as they can help it, are the truths. I will call the attention of the Government and the House to certain resolutions which were passed during the past year by the Boards of Trade of Halifax and St. John, the two commercial centres in the Maritime Provinces. The Halifax Board of Trade met in December last, the 8th December, the same day, I think, on which the right hon. gentleman arrived from England. There were present at that meeting men of all shades of politics, men of the first commercial standing in Halifax, some of them I was glad to see members of this House. The hon. gentleman who fills the position of deputy speaker of this House (Mr. Daly) was present, and I find there names, very familiar to those who know anything about Halifax, of the first merchants of that city of both sides of politics, and they united, which they do not often do down there, in a resolution that was carried unanimously by Liberal and Tory, Conservative and Grit. The following is the resolution, carried unanimously in the Chamber of Commerce, at a meeting of over 50 of the leading business men of Halifax, and which is stated in the report to have been the largest assembly of merchants gathered in that city for some years:

"Resolved, That this Chamber of Commerce unite with the Board of Trade in St. John in requesting the Dominion Government to take prompt and effective steps to rearrange a reciprocity treaty with the United States on fair terms, and to make efforts to secure advantageous trade relations with the Spanish and British West India Islands."

They also passed a second resolution instructing the Executive Committee to prepare a memorial for the Dominion Government asking them to take steps to obtain reciprocity. In that you have a strong resolution which received the unanimous support of all present, and that resolution expressed their desire, and that the Government should take prompt and effective steps to rearrange a reciprocity treaty. This meeting was followed by one of the St. John Board of Trade. At a meeting held the 25th November last in St. John, which also was a representative meeting of the merchants of all shades of politics, the following resolution was unanimously carried:

"Resolved, That the president of this board be requested to ask the co-operation of the Halifax, Quebec, Montreal and Charlottetown Boards of Trade and Commerce in petitioning the Dominion Government to at once take active steps towards securing a reciprocity treaty with the British and Spanish West Indies, and that in consideration of the fishery treaty about expiring the question of reciprocity with the United States be reopened."

So here we have the expressed opinion of the two great commercial centres, at any rate, of the Maritime Provinces, to the effect that it was the duty of the Government to take prompt and effective steps in that direction, and everybody who knows anything of the trade of St. John and the trade of Halifax, everybody who knows anything of the terribly depressed condition of the trade of those two cities, cannot be surprised that the merchants should forward such a resolution and express the hope that the Government will take prompt and effective steps to carry it out. So much for the opinion of Halifax and St. John. The Government, down to the time I have mentioned, when the right hon. gentleman, Sir John A. Macdonald, came back from England, held on to their policy of inaction, and I was of the opinion until just now—but I feel a little inclined to change my opinion from the cheer the hon. gentleman gave just now—that the Government still hold on to that policy, for I find in their organ, the Toronto *Mail*—which, I believe, the hon. gentleman accepts in a general sense as his organ—of March 23rd, an article headed "Reciprocity," which I will take the liberty of reading to the House. It was written for the purpose of showing that it was not desirable that reciprocal trade relations should be obtained and of showing that it would be suicidal on our part to make the attempt; and if it does not reflect the policy of the Government I hope before this debate is over we will have it clearly and distinctly repudiated:

"The Reform journals in the Maritime Provinces and in Manitoba still keep up a clamor for reciprocity with the United States. It is no use telling them it was the Americans, and not Canadians who abrogated the treaty in 1854; that twenty years later Canada sued for reciprocity and was snubbed; and that even now we have a standing offer in our tariff law for a free interchange of national products."

Very much good it is likely to do us; it may remain standing there for the next twenty years and it will produce no result. It is only intended as a blind to lead the people to believe that certain hon. gentlemen are in earnest on this question when they are not in earnest:

"These papers will have it that the Dominion Government could obtain a fair treaty if it tried; and, carried away by this preposterous idea, they are abusing the Premier as though, in declining to go to Washington on his knees, he were guilty of a crime."

The endeavor to obtain a fair treaty is denounced as a preposterous idea. On what grounds? I say it is not a preposterous idea. I believe firmly, and I have had opportunities of conversation with a good many Americans during the past one or two years, that if negotiations were opened up by the Government, or an agent of the Government, with the real and sincere desire of bringing about a reciprocity treaty, such a treaty would be obtained within the next six months. But things cannot be obtained except by those who desire to obtain them, and the Government which does not desire to obtain a thing will very rarely succeed in obtaining it.

"There is only one way of getting it from the Americans that we know of, and that is through a commercial union. But what would that involve? In the first place it would summarily put an end to British connection, or at least would give the Americans free admission to the Canadian market, while British traders would be compelled to pay our regular tariff duties"——

That does not at all follow—

"and that would surely be regarded by England as notice to withdraw her flag from these Provinces. Separation from the mother country under such circumstances would speedily be followed by annexation, for what would be our excuse or ground for remaining independent if in trade and commerce we were practically a State of the Union? This is the only sort of reciprocity the Americans would care to discuss."

What has the present Government done since it came into power? They have done nothing except place that one single resolution upon the Statute-Book in the year 1879, or at any rate if they have done anything it has been very lately and since the returns were brought down to this House last year in the month of April. Up to that time they did nothing, nor did they try to do anything. Not only did they not try to do anything, but they expressed themselves clearly and distinctly as not willing to try; they said it would be humiliating to try; they said they were only standing on their dignity, and that very excuse which was offered last year is cheered by the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) now. I wonder if he will get the Maritime men sitting alongside of him to cheer that remark. I would like to hear them stand up and tell the men they represent in the Provinces below that they believed it would be undignified for us to make the attempt. I would like to see one of them going to his constituents and telling them he did not want reciprocity. How many would be returned to this House? I venture the assertion that not a man in the three Maritime Provinces could be returned unless he expressed his sympathies in favor of free trade with the United States.

"We have done all in our power, and perhaps more than was absolutely consistent with self-respect, to induce them to renew the old treaty; and it would be worse than folly for the Government to invoke another snubbing."

This is the view of the Government organ.

"So long as they decline to negotiate with us except upon the basis of commercial union or of discrimination in their favor against Great Britain, we must be content to look for other markets, first endeavoring to secure possession of our own."

Now I say, if that is the policy of the Government, it is not the policy, I believe, at any rate, of the people of this country, it is not the policy they desire the Government to adopt, it is not the policy which is in the interests of the people of this country, and I mistake very much if the troubles which will follow the abrogation of the fishery articles of the treaty of Washington will not be so great as to make the Government themselves wish they had shown more desire to treat with the Americans for the renewal of that treaty and the opening up of free trade relations. I am not going to detain the House at very great length this time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. It seems to be pleasing to some hon. members. As that seems to please them, I think we will give them some more. In opening, I remarked on the importance of the subject to the people of the Maritime Provinces, and it is not important to a single class alone; it is important to every class. It is important to the farmer that grows the produce, it is important to the ship-owner, the carrier that carries that produce to market, it is important to the laboring man who gets his living by the employment given to him by the farmer and the ship-owner—there is not a class in the community but was benefited when we had those freer trade relations before, or that will fail to be benefited again. And, more than that, they know it; every man down there knows it and does not scruple to say so, and those who represent him do not scruple to say so. Hon. gentlemen will remember well that, when the advocates of the National Policy sought to carry a majority in favor of that policy in the Maritime Provinces, they did so by telling the people: This is the shortest cut to reciprocity, we know that reciprocity is nearest your hearts, that it is the thing you desire the most, that it will bring you larger trade relations and prosperity, and therefore, if you follow the advice we give you and adopt the National Policy, that will bring about the desire of your hearts, reciprocity. In that way they carried it, and up to this day they have never ceased to tell the people: It is coming, do not be in too much of a hurry, we have not had time yet. We know that, during the last election in 1882, it was the cry: We have not succeeded so far, it is true, but we have done a good deal, we are forcing them, and we shall soon have them begging at our doors. I only instance that in order to show that they were aware of the keen desire which is felt by all classes in the Provinces—merchant and trader, farmer and sailor and laborer, one and all to bring about this reciprocal free trade. How could it be otherwise? Hon. gentlemen remember that, away back in the year 1852, when the first reciprocal treaty was entered into between the United States and the then British North American Provinces, the trade between those countries was very small, that it only amounted to seventeen millions. What was the result? Let any hon. gentleman who represents any district in those Provinces be asked the question, and he will tell you that the result was that the trade of those Provinces increased by marvellous leaps and bounds, that the property of that country rose steadily in value, that the shipping property doubled and quadrupled itself during the time that treaty was in force, and that all the benefits which flow from an increased trade and an increased volume of trade flowed upon the people of these Provinces. It was a rich time, a time of prosperity, a time which the people desire to bring back again if possible. They look back to it with pleasure, and they look forward to a renewal of it with hope. I may ask, and we do well to ask, in view of the fact now that we are considering the desirability of reopening negotiations for a new treaty, what brought about the abolition of the old treaty? It was not that the old one was not advantageous to both countries? It was advantageous to both countries. It was felt to be be advantageous. The Americans knew they had great advantages, they were not slow to avail themselves of them, and they appreciated them fully, and our people did the same; but the treaty was abolished by the Americans out of political anger at the supposed sympathies of the majority of this people with secession and slavery. That is the motive which induced them, I believe, the one great leading motive which induced them to repeal that treaty. They felt: This people in Canada are not in sympathy with us in the great struggle in which we are engaged. They are in sympathy with our opponents, they are in sympathy with the rebels, with secession and with slavery; and, while that cannot be said to be the case respecting a very large part of the Canadian people, still it was the case to a considerable extent, and I believe in Ontario to a very large extent. Well, in addition to that, they came out of the war with an enormous debt, they had to put on enormous duties to pay the interest on that debt and the expenses of government, and they felt it was necessary to raise a revenue to some extent in that way. That was one of the minor causes. But that has been all changed now. They have gone on reducing their debt until, during the last seventeen years, they have reduced it nearly one-half; and the present Administration, I think I may fairly say, are more revenue tariff men than they are protection men. I think the policy of that party has been gravitating year by year more and more in that direction, and I think, when the people of that country returned Grover Cleveland to power, they did so on the assumption and in the belief and with the desire that that country would speedily return to a revenue tariff. If that is the case, the old motive which prompted them to repeal the old treaty should not exist any longer. There is no class in this country, I believe, but has the kindliest feelings towards our neighbors in the south. It should be so; it is so. It is for our interest to trade with them and to deal with them as much as possible, and any old feelings of bitterness which once may have existed have passed away, at any rate, I believe, they do not exist among the rising generation. Now we have got, or the Government have, if they refuse to recognise the importance of reopening these negotiations for a new treaty, to consider the facts that they will be face to face with in a few months. They will be face to face, as I said before, with the fact that the fishery articles of the treaty of Washington will be at an end, that the fleet of American fishermen will come down to the gulf of St. Lawrence to prosecute the fisheries for the summer, they will come about the month of July to remain until September or October, they will have to recognise the fact that that fleet must be kept out of the waters or must be admitted under some regulations. What course are we going to adopt? We had three or four years before of a state of things when there was no treaty, that period which followed the abolition of the old reciprocity treaty and preceded the introduction of the Washington treaty, what was done then? We tried the system of licensing those fishing vessels, and I think one and all must admit that that system proved a failure. While we kept the license fee at a merely nominal sum they took out a license. When we raised it to a large sum, a sum which was really felt by them, they refused to take them out, and they ran the risk of being captured. I am sure the right hon. gentleman does not desire to return to that state of things; I am sure none of his colleagues can desire to return to it; I am sure none of those who live in the Maritime Province near the sea fisheries desire to return to it. It was a constant trouble, a constant irritation, a constant worry—with seizures of American vessels every few months, bringing them into port, condemning in the Admiralty Courts, and selling them at auction and creating a feeling of anger, discontent and irritation which, if followed out, would be productive in the long run, I almost

fear, of a breach of the peace between the two countries. Nobody can desire to see that. Well, Sir, what other course is open to us? We have the other course, which so many advocate, of a vigorous policy of exclusion. We know what that means? We know it means the expense by this country of hundreds of thousands of dollars. You must man and fit out cruisers. We have 4,000 miles of fishing coast to protect, and you must man and fit out sufficient cruisers to cover that ground; and even then you cannot do it unless you have the assistance of the home Government. We had their assistance before, but they kept constantly pressing upon us the great and grave importance of settling those irritating questions of the fisheries by means of a treaty; and that is what we are urging now. Well, Sir, there is the other course, as I said before, of treaty negotiations. We can treat to sell our fisheries as we did before, or we can make them the basis and lever for obtaining further commercial relations with the States; and the latter is the course, I believe, which everybody who knows anything about the question desires to adopt. I do not think this country has derived very much benefit from the payment of the four and a half millions of money that we got from the fishery award. It went into the general revenue and was swamped there; and the fact of the matter is the people failed to appreciate the benefit we derived from that sum. Besides that, it is not right, it is not dignified, that the Dominion of Canada should sell a territorial privilege of that kind for a sum of money. It is undignified that we should be prepared to exchange it for money; and I do not think it is right; I do not think the right hon. gentleman himself—in fact I am sure, if he holds the same views he did in 1871, he would not desire to form a treaty, the basis of which would be the sale of the right to fish in our own waters, for a lump sum of money. I remember that in 1871, the Government of which he was a member, framed a Minute of Council in which they expressed that view very strongly, and they forwarded it to the home Government. They said that all the people of this country, whose opinion was worth anything, entertained the same view—that we desired to make the rights we had in these waters, the exclusive right to fish there, the basis of a trade treaty with the United States, the basis of obtaining free trade relations, if possible, with that country; and, Mr. Speaker, that is the only statesmanlike policy. Now, I say it is of great importance that that policy should be adopted, and adopted early. I say if it is not adopted early, you will have the old source of worry, irritation and discontent on you again. I say you are not prepared at the present time to protect your fisheries. No preparations have been made. The Government have not sufficient cruisers, and they know it well; I do not know if they have any cruisers at all ready for that purpose. The season will be upon us in a few months, and when it does come, if your fishermen are left unprotected, and the Americans can come in and fish side by side with your own fishermen in your own waters, and then when your fishermen are met with $2 a barrel duty upon their fish while the Americans can get their fish in free—we know that the result of that must be wrong to our fishermen; it cannot be otherwise. Now, Sir, this business of fishing we know is a precarious business, we know more than that—that so far as the mackerel fishery is concerned, which is the chief article of the fishery, the most important fishery done there, we know that the sole market for the best mackerel is to be found in the United States. If we had, as you have with codfish, markets in different parts of the world, it would not be of so much consequence to us whether the Americans excluded our fish from their markets or not; we would have other markets to go to. But everybody in the fish business knows that for No. 1 mackerel there is no market outside of the United States. We can sell the poorer kind of mackerel in the British and Spanish West Indies, but for No. 1 mackerel you have no market but the United States. Therefore when they put on this heavy duty against us we are at a great disadvantage. Our fishermen now find it difficult enough to fish with success. An immense deal of money is already invested in this business, and if they are handicapped in the sale of their fish it will be, if not ruinous, at least very detrimental to their trade. I think the hon. gentleman himself recognised and appreciated the importance of this subject, for I find that when he recommended the adoption of the Washington treaty, and contended for the very clauses for the renewal of which I am seeking to-day, the hon. gentleman spoke as follows:

"They are so anxious to get free admission for their fish into the American market, that they would view with great sorrow any action of this House which would exclude them from that market; that they look forward with increasing confidence to a large development of their trade, and of that great industry; and I say that, that being the case—if it be to the interest of the fishermen, and for the advantage of that branch of national industry, setting aside all other considerations—we ought not wilfully to injure that interest. Why, Sir, what is the fact of the case as it stands? The only market for the Canadian No. 1 mackerel in the world is the United States. That is our only market, and we are practically excluded from it by the present duty. The consequence of that duty is, that our fishermen are at the mercy of the American fishermen. They are made the hewers of wood and the drawers of water for the Americans. They are obliged to sell their fish at the Americans' own price. The American fishermen purchase their fish at a Montreal value, and control the American market."

Now, Sir, I do not quote that speech of the hon. gentleman because I endorse all he says there. I do not endorse it; I think, in putting the case, he has used very extreme language. I do not think that the consequences will be at all as ruinous as he depicted; but it would be very disastrous, and to handicap our fishermen in this way would place them at a great disadvantage as against American fishermen; but it would not prove ruinous, it would not make us hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Americans. But if the hon. gentleman still holds the views he held then, if he thinks it would be so ruinous and disastrous to the business in which so many millions of money are invested, it is his duty to take some steps to avert the serious consequences which he predicted. Because the very thing that he feared is coming upon us now. The treaty is about expiring; the treaty, the acceptance of which by the House, he was then advocating, is about expiring; the $2 duty is about to be put on again, and we are about to be made hewers of wood and drawers of water once more, according to this view, for the Americans. Our fishing industry is about to be ruined, and it behooves him to take active and energetic steps to avert the sad consequence which, he says, will fall upon our trade from the adoption of this policy by the United States, of the imposition of $2 per barrel upon our mackerel. I would like to call the attention of the House to a few statistics that I have gathered from the Trade and Navigation Returns as to the trade existing between Canada and the United States. They show that notwithstanding the barriers which each country has erected to prevent trade flowing as freely as it ought to, notwithstanding that trade is hampered by the heavy Customs duties imposed on both sides of the border, still, Sir, that country is the natural country with which we should trade, and with which we do trade. Our trade with the United States, in spite of all these restrictions and barriers, has reached enormous proportions. If we take the imports, what do we find? We find that of the total imports of dutiable goods, $32,828,307 come from Great Britain, and $35,796,697 from the United States. In fact our imports from the United States are larger than from Great Britain itself. In the face of the high tariff, the National Policy tariff, we are compelled to go and buy our goods there. Why? Because it is to our advantage. We are not fools enough, if it was to our disadvantage, to go and buy our goods in that market. Of free goods while we take from Great Britain $10,589,707, we take $14,696,129

from the United States. So of a total of $108,180,647, the gross imports of this country, we imported $50,497,826 from the United States and only $13,418,015 from Great Britain. That shows the importance of the trade; that shows that if the trade was allowed to run in natural channels it would run between this country and the United States. We know in the Maritime Provinces that is where our market lies. Our market for the produce we grow from the soil, the fish we take from the sea, the lumber we cut from the forest, is not in Canada. We do not send our produce to you; you do not buy it from us. The Americans, on the other hand, want everything we can grow from the soil, everything we can take from the sea, everything we can bring from the forest. It is our natural market; and if you prevent our people from having access to that market, you are going to bring ruin upon them in the long run. The Finance Minister smiles. Let him go down and look at the deserted wharves at St. John, Halifax and Charlottetown, and he will have his answer. It is more serious than he imagines. If my statement is not correct, I shall expect to hear it denied by some hon. gentleman who represents the Maritime Provinces. I should like to hear some of my friends say whether the remarks I have made in that connection are true or not; whether it is not true that they desire, whether it is not natural they should desire free trade relations with that country, whose people are willing to buy at a profit everything we can obtain from the soil, sea and forest. I find that the aggregate trade between Great Britain and Canada in 1884 was $87,154,242, with the United States $89,333,366. I find more than that. I find to my surprise, it may be known to some hon. gentlemen, but not to others, that our imports from the United States exceeded our exports to the United States by no less than $11,652,286. The exports, including bullion and short returns, from Canada to the United States amounted to $38,840,540. The imports from the United States to Canada were of the value of $50,492,826, showing a balance in favor of imports to Canada of over eleven millions and a half That is in the face of the National Policy tariff. You have made the people pay high duties, but they had to have the goods, and so they had to pay for the goods and the duty besides. We cannot ignore these facts—the fact that the people desire to trade with the United States, and in face of all obstacles you have placed, they have traded, to a certain extent, with their neighbors to the south; and that if we remove these obstacles, we shall have a return of the trade prosperity which existed in this country between 1852 and 1866. I desire to call the attention of the House for a moment to the exports. I have said that the Americans buy the larger part of our fish. I turn to the Trade and Navigation Returns and I find that of the exports of fresh mackerel, value $29,589, the United States took all. Of pickled mackerel, 95,816 barrels were exported, and 85,214 barrels were taken by the United States, of the value of $789,101. The other $10,000 worth of number 2 and number 3, chiefly number 3, went to the West Indies; but they were of very small value as compared with those shipped to the United States. Fresh herrings were exported in value, $18,373; all went to the United States. Pickled herrings, of 137,370 barrels, value $539,911, exported, 80,342 barrels, of the value of $300,455 went to the United States. Of smoked herrings, $154,257 worth were exported; $140,560 went to the United States. Of other fresh sea fish, of the value of $211,369, all went to the United States. Other fresh fish, value $340,507; all went to the United States. That is the great market for our fish, and I am very much afraid when you further hamper the trade by imposing duties, when our fishermen are shut out of the American markets, our fishing industry will suffer very materially. I find that of the total exports from the mines of this country, of the value of $3,247,092, $2,505,501 went to the United States. Of the total exports of our fisheries, $8,591,654, the United States took $3,598,216. Of the exports of the forest, $25,811,157, the United States took $9,838,749. Of the exports of animals and their produce, $22,946,108, the United States took $6,369,702. Of the exports of agricultural products, $12,397,843, the United States took $7,503,111. Of our manufactures, $3,577,535, the United States took $1,265,652. Of miscellaneous goods, $560,690, the United States took $507,691. So of our total exports of $77,132,079, the produce of Canada, no less than $31,631,622 were taken by the United States, showing that that is the country with which we naturally deal in spite of all the artificial obstructions placed in the way. I have abstained from discussing several features of this important question purposely, because I know it is not desirable to say too much if we are on the eve of negotiations with the United States. I do not propose to occupy the time of the House longer, and I shall very much rejoice if I have done nothing more than direct public attention to the vast importance of the subject, and if I succeed in eliciting an expression from the First Minister of sympathy with the resolution I am about to move, and a statement that the Government are alive to the importance of the question and are about taking steps to do, what I say they should have done long since, enter upon negotiations with the American people for a renewal of the reciprocity treaty with that country. I move in amendment to the motion now before the House that all the words after the word "that" to the end of the question be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—

In view of the early termination of the fisheries articles of the treaty of Washington, this House is of opinion that negotiations should be opened with the United States of America, as well for the renewal of reciprocal privileges accorded by that treaty to American citizens and British subjects respectively, as for the opening up of additional reciprocal trade relations between Canada and the United States; and that in the conduct of such negotiations, Canada should be directly represented.

Mr. HACKETT. In rising to make a few observations on the important question before the House I desire to say that it is not my intention to detain the House, but for a short time. The hon. gentleman has introduced this question in a way I am sorry to see it introduced. The question is one of great importance to the people of this country. The people of this country are desirous of having reciprocal trade with the United States, and the Government of this country is desirous of carrying out the views of the people in that direction, and I am sorry the hon. gentleman should introduce a motion of this kind, at a time when the people's representatives assembled here are endeavoring to vote supplies to the Government to carry on the affairs of the country, and that he should endeavour to make a party question out of it and to make a cry in the country. Coming from one of the Maritime Provinces, I may say that the question is viewed in those Provinces as one of great importance. The people of the Maritime Provinces all know that the extension of trade with the United States, that reciprocity of trade with that country, would add materially to their benefits, and would be an advantage to the lower Provinces. But, Sir, the people there consider that the Government of Canada feel the same way. They feel that the Government consider that it would be in the best interests of Canada to have an extension of the trade with the United States, and they are quite willing—and I know I voice the sentiments of a majority of the people of my own Province at least in saying—that they are willing to leave the matter in the hands of the Government, and they believe that justice will be done by them. The hon. gentleman has stated that this Government is very slow in moving in this matter, that in fact nothing has been done to show that they are desirous that we should have reciprocity with the United States. Now I take it that that view is incorrect. The hon. gentleman referred to the clause of the Customs law of 1879, in which it is stated that certain natural products of the United States should be

admitted free of duty into this country, and that certain natural products of this country should be admitted free into the United States, and he attempted to show that this indicated that the Government is unfavorable to reciprocity with the United States; because, he says, those articles enumerated in that list are not brought from the United States into this country, but we send our products to that country. Now, I consider if reciprocity could be obtained on the basis of that list it would be quite satisfactory to at least the people of my own Province. I will read the list of the articles to show the hon. gentleman and the House that in this list is included almost all the natural productions of the country, and that if it could only have reciprocity on the basis of those articles it would be quite satisfactory. I find here that:

"Any or all of the following articles, that is to say:—Animals of all kinds, green fruit, hay, straw, bran, seeds of all kinds, vegetables (including potatoes and other roots), plants, trees and shrubs, coal and coke, salt, hops, wheat, peas and beans, barley, rye and oats, Indian corn, buckwheat and all other grain, flour of wheat and flour of rye, Indian meal and oatmeal, and flour or meal of any other grain, butter, cheese, fish (salted or smoked), and lumber, may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this Act, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles in Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty, or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same under such proclamation when imported into Canada."

Now, Sir, I consider if we could only obtain reciprocity on that basis it would be quite satisfactory, and that the Government by placing that clause on the Statute-Book of the country have indicated their willingness to enter into negotiations with the United States for the purpose of renewing reciprocal trade relations. Now, the hon. gentleman has stated that the Republican party was opposed to reciprocity, but I would like to ask him in what way does he consider his resolution, supposing it should pass, would advance the chances of our obtaining a reciprocity treaty. We should approach the American people in a business-like way, for they are a calculating people, and when you ask them for something you want you must show them that you are going to give them something in return, and if they do not consider it to their advantage to have reciprocity with us, they will not agree to any proposition which is brought up by a resolution in this House. Now, Sir, I know that last year several treaties were negotiated by the American Consuls, the representatives of the United States, that some 8 or 9 treaties were negotiated by the Republican party, but when they came to that power which has the ratification of such treaties in the United States they were all allowed to drop and not one of them has become the law of the country. So you see that in approaching the United States people you must approach them in a manly, honorable way, and not go to them as suppliants in such matters. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman used a strong argument against himself when he used the argument that it would be impossible to obtain a reciprocity treaty from the Republican party. If any justification could be required for the conduct of the Government the hon. gentleman gave it himself in using that argument. If the Government in their wisdom, watching the current of opinion in the United States for the last year or two, saw that it was likely that the Democratic party would come into power, and that they would be more favorable to reciprocity of trade with Canada than the Republican party, I say it was wisdom on their part not to make any advances to the Republican party, but to wait till the Presidential election was over before making those advances. If the Republican party were opposed to a reciprocity treaty and the Government made overtures to them and those overtures were rejected, and no reciprocity could be had, the chances of obtaining a reciprocity treaty again would be very much lessened, and we would be thrown back 10 or 15 years. But the Government instead of doing that, instead of acting hastily, with great wisdom and prudence preferred—so far as I know, and I have no more information on the subject than the hon. gentleman—preferred to wait until such times as the people of the United States were cooled down after the heat and turmoil of a general election, when they would view with greater coolness a proposition of this kind, when another party had come into power, and a party which it is believed are more favorable to reciprocal trade with Canada than the Republican party were. I am willing, so far as I am concerned, to approve of the action of the Government in that respect, and I am certain that the people will view their action in the same way that I do. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman made reference to the great increase of trade during the time we had reciprocity with the United States. Well, there was a very large increase of trade. It is no doubt beneficial to the people of any country to have an extension of their trade; the people of Canada know that, and the people of the United States know it as well; there was a considerable increase of trade during that period of reciprocity from 1854 to 1866. But I contend, Sir, that if we had a reciprocity treaty now the conditions are not at all the same. The conditions are entirely changed. At that time Canada consisted of scattered Provinces which had no central Government, each having a separate tariff of its own and each working in its own direction. But now we have one united, consolidated Canada in British North America. We have to a great extent increased the inter-provincial trade among our people; commodities that we were obliged to send to the United States some years ago to find a market for them, now find a ready market in their own country. We know that one cause of the great prosperity of Canada during the period from 1854 to 1866, was the Russian war. Hon. gentlemen know that about the time when the reciprocity treaty came into force, Russia, Great Britain and France were engaged in a great war. That war added very largely to the business prosperity of Canada; many articles produced in Canada found a ready market in the old country in consequence of that war; and towards the end of the period the United States themselves became engaged in a great civil war, and Canada also found a large market for very many of her productions in that country. But now it is very different; the conditions have changed; the people of the United States themselves produce a great many of the things they formerly received from us; and, with the exception of the articles enumerated in this list, we could not now find a market in the United States for very many more of the products of Canada. Now, as I said before, Canada has progressed very much since that time. We have opened up avenues of trade; we have built railways to unite the different portions of the country; we have deepened our canals; we have improved our harbors and built lighthouses; and we have done a great deal to improve the public accommodation in the country. Therefore, when we approach this subject, we should not by any resolution of this House proclaim to the world that Canada is in any way dependent upon the United States. I know that there can be no dignity in trade; I do not say that it would be lowering the Dominion of Canada at all to make application; but I do not see that we should by resolution of this House proclaim to the world that it is necessary to the existence of Canada that the Government should continue to press to enter into negotiations for reciprocity with the United States. Now, the hon. gentleman has referred at some length to the expiration of the fishery clauses of the Washington treaty on the 1st of July next. The Washington treaty no doubt very greatly increased the fishing industry in the Maritime Provinces. Before the ratification of that treaty the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces, in taking their products to the United States, were obliged to pay a heavy duty thereon. When that treaty was ratified, they had a freer market in the United States; and the mackerel

fishery especially, to which the hon. gentleman has referred, grew to very large proportions. We know that the fishermen of the United States were the parties who called for the abrogation of that treaty. Canadians were quite willing to continue under the operation of the treaty; but the United States fishermen brought such pressure to bear on the Government of that country that the Government gave notice to England that the treaty would cease on the 1st of July next. Now, several meetings have been held in the fishing centre of the United States during the last year to show that the fishermen derived no benefit from that treaty, but that on the contrary it was a cause of great disaster and ruin to them. They endeavored to show that under the treaty the quantity of fish taken by them in Canadian waters was not of very great importance, and that on the other hand, Canada had been paid $4,500,000. At a meeeting held in December last at Gloucester, the principal fishing town of the United States, letters were read from United States senators and other gentlemen holding high and prominent positions in the country, and dissapproving of the continuance of the treaty. Senator Frye said:

"In his opinion the provisions of the treaty of Washington were an outrage on the rights of our fishermen."

Those provisions will expire on the 1st of July next, and he did not want to see a resurrection. Representative Collins, a very intelligent gentleman, and one of the most prominent Congressmen from the Eastern States, said:

"The fishery treaty was a fraud and a cheat upon our people."

Now, Sir, having these statements staring us in the face, would it not be humiliating for our Government to make overtures to these people? It is the duty of our Government not to make any proposal until the people of that country learn to appreciate the value of our fisheries; and if you shut them out you should take proper means of protecting the fisheries of Canada. Keep the American fishermen beyond the three mile limit, and they will begin to appreciate the value of our fisheries, and Congressman Collins will not say to the people of Gloucester that the fishery treaty is a fraud and a cheat. The hon. gentleman said that without the assistance of the mother country it would be impossible for us to protect our fisheries. I consider that that is a slander on the people of Canada. Canadians have not only the means but the desire to protect their fisheries; and I maintain that four and a half or five millions of people on the continent of North America, free-born British subjects, have the desire and the will to protect their right, and will not need to call upon the mother country to send out their fleet to guard their fisheries. Sir, those fisheries are of great value and importance to the people of this country; and I hope the Government will take such means as are necessary to protect them, and to afford the people of Canada the enjoyment of those rights that belong to them. Sir, we know that the United States fishermen at present value those rights. At those very meetings held at Gloucester, resolutions were passed asking the Government to go behind the treaty of 1818, and to insist on the right of American fishermen to fish in the coast waters of Canada. They consider that by that treaty their rights were taken away, and that it was as great a fraud and as great a cheat as the Washington treaty; and they passed a resolution asking their Government to go behind the convention of 1818, and to insist on the right of American fishermen to fish within the three mile limit. Therefore I say that they do appreciate the privilege of fishing in the coast waters of Canada at the present time, and I hope our Government will take strong measures to keep them out. We know that since the Washington treaty was negotiated, the mode of fishing has entirely changed, and it would not be so difficult now to keep these fishermen outside of the three mile limit as it formerly was. Before the treaty came into force, the hook and line was the principal apparatus used by the American fishermen; but now they have abandoned the hook and line, and have taken to the purse seine. At that time they had a very excellent class of fishing vessels, and while fishing within the three mile limit, if they saw the smoke of a steamer coming to them, they could at once haul up their lines, and sail away. But now, there is a different state of affairs. In shooting the seines a great length of time is occupied; and those seines are of great value. The vessels may lie outside of the three mile limit, while the boats and seines may be inside, and if they succeed in catching a haul, it will take a long time, fully twelve hours, to get the haul out of the seine. Therefore, it is not likely that the American fishermen will risk their boats and seines by encroaching on the fishing grounds, because if you have proper steam and sailing vessels to guard the fisheries, they can easily be detected. If you make some reprisals upon these fishermen, they will soon arrive at the conclusion that it will be better for them to keep outside of three mile limit. Therefore I hope the Government will take active steps to guard and protect the fisheries of Canada, and to preserve them for the people of Canada. Another thing that I am very glad to see the Government are doing, is the placing of duty on fish coming from the United States. With our large extent of fishing coast—the hon. gentleman has said some 4,000 miles, and I believe he is correct—with our hardy and active class of fishermen, with some of the best fishing vessels that can be built in the world, we ought to be able to provide our own people with all the fish they require; with these advantages, the people of the Eastern Provinces ought to be able to provide the people of the Western Provinces with all the fish they can consume, better and at cheaper rates than can the United Stntes. A large quantity of the fish now consumed in Western Canada is produced in our own maritime waters, sent to Boston, and brought from Boston and Gloucester to Montreal, the great distributing point of the Dominion; and it must be evident to any sane man that these fish can be sent much cheaper over our own railways direct from the place of production and placed before the consumer at a much lower rate than they can by bringing them by a roudabout way through a foreign country.

An hon. MEMBER. Why do they not come by our own way now?

Mr. HACKETT. The hon. gentleman asks how much is imported. Nearly a million dollars worth was imported last year from the United States, and therefore the people of the Maritime Provinces will, by the action of the Government in protecting their fish, have full control of the markets of Canada, and in this way the Government are carrying out the desires of the people of the Maritime Provinces. The hon. gentleman last year brought up a similar resolution before this House. The idea of the hon. gentleman last year was the same as his idea this year, namely to endeavor to decrease the popularity of the Government in the country. Well, the hon. gentleman had an opportunity last summer of testing what his resolution could do in the Maritime Provinces; he had an opportunity in his own county, the intelligent county of Queen's, Prince Edward Island, of making this test, when hon. gentlemen opposite brought out one of the most popular men that could be produced on their side of politics to contest the county against my hon. friend (Mr. Jenkins). The hon. gentleman at several meetings appeared on the platform and repeated almost *verbatim* the speech he delivered on his motion last year. He said that whenever he rose in Parliament to advocate the rights of Prince Edward Island, and the Maritime Provinces generally, he always found Mr. McDonald and Mr. Brecken, and Mr. Hackett opposing him, and he added: "If you desire to show Sir John and his Government that they have not the confidence of the

people, let the electors of Queen's return Mr. Welsh to support me in Parliament." The hon. gentleman canvassed the county from one end to the other most strenuously in favor of his candidate, but the people by an overwhelming majority placed my hon. friend (Mr. Jenkins) on the floor of this Parliament to support the policy of the Government. There the hon. gentleman got his answer. He endeavored to lessen the popularity of the Government and of my hon. friend and of myself, but he got his answer from the intelligent people of Prince Edward Island; and should the opportunity again present itself, my hon. friend will still find that he is as much mistaken now as he was a year ago. I am not going to refer to the hon. gentleman's missionary exercises during the past week or two in Northumberland where he again canvassed the people and received the same answer that he did in Prince Edward Island. The hon. gentleman, I hope, will see the futility of his partisan course. It is not in our interest to be such hide-bound partisans that we should continually oppose on all occasions the policy of the Government. The Government of Canada stands strong in the affection and esteem of the people, and the hon. gentleman knows that in opposing that Government he is opposing the wishes and the ideas of the people of Canada; and when he brings forward a very important resolution, a resolution pertaining to so important a matter as that of reciprocity with the United States, he should not bring it forward in a narrow party spirit. He should have taken an opportunity of bringing it forward before the motion was made to go into Committee of Supply; he should have brought this matter forward in such a way that it could be honestly discussed, but he did not do that. He thought proper to proceed in the partisan course taken by him last Session, and he will find on this occasion that the hon. members of this House will meet him as they did last year, and that the people of this country will view his action in the same light as they did last year. I need not refer at any greater length to the hon. gentleman's speech, but I wish to express my opinion that I am convinced the Government of Canada will do everything possible to secure the extension of the trade of Canada. That is a part of the policy of the Government. They will do everything in their power to further this end, and I do not want to hamper or embarrass them in their action by supporting a resolution which has no meaning but a partisan meaning, and which, if carried, would mean a want of confidence in the Government. I shall therefore have much pleasure in voting against the hon. gentleman's motion and leaving to the Government the carrying on of the business of the country.

Mr. YEO. I am much pleased that this question, which is of great importance, especially to the people of Prince Edward Island, has been brought before the House, and I hope the Government will deal with it in a practical manner by making every effort to renew the treaty. Not only do I hope they will do that, but that they will secure for us better trade relations with the United States. This is a matter which affects particularly the people of Prince Edward Island. It is very true that we, in that island, can consume the manufactured goods that you send to us from Western Canada, but we have nothing that we can send to you in exchange, and it is a great disadvantage to us that we should have to send you our gold in exchange for what we purchase. I was greatly surprised to hear the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. I had to look at him twice before I could really make sure that it was he who was giving utterance to them. Why, that hon. gentleman, when he was running his election in 1878, denounced the late Government for not making an effort to get reciprocity. That was the strongest plank in his platform; it was that which helped him most to gain his election: that was the whole cry he had, in fact against the late Government, and I was surprised after having heard him speak so loudly on the stump to his countrymen, that he should after he had left that little island for a couple of years, so completely change his opinions. It is possible that this hon. gentleman does not intend to return to his people and ask them for a renewal of that confidence which he has so completely betrayed. He says now we do not want any trade relations with the States.

Mr. HACKETT. I did not say that; I said that we did want them.

Mr. YEO. The hon. gentleman denounced the late Government for being the cause of so many people leaving the country, for being the cause that we had no trade with the United States; and said let us but come into power and you will see a change. Let his party get into power and he would let them see how soon he would vote reciprocity—because it was a great boon and the source of immense prosperity to the country when it was enjoyed in the past. Hearing this hon. gentleman get up and speak in this way, I could not sit still and not reply to him. At the same time, I hope as the Government is strong, and, with plenty of supporters at its back, that it will deal with this question. I have every faith that it will, and, if it does not, we shall have to oppose it strongly down in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. BURPEE. I must take issue with the hon. gentleman from Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. Hackett) in his statement that this is an inopportune time, and that it is against the interests of this country to bring forward resolutions of this kind. I do not understand with him that it is a vote of want of confidence. It need not be so necessarily; the Government can treat it so if they think proper, but I think it is a question which should be treated fairly on both sides of the House, and, if anything could have made it a party question, if anything could have introduced party politics into it, it is the speech of the hon. gentleman. The question of extended trade relations in the Maritime Provinces is a burning question, and we offer no apology for bringing it forward at this time to the attention of the House or the country. It is a question which will not keep; it is a question which they are intense upon. We were told before we went into Confederation, at least we were told before the National Policy was instituted, by Sir Charles Tupper that, if we would adopt the National Policy, if we would adopt a reciprocity of tariff, in less than two years we would have commercial reciprocity with the United States. That he publicly declared. Now we have waited six years, and there is no sign of it. On the contrary, we have every evidence from the Government, from the representative members of the Government, and from their organs, and from the jeers and sneers of those who sit behind them to-day on the earnest appeals of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), who has so ably brought forward this motion, that it is not their intention, that it is not their policy, that in fact it is against their policy to move in the direction of reciprocity with the United States, or even extended trade relations with any country. I do not feel inclined to take up the time of the House, but I think this question is of such vital importance that we should review it at some considerable length. I do not feel inclined to do it myself, but I hope others will. I recollect that a long time ago, 40 years ago, it was a very important question in the country, especially in the Province from which I come, New Brunswick. I recollect, and I have refreshed my memory since, that in 1847 this question of trade relations with other countries was prominently brought before the House of Assembly of New Brunswick. In that year a resolution was passed in that House of Assembly asking the other British North American colonies if they

would accept free trade with New Brunswick, and an Act was passed in 1848 embodying those views. Communication was had with the other Provinces of British North America, and in 1849 a treaty, a virtual reciprocity treaty was made between the British North American Provinces. I believe the whole of them except Newfoundland at that time. Such then was the interest taken in the extension of our markets and our trade relations, and it has continued up to the present time. In 1854, the treaty with the United States was passed. That treaty, although it did not extend to manufacturers, worked favorably and in the interests of both countries. I do say, and as a maritime man I know something about it, that it was just as much in the interests of the United States as in the interests of the Provinces that that treaty should be continued. It included, among a few minor things, grain, flour, breadstuffs, animals of all kinds, meats, seeds and vegetables, fish of all kinds and produce of fish, poultry and eggs, hides and furs; stone and marble, slate, butter, cheese and tallow, ores and metals, coal, timber and lumber of all kinds, manufactured and otherwise, pelts and wools, cotton ,dye stuffs, and a number of other varieties of articles. During the continuation of that treaty trade prospered. It was mutually benebeneficial to both parties. It was the policy at that time to extend our trade relations. It has been stated to-day by the hon. member for Prince, Prince Edward Island, that it is the policy of the present Government to extend trade relations with other countries. I would like to see their policy put into practice. We have been in Confederation some 18 years, and I would like to see the first move towards extending our trade relations with other countries. If that is their policy they have failed most ignominiously in carrying it out. The fact is that at that time the Province of New Brunswick, which I know most about, in order to carry out the trade relations with the British North American colonies, agitated a railway that they might have commercial intercourse. They also made very large sacrifices in order to subsidise a railway to the United States in order that this reciprocity treaty might be carried out. They also built a road to Shediac and they contemplated the Baie Verte Canal, all in the interests of extending their trade relations with their neighbors. At present, in spite, as the hon. member for Queen's has said, of the very high tariff, in spite of the obstacles placed in the way of our trade with the United States, we last year exported some $32,000,000 from the Dominion and imported $50,000,000. From New Brunswick we exported about $3,000,000 and imported $3,095,000, which consisted of produce of the mines, $100,000; fish, $766,000; animals and their products, $410,000; agricultural products, $60,000; manufactures $97,000; miscellaneous, $40,000; product of the forest, $1,547,000. I will just state, with reference to that item, that about one-third of the amount represents manufactures of the United States that passed through New Brunswick; so that we actually exported last year the sum of $3,000,000, in round numbers, and imported about the same amount. Now, this trade cannot be ignored. It would be unfair to ignore it. The people of the Maritime Provinces are in earnest about it. In reference to agricultural products, we have no other market for our vegetables, hay, and other things, except the United States. Ontario and Quebec do not want them. In fact they send us agricultural products amounting to over a million dollars per annum, and slaughter them in our markets. They interfere directly with the agricultural interest of our own country. We have certain surplus products for which we have no other market but the United States, and we are compelled, notwithstanding all the obstacles in the way, to send all those products to the States. This is being felt very severely by us, and I must say that the state of our trade can scarcely be borne; and it cannot exist much longer without serious detriment to our people. Now, with regard to the old reciprocity treaty. We had the privilege of that treaty from 1854 to 1865, about 11 years, and during that time it proved advantageous to both countries. The causes that brought about the abrogation of that treaty, I think, were pretty thoroughly shown by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). The feelings that were aroused in England with reference to the Alabama trouble, the fact that the Alabama had been built in, and escaped from, an English port and had committed depredations on the American navy upon the high seas, was the principal cause of the ill-feeling that arose between the two countries, which was augmented by the Mason and Slidell affair. These causes, in my opinion, principally led to the abrogation of that treaty. That feeling was extended, I may say, also to Canada. There was a large party in Canada who sympathised strongly with the Southern States. After the war was ended the United States had rolled up an immense debt, and they were compelled to put on enormous duties in order to pay the war debt. This rendered it necessary to put a high duty on every article that would bear a high duty, including many articles included in our reciprocal treaty, in order to meet the interest on their debt and pay the expenses of Government. These were the principal causes, in my opinion which led to the abrogation of the treaty, and I think that view is entertained by all parties who have studied the subject. Well, when Canada found out that the abrogation of this treaty was about to take place, a great deal of regret was felt; there was an intense feeling in the Maritime Provinces that we could not prosper without trade relations with other countries, that we could not adopt the maxim which is continually put forward in this country, of Canada for the Canadians alone. We felt that we must have trade, that we had ships, we had lumber and we had agricultural products that we must sell to other countries. We felt that we were a shipbuilding people, and we looked about to know where we could get a market. A council of commercial men was called at Quebec from all the British North American Provinces, except Newfoundland, and that council took measures to extend trade relations with other countries, having lost the trade of the United States. In order to show the deep anxiety of the people that we should have extended trade, I will just trouble the House for a moment with reading an extract from the instructions to the delegates given by Sir A. T. Galt, Finance Minister of Canada at the time.

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. BURPEE. I hope it will be carried. The *Mail*, the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, says it ought not to be carried; they say it is wrong. I will not delay the House a long time. It is an interesting subject, I assure you, to the Maritime Provinces, however hon. gentlemen opposite may be indifferent about it. The several British North American Provinces appointed delegates to meet at Quebec as a commercial council, in order to initiate measures to extend trade with foreign countries, reciprocity with the United States having been abrogated. Sir A. T. Galt was then Finance Minister of Canada, and in giving instructions to the delegates from Ontario and Quebec he said:

"The rapid extension of the productive power of Canada in lumber, cereals and fish, and the early prospects that the great resources of the Maritime Provinces will equally be brought under a uniform commercial policy for all British North America, render it, in the opinion of the Government, most important that an enquiry should be made into the circumstances and conditions of our trade with the West Indies and South America, and into the best mode by which it can be developed."

"This subject becomes of the utmost importance at a time when our important trade with the United States is threatened with interruption, and will certainly hereafter be continued under different conditions from those which have hitherto existed.

"Knowing, then, that the countries to which you are about to proceed offer a market for all the surplus products of British North America, and that they can afford us in exchange all the productions of the tropics, it

is most desirable that an effort should be made to remove the artificial obstructions which exist to free commercial intercourse."

Then is laid down the procedure to be followed by those delegates. I will not read the whole instructions, but only from the 4th paragraph to the conclusion. They were instructed:

"To procure by reciprocal treaties or otherwise, a reduction of the duties now levied on flour, fish, lumber, pork, butter and other staple productions of British North America, in the West Indies, and especially with Brazil and the colonies of Spain."

"5th.—To obtain, if possible from the Spanish and Brazilian authorities, a remission of the heavy dues now chargeable on the transfer of vessels from the British to the Spanish and Brazilian flags.

"6th.—To procure, by negotiations with the proper authorities, an assimilation of the tariffs of the British West India Colonies in respect to flour, lumber, fish, and other staples of British North America, a measure which would greatly facilitate commercial operations and may well be urged in view of the assimilation about to be made in the tariffs of Canada and the Maritime Provinces.

"7th and lastly.—To promote, by prudent legislation and a sound fiscal policy, the rapid development of the great natural resources of the British North American Provinces, and to preserve as far as lies in their power, the advantage which they now possess, of being able to produce at a cheaper cost than any other country, most of the great staples which the inhabitants of the tropics must procure from northern ports."

I read this extract in order to show that the British North American colonies at that time were alive to this question; that it is no new question, and that the prosperity of those colonies depended upon the extension of their trade, if not with the United States with other countries. Although the question of trade relations with other countries than the United States is not directly before the House by this resolution, yet it is germain to it, and the question which most appeals to the public mind with respect to this subject is that of procuring extended markets. I confess that a home market, if we had it, would be the best market. The nearest market would be the next best, and the United States is the nearest market to us and is our best market. But, failing that market, there are other markets to which I have referred, and to which boards of trade have directed attention. It may not be out of place at this point to give an idea of the population of the countries which the delegates were asked to visit in order to effect some commercial treaty with them. Jamaica and Turks Island have a population of 585,536. With respect to Jamaica it is said that one of its leading men, Hon. Mr. Solomon desires to secure the confederation of that island with the Dominion. I asked a question of the First Minister on that subject this Session, and I was informed there was no correspondence. For my own part I do not profess to be very anxious that Canada should annex Jamaica; but I do feel anxious to obtain a commercial treaty with that island. The latter I infinitely prefer to the former. The Leeward Islands have a population of 119,000; Windward Islands, 311,000; Trinidad, 153,000; British Guiana, 252,000; Frankland Islands, 1,500; Bermudas, 13,000; Bahamas, 43,500; Brazil, 9,448,000. Now, the House will perceive it is of very great importance that we should have trade relations, if not with the United States, with these countries. The argument which operated in past days has greater force at this time. It is interesting to look at our imports and exports to and from some of these countries. New Brunswick imports from France goods to the value of $69,000, while its exports amount to $308,000. From Germany, imports, $62,000; exports, nothing. From the British West Indies we imported $250,000 worth, and exported $12,000. From the Spanish West Indies we imported $233,000, and exported only $33,000. From Brazil our imports were $72,000, and we exported nothing. British Guiana, imports, $69,000; exports, $3,000. There is much to be learned from these figures; the Government should study them, and also study the resources of those countries, and see if we cannot enter into some trade relations that would be mutually advantageous. New Brunswick exported last year goods to the value of $7,753,000 and imported $6,513,000 worth, Of this sum, $4,000,000 was with other countries than Great Britain—with the Spanish, West Indies, France, Spain and other foreign nations. So the fact is the prosperity of our country as a maritime country depends very largely upon our trade with foreign countries. The delegates to whom I have referred performed their task to the best of their ability, and they reported favorably with respect to a number of countries with which it was important they should enter into closer trade relations. They made a very exhaustive report with respect to the trade question, with reference to removing the barriers between the trade of the different countries and yet nothing was done. It was barren of results and I must say that I think the Government of that day was very lax in their duty in not making an attempt to extend our trade relations. I think the reason was this, that just about that time the Confederation scheme came on. The whole interest of the people of the country was taken up by Confederation and everything else appeared to vanish into the shade. Confederation was to be the balm which was to cure all our ills. We were told that if we only went into Confederation we would not only have reciprocity, which they held out as something within our grasp, with the other colonies, but that it would increase our intercolonial trade by the construction of an intercolonial railway. Then the Baie Verte canal was spoken of, and it was said that we had no means of transporting our products to the markets, and the country became fairly initiated to the fact that Confederation would be a cure for all our evils, that the cities of the Maritime Provinces would be the Liverpools and the Manchesters of British North America, that everything would be very prosperous, that we would have intercommunication between the Provinces carried out at once, and that an intercolonial trade would take the place of the foreign trade. This appears to me to be the only reason for the want of effort on the part of the Government in not endeavouring to carry out the instructions of the delegates with regard to reciprocal trade with foreign countries. However, that scheme failed too. It was said then on every platform that a union of the Provinces by an Act of Parliament would be a sham unless we became commercially united, and we were told that means would be taken to give us facilities for carrying on this intercolonial trade. But the commercial railway which was promised us turned out to be a military road, turned out to be double the mileage that a direct road would have been; turned out, so far as facilitating intercolonial trade almost valueless. This is very evident from the statistics of the trade of those Provinces. According to a paper furnished by Mr. Fairweather of the Board of Trade of St. John, which I presume is more or less authentic, the import trade from old Canada to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick is $12,000,000, or according to a report of this House furnished two years ago about $18,000,000. Which of the two is correct I do not know. Mr. Fairweather also states that our exports to old Canada all told, are about $4,272,000. However, I examined these figures, and I beg to differ from them. In the first place they are made up largely of cotton, sugar and iron. He says there is exported from the Maritime Provinces to Canada $1,695,722 worth of sugar; $766,000 worth of cotton, and $474,000 worth of iron from Nova Scotia. Now the fact is that these are not our natural products, and the benefit to the Maritime Provinces from these exports is very small indeed. It was stated by an hon. member not long ago that the amount of benefit represented by the sugar which is refined in that Province would be less than $300,000; cotton, $400,000; red granite, $53,899; grindstones, $6,000, and finnan haddie, $82,000. Now, while New Brunswick last year imported from the Upper Provinces, in round numbers, about $5,000,000, we exported to them less than $450,000. These figures show that, although the Upper Provinces have received some benefit from this intercolonial trade, so far as New Bruns-

wick is concerned, it is an entire failure. The agricultural products which we send to the Upper Provinces, amount in all to about $24,000—in wool, $10,000, and in canned goods, $14 000—while they send us $1,450,000 worth of agricultural products. Now, if that is what is meant by intercolonial trade, if that is the benefit we derive from Confederation, and if we are thankful for it, we are certainly thankful for very small favors. Now, I think I have shown that Confederation, with regard to giving us a market in Canada instead of in the United States, the West Indies, Brazil, and other countries, has been an entire failure.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS

Bill (No. 72) respecting the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Rykert.)

Bill (No. 77) to incorporate the Hamilton, Guelph and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

Bill (No. 69) respecting the Huron and Ontario Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Tyrwhitt.)

Bill (No. 62) to amend the Act to incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—(Mr. Watson.)

Bill (No. 75) to incorporate the Canadian Pacific Employés Relief Association.—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 115) to amend an Act to incorporate the Sisters of Charity of the North-West Territories—(*From the Senate.*) —(Mr. Desjardins.)

DOMINION DRAINAGE COMPANY.

Mr. HAGGART moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the Dominion Drainage Company.

Mr. EDGAR. I really do not think that this is a Bill which the House ought to pass. It has appeared in several shapes before the House and the Private Bills Committee already, and has been printed and reprinted and changed several times, and it now comes before us simply as a Bill to incorporate a drainage company—a simple company for the drainage of land. Surely, if there is any one subject more than another which ought to be left to the Local Legislature, this is one. It can be in no sense considered a trading nor a manufacturing company. Although those reasons have been often given for the assuming by this Parliament of jurisdiction to incorporate companies which might have been incorporated by a provincial legislature, still they do not exist in this case at all. It simply deals with real estate within the various Provinces. The second section provides that:

"The company shall have power to contract with the Crown or with any private person, firm or corporation, for the drainage of their lands and to supply or furnish all dredges, excavators and other implements, labor and materials requisite for such work, and to construct all canals, with lockage if necessary, that they may require to construct for effectual drainage, and to build and prosecute such work to completion."

The third section provides that:

"The company may receive, in payment for such work, in addition to money and ordinary securities, real estate, which may or will be reclaimed by drainage."

And then again the fourth says:

"The company may hold such real estate received in payment, as aforesaid, and reclaimed by them, or may purchase swamp and overflown land for the purpose of draining and reclaiming the same, and they may sell and convey such lands and take and hold mortgages thereon in part payment."

And there is a power to issue debentures upon these lands. Now, that surely is entirely limited to subjects which unquestionably and undeniably come within the local jurisdiction. It is not alleged that it is an inter-provincial drainage work that is to be undertaken, or an international, and it is not alleged that this is a work for the general advantage of Canada. If it should prove to be competent for us, as I do not think it is, to pass this Bill at all, it certainly is not expedient for this Parliament to keep on asserting its rights to legislate on matters over which the Local Legislature in each Province has absolute jurisdiction. A Bill was before this House once before for the purpose of incorporating a dyking and drainage company in Nova Scotia. In 1879 this Bill was introduced and met with a good deal of opposition on the ground that it related to matters over which the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia had jurisdiction. Mr. Plumb, who was then a member of the House, objected to it, and he said:

"He knew nothing of the local legislation of Nova Scotia, but he thought that any such legislation brought in here ought to be challenged in its inception. This would be cited as a precedent if allowed to pass here. He thought all such matters should be dealt with by the Local Legislatures."

Then Mr. Vallée said:

"The House had no right to pass the Bill, because the object was of a Provincial character."

The leader of the Government said:

"He agreed with his hon. friend (Mr. Vallée) that this Bill was not within the province of this Parliament at all. It was a local Bill in every way. It was a matter that ought to be passed by the Legislature of Nova Scotia."

It was contended indeed in that case, that because it affected some lands upon a navigable river, that would give jurisdiction, but it was the opinion of these gentlemen I have quoted that it did not. Mr. McDonald (Pictou) said:

"If this was land covered by the Provincial jurisdiction, the parties would have to apply to the Local Legislature for incorporation."

The Minister of Public Works said:

"He thought the Local Legislature should incorporate the company, and then, when they wanted to build a bridge over a navigable river, they could come here as a corporate body and ask for the power."

The order was discharged and the Bill withdrawn. There are other reasons against this Bill, which I do not raise, but I would ask the Government what view they take of the matter, and whether they think this is a proper subject for our legislation.

Mr. HAGGART. The object of the Bill is to form a drainage company. A lot of gentlemen in Ontario wish to be incorporated to form a company for the purpose of draining lands in the North-West Territories or in Manitoba or in the Province of Ontario. They have been advised that this House is the proper place to come to in order to give the company its existence. I am not, of course, thoroughly posted upon the law on the subject, but it seems to me extraordinary if this House could not give the company existence for the purpose of draining lands in the North-West Territories, as there is no other House to go to. There has been objection several times to Bills of this kind being introduced here, but as a rule I think they have passed. It seems to me quite an anomaly that you can go to any of the United States, to Indiana or to Pennsylvania or to New Jersey, as we have heard that a company to build the Canadian Pacific Railway got its existence there, or even to the Sandwich Islands for a company to get its existence, and that this House cannot give it. We are asking no powers which interfere with any of the rights of the different Provinces. We simply ask that the company shall have its existence for the purpose of constructing works and draining lands in the North-West Territories, Manitoba, or any part of the Dominion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think I must ask my hon. friend to allow this to stand over. My attention has only been called to it at this moment, so I would not like to express an opinion on the nonce. I fancy at all events the

Bill has vitality as far as the North-West is concerned, if not in regard to the rest, and, if my hon. friend will allow it to stand over for another day, I will look into it.

Mr. HAGGART. The Bill was submitted by the Chairman of the Private Bills Committee to the Minister of Justice, and he reported that the Bill was within our jurisdiction.

Mr. WELDON. At that time the Bill stood in a different position from what it does now. There is another matter in regard to this Bill, a matter of policy. It is a question if parties should come here who could get incorporated under the Joint Stock Companies Act. Two years ago that question was raised in the Private Bills Committee, and a resolution was introduced to check parties coming to this House for incorporation when they could get incorporated under the Joint Stock Companies Act. While the House may have a right to pass a Bill affecting the Dominion at large, it is a questionable policy where it is a matter properly affecting the Local Legislature, and, while the company would have the right as to the North-West Territories, I doubt whether it has in regard to the different Provinces, which is a matter for the Local Legislatures.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is very likely. One can see that, if a large company with a large capital and a body of shareholders and directors, with machinery specially adapted for this purpose, wished to operate in all the Provinces, it would be much more convenient to have one company with one charter, one entity, using all their machinery and all their capital, than to be driven to have half a dozen separate corporations, with separate liabilities and separate establishments in every way. It is more convenient, of course, to have one incorporation. That is, however, a mere matter of convenience. The question is, whether, constitutionally, this Act is within the power of this House or not. I think it had better stand over.

Mr. BLAKE. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman as to the propriety of allowing it to stand over until Monday, but I suggest to him that the inconvenience which he fears would follow from provincial incorporation, would not in fact follow. In any one of the Provinces this company may be incorporated, and, if it carries on its operations outside the Province as a trading company, as a corporate entity, that must be dependent upon whether by the comity of that Province it is permitted to do so. It is not incorporated, it is true, for any other than a provincial purpose. No Province can incorporate the company expressly to operate in any other Province, but it is incorporated to operate in the Province, and, if it chooses to go outside and operate outside, it is just in the position of a foreign corporation in the United States which, if it came in here to operate, would depend upon the comity of this country.

Sir JOHN A MACDONALD. By legislative act.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think it would necessarily follow that there would be separate incorporation, but of course if it did follow, that would be simply a question whether this was one of the consequences of ours being a Federal and not a Legislative Union. You cannot have the blessings of a Federal and Legislative Union altogether with the same constitution.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is quite true.

Mr. IVES. As Chairman of the Private Bills Committee, I am glad the leader has asked that this Bill shall stand till Monday; and I think even a longer date might be fixed for the adjournment, as I am desirous that a precedent should be established in this case. As Chairman of that Committee I may say that there is hardly a Bill comes before it, except, perhaps, divorce Bills, where this question is not raised. The Bills which come before our Committee are miscellaneous private bills; as a rule they have more or less a provincial purpose in view, and more or less are obnoxious to the charge of being encroachments upon the rights of Provincial Legislatures. We have had a good deal of time spent in that Committee discussing the question whether these charters were in the powers of this Parliament or not, and I am desirous that the question should be looked into by the law officers of the Crown, and that in this particular case a precedent should be established that will be our guide in future. If this Bill is not within our power, certainly the labor of the Private Bills Committee will be very considerably curtailed, because three-fourths of the work we have to do, besides adjudicating upon divorce Bills, is upon Bills of this character; and if this Bill is not within our power a large number of other Bills that come before us are certainly not within our power.

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

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

SUPPLY—RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. BURPEE. Before we separated at six o'clock I had been endeavoring to show that the question before you to-night is of very great importance to the whole Dominion, and particularly to the Maritime Provinces. With them it has been a subject of interest for a long time, and in their case delays are dangerous. In 1847 the Legislature of New Brunswick took action in the matter, and conferred with the other Provinces. In 1854 we had a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, which continued 11 years and gave satisfaction to both countries. It was not repealed because the commercial advantages were not equal in both countries, but on account of sentimental and political reasons. I showed that after we had been threatened with a repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, the British North America colonies took vigorous action, and a commercial council was called in order to devise means to secure trade relations with other foreign countries, and an exhaustive report was made by them on the subject which never has been acted upon. After that it was supposed that the intercolonial trade which would take place after Confederation would supply the place of the trade we had lost with the United States. One of the principal arguments in favor of Confederation was that it would give us a market in the Dominion for our surplus products. I think, Sir, I have sufficiently proved to the House that this expectation has failed—at all events, so far as the Maritime Provinces are concerned. Although it may have given a market in the east to some of the products of the west, yet the markets of the east have not been benefited by any markets that the west have furnished us, to any appreciable amount. That having been the case, it became evident to the Maritime Provinces that their wants had not been supplied. We were then asked to accept the National Policy as a cure for all our ills. The National Policy promised us a home market and intercolonial trade; and I think I need not take up the time of the House in proving that this policy has entirely failed as regards the Maritime Provinces. A home market certainly involves an increase of population; but if you take the Census of 1881, you find that instead of keeping our own population, our natural increase, which ought to be about 20 per cent. in ten years, has been, so far as the Maritime Provinces are concerned, only 12 or 12½ per cent. in the last decade; while in Ontario and Quebec the natural increase has not by any means been maintained. This shows that our home market has not increased, because nothing can give us a home market except an increased population. But the Government say that they have done all they could in order to bring about reciprocity. They tell us that in 1879 they placed upon the Statute Book an offer of conditional reciprocity with the United States in respect to certain articles. I would be willing to submit to any

business man, whether that was the proper course for any Government to take in order to bring about reciprocity with the United States. Their action, in my opinion, is a sham and a farce, got up to make a portion of the people believe that the Government have done all they could in the matter. It is well known, by the statements in the organs of the Government, and by their own inactivity in the matter that they are individually and collectively opposed to reciprocity. They are building up a system and a policy under which it is almost impossible to enter into any reciprocal trade with foreign countries. I say, Mr. Speaker, that that Act of Parliament is a farce, and was passed in order to furnish an apology for the inactivity of the Government. A man might just as well put upon his ledger an entry that he is willing to buy a certain article of a certian person, if the terms can be agreed upon; but would such a man expect that customers would go and trade with him without his first making known to them his willingness to trade? You might just as well expect that a man would become rich by such a commercial policy as to expect that a Government would obtain reciprocity by putting on their Statute Book a conditional arrangement which, if taken notice of at all by the United States, will be rather a barrier to their making any approaches to the Dominion of Canada to renew a Reciprocity Treaty. But the Government and some of their supporters appear to think it would be beneath their dignity to make approaches to the United States. They say it would be beneath them to go on their knees and ask the United States to renew the Reciprocity Treaty. I do not understand that sort of dignity, that a business people, dealing with another people—an emphatically business people—should think it beneath them to go and ask them to enter into closer trade relations, which would be beneficial to both parties. I cannot understand the objection raised by hon. gentlemen opposite, on that point. Why, our Commissioner in England does not think it beneath his dignity to seek to secure commercial treaties with foreign countries. He did not think it beneath him to apply to Spain and France to enter into closer trade relations; and why, then, should we have any different feeling in regard to the United States? We are neighbors, and we are both business people. It would, moreover, be a mutual advantage to have a Reciprocity Treaty. I cannot understand why exception is made in their case and not in the cases of other nations. The truth is that the fiscal policy adopted by the party in power is opposed to reciprocity treaties with other nations. They shout "Canada for the Canadians;" and if that is their cry, why should we not close our canals, tear up all railways leading to the United States, and adopt other measures which would effectually keep this country for the Canadians. I do not, however, think this matter requires further argument. I admit there would be some difficulty now in securing a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States. But what are Governments for but to act for the people and to overcome difficulties when they present themselves? I thoroughly believe if we possessed the power of making our own treaties, independent of Great Britain, we would have a very much better chance of obtaining reciprocity with other nations. The circumlocution and red-tape and all that sort of thing interferes and renders us liable to lose favorable opportunities to secure treaties. If we had the power of making our own treaties, I repeat, and sending our own Commissioner, we would have a very much better chance of accomplishing that very desirable object. I believe the fiscal policy adopted by the present Government is one of the principal hindrances to securing a commercial treaty with the United States. But there is another difficulty in the way, which is one of a serious character, and that is our increasing debt and our increasing tariff. I believe one of the principal factors that induced the United States to withdraw from the treaty of 1854 was their war debt. They found that they would have to impose very high duty on almost every article, and they wished to collect a revenue from some of the articles that entered their country from these Provinces free of duty. We are getting rapidly into that position: our enormous burdens almost preclude our allowing, to any great extent, articles from the United States to come in duty free. However, we might have a Reciprocal Tariff, that is to say, that certain duties should be charged by both countries, an equal and a lower tariff. The present time is a most opportune one to renew the Reciprocity Treaty. The Fishery Treaty will expire in July next. Already that part of the subject has been fully discussed, and discussed in very much better terms than I could, by the hon. member from Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies.) The difficulties that may arise at the close of the Fishery Treaty, make it very desirable that we should endeavor to secure a treaty with the United States, giving them the use of the fisheries of the Dominion in exchange for their admitting free of duty to their markets, certain commodities of which we have a surplus. I think it is a feeling of false sentiment which is thus put forward as an excuse for not making an application in that direction. We have in the Maritime Provinces a large surplus product for which we have no other market than the United States. We export to the United States a large quantity of agricultural products. They do not want those products in Canada, and we have to seek a foreign market for them. The United States is our nearest market. The fiscal policy of this Government obstructs and handicaps this trade. We are compelled to send them to the United States, obstructed and handicapped as we are by the policy of the present Government. There is a feeling of uneasiness in the Lower Provinces which, I believe, the people of the Upper Provinces scarcely realise. In order to illustrate this point, I will take the liberty of reading what has already been quoted in this House in a former debate, to show the feeling of uneasiness and earnestness with which the people of the Lower Provinces refer to this matter. I refer to a resolution passed by the Board of Trade of St. John, which is as follows:—

"*Resolved*, That the boards of trade of the Maritime Provinces, and the Local Legislatures and Governments of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick be requested to take such steps as to them may seem right for the pressing upon Parliament and the Government at Ottawa the need there is that the foreign and Intercolonial trade of these Provinces should not be allowed to be injured by such adverse action as can be avoided, and that such steps should be taken by the Maritime Provinces as may enable them to exercise more influence at Ottawa upon the course of legislation and executive action than hitherto we have been able to; and that as far as this board has power to express its opinion, it declares, irrespective of political parties, that since the union of these Provinces the just expectations of the Maritime Provinces have not been realized, and dissatisfaction with the union has become a general sentiment among the people, who desire a remedy, under, rather than against, the constitution, and whose loyalty to the Crown and respect for the laws of the country is the only reason why stronger and more unmistakeable action has not been taken in the matter."

Now this resolution, strong as it is, has been virtually endorsed by the board of trade of the city of Halifax. I can say for myself that there is nothing more common there than to hear these sentiments expressed every day—to hear it said that we must have a market for our surplus at almost any cost. I believe, sir, that the people of the Maritime Provinces are as loyal as any in the Dominion, and I believe it would be their very last resort to take any step outside of the Constitution, and it is in order that we should take every means in our power inside of the Constitution, in order to get what we conceive to be our rights that this resolution has been moved to-day. Now, on this point I may say that I well recollect attending a lecture in the city of St. John thirty-five years ago, given by a gentleman well known in Canada, Mr. D'Arcy McGee. He said he had lived in Ireland, that he had lived in Canada twice, and in the United States once. In Ireland he said he had been an Irish rebel and that under similar circumstances he would be so again,

but that in Canada he was as loyal a man as any in British North America, because he considered our constitution to be the best in the world. Now I believe the people of the Maritime Provinces echo that sentiment and they go still further. They believe that the Constitution of British North America is a liberal and a good Constitution—the best Constitution in the world, or one of the best. Yet I must say that since Confederation it has been very much strained. I must complain that the political action of the party in power has been such that they have strained that Constitution to an unwarrantable extent, to such an extent as in some degree to undermine the sentiment of loyalty among our people. I have heard hon. gentlemen opposite say that all the discontented people were among the Grits, but I can tell them that there are as many people who hold annexationist sentiments among the Tories of New Brunswick and a good many more, than there are among the Grits. I have heard them openly express those ideas, and give as their reasons for holding them that we are not having those markets for our surplus products that we should have. Now, Sir, I said that our Constitution had been strained and it may not be out of place for me to say in what respect that has been the case. Take for instance the appointments made under our system; they are all made on political and party grounds. When we went into the Confederation one half of the Senate was supposed to be Liberal, and one-half Conservative, and we had a very efficient Senate when we entered into the Union. But such has not been the case since that time, for the appointments to the Senate have all been political, and measures in the Senate are now entirely considered from a political and party standpoint. Much dissatisfaction has been created in the Maritime Provinces at least, if not in the Dominion on that account. I am sorry to say that even the appointments of the Government to the judiciary bench, whose character should always be upheld, are made on political grounds, that they are given to political partisans and more on the ground that they are partisans than for their fitness to discharge their duties. I say that these things, that the appointments generally of this Government have weakened the Constitution in the minds of our people and have created still more uneasiness than that which is created by the condition of our trade relations. Now I am very much obliged to the House for the patience with which they have indulged me; and hoping that the Government will not consider this a party vote, hoping that they will not ask their supporters to vote down this resolution, hoping that they will not consider it a vote of want of confidence, but that they will use every means in their power to bring about a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States at as early a date as possible, I shall now resume my seat.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I would not, Sir, have offered a word to the House in explanation of the vote I intend to give, and in accordance with the vote I gave last year, were it not that a similar resolution to the one proposed to-night by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), was proposed by him last year almost word for word, and were it not that his speech of last year in *Hansard* is almost identical with the speech he delivered here this afternoon. Yet that resolution of last year was voted down by a very large majority in this House. For what reason? For the same reason we will vote it down to-night, not that reciprocity is not desirable on fair terms, but because, when this House is moved by the proper authorities into Committee of Supply, the hon. member for Queen's takes the opportunity of moving that we do not go into Supply, but that we pass a resolution that he has concocted. Why, Sir, if the Government acceded to a proposition like that, they would be unworthy of the confidence of a majority of this House for a moment? It is not for him or the gentlemen acting with him to guide the affairs of this country, when they are in such a glorious minority as they are. I would not have offered any remarks to-night were it not also that last year, after a similar resolution was voted down, the occasion was taken by the Reform press of the Province of Nova Scotia, to which I belong, to assert that we were derelict in our duty in this House in not voting for the resolution of the hon. member for Queen's. The hon. member, in making his remarks to the House, told us there was no better time for reciprocity than now. He stated last year that there could not be any more favorable time than then, and he says the same this year. Well, the hon. gentleman did not sit in this House in 1878, but I believe an uncle of his did of the same name. I believe the senior member for Prince county sat in this House in 1878; and when the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard), and the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) asked the hon. Prime Minister of that day (Mr. Mackenzie) whether he intended to prosecute negotiations with the United States, what was his answer? I quote from the *Hansard* of 1878:

"Mr. BÉCHARD enquired, whether a treaty of commercial reciprocity between the United States of America and Canada is at present in question between the Governments interested.

"Mr. MACKENZIE. There is no such treaty at present in question between the Governments interested. The Government of the United States has made no proposition to us; but when the Government of the United States makes any such proposition we will of course give it due consideration."

The hon. member for Queen's was not here then; he was down on the tight little emerald isle by the sea—safe at home; but he had an honored relative here, a very able man too, and I do not find in the debates that he rose from his seat to say a word. The hon. member for Prince county was here, and he said nothing. There was no resolution moved at that time; hon. members opposite accepted the *ipse dixit* of the then Premier and obeyed as they always did obey. Then, on the same day:

"Mr. CASGRAIN enquired, whether the Government has taken or intends to take any steps to renew or make a treaty of commercial reciprocity with the United States, under the sanction of the Imperial Government.

"Mr. MACKENZIE. The answer I gave to my hon. friend from Iberville a moment ago will apply to this question. I may just say, however, as the question is put here categorically, that we have not taken any steps in this relation; but, as I have said, we will be prepared, when any steps are desired by the Government on the other side, to take such steps as to carry out our well-known views on the subject."

Why, Sir, this question was settled as far as they were concerned by their Premier, and every man obeyed without raising his voice against it. Last year, when a similar resolution was moved by the hon. member for Queen's, who certainly is not a kite flyer, who certainly was sincere, the Premier answered in almost the same words as Mr. Mackenzie used in 1878; and that there was a responsive thrill evoked by his words all through this country, has been shown by the bye-elections which have taken place since—in the hon. member for Queen's own county last autumn, and in almost all of the Maritime Provinces; and the answer given by the Premier of this country has been endorsed by the people. What more, Sir? I will read an extract from a Liberal paper, edited and published in Hants county, Nova Scotia, by Mr. T. B. Smith, whom the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) well knows as having been a supporter of his in the Nova Scotia Legislature for years when he was leading the Government there. Mr. Smith is a liberal yet. He started the paper in December last, when he published his prospectus, a column and a-half long, setting forth what he thinks about politics, and showing how liberal he is, as usual. He touches on the question of a Reciprocity Treaty, and I quote what he says as showing that the young men of this country, be they Liberal or be they Tory, have the same ideas in regard to asking or begging for reciprocity from the United States that the Premier of this Government has, and the Premier of the last Government had:

"In conclusion, we may say we are in favor of reciprocity with the United States, but will oppose the bringing of it about by any other than by means honorable to our country. We will advocate the asking for reciprocity, but we trust our country will never beg for it."

Now, we have to-night the same resolution that we had last year, moved by the same hon. member; we have the same speeches made, the same old ground gone over to show the desirability of a Reciprocity Treaty, although the hon. member got his answer in his own constituency, when he said to the electors of Prince Edward Island: if you believe in Sir John Macdonald and his policy in regard to not sending a delegation to the United States, vote for Dr. Jenkins; if you do not believe in it, vote for Mr. Walsh, and send him to the House. They took him at his word and voted for Mr. Jenkins. I do not believe that there is another gentleman in Prince Edward Island who, after having got the rebuff which was given the hon. gentleman last year by the overwhelming vote on his resolution, I believe there is not another gentleman in Prince Edward Island, who, after having been discounted by his own friends in his own county, as the hon. gentleman was when he put the issue to them, would come here again, while the votes of the people and their speeches had hardly died away from his memory, and propose again the same resolution in the same words that he proposed last year and again ask us to vote upon it as we are going into Committee of Supply. I am in favor of reciprocity with the United States; but I join the Liberal spirits of the country, I stand side by side with the young men of the country, and I say in response to both Premiers of this country, the late Premier and the present one, that we will not go down on our knees to the Americans; that when they ask us to enter into a fair Reciprocity Treaty, we wil meet them half way, but we will not send again any delegate as the leader of the last Government did, when he sent the late lamented George Brown to Washington, and have him come back here without any Reciprocity Treaty but with the knowledge that he had been humiliated in going there and begging reciprocity from the United States Government. We will not send any more such delegations. However desirable a fair Reciprocity Treaty may be, we will not send any delegation to the United States or open negotiations with them until we know that we will not receive a slap in our face, as we did when we sent the Hon. George Brown there. The advantages to our people down by the sea, the advantages to the Maritime Provinces of reciprocity with the United States, are obvious. Everybody knows them; there was no need for the hon. member for Sunbury (Mr. Burpee), to spend an hour and a half in telling us about them; it was not necessary for the hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), to take an hour and a half to dilate upon them; there was no need for the hon. member for P. E. I. (Mr. Yeo), to speak of them; but these gentlemen could not lose an opportunity to draw the long bow, and they put the brightest side of the advantages so far as we are concerned. We all agree that a fair Reciprocity Treaty would be advantageous, but we do not agree, and Canada, by a three-fourth vote will say, that the advantages are not all on our side. The advantages are on the American side as well as ours. We have shown our neighbors that we can live without them; we have shown them that Canada is not to be a slaughter market for their goods; and we will show them that we can protect our own fisheries within the three mile belt, and will not allow the Americans to fish in our waters without adequate remuneration, and when the American people say, as I believe they will, for it is in the interest of both countries that there should be less duties between them, that there should be a lighter tariff—when they say they are willing to enter into reciprocity, we will meet them; but so long as they keep up their high tariff, we will have to meet them on their own ground. Canada has endorsed this stand over and over again, and we will not ask them while they have the high tariff they have now to give us a treaty which will certainly be one-sided and not fair to Canada. I would have not made these remarks to-night had I not been charged over and over again by the Reform Papers of Nova Scotia with having voted down the proposition for reciprocity. I did no such thing, I voted down the theory that a member of this House can constitutionally rise and propose a resolution like this when we are about to go into Committee of Supply. We will vote such a resolution under such circumstances down, for we have too great a respect for the Government of the day, we have every confidence in the administration, in their intelligence and their industry; our Premier is alive, and well alive, to the interests of Canada; he will not allow an opportunity to get reciprocity on fair terms with the United States to pass unimproved; but he will, we believe, perform his duty without any loss of dignity to Canada, and not in the manner in which some hon. members think it ought to be done; and I am confident that the majority of the people will endorse the stand we on this side of the House take.

Mr. KIRK. This being a question of very great importance to the Province from which I come, I beg leave to ask the indulgence of the House for a brief space while I make a few observations upon it. Hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken on this question have made little of this resolution, and say that a member of the Opposition should not have made a motion in reference to this matter. The hon. gentleman for Prince county, P. E. I. (Mr. Hackett), complained that the mover of the resolution (Mr. Davies) made a party question of it, and said he should have brought it so as to secure an honest vote on the question. Well, I wonder why the hon. gentleman should think that a vote cannot be given honestly on this question. I can assure him that every hon. gentleman on this side of the House who votes for it will vote honestly, but the hon. gentleman himself feels that the way he will vote upon it will be dishonest. He cannot vote against that measure without giving a dishonest vote; and he will not vote for the measure, not because he does not believe in reciprocity, but because he believes more in the Government. He puts party first and principle next.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that I could not vote against this resolution honestly.

Mr. KIRK. I have not referred to the hon. gentleman at all. The hon. member for Prince county, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Hackett) believes the Government will do all they can to obtain reciprocity. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman believes in that Government and will vote for them every time. In that he is not to be blamed, but he cannot blame other hon. gentlemen, if they have not such implicit faith in the Government as he has. I believe the conduct of the Government, so far, has not been such as to inspire the confidence in the people of this country with regard to their policy in this matter. We were told last year when this question was before the House that they did not intend to move in the matter, and it was hinted to us that we should not have brought it up, that we ought to speak with bated breath, that it would not do to tell the United States that we wanted a Reciprocity Treaty, but that we should show them that we can live without it; that we are independent and it would be humiliating to our dignity to move in the matter. We are a great people, they said, and therefore we must not bow our knees to the United States. But we do not intend to bend our knees, we do not ask this House to beg for reciprocity, we simply believe that it is the duty of the Government to make overtures to the United States Government and see if it is not possible to obtain a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States which will be in the interest of both that nation and our own. That is all we ask, and I do not think

it would be beneath the dignity of any Government, no matter how great, to go to the United States and ask them to negociate a treaty which would be in their interest as well as in our own. The hon. gentleman quoted a law enacted by this Parliament in 1879 which provides that when certain articles shall be made free in the United States our Government shall have power to make them free here, and in this way he says we are in a position, whenever the United States are willing, to obtain reciprocity. I look upon that Act, so far as it goes, as simply absurd; the proposition to wait until the United States approach us for reciprocity, the proposition that we must wait until they reduce the tariff on the articles enumerated, is simply absurd. It would be better if that Act were not there at all; it is almost an insult to the people of the United States to have it on our Statute Book. The hon. gentleman says we must go to the United States in a manly way and not as suppliants. Who proposes to go in any way other than a manly way? Who proposes to go as suppliants? This will not be the first time we approached the United States with the view of negociating a Reciprocity Treaty. I can remember when both parties, when all parties in this Dominion were favorable to a Reciprocity Treaty, and also to approaching the United States Government in order to obtain that Treaty. I remember full well that, when the old Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 was about to be abrogated, when the action of the Washington Congress pointed to the fact that they intended to notify the British Government of the abrogation of that Treaty, the Government of Canada felt great concern in regard to the matter, and passed resolutions asking the British Government and the Governments of the other Provinces to approach the United States Government in order to prevent them from giving notice of the abrogation of the Treaty. I will read for the information of the House a Minute of Council which was adopted by the Government of Canada, which included Ontario and Quebec, in 1864, in reference to this matter, an Order in Council which was recommended to the Governments of the other Provinces, and which was approved of by them and forwarded to the British Government, and action taken upon it. This is a "Copy of a Report of a Committee of the Honorable the Executive Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General, on the 19th February, 1864," and I believe the right hon. gentleman who is the leader of this Government and this House, was a member of that Government, if he was not the actual leader of it:

"The Committee of the Executive Council deem it their duty to represent to Your Excellency that the recent proceedings in the Congress of the United States respecting the Reciprocity Treaty have excited the deepest concern in the minds of the people of this Province."

That is of Quebec and Ontario:

"Those proceedings have had for their avowed object the abrogation of the Treaty at the earliest possible moment consistent with the stipulations of the instrument itself. Although no formal action indicative of the strength of the party hostile to the continuance of the Treaty has yet taken place, information of an authentic character as to the opinions and purposes of influential public men in the United States has forced upon the Committee the conviction that there is eminent danger of its speedy abrogation unless prompt and vigorous steps be taken by Her Majesty's Imperial advisers to avert what would be generally regarded by the people of Canada as a great calamity."

This Government of which the right hon. gentleman was a member, if not the leader, declared it would be a great calamity if that Reciprocity Treaty was abrogated.

"The Committee would specially bring under Your Excellency's notice the importance of instituting negotiations for the renewal of the Treaty, with such modifications as may be mutually assented to before the year's notice required to terminate it shall be given by the American Government, for they fear that the notice, if once given, would not be revoked, and they clearly foresee that, owing to the variety and possibly the conflicting nature of the interests involved on our own side, a new Treaty could not be concluded, and the requisite legislation to give effect to it be obtained, before the year would have expired, and with it the Treaty. Under such circumstances, even with the certain prospect of an early renewal of the Treaty, considerable loss and much inconvenience would inevitably ensue. It would be impossible to express in figures, with any approach to accuracy, the extent to which the facilities of commercial intercourse created by the Reciprocity Treaty have contributed to the wealth and prosperity of this Province, and it would be difficult to exaggerate the importance which the people of Canada attach to the continued enjoyment of these facilities."

Yet, in the face of this declaration made publicly to the world, these hon. gentlemen come here to-day and say we must hold our breaths with reference to the advantages to this country of a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States.

"Nor is the subject entirely devoid of political significance."

I want hon. gentlemen to pay attention to this paragraph.

"Under the beneficent operation of the system of self-government which the later policy of the mother country has accorded to Canada, in common with the other colonies possessing representative institutions, combined with the advantages secured by the Reciprocity Treaty of an unrestricted commerce with our nearest neighbors in the natural productions of the two countries, all agitation for organic changes has ceased, all dissatisfaction with the existing political relations of the Province has wholly disappeared."

I wonder if the fact that we have no Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, that the trade relations with that country are in the condition they are, has anything to do with the dissatisfaction which is existing in the Province of Nova Scotia to-day, as we see demonstrated by the discussion and the resolutions which have just been passed in the legislature of that Province:

"Although the Committee would grossly misrepresent their countrymen, if they were to affirm that their loyalty to their Sovereign would be diminished in the slightest degree by the withdrawal through the unfriendly action of a foreign Government of commercial privileges, however valuable these might be deemed. They think they cannot err in directing the attention of the enlightened statesmen who wield the destinies of the great Empire, of which it is the proudest boast of Canadians that their country forms a part, to the connection which is usually found to exist between the material prosperity and political contentment of a people, for in doing so they feel that they are appealing to the highest motives that can actuate patriotic statesmen, the desire to perpetuate a Dominion founded on the affectionate allegiance of a prosperous and contented people."

Now, in the face of that report, adopted, as I have already said, by the Government of Canada, setting forth the great advantages of a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States and pointing out publicly, as this did, the evil results of the abrogation of that Treaty, how can these hon. gentlemen to-day come forward and complain if we ask the Government simply to approach the United States Government and ascertain, if possible, whether a Reciprocity Treaty can be negotiated or not. But I perceive that a change has come over the spirit of the dream of those hon. gentlemen opposite. Reciprocity is not now their policy. Protection is their policy, and Reciprocity and Protection do not belong to the party in power they cannot go together. Their cry and their policy is "Canada for the Canadians," and they set out in 1878 to retain Canada for the Canadians, and they imposed upon the people of this country a tariff which has vastly increased the taxes of the people of this country whilst it has not kept Canada for the Canadians. They have by the National Policy vastly increased the taxes of the people, but yet they have not kept the markets of this country for the products of this country, as they promised they would. It is for that reason we find it necessary to ask that trade relations be renewed with the United States and other countries, in order that this country may be able to sell its products in other markets, because we have not a market in our own country for our produce. The hon. member for King's, N. S. (Mr. Woodworth) spoke of the position taken by the leader of the late Government, the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). He said that the hon. member for East York, when he was leader of the Government, took the same position the present Premier does, he refused to enter into negotiations with the United States Government, but thought the United States Government ought to come to us. I think the condition of things has very much changed since then. It was only shortly before, that the Hon. George Brown had been to the United States endeavor-

iug to negotiate a treaty, in which he had failed. The Fishery clause of the Washington Treaty had only run a very few years, and could not possibly be abrogated for five or six years further, and consequently, now that the fishery clause of the Washington Treaty is about being abrogated, it changes the condition of affairs altogether. I want to know from the hon. member for Kings, N.S., (Mr. Woodworth) where he is to have a market for his fish after the Fishery clause of the Washington Treaty is abrogated? I find that last year we exported of fish from the Dominion of Canada $8,591,654 worth. Of that Nova Scotia exported $5,316,057. Now, I want the hon. member for Kings, or any other hon. member in this House, to show where Nova Scotia is to find a market for her fish if the United States market is closed against us. We send of this $5,000,000 worth, $2,145,622 worth to the United States. Close the market of the United States and what will you do with the fish? Canada cannot take it; Canada does not require it. The whole of Canada imported last year only $800,379 worth, the Maritime Provinces included. Quebec and the other Maritime Provinces imported $100,000 worth of that, and we know that the Maritime Provinces and Quebec are fishing Provinces; they catch enough of fish for their own use. But there is a certain kind of fish that the Maritime Provinces and Quebec import. Notwithstanding that they export so much, still they import a certain kind of fish which they do not and cannot supply for themselves. Now suppose we send all the fish to Ontario, that Ontario requires. She only requires, or only required last year, $700,000 worth. Suppose Nova Scotia should send to Ontario all the fish she required to import Nova Scotia would still have $5,000,000 to export. Where is she going to send it? Therefore the market, so far as Ontario can afford one for fish, is a very small matter to the Maritime Provinces. The hon. member for King's, Nova Scotia, quoted from a newspaper which, he said, was published by a Liberal from Nova Scotia. But what did it amount to? That paper simply took the position we take. The editor declares in favor of reciprocity; and he says: We will ask for reciprocity, but we will never beg for it. Who wants to beg for reciprocity? We do not want to beg for it; we simply ask that this Government approach the United States Government for the purpose of obtaining a treaty. Now, Sir, as I said before, when this National Policy was introduced, we were promised that we should have the markets of this country for the products of this country. We were to have the markets of the Maritime Provinces for the farmers of Ontario. Flour, which was imported into the Maritime Provinces previous to 1878, was to be displaced by Canadian flour after that policy was introduced. Now, Sir, what are the facts? How has this National Policy dealt with flour? In 1878 we imported, all told, into this Dominion 314,520 barrels of flour. The Opposition of that day, who are the Government now, proclaimed over the country, that the Ontario millers were being injured in consequence of the fact that the Maritime Provinces were permitted to import so much flour from the United States, and they set about to remedy it. How have they remedied it? Do the Maritime Provinces not import flour to-day? Why, I find we imported last year 531,188 barrels. How is this? We imported nearly twice as much flour last year as we did in 1878. Yet we do not hear a word from the Government or their friends about this fact. Why do they not stop this evil? Why do they not carry out their promises to the Ontario farmers? An hon. member says we want cheap flour. Yes, and this is the way to get it with a vengeance —put 50 cents a barrel upon it. Suppose it was 60 or 70 cents a barrel, the Maritime Provinces would still continue to import it from the United States, because it is more convenient for them, and cheaper in the long run, in consequence of the carriage, than to get it from Ontario. Sir, the importation of flour is still increasing. Between the 1st of July, 1884, and the 31st December, we imported 379,453 barrels of flour. That is, we imported more flour in the last six months of last year than in the whole year previous to 1878. Yet, the hon. gentlemen opposite, when our friends were in power, fairly wept because we could not get the Maritime Provinces market for the Canadian millers. We have not got it now. Matters seem to be worse in that regard than before. Yet the people of the Maritime Provinces have to pay dearer for their flour, they have to pay 50 cents additional for every barrel. Then again, the coal owners and miners in Nova Scotia were promised the markets of Ontario for their coal. It was said if we only put 50 cents a ton upon coal we would command the markets of Ontario for the Nova Scotia coal. It is claimed that the 60 cents a ton that has been placed on bituminous coal has been a great boon to the coal interests of Nova Scotia. Well, Sir, a few days ago I received the report of the Coal Mines Department of Nova Scotia, and what does it reveal? It reveals the fact that the annual average increase for 20 years previous to the date of the National Policy, was greater than it has been since. I find that in Nova Scotia, between 1861 and 1870, the increased sale of coal was 2,527,510 tons, representing the increased sale in 10 years, or an average increase annually of 252,751 tons.

Mr. PAINT. That was owing to the American war.

Mr. KIRK. The hon. gentleman can find an explanation very readily. From 1871 to 1880 the total increase of coal sales amounted to 2,450,080 tons, or an average annual increase of 245,008 tons. How has it been since 1879? We hear a great deal of boasting about the great increased output of coal, and sales of coal in Nova Scotia since 1879. What has been the annual increase since then? The National Policy has been in operation since 1879, and during the subsequent four years, the total increase was 306,388 tons, or an average annual increase of only 76,597 tons. Yet I have shown that the average annual increase, of the twenty years previous to 1879, was 250,000 tons, while since the National Policy was introduced it has only been 76,597. Now, what has the National Policy done for the coal interests of Nova Scotia? Why everyone knows, who reads the papers, that the coal industry of Nova Scotia was never in so depressed a condition as it is to-day. The coal miners have sold coal cheaper this spring than ever they did since they began operations in the Province of Nova Scotia, yet these hon. gentlemen boast that great benefit has been done to Nova Scotia in respect to the coal industry. What has it cost the Dominion of Canada to obtain this great reduction? We know that last year there were 36,473 tons less coal sold in Nova Scotia than in the year previous, yet the National Policy is said to be doing great things for Nova Scotia coal mines. What do we pay for this increase, I should call it a decrease, for it is an increase not worthy of the name? It is costing the Dominion $1,105,171. We pay that amount in duty annually for the privilege of sending Nova Scotian coal to the western part of the country. I maintain that even if it were true that the National Policy is the cause of the whole of this increase of 76,597 tons, the duty we pay would reach the full value of the increased outport of coal at the pit-head. That is not all; and I may say here that I do not complain of this next matter to which I am about to refer. We know in order to aid the coal miners of Nova Scotia, the charge for carrying coal over the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal is cheaper than that charged for any other commodity carried over that line. I am told—I do not know it for a fact—that coal is carried for one-eighth of a cent per ton per mile over the Intercolonial Railway to Quebec, and that other goods are charged one cent per ton per mile. If that be true, we are paying rather dear for our coal trade. We know that when we had the old Reciprocity Treaty in force the coal

mines of Nova Scotia and all other industries prospered as they never prospered since. The quantity of coal raised and sold in Nova Scotia in 1861 amounted to 326,429 tons, of which we exported to the United States 204,457 tons. In 1866, the last year of the Reciprocity Treaty, we sold 558,520 tons, of which we sent to the United States no less than 404,252 tons, or more than two thirds of the whole quantity. The quantity exported has been diminishing year by year since that time, until last year we sent only 65,515 tons to the United States. I maintain that if a Reciprocity Treaty could be arranged with the United States, Nova Scotia coal would be exported to that country as it was under the old treaty; and it is for that reason I feel anxious for a renewal of the treaty. I also feel anxious that the Government should take some steps to prevent, if possible, the abrogation of the Fishery clauses of the Washington Treaty. The condition of affairs since last year even has changed. I think the present is a very opportune time for the Government to approach the United States and endeavor to obtain a renewal of the treaty. A revolution has taken place in that country since the resolution on this subject was introduced into this House last year by the hon. member for Queens, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies), and the Democratic party, which is said to be favourable to a Revenue Tariff policy, is now in power, and it will likely favor negotiations with this Dominion for reciprocal trade. That is another reason why the Government should make a vigorous effort to secure the object we so much desire. There are many other articles besides coal which we trade with the United States. Notwithstanding the very high tariff that prevails both in the United States and in this country, we carry on a very large trade across the line. Our total exports, exclusive of bullion to the United States, amounted last year to the value of $86,521,185, of which $31,631,222 was to the United States. The figures which I shall read will show that every Province of the Dominion is with the United States equally interested in obtaining reciprocal trade relations. The exports of the respective Provinces were as follows:—

ONTARIO.

Ontario exported, total		$23,735,055
" " to United States		19,570,215
Produce of the Mines	$ 141,071	
" Fisheries	282,442	
" Forest	7,597,049	
Animals and their products	4,161,460	
Agricultural products	6,363,341	
Manufactures	644,306	
Miscellaneous articles	382,345	

QUEBEC.

Quebec exported, total		$32,424,707
" " to United States		4,384,077
Products of the Mines	$283,824	
" Fisheries	70,071	
" Forest	1,528,897	
Animals and their products	1,207,600	
Agricultural products	907,512	
Manufactures	312,743	
Miscellaneous articles	74,430	

NOVA SCOTIA.

Nova Scotia exported, total		$9,406,971
" " to the United States		3,379,611
Produce of the Mines	$ 585,174	
" Fisheries	2,145,622	
" Forest	298,652	
Animals and their products	165,617	
Agricultural products	122,000	
Manufactures	146,451	
Miscellaneous articles	6,000	

NEW BRUNSWICK.

New Brunswick exported, total		$6,655,402
" " to the United States		2,006,782
Produce of the Mines	$ 79,716	
" Fisheries	766,353	
" Forest	547,969	
Animals and their products	410,822	
Agricultural products	63,558	
Manufactures	97,751	
Miscellaneons articles	40,358	

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Prince Edward Island exported, total		$1,309,639
" " " to the United States		467,854
Produce of the Fisheries	$196,001	
Animals and their products	190,846	
Agricultural products	32,297	
Miscellaneous	2,793	

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

British Columbia exported, total		$3,075,177
" " to the United States		1,691,767
Produce of the Mines	$1,416,714	
" Fisheries	114,370	
Animals and their products	155,702	

MANITOBA.

Manitoba exported, total		$722,730
" " to the United States		328,949

The total imports and imports from the United States were as follows:

Canada imported, total		$108,180,644
" " from the United States		50,492,826
Ontario imported	$40,332,245	
" " from United States	23,888,917	
Quebec imported	43,026,172	
" " from United States	14,352,973	
Nova Scotia imported	9,183,346	
" " from U. S.	3,957,754	
New Brunswick imported	6,513,924	
" " from U. S.	3,098,292	
British Columbia imported	4,040,335	
" " from U. S.	2,307,612	
Manitoba imported	3,768,851	
" " from United States	3,140,685	
Prince Edward Island imported	829,032	
" " " from United States	259,844	
North-West Territories imported from United States	486,739	

Now, Sir, in conclusion I would say that the Dominion of Canada is not the only party interested, that each Province in the Dominion is equally interested in a Reciprocity Treaty. The United States is quite as much interested as we are, and therefore I can see no reason why the United States should not be willing, and I believe they would be willing, to meet this Government half way if this Government were willing to meet them. Now, I have no desire to keep the House for any length of time on this question. All I have to say is that the proposition laid down by the hon. Premier, when he was advocating his Protective Policy, has not been fully carried out. I maintain that the relations which exist between these Provinces of the Confederation are not such as they should be, and why? Simply because the National Policy which imposes tremendous burdens on the people is distasteful to the people and is extremely burdensome to them. I find that the Premier, when advocating his policy, said this:

"Formerly we were a number of Provinces which had very little trade one with the other, and very little connection except a common allegiance to a common Sovereign, and it is of the utmost importance that we should be allied together. I believe that by a fair readjustment of the Tariff we can increase the various industries, which we can interchange one with another and make this union a union in interest, a union in trade and a union in feeling. We shall then grow up rapidly a good, steady and mature trade between the Provinces, rendering us independent of foreign trade."

Now, Sir, the figures I have quoted show that we have not been rendered independent of foreign trade. It shows, Sir,

that the foreign trade was quite as great as it ever was, notwithstanding the high protective tariff, and I maintain that this high protective policy has created dissatisfaction in the minds of the people, especially in the Maritime Provinces. I maintain that that dissatisfaction is growing deeper and deeper every day, and even now, or only a few days ago, we find that the Province of Nova Scotia at any rate, is acting on the advice which was given by the hon. Minister of Finance, and which was quoted in the House already. The Nova Scotia Legislature has in effect resolved that

"The time has come for this Province to address the Sovereign with an explicit declaration that unless relief be obtained, separation from the Empire and the independence of Nova Scotia will be desirable and inevitable."

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). It is not my intention at this late hour to detain the House for any length of time. But I desire to say a few words with reference to this question, particularly because my hon. friend from Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) has referred to a commodity in which the people of the island from which I come are very much interested. The late Government sent a delegate to Washington with a view of obtaining reciprocity, and that delegate failed. The present Government since it attained power, refused, and very properly refused, to send a delegate to that quarter because they felt, as any reasonable Government would feel, that they would also fail. But in 1879, they placed a law on the Statute Book upon which they could act at any time that they found that the American Government was disposed to reciprocate trade with us. It has already been quoted, but as it is of such importance, it will bear quoting again. The clause is as follows:—

"Any or all of the following articles,—that is to say: Animals of all kinds, green fruit, hay, straw, bran, seeds of all kinds, vegetables (including potatoes and other roots), plants, trees and shrubs, coal and coke, salt, hops, wheat, peas and beans, barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat and all other grain, flour of wheat and flour of rye, Indian meal, and oatmeal, and flour or meal of any other grain, butter, cheese, fish salted or smoked), lard, tallow, meats (fresh, salted or smoked), and lumber, may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this Act, upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that several articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty, or as a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same under such proclamation when imported into Canada."

This enactment, Sir, placed on our Statute Book the means by which this Government could at any time obtain reciprocal trade with the United States on fair terms. Either a reciprocal free trade or a reciprocal trade on any other terms which may be considered fair by both Governments. But, Sir, my object in rising now is to refer particularly to the subject of coal. I was astonished to hear my hon. friend from Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) speak of the small increase in the output of coal in Nova Scotia. Of course, not representing a coal district, he was liable to err, and he failed to give the figures from the returns correctly, as I can show from statistics I happen to have. He stated that the annual output of coal in Nova Scotia during reciprocity was 558,520 tons. The annual output of coal never increased beyond 600,000 tons during the existence of the Reciprocity Treaty; but we find that in 1884 the output of coal in the Province of Nova Scotia was 1,200,000 tons, or more than double what it was in 1865 under reciprocity. From these figures my hon. friend will perceive at a glance that he must have been mistaken in his figures. When I state that the output of coal from the island of Cape Breton alone is to-day equal to the output from the whole Province of Nova Scotia during the time the Reciprocity Treaty existed, the hon. gentleman must certainly conclude that he has failed to quote the figures correctly. The output under reciprocity in 1865, as given by himself was 558,520 tons, while the output from Cape Breton alone in 1884 was 531,220 tons, which is nearly equal to the output from the whole Province at that time. But, Sir, the price of coal depends upon the cost of producing it, the cost of transporting it and the scarcity of the article. These three elements always combine to fix the price of any commodity in the market. The reason the coal interest of Nova Scotia was so prosperous during the existence of the Reciprocity Treaty was simply that the price of coal in the United States was very much higher than it is at present, and that the facilities for the distribution of coal were very much inferior to what they are to-day. In the New England States in 1865, at the termination of the Reciprocity Treaty, there were only 3,048 miles of railway available for the distribution of the coal of Ohio and Pennsylvania, while in 1883 the mileage of railways in the New England States was no less than 6,118 miles. Therefore the mileage of railways in those States since the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty in 1866 has doubled, and the facilities for distributing that commodity throughout the country have correspondingly increased. Consequently the competition that we have to meet in the United States in the article of coal has very materially changed since that time. I find, Sir, by a late sale of coal, under contract to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, during the month of March last, the disposition of the coal was as follows:—

"On Saturday night Mr. Joseph Hickson awarded the contract for the supply of the 375,000 tons of coal required by the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Of this amount 250,000 tons is to be delivered at the Suspension and International Bridges, 55,000 at Detroit, 20,000 at Sarnia, 20,000 at Brockville, and 30,000 at Portland, Maine. The contracts for the supply at Niagara were awarded as follows: 100,000 tons to Messrs. Bell, Lewis & Yates, of Buffalo; 130,000 to the New York, Lake Erie and Western Railway, and 20,000 to the Rochester and Pittsburg Railway. The coal to be delivered at the International Bridge was sold at the following rates: lump, $2.25; lump and nut, $2.20; run of mine, $2,05. At the Suspension Bridge the same kinds of coal fetch $2.40, $2.35 and $2.20 respectively. The Detroit and Sarnia contract was awarded to the Cleveland, Loraine and Wheeling Railway. The prices were $2.05 at Detroit and $2.20 at Sarnia. The coal for Brockville is to be furnished by Messrs. Bell, Lewis & Yates at $3.50. While the contract for Portland, Maine, was secured by the Chesapeake & Ohio Coal Company at $3.50."

I can assure the hon. member for Guysboro' that if the coal owners of Nova Scotia had been brought into competition, during the existence of the Reciprocity Treaty, with American coal at Portland and Boston at $3.50, the prosperity of the coal mines at that time would not have been so great as it was. But the fact is that instead of competing with coal at that figure, as they are obliged to do to-day, the coal was placed at that time in the markets of the New England States by the American coal owners, and therefore by the Nova Scotia coal owners as well, at the very handsome figure of $10.37, being three times the value of coal placed now at Portland. That is the reason the coal interests of Nova Scotia was so prosperous at that time.

Mr. KIRK. You are talking about greenbacks.

Mr. CAMERON. There were no more greenbacks at that time than there are now, and even if there were, the price would have been much greater than it is to-day. The transportation of coal from Pennsylvania and Ohio to the eastern States in 1865 cost $4.26 a ton, but the carriage of coal now from these coal districts to the New England ports cannot exceed $2 a ton. Now, supposing we had to-day a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, it would be utterly impossible for the coal owners of Nova Scotia to place their coal in the American markets at $3.50. I can assure the hon. member for Guysboro', however, that all parties in Nova Scotia are favorable to reciprocity, but they are only favorable to it on fair terms. When the Americans admit our fish free of duty I have no hesitation in suggesting that we should also admit the fish of the United States free of duty into Canada; but while they impose a duty of $2 a barrel on our fish I hold it to be a wise policy that we should also impose $2 a barrel on fish coming from the United States. One-sided reciprocity is

no reciprocity at all. While my hon. friend from Guysboro' seems to be willing that we should open our markets for the products of the United States on condition that they would open us their markets for our products, he fails to show us the manner in which we could attain that end. The people of the United States have a keen eye to business, and they will hereafter, as they did before, refuse to grant us reciprocity, except on such terms as will be advantageous to themselves; and the more we advocate a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States, the more we endeavor to convince ourselves of the necessity of reciprocity, the less willing they will be to grant it to us. I, therefore, while quite willing to advocate reciprocity, a free interchange of all commodities, the natural products of the soil, the mines, and the sea, with the United States, I think it is the duty of this Government to protect the products of the soil, the sea, and the mine, in the same manner as that in which the United States protect their interests. This is the only reciprocity I am willing to accord; and I have not the slightest doubt a large majority of the people of Nova Scotia realise the necessity of having a reciprocity of tariff, if they fail to have reciprocal free trade.

Mr. WELDON. With regard to the proposition put forward by my hon. friend from King's, Nova Scotia, (Mr. Woodworth) who attacked the mover of this resolution for dictating the course this Government should follow, my hon. friend must have forgotten many instances in which, while hon. gentlemen opposite were in Opposition, they endeavored to advise the Government led by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) as to what course they should take. My hon. friend will not forget that in the case of the Hon. Letellier de St. Just, the Premier then moved a resolution dictating the course which the Government should adopt.

Mr. WOODWORTH. You voted it down.

Mr. WELDON. Exactly as hon. gentlemen opposite will do this resolution; but that did not prevent them from giving their advice to the Government of the day; and I think that if my hon. friend is in favor of reciprocity, he would not, in voting for this resolution, vote against the Government. We have an instance in 1883 of this, when in a matter involving the commercial relations of this country with other countries the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) now with his battalion, and the hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Coursol) voted for the resolution of my honorable friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake) with regard to commercial treaties. As regards this question, as has been stated already by other members of the Maritime Provinces, there is no action of this House, no motion made in this House which will excite more interest and engage more attention, which is of greater importance to the Maritime Provinces than the one proposed by the honorable member for Queens, P E.I. (Mr. Davies). I had occasion some years ago, in my place in this House, to speak of the state of trade in the Province and the city and county which I have the honor to represent. I was then charged with having depreciated my county and Province; in putting forward the true position of the trade and commerce of the country I was taunted with recreant to my duty and false to my constituents. Therefore, on this occasion, in referring to the depressed state of the Maritime Provinces, and more particularly with regard to the Province of New Brunswick, I shall not content myself with giving my own assertion, but will quote the language of the President of the Board of Trade in St. John, a body which represents all shades of politics. This Board has declared without regard to political feeling, our desire for reciprocal trade with the United States, which we feel to be almost of vital importance to us, and the necessity of obtaining which every member of the Maritime Provinces, if true to the interests of those Provinces, should urge upon the Government, irrespective of political feeling, as a matter of importance to those Provinces. On that occasion the President of the Board of Trade said as follows:—

"To improve the commercial and manufacturing interests of our city, is a matter that may well occupy the earnest and careful thought of our best citizens. Our trade and manufactures are depressed, and it is no satisfaction to be told, 'So are they elsewhere.' Confederation has not given to the Maritime Provinces or to our citizens extended markets or the greater prosperity anticipated."

And so it is. I do not wish to go over the ground taken by other hon. members, but I must say I think the picture drawn by the hon. member for Sunbury (Mr. Burpee) with regard to the position in which we were before Confederation and that in which we have been since, is not by any means over drawn, and that the promises that have been made to us have not been carried out. On looking over the report of the manufactures of this country, and referring specially to that portion dealing with the manufacturing interests of St. John, I find it is bolstered up by putting in persons who can scarcely be called manufacturers at all, such as butchers, dentists and others; and yet they only made out 4,800 men employed in the factories in St. John, while before Confederation we had nearly 7,000 employed in those industries. While the Treaty of 1854 was in force, our trade rapidly increased with the United States, and American capital flowed in to develop our industries, our mines and our forests; but when that treaty ceased, matters changed, and although we were told that the National Policy would give us a remedy and that foreign capital would again flow in, this prediction has not been in any way fulfilled. With regard to the Maritime Provinces and the relative geographical position in which we are with regard to the United States, the products of our forests and our mines and our agricultural products are those which are required by the United States. The Provinces of Ontario and Quebec can never be large consumers of our products, because we live in the same zone and produce the same articles; and therefore to the country to the south of us, we must look for a market for what we have to sell. Not only that, but there is a large branch of industry in connection with our commerce which depends also on the United States. I mean our shipping industry. It is not only those large vessels of 1,000 and 1,500 tons which have been built in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and bear the flag of our country over every sea, carrying the riches of India and the southern climes all over the world, to which we must look; but we have also a large class of small vessels which produce a large amount of money. I allude to the small schooners employed in the coasting trade in this country and the United States. In St. John last year, nearly 700 vessels of under 100 tons each were registered, and those vessels are employed almost entirely in the trade of the United States and the Maritime Provinces. During the existence of the Treaty, they were engaged in carrying cargoes not only from the Maritime Provinces to the United States, but in bringing return cargoes; while to-day, owing to the National Policy many of those vessels have to be laid up, and those which take freights are obliged to come back without a return cargo, thereby diminishing the profits and earnings to which they are entitled. The hon. gentleman who preceded me addressed the House on the subject of our mines and fisheries, but with regard to an important branch of industry in the Province to which I belong, it is very important to consider the peculiar position in which a portion of that Province is placed. You are aware the river St. John is a treaty river. A number of its sources are in American territory, and under the Ashburton Treaty of 1842 that river was thrown open to both countries by an article of that treaty. I will read the article, to show what is the position of the river St. John. The article referring to the river St. John in the Ashburton Treaty is as follows:—

"In order to promote the interest and encourage the industry of all the inhabitants of the countries watered by the River St. John and its tributaries, whether living within the Province of New Brunswick or the State of Maine, it is agreed that the navigation of the said river shall be free and open to both parties, and shall in no way be obstructed by either; that all the produce of the forest, in logs, lumber, timber, boards, staves or shingles, or of agriculture (being the produce of Maine) shall have free access into and through the said river and its said tributaries having their source within the State of Maine, to and from the seaport at the mouth of the said River St. John, and to and round the falls of the said river, either by boats, rafts or other conveyance."

That opened the lower waters of the River St. John within the Province, now in the Dominion, to the lumbermen of the State of Maine. The lumber of the State of Maine comes down that river and is sawn in St. John in mills owned and run by Americans, and that is shipped to the United States and goes in free of duty in competition with our lumber. The amount of American lumber shipped from that Province to the United States is of the value of $992,000, against a little over half a million of New Brunswick lumber. That is the position in which we are placed. It had the same effect to a certain extent as the Treaty of 1854 in bringing American capital into the country from which we get the benefit, though the Americans themselves get the greater benefit, while our lumbermen are handicapped by the excessive duty. As has been pointed out with regard to the product of the mine and the fisheries, so with regard to the product of the forest, we look with anxiety to this Dominion Government, to the Government whose duty it is to endeavor to bring about a position of affairs similar to that which existed under the Treaty of 1854, or even the minor advantages received under the Treaty of Washington of 1871. My hon. friend from King's (Mr. Woodworth) taunted the mover of this resolution with the election which took place in his county last summer, when a supporter of the Government was elected in opposition to the wishes of my hon. friend. It is true the election terminated in favor of the Government, but I think it is equally true, as I am informed and I speak subject to correction, that it was declared that to elect the candidate supporting the Government was more likely to assist in bringing about reciprocity, than to elect a candidate favored by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies).

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Quite true.

Mr. WELDON. I believe that, so far as the Provinces are concerned, there is but one feeling in regard to this question, to endeavor by all means to have the trade between the Lower Provinces and the United States untrammeled. The policy of the United States has changed, the treaty of 1854 was abolished by the American Government under circumstances of irritation. They had gone through a war in which they had felt, rightly or wrongly, some irritation against Great Britain and the people of Canada or of the Provinces, and it was under those feelings that they put an end to that treaty. The treaty of 1871 was subsequently made, and two years ago they gave notice to abrogate it, which notice will expire in 1885. At that time the republican party, the protectionist party, was in power, and were carrying out a policy to some extent the same as that put forward by hon. gentlemen opposite. Since that time a great change has taken place, and I think, with all due deference to the hon. member for Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. Hackett), that we should be in no humiliating position if we chose to enter into negotiations with the United States for the purpose of getting a renewal of that Treaty. Within the past two years the United States have changed their policy. They are endeavoring to imitate other nations in extending their foreign trade. Even the nations on the continent of Europe are endeavoring to extend their trade. Germany is waking up to it, and a Commission is now sitting with a view to getting the trade of central Africa opened. Germany is also trying to extend her possessions to Australasia.

European nations are endeavoring to extend their trade, and the policy of the people adjoining us, the people with whom we deal and with whom we desire to deal, has been very much altered. In the report of a committee of the Chamber of Commerce of New York, I find the following:—

"Clearly this treaty" (speaking of the Spanish treaty, to which I will refer hereafter) "must be judged of, not only as a whole, but also as an integral part and specimen of that American policy which the President in his late annual message has revealed as the commercial policy of his Administration. That policy has been foreshadowed by the treaties with Hawaiian Islands and with Mexico. It is now further exemplified by the convention with Spain for its West India Provinces, and it will undoubtedly be embodied in the treaties with St. Domingo and with several central American Republics. The controlling aim of that policy and of these treaties is the extension of our commerce with the other portions of the American Continent and the adjacent island by granting them and obtaining from them specific concessions not offered by the general laws and customs tariffs of the contracting countries. The general idea of such a policy, we all know, is not a new one; but never in the history of the United States as any such distinct proposition been made for adopting it, and for departing from the policy hitherto followed by the United States of maintaining uniform conditions for our trade with the whole world, as is now submitted to the decision of our national Legislature by these treaties."

These treaties are being made by the United States, and with countries which deal far less than we do with the United States. The exports from the United States to the Hawaiian Islands are about $3,500,000, and the imports nearly $8,000,000. The exports to Hayti and to San Domingo are $4,000,000, and the imports $3,800,000. The exports to Mexico are $12,700,000, and the imports $9,000,000. The exports to Cuba are $10,910,000 and the imports $57,181,000. The exports to Porto Rico are $2,224,615, and the imports $6,890,000. To Canada the exports are $46,411,000, and the imports from Canada into the United States $39,000,000. Ours is the largest importation into the United States of any of the countries I have referred to with the exception of Cuba, and the bulk of our combined trade is greater than that of either of those countries with which the United States Government have made treaties. It seems to me that, if countries with which a smaller trade is concerned have been able to enter into these negotiations with the United States, it may be presumed that they will not be disinclined to do the same thing with us. I see no impropriety, nor do I see that there is any loss, either in dignity or position in the endeavor to secure the benefits of free commercial intercourse with other nations. With regard to the remarks of the member for King's, as to the statement by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Mackenzie) in 1878, in reply to the question put by the hon. member for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) and the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) that he did not then intend to open negotiations, it must be borne in mind that that was the year after the failure of the negotiations by the Hon. George Brown at Washington. Of course there was then a fair reason why we should decline immediately to enter into negotiations again. But a long period of time has elapsed since then, and we find that there has been a change of policy in the United States; that Congress has not been afraid to approach this question; and, as pointed out by the hon. member for Queen's, are solution was introduced into Congress by a representative from Michigan in December, 1883, requesting the President to open negotiations, which resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and in July last, just before the close of the Session of Congress, that committee reported the resolution requesting the President to open negotiations, and we find that committee going on to say that they believed the negotiations would be favorably received by the country, and they believed that the feeling in the larger communities of the United States was in favor of reciprocal trade. It is true that the hon. member for Prince referred to the expressions of Senator Fry of Maine, and also to Representative Collins, I think from the same State. But we must remember that the feeling in Maine has

always been hostile to reciprocal trade relations with Canada, because they feel that Canada would become a competitor with them in furnishing the Southern markets; and so they oppose reciprocity, even at the expense of their sister States. But if we are to wait, as the hon. member for King's, Nova Scotia (Mr. Woodworth) desires, until the United States people make the first move, I think we shall have to wait many years, because you will always find in that great country a certain party ready to oppose reciprocal relations. But I believe, when we see the position that the Americans hold towards us now, the friendly feeling that has been developed, and when we find that a great political change has taken place in that country and that the party which has hitherto advocated a revenue tariff, or free trade, has now attained to power, I think, under these circumstances, it would not be derogatory to us, either as a portion of the British Empire, or as the Dominion of Canada, that our Government should take steps to open up negotiations with the United States for the purpose of renewing the treaty. I am satisfied that the mother country would not object to our doing so. We find further, that the United States are prepared to make overtures to other parts of the British Empire with regard to a treaty. I find in a newspaper the correspondence between the Foreign Office of Great Britain and the Government of the United States in relation to forming a treaty to control the trade of the British West Indies. In a letter from Earl Granville to the Hon. Sackville West, dated 25th October, 1884, he states that the British West India colonies are willing to abolish the duties on bread, biscuits, butter, cheese, corn, meal of all kinds, flour, lard, lumber, kerosene oil, meal and oil cake, on the condition that the United States reduced the duty on sugar at least one-half. Some of the colonies were also willing to abolish the duty on hams, meats, shooks and staves. The Hon. Sackville West wrote to Earl Granville on 20th November, 1884, that the United States desired a wider basis for the treaty. That shows that the United States does not consider it undignified to enter into those negotiations to secure a wider basis for the treaty. The paper goes on to say:

"Also that the advantages conceded to the United States should not be conceded gratis to any third porties under the favored nation clause. On December 4, Hon. Mr. West forwarded to Earl Granville, Secretary Frelinghuysen's draft of a counter treaty, in which the United States agree to abolish the duty on sugars under grade of No. 16. In the letter accompanying the draft, Secretary Frelinghuysen insisted upon the exclusion of third parties as indispensable.

"Sir John Lubbock estimated that the proposed treaty would cause a loss of revenue to the United States of £2,500,000 yearly, while the colonies would only lose £180,000."

That shows that the United States, so far as regards the dependencies in the West Indies, are willing to enter into negotiations with reference to the West India trade. Now, if they obtain that trade, in what position shall we be placed? If that Spanish Treaty made with Mr. Foster is ratified by Congress and becomes law, what position we will be placed in has already been pointed out in this House on a previous occasion. We will then be, to a certain extent, driven out of the ports of the Spanish West Indies, and if the British West India trade is also throw open to the United States, the position of Nova Scotia with regard to the fisheries will be a very unfavorable one. It has been pointed out by the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) that we exported $5,000,000 worth of fish, nearly one-half of which goes to the United States. Nearly $1,000,000 worth goes from the ports in those Provinces to Cuba and Porto Rico; while to the British West Indies we send in the neighborhood of $200,000 worth. So that nearly the whole of our exports of fish go to the United States and the British West Indies, and if we are shut out from those markets the hon. member for Guysboro' has pointed out that we shall have no other market. Ontario and Quebec can take but a small quantity of our fish, and our position, bad as it is now, will then be doubly worse. Then, I find that the Government have not taken any steps with regard to this treaty. This appears by the remarks made by the Prime Minister in New York last December, from which we gather that no steps have been taken to initiate negotiations for the purpose, either of renewing the treaty, or of renewing the fishery clauses of it. It seems that the Finance Minister went to London prepared to take part in the negotiations then going on between Great Britain and Mexico, and he asked that the Dominion should be included in the treaty which was being made between those two countries. We find in the paper that he said this:

"Sir Leonard Tilley wrote Mr. Ansell just before the close of the last Session that the Government had intended to take a vote for the expenses in connection with promoting a new treaty, but as he thought nothing would be definitely concluded before the next meeting of the House he deferred it. It is now believed here that the Finance Minister has exerted himself while in England in favor of this grand movement, and that his arguments on behalf of the Dominion have produced the initiation of the negotiations, which it is earnestly hoped will be consummated in a much desired Reciprocity Treaty."

If then the dignity of the Dominion was not endangered, and there was no humiliation in endeavoring to negotiate a Treaty with Mexico, there would be much less danger and much less humiliation in considering our relations with the United States, and there would not be any loss of dignity on our part. Now with regard to the trade of the Maritime Provinces. As I said before, no action of this House can excite more interest among the people there. As a member from the Lower Provinces, I feel that I cannot too strongly urge upon this House and the Government to use every effort to place us in a position in which we can open that trade and procure us the benefits of its markets, which are the natural markets of our country. The hon. member for Prince charged that it was a slander to say that we would appeal to the British Government for the protection of our fisheries. He admitted that we have 4,000 miles of coast line. If we look back to the past we shall see how the fisheries were protected. If the Dominion is compelled to bear the expense necessary to secure the adequate protection of our fisheries and to keep the Americans outside the three-mile limit, it will require one-half of the revenue of this country. We find that $50,000 are already demanded for the protection of our fisheries, and I am satisfied that will go but little way in protecting the smallest portion of those fisheries. We shall be obliged to call on the British Government to protect them with her fleet, or if we are to equip a fleet it will strain our resources, and even then will not be thoroughly efficient. I may here refer to the fact that the position is entirely altered from the position when the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) introduced a similar resolution last Session. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth) said it was the same resolution and the same speech. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) on this occasion used arguments he could not use on the former occasion, because he was not aware at the time that the Secretary of State for the Colonies had urged, not once or twice, but three times on the Dominion Government to give their views on this subject, a request which in itself implied that they desired the Dominion Government should do so. But they did not do so. I further point out that the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), in 1871, he being at that time at the head of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, sent the following instructions to Dominion cruisers, with respect to the three mile limit:—

"The limits within which you will, if necessary, exercise the power to exclude United States fishermen, or to detain American fishing vessels or boats, are for the present to be exceptional. Difficulties have arisen in former times with respect to the question, whether the exclusive limits should be measured on lines drawn parallel everywhere to the coast, and describing its sinuosities, or on lines produced from headland to headland across the entrances of bays, creeks or harbors. Her

Majesty's Government are clearly of opinion that, by the Convention of 1818, the United States have renounced the right of fishing, not only within three miles of the colonial shores, but within three miles of a line drawn across the mouth of any British bay or creek. It is, however, the wish of Her Majesty's Government neither to concede, nor for the present to enforce any rights in this respect which are in their nature open to any serious question. Until further instructed, therefore, you will not interfere with any American fishermen, unless found within three miles of the shore, or within three miles of a line drawn across the mouth of a bay or creek which is less than 10 geographical miles in width. In the case of any other bay—as the Bay of Chaleurs, for example—you will not admit any United States fishing vessel or boat, or any American fishermen, inside of a line drawn across at that part of such bay where its width does not exceed ten miles."

I find as follows:—

"This reassertion of the headland doctrine did not seem to meet the approval of the Home Government. June 6, 1870, Lord Grenville telegraphs to the Governor General: 'Her Majesty's Government hopes that the United States fishermen will not be, for the present, prevented from fishing, except within three miles of land, or in bays which are less than six miles broad at the mouth.'"

The instructions were modified. The seizure of American vessels has been a source of irritation and trouble, and in case of seizures being made, we shall not be called upon to answer for them, but the American Government will look to the Court of St. James and hold the English Government responsible. If this be the case, the Imperial Government will insist that we shall follow their instructions; and I do not think that that Government would, unless the case was very serious, endanger their diplomatic relations, and disturb the peace and harmony which has prevailed between the United States and England on any question as to fishing rights. There is another point with respect to this matter, to which I alluded a short time ago, and I still press it on the attention of the Government. It is as regards our right to negotiate our own commercial treaties. If such were granted, it would not separate us from the Empire. If we ask it and it should be granted, instead of creating differences between us and the mother country, it would only bind our connection still closer. If it is true, as is stated in the newspapers, that Newfoundland has asked and been conceded this privilege—it was so stated some time ago, and I did not see it contradicted, though the political differences in Newfoundland may have interrupted it—it is an important concession: at all events we find Sir Ambrose Shea appointed to negotiate with respect to the fishery clauses of the Washington Treaty, and the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) says he has gone on his mission. How much more strongly he would have been fortified if there had been a deputation from the Dominion of Canada to support Newfoundland on that occasion. If that colony gains the point, in what position shall we be placed? They will have control of the United States market, and we shall not. I feel strongly on this point because I am satisfied the American people will meet us in a friendly spirit and give us fair play. The old feelings with respect to the South have passed away, and I repeat that I speak feelingly because I represent a city to whose relief, in her hour of ruin and destruction—at the time of the great fire, the Americans came, sending money and provisions for our relief. They showed to us at that time that blood is thicker than water; that they did not forget the Province was peopled from New England. I feel that a similar spirit will be displayed by them in the event of approaches being made to them with respect to reciprocity, and that they will be willing to open their markets to us as we shall open our markets to them. On the occasion of the Washington Treaty discussion, Sir Charles Tupper, in a debate in 1872—and I think it was a singular speech from a gentleman who assisted to place the taxation of the Dominion at so high a rate—used the following language:—

"While in 1854 American fishermen were able to compete with Canadians, because they had no high taxes to pay, and the cost of outfit was much less than at present, the war and the burdens it had left behind had so changed their position in relation to this question, that every Canadian fisherman who had the fish in the sea at his own door, with all the advantages of cheap vessels and cheap equipment, if he belonged (as no one doubted) to the same courageous and adventurous class as the Americans, would enter into the competition with an advantage of 40 or 50 per cent. in his favor."

That, I am afraid, has been taken away.——

"Who would say that the Canadian fisherman was deserving of any consideration, if he was not able, with that premium in his favor, to meet the competition not only of the United States, but of all the world? Why, then, instead of the treaty surrendering our fishermen and fisheries to the destructive competition of the foreigner, the result would be—and mark his word, the facts would soon show it—that the American fishermen who employed their industry in the waters of Canada would become like the American lumbermen who engaged in that trade in the valley of the Ottawa, they would settle upon Canadian soil, bringing with them their character for enterprise and energy, and would become equally good subjects of Her Majesty, would give this country the benefit of their talents, and their enterprise and their capital."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I apply the same remarks in this case. I believe those were the fruits of the Treaty of 1854, and I believe if a similar treaty was negotiated those fruits will result, and instead of the millions, which were promised, would be brought in by the National Policy, that money will come in by the negotiation of a treaty similar to that of 1854. I believe those treaties are beneficial to both countries, that they would not only give us better trade relations, but that they cultivate kindly feelings of Christian liberality between these two nations. These treaties have not merely the effect of improving our trade relations, but that they have moral and social effects of incalculable advantage to both countries. And I cannot conclude better than by using the language which was used by an honored and departed friend of mine—one of the most eloquent of men—in concluding his remarks before the Commission with regard to the Treaty of Washington. He said:

"On the day that the Treaty of Washington was signed by the high contracting parties, an epoch in the history of civilisation was reached. On that day the heaviest blow ever struck by human agency fell upon that great anvil of the Almighty, upon which in His own way, and at His appointed time, the sword and the spear shall be transformed into the plough-share and the reaping hook."

Mr. JENKINS. I wish to make a few remarks on this important question—and they shall be really few—first, because I think this question has been brought before the House at a most inopportune time and in a most objectionable form, and secondly, because I think the discussion in this House, in a party spirit, of a question which may at any time become the subject of difficult and delicate negotiations with another Government, will only tend to weaken the hands of this Government and embarrass them in bringing about what hon. gentlemen of the Opposition seem so anxious for—a change in our trade relations with the United States. Now, my hon. colleague may be sincere in bringing this motion forward, but I think his sincerity would have been more manifest and palpable if he had brought the motion forward in a form in which it might be discussed on its merits, instead of in a form in which it is tantamont to a vote of want of confidence in the Government, as a challenge to the loyalty of the supporters of the Government, and of the people who sent them here, as an invitation to break up a Government which has the full confidence of the people of this country, a Government which has two-thirds of the representatives of the people supporting them, and a Government which I fully believe has and deserves the confidence of the people. And for what purpose have they invited us to break up this Government and support a Government which at its best was unable to bring about the very object the Opposition now pretend to be so anxious for. We know very well that the late Government when it was at its strongest and best, made an endeavor to bring about this change in our trade relations with the United States, and that they got a most humiliating rebuff. And we are to upset this Government which has the confidence of the people, and put a party which has not the confidence of the people,

a party that at its best was never able, as this Government has been, to carry on the business of the country and develop its resources. It must be in the memory of all, the easy and rapid way in which this Government lifted the country out of the slough of despond in which it was left by its predecessors. I think this House can never for a moment think of entertaining a question of this sort in the form in which it has been brought before us. I am as desirous of seeing a reciprocity of trade with the United States as any man, and I fully appreciate the advantages to this country of reciprocity with the United States, but Sir, much as I would deplore any occurrence which might check that feeling of cordial amity which is growing daily between this country and the United States, I am not prepared to see the Government approach the United States and beg for reciprocity. We know, Sir, that it would not only be futile but undignified. We know that the Americans are a very astute and shrewd people. We know that if we want to approach them and obtain any change in our trade relations with them, we must not go there begging and saying that this change is absolutely necessary, that it is of vital importance to our existence. That is a very wrong way of obtaining reciprocity. But our Government must go prepared to show that reciprocity of trade between the two countries is for the benefit of both. If they can do that, I believe there will be no difficulty in obtaining reciprocity, but until then we would only get, as the late Government got, a humiliating rebuff. Why, Sir, what do they say in the United States? Here is a letter from Congressman T. B. Reed, to his constituents:

"The fact that Canada, on the one hand, is by large meetings urging the renewal of the Treaty, and that our people, on the other, with at least equal earnestness, are protesting against such action, is an interesting commentary on the decision that we owed five and a-half millions for a privilege we don't want and they do."

Now, Sir, I think that shows, as far as this part of the United States is concerned, that the prospects of a Reciprocity Treaty are not so bright as our friends seem to think. I believe, Sir, and I think the opinion is general, that under the recent change in the Government of the United States our chances of reciprocity are better, but the only way to get reciprocity is to be in a position to show that we can be without it. We know—every man who knows anything about the trade and commerce of this country knows, that in 1854, when we had reciprocity with the United States, everything was booming. But it was not to reciprocity alone that that was due. It was due to the fact that a great European war was going on at that time which made provisions of all sorts high. That was to a great extent the reason why reciprocity was such advantage to us, and afterwards we know that a civil war in the United States carried on that boom. We know that at that time oats, the great staple of the Lower Provinces, were sixty and eighty cents a bushel in the markets of New York. What is the case now? In Chicago oats last year were 25 cents, and they were delivered in New York free of expense on board ship at 32 cents. We must not expect, even if we get reciprocity, that it is going to be of that great benefit that it was in the olden times. There has been a great change in the productions of the United States. At that time they produced very little oats, but now they produce them largely and can grow them more cheaply than we can in Canada, and therefore in that matter we must not expect such great advantages. My hon. colleague has said that reciprocity would stimulate the shipping interest. Now, Sir, as far as wooden ships are concerned it will not have any effect whatever, because even supposing we had reciprocity of trade with the United States a large quantity of that trade would be carried on through steamers, and not in wooden vessels, and therefore I take it that the decadence of shipping in the matter of wooden vessels is a natural one, and no trade relations can affect it.

When the Reciprocity Treaty was abrogated in 1866, the idea that many men held was that our trade was doomed and that we were effectually ruined; but those predictions have been falsified. The abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty and the initiation of the National Policy have made us a more independent and self-reliant people, and in that respect have worked to our advantage. And I believe we can still do without reciprocity, and that we will do without it, great as its advantages would be; and Sir, until we are able to do without it, it is quite certain that we shall never get it. Now, Sir, with regard to the fisheries, I think it behoves the Government, at any or every expense, to use such means as will protect our people in the rights of their fishing grounds. We must let our American friends know that they cannot have their cake and eat it. They must either give us free trade in fish or keep off our fishing grounds; and if the Government use efficient measures, and I have no doubt they will, I am quite satisfied that the loss of our fish in the United States will produce such a scarcity and so increase the price, that our people will scarcely feel the duty, if it is put on. It is very well known that to the Canadian fishing grounds the Americans are largely indebted for their catch of mackerel, and if they do not have the use of those grounds, there must be a scarcity. The United States consume mackerel largely, and without our fish they cannot get on; so that I take it that even if there is not a renewal of this Treaty, our people will not suffer to the extent that some hon. members imagine. My hon. colleague brought this question forward last Session, and his object then was very clear, as it is now. He did not bring this question forward in the ordinary way; he brought it forward in such a shape that he knew that the supporters of the Government could not vote for it, because he wanted to place them in a false position before the electors. He wanted to have it to say that when he brought forward the subject of reciprocity, we voted against it, while he voted for it. That has been the object of my hon. colleague, and I think it is most unfair and disingenious, when he goes before the people of our Province, who are unacquainted with the usages of this Parliament, to endeavour to make them believe that those who vote against this resolution are opposed to reciprocity, while he is in favor of it. I do not think the vote on this occasion will bear that significance at all. It will show that the supporters of the Government are true to the policy of the party that sent them here, and that they are not so simple as to be entrapped into giving a vote tending rather to break up the Government they were sent here to support than to bring about reciprocity.

M. DAVIES. Hear, hear.

M. JENKINS. The hon. gentleman says hear, hear. Sir, I feel satisfied that I can go to my constituents and justify the vote I am going to give to-night. I am not afraid to meet my hon. colleague on the hustings. I admit that my hon. friend has a great deal of eloquence and is very fluent; but there are other qualities in a politician besides fluency; a little judgment and a little weight are required. I will not say that my hon. colleague is deficient in those qualities—I leave to the House to judge. My hon. colleague thinks he will be able to play this game a second time; but it won't work; it is a trap that will be very stale at the next election; the people will not be taken in a second time. They were not altogether taken in before; if they had been I would not be here to-night. I am here as a protest against this vote.

Mr. DAVIES. Hear, hear.

Mr. JENKINS. Yes, the people have sent me here to protest against the form in which my hon. colleague has brought this matter before the House. Not that the people are not anxious for reciprocity; they know the benefit of

it, but they are not quite so green or so simple as my hon. friend supposes; and, I am sure, after the lesson they have had, that they will not be taken in a second time.

Mr. FISHER. In opening a few remarks on this question, I cannot refrain from alluding to one or two observations that have fallen from the last speaker. It is quite possible that a great many members of the House who support the Government may be afraid that if they voted for such a resolution as this, they would hurt the Government. They do not seem to reflect, that by not voting for it, they may hurt their country. But my hon. friend who has preceded me seems to feel, that notwithstanding that he thinks a good deal of reciprocity, and would do a great deal to secure it for the people he represents, still, because he is devoted to the hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial Benches, he dare not to vote for the resolution. That, I think, is the key-note of the whole discussion to-night. Why do hon. gentlemen acknowledge that reciprocity would be a good thing? They are obliged to acknowledge it, because they know that the country wants it, and would do a good deal to obtain it; but they will not support a motion in that direction simply because it comes from a member of the Opposition. Hon. members who have supported the Government in this discussion have alluded to a standing offer of reciprocity made by our Government to the Government of the United States. I refer to that clause in the statute of 1879, which was quoted by the hon. gentleman who comes from the Island of Cape Breton (Mr. Cameron). Sir, I would like to ask the Government if that clause has ever been officially communicated to the Government of the United States. I would like to know whether, because a clause happens to be incidentally inserted in a statute, that this is to be regarded as a diplomatic offer to a foreign Government. I would like to know if these gentlemen are assuming that they made a standing offer to the United States Government, while they, in fact, never did so. Unless they can show that this is a diplomatic offer, and has been communicated officially to the United States Government, their whole contention falls to the ground at once and forever. We are accused also of trying to embarrass the Government, because my hon. friend the member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has introduced his motion on going into Committee of Supply. Sir, if we have to introduce these motions in favor of reciprocity in this House, it is in consequence of the inaction of the Government. If the Government would do something, it would not fall upon us to do it; but it is because the Government, in their responsible position, fail to do their duty to this country that the members of the Opposition have to call them to account? This is the only reason the members of the Opposition have had to bring this matter before the House a second time. It is not because we wish to embarrass the Government; it is because we want reciprocity, and for no other reason whatever. The hon. gentleman says we are obliged to show the United States that we can do without reciprocity, and that is the only way we can obtain reciprocity from them. The Reciprocity Treaty with the United States came to an end in 1866, and from that time until the end of the year 1875 we did without reciprocity, we showed the United States that we could do without it, we showed them that during those 10 years we progressed very fairly and well; and I believe the hon. Mr. Brown, who went to Washington in 1875 to try and negotiate a treaty with the United States, showed very clearly to the representatives of the United States that Canada could do without reciprocity, that Canada had done without reciprocity, and had progressed very well without it, but at the same time, without any false sentimentality, he said plainly and frankly to the people of the United States; we have done well without reciprocity, but we can do better with it; you also have done well without it, but you can also do better with it; and he established that clearly from the figures of the trade and navigation returns of the two countries. I believe that if we sent a deputation to-day to the United States to try and enter into negotiations with the American Government, we could show a similar result, we could show clearly that Canada has, within the last two decades done well without reciprocity, that we are doing well without it to-day, but that we could do better with reciprocity; I think at the same time we could show clearly and strongly that while the United States have done well without reciprocity, they would also do better with it. The United States themselves think so. It is absurd for hon. gentlemen opposite to say that the United States do not want reciprocity. How is it that they have endeavored to negotiate reciprocity treaties with other countries? How is it they negotiated one with the Sandwich Islands? How is it that only a year ago they negotiated a Treaty with the Spanish West India Islands and another with a country of which at the moment I do not remember the name? And these two treaties were only dropped in consequence of the result of the elections in the United States last autumn; in consequence of the knowledge that a change was going to take place in the Government of the United States; but if the United States wish to negotiate those treaties with much smaller countries than Canada, why should they consider that they would net be benefited by negotiating a treaty with us? I believe the secret of their objecting to negotiate a treaty of reciprocity with us is to be found in the inauguration of the protective policy of which hon. gentlemen opposite boasted so much in 1878. I believe it is in consequence of that policy that the United States have not since been willing to negotiate a treaty with hon. gentlemen opposite, and I am confident they will find it more difficult to negotiate such a treaty than would other hon. gentlemen did they hold positions on the Treasury Benches. I believe this country would be much more likely to obtain reciprocal trade relations with the United States if hon. gentlemen on this side were in office. To-day a new Government has come into power in the United States, a Government which appears to be in favour of freer trade relations, a Government which is not so wedded to the protective policy that has held in the United States for a great many years back, and I believe that this year will be a favorable occasion for our Government to endeavour to open negotiations in this matter. I think that our Fishery Treaty with the United States having come to an end, is certainly the strongest reason to be urged that we should even at this late hour, do our utmost to obtain reciprocal relations with our neighbors. So far in this debate, hon. gentlemen from the Maritime Provinces have held the floor, but I would not have it thought for an instant that this question is only one that affects the Maritime Provinces. The question of a Reciprocity Treaty affects the whole Dominion, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, as it also affects the whole of the United States from the Atlantic to the Pacific; and coming, as I do, from the Eastern Townships, representing a section of the country which has just as great interest in reciprocity as has Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, or Prince Edward Island, I feel it my duty here to express my opinions on this question. I cannot speak perhaps with so much authority for the other parts of the Province of Quebec, although I believe that all over the Province there is a strong feeling in favor of reciprocity, but I am positive that among the Eastern Townships, in the English speaking portions of the Province of Quebec which border on the States, that feeling is strong and universal, a feeling which does not simply exist among the Liberals but has an equally strong hold among the Conservatives. It is a feeling so strong that no gentleman need show himself on a hustings in the Eastern Townships to-day who is not prepared to

express his intention to do all he can to secure reciprocity with the United States. It may be that his political allegiance may prevent him from doing anything, but he must at all events profess his readiness to do something or he will have little chance of being favorably received. Some hon. gentlemen who were here in 1878 may remember that an hon. gentleman in this House, then representing a neighboring constituency to my own, I allude to the hon. gentleman for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), made a speech on the Tariff during which he alluded particularly to the question of reciprocity; and I believe he was the originator of that famous phrase which has since often been quoted: "If we can not have reciprocity of trade, let us have reciprocity of tariff." In that speech he gave as one of the great reasons why we should have a protective tariff in this country that it would force the United States into giving us reciprocity. That was six years ago. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been on the Treasury Benches ever since and what have they accomplished? Have they obtained for us reciprocity? No, they have not; they say they cannot get it, they say that they cannot go to the United States and get anything. Has their protective tariff brought them any nearer to that goal of reciprocity? No, it has not; and what is more it has not got for us any of the things which were to make up for the want of reciprocity. One great reason why the people of the Eastern Townships want reciprocity is that it will give them local markets for their produce. We, in the Eastern Townships, are not blessed with wide stretches of prairie but are obliged to do our husbandry on a smaller scale. We have to engage in mixed husbandry, and the things we raise and sell are those which are peculiarly adapted to a local market. As a matter of fact we do still export a great quantity of our products to the American markets, and were it not for the tariff of the United States we would enjoy a much greater advantage in those markets than we do now. At the time we had reciprocity we had those markets almost as completely as if we belonged to the United States, but to-day unfortunately for ourselves and in consequence of the peculiar position in which we are, owing to circumstances of a peculiar nature which I am not going to discuss just now, we have to pay the duties imposed on our produce on their going into the United States. The result is that on our side of the line we cannot obtain such high prices as those which are obtained in the market to the south of us by the American farmers. At the time, however, that the protective policy was introduced, it was held out to us that if we did not get a Reciprocity Treaty we were going to have local markets built up among ourselves which would accomplish all the good a Reciprocity Treaty could accomplish. Where are those local markets? I happen to know pretty thoroughly the border towns of the Eastern Townships, and I know that we have no such markets as were promised. It was said that everywhere a local manufactory was established the farmers around would get higher prices for their products. Well, I can state one fact which I know of my own knowledge that will show pretty clearly such is not the case. To-day in the village of Magog, where the print works which were built up by hon. gentlemen opposite are in existence, the produce of the farm is sold at exactly the same prices as in the village of Knowlton where I live, where there is no manufacturing of any kind whatever. And why is that the case? Simply because any one of the townships through that part of the country can supply and more than supply all the manufacturing people that there are in any of those villages and towns. In the towns of Sherbrooke and Coaticooke, where there is a larger manufacturing population than in the village of Magog, the prices of agricultural products have not been raised at all on that account, simply because the number of the farmers around them is so great that the moment their prices rise there is an influx from all the neighboring country into that village or town and the prices go down again at once. I know as a matter of fact that, two years ago, when some 200 people were at work in the village of Magog, building the manufactory there—quite as many as will be employed in the manufactory, more than are now employed—farmers from my neighborhood took their potatoes and pork to Magog, hoping to get a higher price, owing to the promises which had been held out by hon. gentlemen opposite, and they brought them back and sold them in Knowlton instead, because they could not get a higher price, but on the contrary the prices were decreased, so great was the influx of those men with their produce to that place. This is a fair instance of the local market which protection has built up in the rural portions of this country, and it is of a piece with all the fallacies which underlie that policy, and among them is that which was put forward by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), in his speech in 1878, that by means of that reciprocity of tariffs, they were going to bring about a reciprocity of trade. They have not done that and they could not do it, and I think they were very foolish in supposing that they could do it by any such means. We are accused of going hat in hand and begging for reciprocity from the United States. It is nothing of the kind. Such a thought is as far from us as from the hon. gentlemen opposite. I have yet to learn or to think that a diplomatic negotiation with a foreign power can, in any sense or in anyway, be considered as derogatory to the power which commences it. I understand very well that the hon. gentlemen opposite may not desire reciprocity. Their whole policy has been such as to lead them entirely in the opposite direction from reciprocity. They have announced it necessary as a part of their policy to retain Canada for the Canadians, that they should build up our manufactories and our people here by means of a protective policy, and we know perfectly well that a reciprocal tariff is a great blow at any protective policy. We know that the facts shown in favor of reciprocity would tell against the protective tariff, because, although reciprocity may not be so great a boon as free trade, still it would be a step in that direction, and, were it successful, as even the hon. gentlemen opposite themselves acknowledge it would be, it would necessarily weaken their arguments that protection is a good thing for the country; and that I believe to be one of the great reasons why the Government opposite are so much opposed to commencing any attempt to bringing about reciprocity. At this late hour in the evening, I will not go into some figures and details of our trade relations with the United States which I have prepared and which I intended to bring before the House. I think I have shown shortly that the accusations which have been hurled against us in consequence of our motion this evening are not founded, and I think I have also shown pretty clearly that the policy of the Government is not to get reciprocity, but to work as much in the contrary direction as they can.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Davies, p. 1001.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fisher,	McIsaac,
Armstrong,	Fleming,	McMullen,
Auger,	Forbes,	Mills,
Bain (Wentworth),	Geoffrion,	Mulock,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Blake,	Gunn,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Harley,	Ray,
Burpee,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Somerville (Bruce),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Jackson,	Springer,
Cartwright,	King,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casey,	Kirk,	Sutherland (Selkirk),
Catudal,	Landerkin,	Thompson,
Charlton,	Langelier,	Vail,
Cook,	Laurier,	Watson,

Davies,	Lister,	Weldon,
De St. Georges,	Livingstone,	Wilson and
Edgar,	McCraney,	Yeo.—58.
Fairbank,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Dupont,	Massue,
Allison,	Farrow,	Moffat,
Bain (Soulanges),	Ferguson (Welland),	Paint,
Baker (Victoria),	Fortin,	Patterson (Essex),
Barnard,	Foster,	Pinsonneault,
Beaty,	Gagné,	Pope,
Bell,	Gigault,	Pruyn,
Benoit,	Gordon,	Reid,
Bergeron,	Grandbois,	Riopel,
Bergin,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hastings),
Blondeau,	Hall,	Rykert,
Bourbeau,	Hay,	Shakespeare,
Bowell,	Hesson,	Small,
Burns,	Hickey,	Smyth,
Cameron (Inverness),	Homer,	Sproule,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hurteau,	Stairs,
Carling,	Ives,	Taschereau,
Caron,	Jamieson,	Tassé,
Chapleau,	Jenkins,	Temple,
Cimon,	Kaulbach,	Tilley,
Cochrane,	Kilvert,	Townshend,
Colby,	Kinney,	Tupper,
Costigan,	Kranz,	Wallace (Albert),
Coughlin,	Langevin,	Wallace (York),
Curran,	Lesage,	White (Cardwell),
Cuthbert,	Macdonald (Kings),	White (Hastings),
Daly,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Renfrew),
Daoust,	Mackintosh,	Wigle,
Dawson,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wood (Brockville),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McCallum,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dickinson,	McDougald (Pictou),	Woodworth and
Dodd,	McLelan,	Wright.—98.
Dugas,	McNeill,	

Amendment negatived.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). The hon. member for South Perth has not voted.

Mr. TROW. I paired with Colonel Williams in the event of my not succeeding in getting another pair for him. The hon. member for L'Islet has not voted.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I paired with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). I was voting for the amendment.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

To meet expenses in connection with the care of the Archives $6,000 00

Mr. POPE. The money expended on this item is for the purchase of books and the copying of books, in London and Paris, and printing and binding the same. Stationery is also added, as well as the salary of Mr. Marmette, who was at the time in Paris, and to whom we gave $4 a day. He has returned to Canada and is now occupied in this particular business.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose you have employed this money in obtaining copies mainly of some historical books. What historical works did Mr. Marmette succeed in procuring for us during the past year? And what is he going to be employed on this present year?

Mr. POPE. In the present year, state papers relating to the events immediately succeeding the conquest of 1759 and 1760, down to 1791, when the Provinces were divided; also the papers from that date relating to Lower Canada, and the same for Upper Canada, up to 1811. That is for the coming year. Also copies of state papers relating to the operations of Amherst, Howe, Wolfe, etc., and the events which preceded the taking of Quebec. Also, in Rome, important documents have been selected and copied, although not yet received. At Quebec a large amount of work has been done, the result of part of which will be found in the report of 1884. At Windsor, Sandwich and Detroit, registers from about 1704, and important documents relating to the early settlement of that territory, are in course of being copied, many of them being already received and bound. Some of the papers, as I said before, are copied in Rome, and some few in Paris.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What papers in Rome do you expect to become possessed of?

Mr. POPE. I could not tell the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Have you any idea of the cost of these papers in Rome?

Mr. POPE. No; there is not much to do there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What officer has charge of the work at Rome?

Mr. POPE. I cannot say. Of course there is no officer. There is only a copyist employed,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, I take it for granted that if you are spending money in Rome you are doing it through some particular channel. Who is responsible for it?

Mr. POPE. I am doing it through some particular channel. The Pope, of course, is at the head of that, and the Pope is at the head of this.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hope the other Pope knows more about it than this one.

Mr. BOWELL. Order.

Mr. BLAKE. One knows everything and the other knows nothing.

Mr. POPE. That is complimentary, as usual.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Although the hon. gentleman was good enough to inform us that he was under the direction of His Holiness, he did not state that either His Holiness here or His Holiness there is doing the work. Who is doing the work in Rome for us?

Mr. POPE. Well, I cannot say. There are only copyists doing work there.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What papers are you obtaining from Rome?

Mr. POPE. I am obtaining some papers that Mr. Marmette, who quite understands the value of papers, has suggested should be copied, as they relate to the early history of this country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are they?

Mr. POPE. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman what they are.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Surely, if the public money is being spent by direction of the hon. Minister for the purposes of obtaining copies of certain documents in Rome, he ought, before he allows public money to be expended, to be in a position to tell us what these documents are, and how they come to affect the history of this country. That is his business, before he comes here to ask us for money, he should tell us what the money is to be spent for. I can understand, of course, that there may be, in the possession of some great societies at Rome, documents which affect the early history of this country—I suppose it may be in connection with the society of the Propaganda, or some of those great religious societies which, in early years, employed missionaries in this country. I can quite understand they may be of great importance, but we ought to know what they are; we ought to know what the hon. gentleman wants to get the money for, and what he proposes to give us for our money.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is a new theory that when we are collecting antiquities and archives, a Minister

who orders the collection must know what they are all about.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, but he ought to know where they are.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That pretension is absurd. Mr. Marmette, who is doing the work, is a gentleman of education, an archæologist, specially employed for the purpose of examining documents, both at Paris and at Rome, and making researches in the proper quarter for documents and papers connected with Canada, or relating to the history of Canada. Now we know that in Rome there must be a great many papers, instruments and documents, and books of great interest to Canada, connected with the early ecclesiastical history of Canada. We know, from the *Relations des Jésuites*, what they have done. I have no doubt that there are in the records there a large number of documents largely relating to Canada. I have no doubt, also, that at the Vatican itself there are a great many instruments and documents connected with the ecclesiastical occupation and early settlement of this country, when Canada was considered as in *partibus infidelium*, and afterwards, when it was laid out, as it is now, regularly as a Christian country. And is it to be supposed that my hon. friend, or any Minister having charge of the collection of documents of this kind, should be obliged to know all about them? I wonder what Lord Palmerston knew about the collections made by Mr. Kanitzsky? Why, of course, these gentlemen are employed for the purpose of collecting such papers and such books, and we must trust to them as experts. I have no doubt the results will be that we will have—and we are doing it now, early in the history of Canada—a collection of documents of very great importance to Canada.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That may all be very true, but we have not yet received explanations in regard to the cost. I can furnish the hon. gentleman with more information than he has given to the House. I think the person who volunteered his services was Archbishop Taschereau of Quebec. His presence in Rome was used in order to obtain access to the Library of the Jesuits, and it was through his instrumentality that the work was entered upon. That is the fact so far as my information goes, and it will not be denied by the other side of the House. There is no doubt as to the value of the documents; though they are not very numerous, yet there are some documents of interest in relation to the early history of Canada. What is the amount likely required to be paid for continuing those researches, and what has been said?

Mr. POPE. The sum placed in the estimates has been $6,000 a year. For the year of which we are now speaking $4,000 more. The whole vote has not been expended.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is perfectly absurd for the First Minister to talk, as he has done, about the impossibility of giving the Committee information in regard to these matters. Here is a small vote, $6,000, for which we are to get information in London, Paris and Rome. You may spend a very considerable amount to very little purpose in making enquiries in the old libraries, which are of immense extent, and where there are immense masses of all kinds of books, unless the work is carried on under some definite rule, and with some particular object before you. What I want to know is, whether the money was being distributed in London, and whether it is a definite class of information that the Minister of Agriculture expects to get; because, unless this is being done in some regular way, the amount, although it is not a very large sum, will be thrown away. I know quite as well as the hon. First Minister, that there are documents of very considerable value there; but it was quite evident the Minister of Agriculture, unless the First Minister has since coached him, did not know anything about them himself.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. CASEY. It was very kind of the Premier to come to the assistance of his colleague and suggest what never apparently occurred to himself, the nature of the documents that might be copied at Rome. But it was very unkind of him, on the other hand, to say that it was absurd to imagine that the Minister should know what was being done. That was an unwarrantable slight on the hon. gentleman. I think the Minister of Agriculture is quite capable of understanding the value of documents of this class if he would have a few minutes conversation with the gentleman directly in charge as to what was going on, what documents were being copied and at what cost. It would not be asking too much from the hon. gentleman to request him to bend his powerful mind in that direction for half an hour before he comes down with the estimates, so that he could give the Committee a general idea of what interesting historical records are being obtained. We have this annual vote for our Archives. We have no statement that I know of as to the nature of the documents copied from year to year. It should be in the report of the caretaker of the Archives, but I have not seen the report for this year. I have not, in fact, seen the report of the Department of Agriculture in which that would be contained.

Some hon. MEMBERS. It is down.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear. You might have spent half an hour on that.

Mr. CASEY. It is not my Department. I am not paid to look at the report of the caretaker of the Archives.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You are.

Mr. CASEY. If part of my indemnity is paid for looking at the Archives Report, if it is my duty to see that report immediately it comes down and make myself thoroughly familiar with it, then surely to a greater extent it is the duty of the head of the Department, under whose direction it has been prepared, to have some acquaintance with it. It has been shown that the hon. gentleman does not know so much about it as a member of the Opposition. He has been asked as to official documents copied in Rome, and he does not pretend to know anything about the matter. He had to resort to his leader to ascertain what the documents might be, and to receive information from this side of the House as to what has been done in his own Department. I must say it is a very ridiculous exhibition of incompetency in connection with the estimates. I know these are strong words to use. I do not expect very full and detailed explanation from the Minister in question, but in a matter of this kind, which, I repeat, he could have learned in half an hour's conversation with the proper officer, it is too bad we should be treated to such answers as he has given to-night. It appears from the information we have in the Public Accounts that last year $1,643 were spent by cheques drawn by the High Commissioner of Canada in England in connection with this service. As this is a very considerable sum, probably the Minister of Agriculture may be prepared to give some information as to how this money was spent, as to whether it was all for copying, what the documents are, and so forth.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Carried.

Mr. CASEY. No, not carried yet. I want an explanation. It is the Minister's duty when a question is asked to answer it. If the hon. gentleman persists in treating the House and independent members of the House in this way——

Mr. RYKERT. You.

Mr. CASEY. Yes, me; and I can tell the hon. member that I am an older member of this House than is the hon. gentleman who attempts to sneer at me. If the Minister continues to treat with studied discourtesy hon. members, and to

refuse to answer questions, I can only put it down to ignorance.

Mr. LANGELIER. I must say that this kind of work requires a great deal of care. The Government of Quebec have been publishing, during the last two or three years, a very important collection of documents concerning the old history of Canada, and especially of the Province of Quebec. They have published three large volumes, well got up, and which do great credit to the Department which has prepared them. But I call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to these volumes, on account of this fact: when the first volume was published people well acquainted with the old history of this country pretended that the documents were not complete, and not only that they were not complete, but that they were garbled and inaccurate. A long discussion went on, and I may briefly state the result. It was contended that the inaccuracies to be found in those documents were intentional on the part of the Government: that some changes had been made in order not to displease high ecclesiastical authorities. After a good deal of discussion it was ascertained that the cause of the inaccuracies and of the lacunes in the documents was due to this fact: the proper place had not been gone to for the documents. They had been obtained from some public department in Paris, and copied by a gentleman in Boston. And the Government of the Province of Quebec sent to Boston to have them copied again, and the gentleman who prepared them for the Massachusetts Government said the documents were correct as far as they went, but, of course, as he said in explanation, he went to Paris to copy these documents for a particular purpose, and he only copied those portions which were useful to his purpose and he left the rest, not with any bad intention or for the purpose of publishing inaccurate documents, but simply because he did not require to publish the rest. It is important that those who go to Paris or Rome to copy documents should go to original sources, and not copy second-hand documents which have been copied by some one else, or otherwise we are likely to lose our money. I do not say that this is the case, as I have no information to that effect, and I have no reason to doubt from the information given by the hon. gentleman that the documents will be copied from really original sources. I simply call attention to the importance of getting these documents from original sources and not taking second-hand copies. Whilst I am on my feet I wish to call the attention of the Government to another matter. I see by the Quebec papers that the Government of that Province are going to continue the publication of these papers. They are about now to begin the publication of a most important series—the archives of *Le Conseil Souverain de la Nouvelle France*. The value of these documents it is almost impossible for any one to conceive who has not seen a portion of them. They contain all the acts of the Governments of New France, almost from the time of the settlement of Canada until the cession of this country to England. As I have said already, the Government of Quebec are going to commence the publication of these documents, and I would ask if it would not be possible to make some arrangement with the Government of the Province of Quebec, by which this Government would have the opportunity of distributing these documents as they are published by the Government of Quebec, for they have not only reference to the Province of Quebec, but to the whole of British North America. The decisions of that council refer to all the acts of the Government and its Administration, and the judicial decisions which were rendered at that time are to be found in these archives. Some of those documents, I am informed, refer to some portions of the North-West with reference to the *Coureurs des Bois*. I think it would be a good thing if the Dominion Government could make some arrangement with the Government of Quebec, in order to distribute to those who receive such documents as are published by the Government of Canada, those which are to be published by the Government of Quebec, for they are of very great importance.

Mr. POPE. I can only say that I receive the suggestion of my hon. friend in the same kind and gentlemanly spirit in which he has made it. I have had some little correspondence with the Government of Quebec about this matter, and I hope we will be able to make some arrangement of the kind, and that we will be able to send Mr. Brymner down to look over them. With respect to copying from copies, there is nothing surer than the fact which the hon. gentleman has stated. It is utterly impossible to avoid mistakes if these letters are copied from copies; but we get no letters except those which are taken from original sources. We have those papers in London examined by two specialists—two gentlemen whose business it is to examine every single one of them and see that they are correct before they are bound, so that I think our papers will prove to be correct. With respect to what the hon. member for Huron said, it is possible that I may have mentioned the matter to Mr. Marmette, though it has passed from my mind; but I will endeavor to get the information.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How much do you mean to apportion to the service at Rome?

Mr. POPE. It is a very small amount—I cannot say at the moment how much, but I will ascertain.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My reason for asking is that where there are voluminous archives to be examined the assignment of a very small sum is practically thrown away. I do not think the hon. gentleman will find that these documents relating to the early history of Canada—with which we are going to charge ourselves chiefly—are separated carefully. I think a considerable amount of research would be required in order to get at the information he wants, and that is my reason for calling his attention to the matter. I know that is the case in these old libraries. I have had occasion to hunt myself for documents in similar places, and I know that a small sum of money soon disappears. I have had some doubt whether we can expend advantageously the sum of $6,000 in four or five different directions I think, last year the hon. gentleman talked of extending his researches in New England. Was anything done in that direction?

Mr. POPE. From the work we are doing, and having these parties engaged particularly in London, who are accustomed to this sort of work, I was advised by the High Commissioner that the sum we had at our disposal for obtaining information with reference to the early history of Canada was not enough. Of course, these I speak of are something in connection with copies which have already been made. My attention was first drawn to this by the Abbé Verreau, and he first went to Paris, and afterwards visited Rome and looked over them. It is true that the selection of these documents requires the greatest possible care, and you have sometimes to go through very voluminous documents to pick out a very little. It was first the suggestion of the Abbé Verreau, and afterwards Mr. Marmette gave his observations.

Mr. BLAKE. As to the absurdity of asking the information which my hon. friend asked, the Minister of Agriculture has relieved him because he has promised very properly to give the information which the First Minister declared it was impossible to give. The First Minister said we must have the documents before we can talk over them, and it was absurd, he said, to demand the character of the documents, but now we are going to know in a general sense what we are going to get. The hon. member

for Huron did not ask the hon. gentleman to repeat or read the contents of the papers, or even to be conversant with them, but he asked the general character of the papers which have been obtained.

Mr. POPE. We have not got them all.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course we understand that with reference to the Haldimand collection. But when we are told that you are going to documents existing in the libraries of the Jesuits and the Propaganda we want to know something of the general line in which you are working, in order to have some idea of what the processes of investigation and acquisition may be. I was delighted to hear this statement of my hon. friend from Megantic (Mr. Langelier), and I am quite sure the hon. gentleman will arrange that we should have the benefit of those documents, which must be of the highest value not to the Province of Quebec exclusively, but as appertaining to almost the whole of Canada and to a country much more extensive. And I dare say, when the hon. gentleman publishes these documents, that in the archives, the locality of *La Nouvelle France* will be ascertained, as well as the locality of the Province of St. Paul, about which there appeared to be some obscurity the other day in the discussion which took place in the House.

Mr. CASEY. As the hon. gentleman chose to retire into what I suppose he considered a dignified silence in answer to my question about the expenses in London, perhaps he will not object to receive a little information on this point if he will not give any. I find that the expenditure for copyists last year was $2,023, while books, maps, etc., only cost $1,714, and the stationery and binding apparently trifling sums. This comparatively large expenditure on copying would naturally be expected when old documents were to be copied; but the question arises, who did this work, which has been so frequently referred to, of looking through the documents and deciding what should be copied? I see that Mr. Marmette is down for a salary and living allowance. Do I understand that he was in charge of the work of selecting what was to be copied?

Mr. POPE. No; Mr. Brymner himself made the selections to be copied in London.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Brymner went to London for that purpose?

Mr. POPE. Yes. He went twice to London.

To meet expenses in connection with preparation of Criminal Statistics..... $4,000 00

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman explain what progress he is making in this?

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman will perhaps receive earlier than usual the statistics for 1883-84. All that we have for 1883-84 are already compiled; but the returns come in slowly, and they cannot be published until they are nearly all in. But we are making fair progress, and we are improving this year over last year. We are much farther in advance now than we were at this time last year.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman can hardly have failed to observe some rather serious criticisms on the results of those statistics which have appeared from time to time, seeming to indicate that the information he has received can hardly be reliable. Some of the results seem to be so extraordinary that I cannot but fancy there must be some carelessness in the preliminary preparation of the information. Of course, I quite understand that in the initiation of a system of this kind, you have to train the people as you get them, and it is only by degrees that you can approach perfection and accuracy; but perfection and accuracy will not be attained unless there be a system at the head office for watching the results from the different quarters, making a test, and communicating with those officers whose returns appear to be abnormal, with the view of getting them righted from year to year. That is one point I would like to ascertain, whether such enquiries have resulted in finding the cause of some of these extraordinary inaccuracies, or whether we are to assume that they are not inaccuracies. Another point is this: I suggested to the hon. gentleman last year that the value of these papers very largely depended upon his getting each year, in easy and plain form, a comparative statement, not of all the details, but of a considerable portion of them, that would enable us to ascertain the rise and fall of crime from year to year at a glance.

Mr. POPE. I was not here last year to hear the hon. gentleman's remarks; but I did observe some criticisms, and I instructed Mr. Layton to carry out the system in the direction suggested as far as possible. As for errors, it is entirely impossible for me to entirely remove what the hon. gentleman calls errors. There may be a great many arrests, and there may be a great many warrants issued more than there are detections; a great many may be arrested this year who are tried next year; so that the figures cannot be got to agree exactly. I have instructed Mr. Layton to correspond with the officers so as to have the statistics as correct as possible.

To meet expenses in connection with Dominion Exhibition. $10,000 00

Mr. HALL. I would like to ask if this sum or any portion of it is already pledged to any particular locality. My object in asking is to call the hon. Minister's attention to the fact that we are establishing an exhibition building on a large scale at Sherbrooke; and as we expect that Sherbrooke will shortly be on the short line railway between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Maritime Provinces, it would be a very desirable locality at which to hold the Dominion Exhibition.

Mr. POPE. I must say that it is not applied to any particular place. As usual, there have been a good many applications, but nothing has been settled. The programme that will be carried out will be the same as formerly, as far as possible, that is to assist the people in bringing in their products as cheaply as possible.

Mr. BLAKE. The programme has rather varied. Originally, this was a grant of $5,000; then there was a particular occasion in which it was increased to $10,000 for some special reason. The exhibition was to have been held in the city of St. John, and it was alleged that owing to the distance or the very special character of the exhibition or otherwise, an increase was necessary. Having once got up to $10,000, as is the habit of estimates it stuck at $10,000. Then, the hon. gentleman divided it, and gave $5,000 each to two exhibitions, last year, so that instead of having $5,000 for one, ultimately increased to $10,000, and then carried on normally at $10,000, we have $10,000 for the two. Is it proposed, this year, to keep this grant for one place or to again divide it?

Mr. POPE. It will be kept at one place.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the original system of rotation to be adopted in choosing the place?

Mr. POPE. I think that as a rule, the system of rotation is adopted as far as it can conveniently suit the whole country. The hon. gentlemen is aware that the $5,000 was found to be too little to do the service adequately, and I being a simple and a honest farmer thought my cooperators in farming had a right to a little more and gave it to them.

Mr. BLAKE. Sometimes these people who are very simple deceive themselves and fail to deceive the rest of the world. The hon. gentleman says in the same breath that he found that he could not do with $5,000 for one place and

took $10,000, and then he divided the $10,000 into two grants of $5,000 each for two principal places, $5,000 in one place and $5,000 in the other. That is very simple.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I gather from the remarks of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, that this specific sum of $10,000 is not applied to any particular place at present, and that the whole amount should consistently be expended in one particular spot. I am aware that the Dominion annual exhibition, has been held in every capital city of the Dominion with the exception, as my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) informed us last year, of Charlottetwon, P.E.I., and I am informed that Winnipeg has also not been favored in that regard.

Mr. BLAKE. Nor Quebec.

Mr. BAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman will kindly take into consideration the claims of a Province that has already been fourteen years in the Dominion and has not yet been blessed with any demonstration of that kind. Of course the innate modesty, for which the hon. members from British Columbia are proverbial, precludes the possibility of our asking for the entire sum; but when you take into consideration the distance that Victoria is from, the capital of the Dominion, I think our modesty, feigned or otherwise, may be overlooked, and the entire sum for the annual Exhibition of the Dominion be given to Victoria, and the exhibition held there this year. I think we can guarantee to give an exhibition which will be worthy of one of the capital Provinces of the Dominion, and certainly if we have no other exhibit we shall be able to give a very large exhibit in the shape of Chinese, one which will afford, not only many members of this House, but visitors from all parts of the Dominion, an opportunity of really seeing what this particular class of animal is like. But in any case, speaking seriously, I think that the Province of British Columbia has some claim to having this vote expended in that section of the Dominion. We have been told over and over again that the rapidly approaching completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway is going to bring us so many and so great boons that I hope this will be one of them.

Mr. WATSON. I think I followed my hon. friend last year in asking for this grant, and I think the hon. Minister of Agriculture last year promised he would try and give the question of holding the exhibition in Winnipeg favorable consideration. I laid before the House last year the reasons why this exhibition should be held in Winnipeg. It will be the means of enabling people from other parts of the Dominion to judge the products of the country and to see the country itself, and I think it will be the means of assisting immigration to that country. One hon. gentleman said that the county he represented was on the short line, but we are on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is supposed to be opened this fall, and the people who visit the exhibition in Winnipeg will be able to take an excursion over the Canadian Pacific Railway. I hope the hon. Minister will see fit to give this grant to Winnipeg and I am sure the results will be beneficial.

Mr. BAKER. As far as I am personally concerned, I have not the slightest objection to the exhibition being held in Winnipeg, as Winnipeg has a priority of claim having been longer in the Dominion than Victoria, and therefore I shall be glad to know that it is the intention of the Government to work west, for in that case they will eventually reach British Columbia.

Mr. BLAKE. We will meet you half way.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. minister might have some difficulty at present to get to either place.

Mortuary Statistics.....$15,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like the hon. minister to explain in detail what he is doing and what he proposes to do with respect to this subject. Over what extent of the country does this extend and what number of people does it embrace? Of course for $15,000 he can get over no great extent of ground, but I would like to know what the present arrangements are.

Mr. POPE. At the conference of physicians, as explained to my hon. friend the other night, who met here upon this question, they decided we ought to commence on a small scale at first, but it will take a long time as my hon. friend from West Durham says, to get people into the way of giving correct statistics. We began with the chief cities of Canada, for instance Montreal, Quebec, Fredericton, Halifax, St. John, Winnipeg and Victoria; and collected statistics. I do not know whether the hon. gentlemen has seen the report but the books have been distributed. Some of these, before they were published at all, had to be sent back half a dozen times or more. At the time this was decided upon, it was decided that we should commence with these principal cities, and extend it afterwards to the smaller towns with a population of 5,000 or upwards. Within the last six months several of these towns have appointed health officers. They themselves appoint the officers who procure these statistics. When a town has appointed the officer and asked to come in for the purpose of the collection of these statistics, the man it has appointed health officer procures the statistics for us. That is the invariable course. We expended last year, on the ten principal towns that came in, $4,645 of this money. This year I think it will take the whole vote of $15,000 probably, because there are so many smaller towns.

Mr. WILSON. How many smaller towns have made application?

Mr. POPE. Any town that has appointed a health officer—and that is a *sine qua non*—and makes an application, if it has over 5,000 population, is allowed to come in. I have not the number here, but I think that probably ten or twelve have come in. I think there are 25 such towns that would be entitled to come in if they appointed their health officer.

Mr. WILSON. You say that only $4,645 have been expended in the 10 cities. It is evident that they would cost more in the collection of the returns there than in the smaller ones. You have added only six or eight more, and certainly, if they cost as much as the cities, it is not likely it would make more than $3,000 or $4,000 additional.

Mr. POPE. There are twenty-five or thirty more entitled to come in. If I do not spend any more, it will not go.

Mr. WILSON. Has the city of London applied to come in?

Mr. POPE. I do not think so. I do not recollect that it has.

Mr. WILSON. Formerly that was one of the cities embraced in this system, but, as I undersrand, the city of London found that it was not beneficial to remain longer, and it has refused to appoint a health officer, so, of course, it is no longer under the regulations.

Mr. POPE. We have never had a report from London. It has never been in.

Mr. WILSON. As, unfortunately, last year the hon. Minister was not here to give us a full account, I should like to have it now. A number of physicians met in the city of Ottawa, and after being in council for some time with the then Minister of Railways, Sir Charles Tupper, they decided to introduce a system of this kind. The Minister has adopted this system and, as it has been in operation for a length of time, I think we are entitled to full information as to its

working up to the present. We are gradually increasing the amount of the expense.

Mr. POPE. No, I have reduced it.

Mr. WILSON. They did not expend the amount they formerly took, they expended only a little over $4,000 last year, and now they propose to expend $15,000, so it appears that we are increasing the expense, and it is no more than right and fair that, when the hon. gentleman is introducing something of this nature, he should give full explanations and show some reasons for the course he is proposing. I think it would have been better if we had adopted the system and taken advantage of the provincial boards of health, and worked in unison with them. He might have had some scruples, some objections, to adopt that system as far as the Province of Ontario is concerned, but I think their arrangement has been very efficient and their collection of health statistics has proved to be very successful as far as a system of this kind can be. It would therefore have been much better for him to adopt some means, whereby he could have worked in unison with the provincial boards, and we would have had better results. The Minister ought to give us a little more explanation as to the working of this system, so that we may understand it, and that we may be in a position to see the results he is likely to produce from the expenditure of this large amount of money. If he can succeed, I would be the last to object to a vote of this kind. It would be a good thing if he could show that the people of Canada are a long lived people, a hardy people, and a people likely to live to an advanced age. I think he would promote immigration if he could prove that and send it forth to the world, but, with the meagre information we have, I think we are not justified in voting $15,000 at this time.

M. CASGRAIN. I desire to make a suggestion to the minister. There is one fact in this country which baffled all the tables of insurance companies. It is the fact of so many militia men having survived the ordinary length of life.

Mr. PAINT. Pensioners.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Yes, of course. I mention this because I had to study the subject when I was connected with a life insurance company, and it is a fact of such importance that it baffles all the calculations of insurance tables. I have no doubt that there may be a few cases of fraud among the pensioners, but that ingredient would not be sufficient to show the wide divergence there is between the insurance tables and the survivorships of those pensioners. It would be a matter of easy work, I think, to collect the statistics as to these pensioners, ascertaining their birth and their age, and following them to the day of death, because, if you look at the insurance tables, the age at which it ceases to operate does not go beyond 80, and all your pensioners to-day are over that age. Therefore, if any of these men called upon an insurance office to get the insurance, they would all have been wiped out by the ordinary table, and the fact is that there remain some 565 out of 28,000 militia men all round. This shows the longevity of this conntry to be far beyond that of any other country of the world.

Mr. MILLS. Some of these are not the same men as they were ten years ago.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the hon. gentleman do with these health statistics? Does he require from these officers simply statements of the number of persons who die and the cause of the death, or is it intended also to trace the progress of disease in these cities and towns?

Mr. POPE. Yes, it is.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And to send in reports showing the sickliness or health of particular seasons and the classes of disease which have caused the most ill-health in a particular way. What is the idea in short?

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman will find the different diseases classified, and the number of people who have died of each disease, or been sick with it. He will find, perhaps three or four diseases that have been specially fatal. The real object is to find what diseases are most fatal, and those generally prevailing in the country, as such information will be of great value to the medical profession.

Mr. LANGELIER. I happened to attend that meeting of medical gentlemen which took place here two years ago, and I remember that a very important question was raised. It had been proposed by all the gentlemen at that meeting to have a Bill pass by this Parliament—and I think the draft of it was already prepared—for the purpose of obtaining vital and mortuary statistics, and at the same time to take measures for the preservation of the public health. An objection was made by Sir Charles Tupper that this Parliament had not jurisdiction, and I think that objection was well taken. Sir Charles Tupper, speaking in the name of the Government, promised that some correspondence should be had with the Imperial Government in order to have our Constitution amended. He pretended that there had been some misunderstanding in the original draft of the British North America Act; that by the draft the public health had been put under the control of the Dominion Parliament, but when the draft in question was passed into an Act by the British Parliament, this provision had been left out. It is evident that this point, relating to civil rights, fell under the jurisdiction of the Local Legislature. I would like to know whether any steps have been taken, as Sir Charles Tupper promised, to secure from the Imperial authorities an amendment to our Constitution; or whether the Government have abandoned the idea of amending the Constitution in that particular?

Mr. POPE. I do not know that any steps have been taken in that direction.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman answered only one-half of my question as to the health statistics. I wanted to know, whether it was a part of the business of these officers to make what one may call a report of the characteristics of the year, so to speak.

Mr. POPE. I do not know.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The point is one not much attended to, but it may be considered important by medical men. It is admitted, I believe, now-a-days, that diseases are changing from time to time. Certain classes of diseases are much more dangerous and fatal from year to year than they used to be; and others less so. These are largely affected by the climatic positions and other conditions which would naturally suggest themselves to a medical man. I wanted to know whether, besides a bare record of the causes of death, anything of the nature of a detailed report as to the healthy or unhealthy condition of particular localities, was submitted to the Minister; or whether, as yet, he has confined himself to mortuary statistics in the strict sense of the word.

Mr. POPE. The report will be in the direction indicated by the hon. gentleman. Each medical officer is expected, at the end of the year, to make a report upon anything extraordinary in his locality, and that is to be published. These returns are made monthly, and I hope to be able to publish them monthly. I think I would have been able to publish them from the first of this year, but I have not been able to get the last volume ready for distribution, although it is completed. I do not complain of the Queen's printers, but there has been some difficulty in getting the volume ready.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is Dr. Playter's little journal; that might, perhaps, be utilised.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman did not understand me. I hope to get a monthly report made of each of the places. But you cannot do that at first, although I think I would have been able to do it if I could have got the printing done. Some of the reports come in such an incorrect form, that I have had to send them back, and that has delayed publication.

Mr. HICKEY. I think the Minister has explained a great point in this matter. There are statistics of very great importance to the medical fraternity, and to the public at large, but of very little use unless they can be given to the people as soon as possible. As he says, if they could be published monthly, so that the public could get a knowledge of the existence of certain diseases, it would be of the utmost importance, but these statistics would be of very little use unless they can be quickly circulated in order that the hygienic and vital inferences can be drawn from the facts collected.

Mr. WILSON. Does the Minister send out any forms?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. Could he tell us what these forms are? It appears to me, according to the item, that the greater portion of the expense is in reference to the collection of the death records and existing diseases. I think it would be well to send out a blank form embracing all the subjects that have been spoken of.

Mr. POPE. We always do that; but although it is so simple a thing, we find that the returns are made so incorrectly that we have to send them back five or six times, perhaps more, before they come in correct.

Mr. PAINT. I would like to see some plan adopted whereby we might obtain, if possible, correct returns at the end of each month, of the births and deaths throughout the Dominion. It will be information that will be read and looked upon with as much interest as a great deal we receive. I hope some plan may be devised whereby that result can be reached.

Mr. BLAKE. The system which the hon. gentleman has adopted is, as I understand him, one which is only applicable to urban populations, and not to the rural portions of the country. Does he think that is satisfactory as a permanency?

Mr. POPE. Perhaps not; it is only done as a trial.

Mr. BLAKE. It is a trial after a plan which will never give satisfaction, because it gives you no reasonable idea which you can communicate to the public as to the average duration of life and the condition of health throughout Canada as a whole, because you are dealing simply with urban population, which have special types of disease, and, at all events, special modes of life very different from those of the country. We have some conditions tending to life and others to disease existing in cities. Our sewage arrangements, and arrangements for water conveniences, and so forth are very often the machinery for the introduction of disease into our houses, as we know very well. My difficulty with the hon. gentleman's plan is not merely that it is confined to urban populations, but it is one not capable of expansion to the whole country; so if it does succeed with the urban population after all, he has not done half his work. What is the hon. gentleman doing? So far as I can gather almost the whole of the work is connected with mortuary statistics.

Mr. POPE. We get the several diseases.

Mr. BLAKE. Diseases from which persons were supposed to have died. Does the hon. gentleman obtain the duration of the illness?

Mr. POPE. No.

Mr. BLAKE. You get the deaths from fatal types of diseases which have occurred?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. I must say it seems to me that a plan which, in its nature, is confessedly applicable only to one part of the population is one that really ought to be abandoned, and the hon. gentleman ought to work on lines which, even although he may, from motives of economy, apply them for the moment only to one class of the population, would ultimately be capable of expansion to the whole country. If the suggestions made by the hon. gentleman and by the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey) were carried out, he would be very largely trenching on local matters. We have, of course, a right to deal with statistics; but when we talk of engaging in the collection of figures, and the publishing of them monthly, with a view to informing the public and the medical fraternity as to the condition of the public health, we are rather engaging in matters connected with the public health than with the publication of statistics. If the hon. gentleman proposes to adopt that system, I do not see why he should not act on the suggestion of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson), and endeavor to cooperate with those now actually engaged in that work. For some time in the Province of Ontario they have been engaged in carrying out, under difficulties such as those which the hon. gentleman says attend the initiation of any plan of this kind, a system for obtaining a record of the public health. Maps are published monthly in alarming colors, which show the waves and zones of disease over the Province, and they make a man disposed to leave it altogether. Their plan is in its nature—I do not know whether it is capable of being well worked out—but it is in its nature different from that of the hon. gentleman. It is to be applied to municipalities. The municipality is the unit, and appoints the board of health and officers, and the plan is one which will ultimately deal with the whole question. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman ought to call a halt and decide whether his scheme is one which, so far as it has advanced, is likely to prove really useful or not. I say that a plan which deals only with the city and leaves out the rural population is one which will not answer. We should adopt a plan capable of being applied to the whole country, although you may begin with the population of a certain section of the country and see how it works and how much it costs. When the hon. gentleman proposed the vote some years ago he gave no explanation in regard to it, because, he said, it was only experimental. Now that it has been in operation for several years the hon. gentleman thinks he should not give an explanation because the working out of it lies in the future. The system has been established in a certain way and to a certain extent, but it does not seem to me, from what the hon. gentleman has said, that it is likely to be such a system as we ought to make permanent in this country, and I think, therefore, the hon. gentleman ought to perfect a plan applicable to the whole country, if we are to go into it at all.

Mr. POPE. It would involve a very much larger expenditure of money than I would feel disposed to ask, until we had tried this experiment. A very large body of influential men pressed this matter upon me and the Government decided to give it a trial. We have hardly had a chance to give it a trial yet, and I cannot accept the hon. gentleman's proposition.

Mr. BLAKE. I dare say a body of very influential gentlemen pressed the hon. gentleman recently to expend public money, and he may have yielded to that pressure. But we want to know whether that body was right or wrong, and whether the plan which the body of influential

gentlemen proposed and to which he yielded is one likely to be satisfactory to the country at large. Are we to be told that a system of mortuary statistics which the hon. gentleman frankly admitted is, in its essence, a plan inapplicable to the whole rural population, is one which is to be made permanent? I do not care how influential those gentlemen are, I say they were wrong, and that they should have devised a plan which was susceptible of expansion to the whole community. The First Minister has said we are a rural population with the prejudices of a rural population. Amongst those prejudices is this: if there is to be a system of mortuary statistics, it should apply to persons living in the country as well as in towns. You cannot get such general results as are useful otherwise. To what end shall we appeal? To the agricultural populations of other countries for particulars with respect to longevity and public health if we do not get the statistics of that class of our community?

Mr. POPE. You must creep before you walk.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think this is creeping, because the plan is incapable of being applied to the whole country. The hon. gentleman said it was inapplicable to the rural parts.

Mr. POPE. I did not say so.

Mr. BLAKE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that his plan in its nature was inadmissible as to the rural parts. Can he form any idea of what it would cost to apply it all over?

Mr. POPE. It would cost very largely.

Mr. BLAKE. How largely?

Mr. POPE. I could not say now, and surely the hon. gentleman could not expect it. I fancy, however, it would cost five times the $20,000.

Mr. BLAKE. I should think so—more than that. Has the hon. gentleman con idered the suggestion of my hon. friend from Elgin, which I suppose must have been presented to him, as to attempting to cooperate with the provincial authorities as far as they have established systems of this kind?

Mr. POPE. My impression is that it would be quite impossible to collect through that machinery—unless they were more careful than they have been—anything which would give accurate statistics.

Mr. WILSON. Through what machinery are you collecting them at the present time in towns and cities? Is it not the same machinery which is used in the Province of Ontario? What is the system the hon. gentleman is adopting, and what are the results of that system?

Mr. POPE. They are very good.

Mr. WILSON. They may be very good, but it is evident that the hon. gentleman is the only one who has any knowledge of it; none of the rest of us have.

Mr. POPE. I will see that you are educated to it.

Mr. WILSON. I think what the hon. leader of the Opposition suggested is the better system, and that the hon. gentleman would do well to cry a halt and get some other scheme. He stated that it may be a foolish scheme, but I think it is very evident that his scheme is a very foolish one, and until he gets a little more wisdom than he has displayed in this scheme, we had better save the money.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not see any difficulty in extending the scheme, provided there was more money given. I was one of the committee who waited on the Minister of Agriculture and pressed the matter on his attention, and I believe it was the general opinion of all the medical men of the House that it was both practicable and useful, and so far as the expenditure of a small amount of money has been able to do it, it has been productive of good results. I do not see any difficulty in extending it in Ontario, where we have vital statistics collected by clerks of municipalities, but to act in cooperation with the organisation which exists in Ontario would be very difficult, because I believe there is no disposition on the part of that organization to work in harmony with this. They seem to contend, in the first place, that they have not the authority, and in the next place that they are not inclined to associate themselves with this organisation and carry out the work on the same principle that it is being carried on here. The one involves a very large number of officers who must be paid, and the other a very small number. Possibly a little more experience would be useful, so that the reports might be given monthly instead of quarterly. I think the only difficulty now is the small amount of money voted, and I believe a portion of it is expended in keeping up sanitary journals, which is an important matter, because they are distributed all over the country to sanitary commissioners, medical men and others, and they are found especially useful in cities and towns where great defects in drainage and other sanitary conditions produce a great deal of sickness and disease. I think the expenditure has been used very wisely, and it only requires a larger expenditure in order to develop the scheme and make it still more useful.

Mr. BLAKE. We are getting more information. The hon. member for Grey says that a portion of the money was expended in keeping up sanitary journals. I should like to know if this is correct.

Mr. POPE. Is there anything wrong in that?

Mr. BLAKE. What has that to do with mortuary statistics, which is the nominal purpose for which the money is voted. The hon. gentleman is amending the Constitution by an executive act, and not doing what his late colleague promised to do—to go home to the Imperial authorities for that purpose. What have we to do with subsidising sanitary journals?

Mr. POPE. Anything for the public good.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, but we should work it in our own lines, and I do not see how the hon. gentleman defends the subsidising or keeping up of sanitary journals from a vote for mortuary statistics. How much is paid for the sanitary journals?

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman does not seem to be aware how much is paid. Last year $600 were paid to Dr. Playter for services and 400 copies of the *Journal*, but how much of that went for services and how much for the copies of the *Journal* perhaps the Minister may know. The question I was about to ask is, what has been done with the 400 copies of the *Sanitary Journal*? Who gets them? I have been getting a copy of that journal some time back and I have some idea that perhaps they might be distributed by the Government, but I got a bill for it the other day so I did not get any of this money, and perhaps others may be in the same position. I would like to know who gets these 400 copies of the *Sanitary Journal*, and what services does Dr. Playter give in addition to the *Journal*?

Mr. SPROULE. Part of the duties of that gentleman, as I understand, is to publish the information through the *Sanitary Journal*. If it were to be published in other papers some of them would not publish except as a matter of expense, and it would not get as prominently before the public as through a publication of this kind, which is devoted to matters relating to the public health. I believe the gentleman who runs that journal is one of the parties who assists in collecting this information all over the country, and he distributes the journal to responsible officers who

have in charge the public health, and to other prominent men I presume like my hon. friend from Elgin.

Mr. BLAKE. But my hon. friend from Elgin has got a little bill for his copy of the *Journal*. Now what is the distribution?

Mr. POPE. I cannot tell you what the distribution is now, but I will bring the information down.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman in answering me a little time ago, said it would be impossible to utilise the provincial system because it was so defective. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) has volunteered, as volunteering is a very common thing in these days, and in the course of the information by which he has assisted his general-in-chief, he has added to the explanation of the Minister, and he has said that there will be great difficulty in acting with the provincial authorities, because of the want of harmony which would prevent the Minister and them from conserting measures for cooperation in this laudable purpose. I am glad that statement did not proceed from the Ministerial benches, and I do not suppose it will be endorsed by hon. gentlemen. It would be a bad day for Canada, when because it happened that a provincial and central Government did not entertain the same views in politics, it would be impossible for them to cooperate cordiallyin any matter of the description, and I repudiate any such notion as at all pervading the provincial politics of the Province from which I come. What the hon. gentleman said was "such an effective plan;" but I am not quite sure that he was very well qualified to criticise. I do not know the relative merits of the two plans in their execution. The hon. gentleman has pointed out that he made his blanks as nice as perfect, and as simple as possible, so that it would be almost impossible for the wayfaring man to go astray; yet he had to send them back as much as six times to get them corrected. I suppose some difficulties will exist on the part of those engaged in these tasks whether their seat of operation should be at Toronto or at Ottawa; therefore I do not see why a conference could not be had with the provincial authorities, not of Ontario alone, but of any Province engaged in the work; and if the work is to be done by both, why it should not result in greater efficiency and greater economy as well. I think that is a practical and reasonable suggestion. I must say that I hope my hon. friend's efforts at education will be more successful on future occasions than they have been tonight, when he endeavors to educate my hon. friend from Elgin; and I would recommend my hon. friend to learn before he tries to teach.

Mr. SPROULE. Perhaps I failed to make myself understood by the hon. member in reference to the difficulty of carrying out the system by the provincial officers. I did not mean to convey the idea that there was any conflict between the Provincial Government and the Dominion Government. But those persons, understanding that they were officers under the Provincial Government, recognsied that they had a specific duty to discharge, for which they were paid by the Provincial Government; but if they assume part of the duty belonging to this Department, they must occupy the same position as any other officers. Consequently, it would be of no great benefit for the Dominion Government to avail itself of that organisation to collect this information, because it might as well collect it from independent sources, because it would cost the same amount.

Mr. CASEY. I think we understand the matter now. The hon. volunteer assistant to the Minister of Agriculture, or the medical adviser to the Department, whichever may be his functions, has, I think, made it clear that the incompatibility is not between the Provincial Government and the Dominion Government so much as between the two medical organisations which are connected with those two Governments. There is a Provincial Board of Health and a Dominion Board of Health, and it would be almost too much to expect two organisations of doctors to work in harmony about a question of this kind; but it is not too much to expect that the Dominion Government should accept the provincial statistics and make use of them. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says that there is no object in getting these statistics from the Local Government rather than from independent sources, as they would cost the same. This is absurd. The statistics collected by the Local Government are published, and all we have to do is to use them. So that we would get them for nothing. But what is suggested is that by this Government cooperating with the Provincial Government and contributing something towards the collection of those statistics, they could be made more accurate and full than they are now, and for a much smaller sum than we are now asked to contribute towards the work. The hon. Minister of Agriculture thinks the local statistics are not reliable. It seems to me that the local statistics must ultimately be, if they are not now, the most reliable. In all probability they are more full and reliable now than those collected by this Government. The system is better and longer organised, and the Local Government has, what we have not, the power to direct municipalities and municipal officers who are under its control and subject to its direction, to grant the information required. It can compel the giving of the returns, which the Minister of Agriculture can only ask for. I think this Government should confine itself to the publication of classified statistics for the Dominion, taken from the statistics collected by Provincial Governments which undertake this work. It is only mortuary statistics that we get. It is a misnomer to call them health statistics. We do not get any sanitary information in the documents published by the Department. Sanitary statistics are very different and more generally useful, and they are collected and distributed by the Local Government, and this Government might take advantage of its labors in that respect, or supplement its expenditure upon them, and so get more complete returns. As to spending money for the publication of annual returns, I think it should be confined to mortuary statistics, as it is now; and that we should not be taking money for the collection of sanitary statistics which is not used for that purpose. I do hope the Minister will be able to recall to his mind what he has done with the 400 copies of the *Sanitary Journal*. He told us he did not know, but surely he ought to have his deputy here to give us these little details, instead of relying on the chance assistance of some supporters, who may not give very accurate information. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) stated that sanitary matter published on behalf of the Dominion Government would obtain much wider circulation if published in a journal entirely devoted to such matters than if published in the ordinary newspapers, in which case, moreover, the Government would have to pay for their publication. Well, it seems that instead of paying the *Mail* or the *Gazette*, or some other paper of large circulation, we are paying this little paper in Ottawa which must have a very small circulation, that perhaps does not go into the thousands, but is only taken by medical men, or by those who take a special interest in sanitary matters. We are paying the same for having the information published in this journal as would secure its publication in more widely circulated journals. I am not attempting to decry the paper. As a sanitary journal, it is a very fair one; but the information published in it on behalf of the Department is very small, and we are paying $600 for it. I think the hon. Minister should furnish the information what has been done with the papers.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He said he would bring it down.

Mr. CASEY. I did not hear him.

Mr. MILLS. I do not see why the Government should take an appropriation for this purpose at all. They have not the machinery for getting such information. They admit the information they collect only refers to a few cities, and they cannot extend the system to the rural districts without incurring an expense they do not feel called on to incur. Why not leave to the local authorities the collection of these statistics? They have the machinery and will do the work more fully than the Government can. We have quite enough enterprises on which to expend the revenue of the country, without undertaking a matter which can lead to no satisfactory result.

Mr. PLATT. Some few years ago I had the honor of pointing out to the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper some of the difficulties which confronted the inauguration of this scheme, and I suggested that some kind of cooperation should be had with the provincial authorities. The House was then told it was only an experiment and that the Government wished to avoid criticisms until the result was known. Two years have elapsed and we are as much as ever in the dark. The same difficulties which confronted us then confront us now, and I do not see that the progress made within the last two years warrants us in coming to the conclusion that for many years to come this system will extend to the rural districts, and until it does there will be serious objection against it. I also pointed out that it would be a grievance to the Province of Ontario to be taxed for duplicating in parts statistics which that Province had procured itself, and which are much more satisfactory to the people and to the profession of that Province, than the statistics collected by the Dominion authorities. I do not wish hastily to pronounce on the scheme; but if it is to extend only to the cities and to the larger towns, and is only to contain the statistics given in those voluminous reports placed in our hands, reports which prove conclusively that the printing absorbs the greater part of the grant, we must conclude that the scheme has proved a failure, and that the money voted is as good as thrown away. As far as Ontario is concerned, all the work that is done by this system, and a great deal more, is done for that Province by its own authorities. We have health statistics and mortuary statistics; we have monthly reports of the different diseases in particular localities, and a member of the board visits every locality where there is any infectious disease. I do not know what is done in the other Provinces; but so long as one Province is expending a large sum of money in doing this work, and is doing it very successfully, it is not fair that it should be taxed for duplicating any part of the work that it is doing and paying for itself.

Colonial Exhibitions..... .... $40,000 00

Mr. FISHER. What arrangements have been made to represent this country at these exhibitions?

Mr. POPE. The arrangements, generally speaking, for the Antwerp Exhibition are under the charge of Sir Charles Tupper. Mr. Fabre, of Paris, will also be one of the representatives of Canada at that exhibition. They are the only representatives that I know of at this moment, except those employed by Sir Charles Tupper himself. We get 1,019 metres for which we have to pay $5,000. They are in a very good place, situated between the United States departments and those of Great Britain. In London we have 54,000 square feet for which we pay nothing, but we are asked to co-operate with the other provinces and with India in guaranteeing a fund to meet the expenses, if there should be any. It is not supposed there will be any. So far as the London Exhibition is concerned, all the exhibits that are sent to Antwerp are expected to go to London also, and I have no doubt a great deal more will be sent there. I shall have to make more arrangements in London than we made in Antwerp.

Mr. LANGELIER. Is it proposed to send out some one to collect the exhibits of the Antwerp Exhibition? That was done in 1876 for the Philadelphia Exhibition. The Minister of Agriculture at that time, the lamented Mr. Letellier, took the trouble to go through the country himself to encourage the people in sending exhibits there to the exhibition, which was a great success for this country. Is it now proposed to do the same thing? Will the Minister of Agriculture himself, or some other member of the Government, or somebody representing the Government, see the manufacturers and insist on their sending their exhibits? It would be better to have no exhibition than to have an inferior one.

Mr. POPE. I agree with the hon. gentleman that we ought to make as good a show as possible, and that we ought to make a good show or none at all; but so far as the Antwerp Exhibition is concerned, our time has been very limited. We have been pursuing exactly the same course as that which the hon. gentleman intimated. The manufacturers have been visited by a gentleman whom we sent out, and we pay the expense of sending exhibits to Antwerp and of returning them if not sold. Every effort that could be made has been made.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman informed me that Mr. R. R. Pringle, who is a celebrated missionary, known to most members of this House, has been employed for this work at $4 or $5 a day and $3 a day for expenses. How long has this gentleman been employed and how much has he been paid? I suppose he may have refreshed his memory on these points.

Mr. POPE. No.

Mr. CASEY. He has not? He does not know how much has been paid to this returned missionary? I wanted to ask if he knew how long he has been employed and how much has been paid him. I know he was employed during a period when his services would naturally be expected to be required elsewhere, because an election was going on in the constituency in which he resides, and it was not to be expected that he could tear himself away from his duty to his party and his country, which he fulfils so admirably in every election in the county of Northumberland that he should devote himself to this service without ample compensation.

Mr. FISHER. The Minister of Agriculture alluded to his having sent gentlemen around the country, and he said he had sent to all the manufacturers. Are we not to have other exhibits besides manufactured articles?

Mr. POPE. Yes, of course we are.

Mr. FISHER. They were sent round to other places, were they sent generally to obtain these exhibits?

Mr. POPE. As much as they could be.

Mr. FISHER. When were they started out on this work?

Mr. POPE. I stated the other day that it could not have been more than six or eight weeks ago when they started.

Mr. FISHER. It was only at that time, then, that he decided to have a Canadian exhibit at Antwerp and to do this work, or was it an afterthought?

Mr. POPE. It was no afterthought. We intended to do it, and we are doing it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This is a matter of such great importance that I think the Minister might depart from the rule he seems to have adopted to-night of being as brief as possible. It is a vote of $40,000, and it is of

moment, not only because of the amount of money involved, but because of the great interest at stake. Anyone can understand that if we are to have an exhibit at Antwerp or at any other international exhibition, the amount of $40,000, large as it may be, is a secondary consideration to the character of the exhibit we are to make. The honor and credit of the country are at stake. The questions which have been put are pertinent questions, and they should be answered.

Mr. POPE. I answered them.

Mr. PATERSON. Not with that directness which might have been expected, and, if the answer which the hon. gentleman has given be the correct one, I am afraid it would tend to prove that the $40,000 is to be voted not to make it redound to our honor and credit as a Dominion, but for something that will tend I fear in the other direction. That a complete collection of exhibits such as would do credit to us can be got together in a few weeks is more than you might expect, and, if it is true, as the Minister says, that these gentlemen have been engaged in this work only three or four weeks, I hold there is culpable neglect on his part.

Mr. SPROULE. He said five or six weeks.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six or eight.

Mr. PATERSON. Then he has given different answers. Which is the correct one?

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). Six or eight.

Mr. PATERSON. Then another gentleman on the other side is wrong.

Mr. RYKERT. And you are right, of course.

Mr. PATERSON. The member for Lincoln says I am right.

Mr. RYKERT. Yes, you are always right.

Mr. PATERSON. I am not often wrong. I find that, on the 15th November, the Government charged the Minister with the duty of attending to this. The Minister tells us that he allowed weeks and months to elapse before he took the first initial step to send out his agents to make the collection. Is no explanation due to the committee with reference to that? Is the Minister in a position to say that he has secured a collection of exhibits that will do credit to this country? He ought to be in a position to tell us that. In his report it is stated that the exhibits, in order to be in their place by the 1st May, should be ready for shipment to Antwerp not later than the 1st March. On the 16th March his secretary says they hope to have the first shipment some time during the month. The 1st March had passed and the 16th March had passed, and he only promises that by the 31st March he will have the first shipments of exhibits made to be put in position by the 1st May. I think we are entitled to an explanation on this matter, and I think we are not unreasonable in asking that this item should stand until the Minister can give the information, because it is a matter of very great importance indeed, and he ought to be in a position now, when the exhibits were to go on the 1st March, to lay before the committee a detailed statement of the number of exhibitors, the kinds of manufactures that are to be sent, the kinds of cereals and minerals and other exhibits that are to be procured by purchase. We are bound to know that. We would like also to know this. He has appointed three agents to collect these exhibits in Ontario. I would like to know how their work was divided up, and how it was accomplished. R. R. Pringle is one of them. Whether he is now in the employ of the Government or not I do not know, but it was reported that he was employed in other work.

Mr. RYKERT. He did very good work.

Mr. PATERSON. And the member for Lincoln thinks it is right and proper that a gentleman, employed to collect exhibits in which the honor and credit of this Dominion are at stake, may neglect that work to run up and down the country and to go and advocate the claims of a particular candidate. We see what his ideas of patriotism are. We see how he thinks the interest of the country may be forwarded, by his remark. Another gentleman is Mr. Wright, who, I should judge from my knowledge of him, would be not an unlikely person to go to the manufacturers and to induce very many of them, as he is a gentleman who stands well with the manufacturers and might have some influence in inducing them to enter into the exhibition, and would do it as any other gentleman perhaps might be able to do it. I know, however, that he did not get through making his enquiries until some time after Parliament met, and what the result may be I do not know. There is another, a Mr. Leith from Bowmanville, whom I do not know. I would like to know how the work of these gentlemen was apportioned, whether they were working in different parts of the Province, the time being short, whether different districts were allotted to them so that more work could be accomplished? Two gentlemen were also appointed for the Province of Quebec, and I should like to know if their territory was allotted to them, if one took the eastern part and the other the western part of the Province? There is only one agent in the other Provinces, but I should like to have some idea how they are going on? I do not make these remarks in a fault-finding spirit at all, but I think, as I have said, the Minister ought to depart from what has characterised his answers to-night, extreme brevity, and go into some more explanations on this matter; and, if it is not at his hand, I think it is not unreasonable to ask him to allow it to stand, so that on another occasion he might give us the information which I think even he himself and those who support him might admit to be a fair and reasonable request.

Mr. GILLMOR. I do not see how the Minister can be brief when the questions are being put by the hour. I would like to know who is appointed in New Brunswick to collect articles for this exhibition.

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. W. T. Best, of St. John.

Mr. FISHER. I was about to ask the Minister who were appointed for Quebec.

Mr. POPE. Mr. Stevenson, of Montreal, and Mr. Desjardins, of Quebec.

Mr. BLAKE. I think really we have not had a sufficient explanation of the circumstance. The hon. gentleman has himself stated that they were doing as well as they could in the short time they had, six or eight weeks. Well, why is it that there are only six or eight weeks? The suggestion of withdrawing was given a long time ago. The decision of the Government was, I think, delayed a very considerable time. They reached a decision as long ago as the 15th of November, and the hon. gentleman says he had only six or eight weeks. But why was it that there were only six or eight weeks to perform a work which requires a considerable time? Why was so short a time taken for this work. There is only one explanation that occurs to me—that the Government was so very much engrossed in settling the difficulties and discontent in the North-West during the last fall and winter, that consequently this effort to be represented at a peaceful exhibition may have been postponed awhile in view of these other arduous duties.

Mr. POPE. I think that six or eight weeks will do very well. I think these gentlemen have been very energetic

and have well attended to their business, notwithstanding what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have not said they did not. I was only asking.

Mr. POPE. As to the division of labor they are called here to make their own division of territory, and they do it themselves. And so it was in Quebec and the Lower Provinces. As to the articles that are going to be sent, I cannot tell what they are.

Mr. TROW. Are there any arrangements with the railway or steamboat companies with reference to a reduction of fares?

Mr. POPE. Yes, and also for ocean rates. As I said before, the Government pay the freights there and back again between London and Antwerp, and after the London exhibition is over they are brought back here. They can exhibit at both. If they sell at Antwerp they undertake to supply the place of the article in London if we pay the freight over. If they pay the freight over, they agree to put the same, or a similar thing, into the London Exhibition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why was nobody appointed for Manitoba? If there was one thing more than another for which this exhibition vote would be of use, it would be calling attention of the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. POPE. There was already a collection in England; we accepted a collection made by the Canadian Pacific Railway which was better than we could provide.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This exhibit must be shipped now, according to the instructions.

Mr. POPE. I intended to say to the hon. gentleman that the exhibition was delayed for a month after the time it was to be opened.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Certainly the hon. Minister could not know that the exhibition was going to be delayed a month when he delayed his preparations for it. He had very little time for his agents to collect these exhibits, and I would like him to say in definite terms whether it has been reported to him that they were successful in their mission, and whether he has reason to believe that there will be a creditable exhibit made.

Mr. POPE. That is a fair question. I say it has been reported that they have been fairly successful. They have found there was a little reluctance in some quarters, and a good many that had intended to send to London were finally induced to send to this. I have no doubt the London Exhibition will be far superior to the Antwerp Exhibition, but it has been reported they have been fairly successful.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That was the impression I gained. Of course I would not make use of a private conversation, but I gathered, in speaking with one of the gentlemen, that he might have some little fear in his own mind about the Antwerp Exhibition. He seemed not to have much fear about London, and it does seem to me to be more important that we should make a good show at London than at Antwerp; I would like the Minister now to say why he delayed, after authority was given to him, so long in getting to work.

Mr. POPE. I think I have told the hon. gentleman all I have to tell. I think the time has been sufficient, and that we will make a good exhibition. I doubt, even if we had had two months more to work, whether we would have had a much larger exhibition, because I found some reluctance to exhibit.

Mr. PATERSON. I say he had two months more of which he did not avail himself.

Mr. POPE. I had twelve months more.

Mr. PATERSON. Then the blame must rest wholly with the Minister.

Mr. POPE. Yes, I take the blame, if there is any. I expect to be blamed whether there is any or not.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the hon. gentleman takes a very great deal of blame, because I conceive that it would be infinitely better that Canada should not be represented at the Antwerp Exhibition at all, than to be inadequately represented; and if there was reluctance to exhibit at Antwerp, and if there was the least apprehension that there would be reluctance, it was all the more necessary to come to a conclusion early so as to give full opportunity to overcome that reluctance; and if it existed in some quarters to look to other quarters for exhibits. It is one thing to decide you will not exhibit; it is another thing to undertake to exhibit; but when you do undertake to exhibit you are bound to make it a success. The hon. gentleman says: I take the blame, although I am obliged to admit that I found reluctance; I am obliged to admit the London Exhibition will be much larger than at Antwerp, still I have been fairly successful. When a Minister says, I have been fairly successful, ordinary people will place a very different interpretation on the meaning of those words.

Mr. FISHER. I think the hon. Minister, indeed, has assumed great responsibility, and I think the words of his leader, last Session, in reference to the Forestry Exhibition at Edinburgh, will bear me out. It was suggested that Canada should be represented at the Forestry Exhibition, and when the matter was brought to the attention of the leader of the Government by some of his own supporters in the House, he gave, as an excuse, that it was too late to make an appropriate exhibit for the Dominion of Canada at the Forestry Exhibition which was not to open until the 1st of August, although it was then at the beginning of April. The Minister of Agriculture now tells us that some six or eight weeks ago, he began to make some arrangements for Canada to make a creditable exhibition at Antwerp, which was to open on the 1st of May, and I think it requires but little arithmetic to show that the views of the two members of the Ministry do not at all agree. In fact the Minister of Agriculture is condemned out of the mouth of his own leader. I regret very much that this should have taken place, because I know a great many people in the country are anxious that Canada should be properly represented at that exhibition, that it is almost as important that the Dominion should be well represented at Antwerp on the continent, where we are now making efforts to have Canada become known as a field for immigrants, as that we should be well represented at the Colonial Exhibition in London. I desire also to enquire if the $40,000 includes the expenses to be incurred at the London Exhibition in 1886, or whether it is expected to cover only the preliminary expenses for that exhibition?

Mr. POPE. This vote is for two exhibitions, and I do not suppose it will meet the whole expenses of the two.

Mr. FISHER. Has the hon. gentleman an estimate of what will be expended at Antwerp alone?

Mr. POPE. My own impression is that it will cost from $25,000 to $30,000.

Mr. FISHER. The other $10,000 or $15,000 are intended for preliminary expenses of the Colonial Exhibition.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the London Exhibition cost a very large sum in excess of the gross sum of $40,000?

Mr. POPE. It will cost considerably over $40,000, I presume; but a good deal of work will be already done.

Mr. BLAKE. We understand that, so far as exhibits exists, they will be sent from Antwerp to London, and

there may be some storage expenses in the meantime. But there is, I understand, a considerable amount of extra material which the hon. gentleman expects to send to London. Does he expect that $10,000 or $15,000 more than the $40,000 will be required?

Mr. POPE. Yes, more than that. I would not be surprised if it costs $40,000 or $50,000; and I would not be surprised if it did not cost that sum.

Mr. BLAKE. $40,000 or $50,000 in all?

Mr. POPE. Yes. That is irrespective of the risk on the guarantee.

Mr. BLAKE. That is the whole amount will be from $80,000 to $90,000?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Apart from the risks on the guarantee?

Mr. CASGRAIN. I have heard the name of Mr. Fabre mentioned as one of the commissioners. Will he receive any additional salary for that extra work he is going to perform for the benefit of Canada, or is he going to act as High Commissioner or agent without additional salary?

Mr. POPE. He is acting under the High Commissioner.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Does he get any additional salary for this work?

Mr. POPE. His expenses, of course, will be paid; any additional expenses he is put to in any way.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Only his expenses. I am very particular about this gentleman, because my attention has been drawn to him specially, and I do not think he is doing much for his money. If he is going to receive two distinct salaries, perhaps the committee will not be very willing to grant him an additional sum.

Mr. POPE. I will not say that he will get anything more, but his expenses will be borne at any rate, and he will be fairly treated, as he should be.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does the Minister know whether the exhibits have gone?

Mr. POPE. Yes: I think a portion of them went on the 1st of this month.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Can the Minister give us any idea as to how many manufacturers are taking part?

Mr. POPE. I was told by the gentlemen who were collecting the exhibits that a good many of the manufacturers were sending over woollens, cottons, agricultural implements and so forth. I was told that a good many were sending, and that there would be a fair exhibition.

Mr. BAIN. There is one other side to this question, as to which I desire some information. While the manufacturers are making a respectable exhibit so far as manufacturing industries are concerned, I infer from the fact that the Manitoba collection is being sent there to show the agricultural resources of the North-West, that the ulterior object is if possible to secure increased immigration from the continent to the Dominion. Are any special arrangements being made for our agents to take charge of that branch, to interview visitors and give information with special reference to Canada as a field for immigrants, and to distribute literature? In a word, what arrangement has been made?

Mr. POPE. I was requested by the High Commissioner, who thought it was a first-rate opportunity to distribute French and German pamphlets upon four or five different subjects, to attend to this matter. They will be, first, as to minerals; second, as to fisheries; third, as to the agricultural capabilities of the country, and there are one or two other subjects which I forget. Mr. Dawes will be specially charged with this matter. Mr. Dawes speaks French, English and German, and the other gentleman speaks English and French; and Sir Charles Tupper wrote to me that he probably would have to employ three or four other people; some to take care of the exhibits and others to distribute literature.

Mr. BAIN. There will be no obstruction placed by the Government in the way of reaching parties by that means?

Mr. POPE. No.

Mr. TROW. Are those pamphlets already published, translated into the languages of which the hon. gentleman has spoken, and ready for distribution?

Mr. POPE. Some are published, some are being published, and they will all be ready in a very short time for shipment.

Mr. MILLS. Are they Bray's pamphlets?

Mr. POPE. I have not heard any braying of any consequence.

Mr. WATSON. Is any particular person who is acquainted with the country going with the Manitoba exhibit? Is Mr. Begg to be in charge?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. Is the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to be paid anything for allowing their exhibit to be displayed?

Mr. POPE. I hope they will be, but we do not pay anything.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe the statement is made that Sir Charles Tupper has secured for the Dominion a space of 10,090 metres between the English and German sections, and opposite the French section. That is a space equal to nearly 110,000 feet.

Mr. POPE. A metre is something over a yard.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes, it would be about 110,000 square feet, and I recollect well that on one or two occasions, particularly in the Exhibition in 1851, when the American Government secured an enormous area in a very advantageous position, and the result was very bad. The area was very indifferently filled, and the consequence of having a much larger area than they were able to fill was that, of all the nations represented there, the Americans made a poor exhibition, not so much on account of any intrinsic defect in the exhibits as on account of the fact that the space was not well filled. I think this amount of space is more than we are likely to fill for the amount of money the hon. gentleman intends to expend.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the hon. gentleman give us any idea of the number of these pamphlets, and where they have been printed?

Mr. POPE. I cannot now, but I will get the information.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It would be well for the hon. gentleman to give us the number of exhibits, and something to give us an idea of these exhibits.

Mr. POPE. I will give what I can get.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Surely these agents will report to the Minister when their work is completed. There should be no doubt about that.

For collecting and compiling agricultural, industrial, and other statistics in Manitoba and the North-West Territory, and also for acquiring and compiling such statistics elsewhere	$20,000 00

Mr. FISHER. I see that this vote of $20,000 has not, as far as I can make out, been expended by a great deal, and I would ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture how it is that a

greater interest has not been displayed in this matter by the Department.

Mr. POPE. That money is expended in this way. In the first place we pay to the Provincial Government of Manitoba for collecting those statistics about $3,000. Then this year we have collected these statistics all over the North-West, as far as we possibly could which we have never been able to do before. They have not yet been compiled because it was only about a week or ten days ago that we received those from Manitoba. We also made arrangements with the Government of Ontario that we would give them free postage for the literature they were sending out, and they were to furnish their statistics. Those have not yet been received, though I presume we will get them before long. Of course it is impossible to tell what will be the expense of collecting in the North-West. Then in those Provinces where they do not collect statistics we have made an attempt to collect them through the postmasters, the inspectors being those through whom we work. The expenses of that service have not yet come in, but I am sure it will consume the amount of money asked for. I do not know what the result will be as it is an experiment in some respects.

Mr. WATSON. Are the postmasters under the control of the Local or the Dominion Government?

Mr. POPE. The Dominion Government.

Mr. WATSON. And the Local Government gets about $3,000 for collecting them in Manitoba?

Mr. POPE. When I say the Local Government, I mean Mr. Acton Burrows, who I understood collected them for the Local Government.

Mr. WATSON. He is Deputy Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. FISHER. I see the item refers to the collecting of statistics elsewhere, and I suppose that some circulars which were distributed—very slightly I am sorry to say—through my own county for the farmers to fill up are part of the system to which the hon. gentleman has alluded. I am sorry to see that the Minister has not undertaken more in this direction. Last year a Select Committee was appointed by the House to enquire what might be done to assist the agricultural industries of the country, and the committee asked for, and presided over by one of the supporters of the Minister of Agriculture, prepared and issued an elaborate report, but it was issued so late in the Session that I dare say many members hardly looked at it. Since that time I believe the report has been circulated largely through the country, the whole edition having been distributed by members in their constituencies. I have in my hand a copy of that report, and I find that the Government are strongly recommended, among other things, to take steps to collect agricultural statistics. The committee who drew up that report examined many individuals who are concerned in agriculture throughout the country, and especially one who has been largely concerned in the collection of agricultural and other statistics in the Province of Ontario. I refer to Mr. Blue, who is the secretary of the Bureau of Industries in that Province. That gentleman recommended very highly indeed the adoption of a system such as that which is in operation in Ontario, and explained that it would not only be of great benefit to the other Provinces but to the Province of Ontario itself which has under its Local Government a pretty efficient system. The results of that system have been very marked in Ontario. As he stated in the evidence he gave before the committee, the results have been satisfactory in every sense. I have myself been fortunate enough to see the bulletins which the Bureau of Industries issue, and I know they contain a great deal of information which would be very much to the advantage of the farmers of this country, if they could be distributed all over the country. Of course if the information could be obtained in every part of the Dominion the results of the bulletin would be much more satisfactory than they are, when this information comes from only one Province. Mr. Blue, in the evidence he gave before the committee last year, said this was one of the difficulties he found, that the area of the Province of Ontario was comparatively so small that proper deductions could not be drawn from the information he received; but that if that information could be received from the whole Dominion, the deductions which could be drawn from it would be very beneficial to the agricultural class, and the results of such an experiment would be much more valuable. I was in hopes last Session that the Department of Agriculture would take some steps towards acting on the report of this committee. The committee asked Mr. Blue about the expense of this work. He stated that in the Province of Ontario the expense in the first year was a little under $8,000. Now, when I first saw this vote of $20,000, and when I looked in the Public Accounts and found that only some $3,000 had been spent it seemed to me that the Minister of Agriculture had not been taking advantage of all his opportunities. It seemed to me that although Parliament had given him authority to spend this money on agricultural statistics, etc., he had not taken the trouble to extend the system over the Dominion, although the money voted would have been sufficient to enable him to do so. I think I am not blaming the hon. Minister of Agriculture too much when I say that he has been neglecting the agricultural interests of his country. When I look at the expenditure of the Department of Agriculture I find that a very large part is devoted to immigration and some portion to statistics, but that a very small portion is devoted to agriculture; and yet we have this large vote for agricultural purposes which he has not taken the trouble to expend or to try to expend, notwithstanding that the committee appointed by this House last year took a great deal of pains to obtain all the information possible on this subject. I would like to allude to one or two things in the report as showing that the work of that committee was pretty thorough. The committee issued a large number of circulars containing the following question:—

"Would the establishment of a Central Bureau, having for its object the collection of information upon all matters relating to agriculture, and having a skilled staff capable of giving advice, making experiments, and noting the improvements effected in other countries that might be advantageously introduced into the Dominion, be a benefit to our agriculturists?"

To that question there were 211 affirmative, and only 74 negative or doubtful answers as to the establishment of a Statistical Bureau. As to the establishment of a Central Bureau, we received 256 affirmative answers, and only 62 doubtful or negative. We also asked a question as to the establishment of an experimental farm and the appointment of an entomologist. On the latter point, I was a little surprised to see, we obtained the fewest favorable answers, because when examining gentlemen brought before the committee, and discussing the question of entomological researches in the country, we learned that a great deal had been done to help the agricultural community. But unfortunately the results of these enquiries had not been diffused. The labors of the entomologists had been, comparatively, not utilised, although if such a bureau as I am speaking of had been established, very great and beneficial results might have ensued from these researches to people in the country who raise fruits, grains and roots. I will read you the answer which came from the Hon. Mr. Joly, of Quebec, in answer to that question:

"Yes; with good and intelligent management, such a farm would render great service. It is not easy for our farmers to make such experiments, even if they were willing and able to risk them, but they

would watch them with much interest and would not be slow in appreciating the results and benefiting by them."

Mr. Saunders, chemist, public analyst, orchardist, etc., of London, Ont., says:

"Such experimental farms or stations should be established in every Province of the Dominion, but the Dominion Government should have some central establishment, as at Washington, in the United States, where young trees and plants might be grown and sent by mail to be tested in all parts of the Dominion. Such an establishment should be managed by a council or board of managers apart from politics, and have a revenue to support it derived from a donation of public lands for this purpose, as in most of the United States."

I wonder if that is one of the reasons why the Minister of Agriculture has not attended to the business. Perhaps, if it had been a matter of political preferment, it would have been attended to. Not only had he a vote which he might have devoted to this purpose, but, according to the Act of 1868, constituting the Department of Agriculture, there is a distinct provision that the Minister of Agriculture may establish a Bureau of Agriculture. Mr. John Lowe, the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, before the committee, stated:

"There has been no special vote for the general purposes of agriculture, except for quarantine and inspection."

The following are the conclusions which the committee drew from the evidence they had before them:—

"That the Government take into earnest and favorable consideration the advisability of establishing a Bureau of Agriculture, and an experimental farm in connction therewith.

"That this Bureau be formed in connection with and under the supervision of the present Department of Agriculture.

"That the objects aimed at in the establishment of such Bureau and farm be as follows:—

"1. To conduct such experiments in the introduction and culture of new varities of seeds, plants, trees, &c., as will most efficiently aid in the advancement of Canadian agriculture; to institute experiments with regard to the comparative value of fertilisers, the proper testing of seeds as to vitality and purity, and the healthy preservation and productive conditions of plants and animals.

"2. To make careful investigation into the origin, distribution and habits of insects injurious and beneficial, and the contagious and other diseases to which animals and plants are subject, in order to arrive at the best method of destroying and counteracting them.

"3. To study the qualities of the various breeds of cattle and other domestic animals, with the view of reporting on the best means of improving them; of protecting them from parasites and epidemic diseases, of feeding them for the market, and on the treatment of milch cattle.

"4. To initiate and carry out a convenient and comprehensive system of gathering the latest and most useful information, statistical and otherwise.

"5. To publish and send to the press and the various agricultural and horticultural societies of the Dominion, at different periods of the year, bulletins giving the results of trials made on the experimental farm, and whatever other information the Bureau may consider useful, either in the prevention of the ravages of insects and of contagious diseases among animals, concerning improved methods of culture that have stood test, or for the special advancement of any line of agricultural pursuits."

The last two or three sections of that report distinctly recommend the Minister of Agriculture to do what I say he has not done. Of course, I quite understand that it is in the power of the Government to act upon such a report or not, just as they please, but they must accept the responsibility before the agricultural community of having neglected their interests. Mr. Blue, in recommending the way in which this work should be done—and I would recommend the Minister of Agriculture to read this report if he has not done so—among other things said that for a couple of months extra clerks are employed to carry on the work of issuing bulletins, and a larger staff of clerks have to be employed to tabulate the returns. Mr. Blue is very well satisfied indeed, with the number of returns he has received in answer to the questions he has distributed throughout the country. I think, from that testimony, there is no question but that this kind of work of obtaining statistics can be easily and satisfactorily carried on, in the business-like manner for which the hon. Minister of Agriculture is noted. If it is done in the manner in which he seems to be collecting exhibits for the exhibition in Antwerp I can quite understand it may not do a great deal of good to the farmers of the country, but that will not be the fault of the committee that recommended the report.

Committee rose and reported progress.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 123) to amend the Act intituled An Act respecting Offences against the Person—(*from the Senate*).—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

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

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 2:45 a.m., Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 13th April, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 124) to restrict and regulate Chinese immigration into the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. BLAKE. Explain.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This Bill, as the title explains, is to restrict and regulate Chinese immigration into the Dominion of Canada. The first provision of the Bill is for the imposition of a tax of so much per head upon each Chinese immigrant entering the Dominion.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the amount?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is left blank; the intention is to leave the sum to be determined by the House. The second provision is with respect to the number of Chinese to be carried on any vessel. It is provided that the number of Chinese to be carried on any vessel coming into any port of Canada shall be limited to one person per ten tons on the tonnage of the vessel. This, of course, will comprehend other passengers and the crew in the persons to be carried by the vessel carrying Chinese immigrants. The balance of the Bill covers details as to the manner of landing such passengers, the restrictions to be imposed upon the master of the vessel before landing such passengers. For instance, the whole of the amount due on such Chinese immigrants is to be paid in advance to the officer appointed by the Government to control Chinese immigration. There are additional regulations with respect to quarantine, and a special certificate of health is to be obtained before the landing of such immigrants in any port of the Dominion. The payment is to be made at such port where each Chinese immigrant shall enter Canada; that does not apply, as the Bill will show, to one part of the Dominion, but to every part, and by whatever means of entry the immigrant may select, either by water or land. The fee is to be paid to the Customs house at the frontier or, if more convenient, at the next Customs house in the Dominion. Then there is a clause which will apply to the Chinese resident in the Dominion. They will be required to register with the officer named in the Bill their actual domicile in the Dominion, and this will amount to a kind of census during the twelve months following the Bill being put in force. There are other clauses for the purpose of regulating the different officers. There is a clause also with respect to Chinese entering into any secret society, having reference

to the trial of criminal offences. The other clauses are matters of detail, which will be explained when the Bill comes up for the second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INSOLVENCY.

Mr. EDGAR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I may be permitted to ask the First Minister what the intentions of the Government are with respect to dealing with the question of insolvency? It will be remembered that early in the Session a large committee was appointed, on the motion of the First Minister, to consider this subject, and I am aware that the committee gave considerable time and attention to the work before it, and succeeded in reporting a Bill. I hope the Government will not allow the labors of the committee to be altogether thrown away. As the business of the House now stands that cannot be read unless it is placed on the Government Orders. I think that was done in 1878 in the case of a Bill providing for the winding up of insolvent Fire and Marine Insurance Companies, and in the case of another Bill dealing with Insolvency introduced that year. I think, therefore, that the members of the House should be informed what the Government propose to do in the matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As a matter of fact I was not aware until the hon. gentleman mentioned it that the report was made.

Mr. EDGAR. It was made last Tuesday.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand that the Bill is now in the hands of the printers.

Mr. EDGAR. It has been printed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman will repeat the question again I will be able to inform him, as I have not even seen the report yet.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may as well now inform the House, that there are no further news from the North-West that would interest the House, except the fact that Mr. Dewdney, the Lieutenant Governor, accompanied by the Rev. Father Lacombe, missionary to the Blackfeet, have held a meeting with the great band of the Blackfeet, headed by their chief, Crowfoot. Father Lacombe says they had a most enthusiastic reception, that the Indians pledged their loyalty to the utmost extent, and I have received a telegram signed by Crowfoot which I will read. It is not in Blackfeet:

FROM BLACKFOOT CROSSING, VIA GLEICHEN, N.W.T., 11th April, 1885.

"On behalf of myself and people I wish to send through you to the Great Mother the words I have given to the Governor at a council held at which all my minor chiefs and young men were present. We are agreed and determined to remain loyal to the Queen. Our young men will go to work on their reserves and will raise all the crops we can, and we hope the Government will help us to sell what we can't use. Continued reports and many lies are brought to us, and we don't know what to believe, but now that we have seen the Governor and heard him speak we will shut our ears and only listen to and believe what is told us through the Governor. Should any Indians come to our reserve and ask us to join them in war we will send them away. I have sent messengers to the Bloods and Piegan who belong to our treaty, to tell them what we are doing and what we intend to do about the trouble. I want Mr. Denny"——

Mr. Denny was formerly an officer of the Mounted Police who settled up there, and while amongst them he acquired their confidence. They enquired for him to go there and I sent him there.——

"I want Mr. Denny to be with us, and all my men are of the same mind. The words I sent by Father Lacombe I again send: we will be loyal to the Queen whatever happens. I have copy of this, and when the trouble is over will have it with pride to show to the Queen's officers; and we leave our future in your hands. We have asked for nothing, but the Governor has given us a little present of tea and tobacco. He will tell you what other talk we had at our council. It was all good—not one bad word.

"CROWFOOT."

ENQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would call the attention of the First Minister to the fact that a certain return I moved for with regard to timber licenses; I would ask him whether I may expect it this Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe that all returns ordered are in active progress.

Mr. CHARLTON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could inform us what degree of progress has been made?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot say as to that. During the recess, as I have already mentioned, I called the attention of the different Departments to these returns, and I asked them to hurry them up as much as possible. I fancy they are making considerable progress.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice in this connection that since the House met there have been 282 returns ordered by the House, and up to the present time only 126 have been brought down. There was one brought down on Friday, which makes 127. In the Session of 1877, 220 returns were asked for during the Session and 196 were brought down, all but 34, and the House only sat 79 days, whereas in this Session we have already sat 74 days. I wish to draw attention to that fact, which shows that we have not anything like the same percentage of returns brought down, up to this period of the Session, that we had in that Session. In the Session of 1878, 152 returns were ordered, and all were brought down but 30, that Session having lasted 92 days. Under these circumstances I certainly hope that some further pressure will be brought to bear on those who have the preparation of these returns, so that we may have them brought down. In my humble opinion it is utterly impossible for the Opposition to discharge the duties devolving upon them, of examining into public affairs, without the information asked for in these returns. There is one on the rates of freight on the Intercolonial Railway, and the amount of coal carried over that line, which I should like to have; also another in connection with the amount of money paid to the several printing and publishing companies in this Dominion within the last year. There were two passed on the 6th of February which have not been brought down, although this is the 13th of April, and I certainly think it is time that the Government should bestir themselves in this matter if we are to get the information.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think if the hon. gentleman were to ask his hon. friend the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), why the number of returns brought down is numerically less than in those years, he would be able to give him the answer. It is the case of the rabbit in the fable. The rabbit said to the lioness: "I have 20 young ones, and you have only one." "Ay," said the lioness, "but mine is a larger one." They were small in those days, but when the hon. member for Norfolk asks for returns they are all lions, so that there cannot be so many.

Mr. CHARLTON. With regard to the size of the returns I wish to say to the right hon. gentleman that that is not my fault. The policy of the Government and the fact that they are rewarding so many of the Government's friends, their cousins, their aunts, their nephews, and their brothers, are to blame for the voluminous nature of those returns. I may say that I waded through those returns with almost infinite labor and I find applications from friends of the Government in every part of the Dominion, and I am sure,

Sir, that any criticism with regard to the voluminous character of the returns does not apply to me.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I was not criticising; I merely say you are a lion.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would ask the Minister of Fisheries when I may expect the return which was ordered by the House in 1884, with regard to the amount of money received for rentals of rivers and streams. This information was required in connection with an officer in his own Department, as to whom a very serious charge has been mentioned in this House in connection with his duties, and the hon. gentleman promised that the return would be brought down at once. It has not, however, been brought down, though it is now 14 months since it was ordered. There is also some correspondence with the Auditor General and the Deputy Minister of Fisheries with regard to this whole question. I would like to know when we may expect them.

Mr. McLELAN, I think they have been brought down. I certainly laid the return the hon. gentleman refers to on the Table a fortnight or three weeks ago.

Mr. McMULLEN. I enquired of the proper officer, and he said it had not been brought down.

Mr. McLELAN. I will make enquiry about it.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. First Minister has not yet brought down the promised papers with reference to the North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Which papers? There are a good many.

Mr. BLAKE. The papers the hon. gentleman promised, distinguishing them from those which were ordered by the House—in connection with the half-breed claims.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are being prepared. I will have them down in a day or two.

Mr. BLAKE. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention also to those returns with reference to the half-breeds which were ordered by the House in 1883, and which have have not yet been brought down.

Mr. EDGAR. There were five papers which I moved for early in the Session in connection with railway matters, not one of which has yet been brought down. I do not want a "lion" return.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Do you want a "rabbit" return?

Mr. MILLS. He wants a truthful one.

Mr. LANGELIER. A return was ordered on the 2nd of March last for copies of all advertisements for tenders, etc., for fog-horns and letter-box fronts, from 1st January, 1884, to 31st January, 1885. That return has not yet been brought down.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It is prepared, and will be brought down in a day or two.

SHINGLE SHAVINGS IN THE MERSEY RIVER.

Mr. FORBES asked, When will the correspondence in relation to throwing shingle shavings, etc., into the Mersey River, Queen's County, N.S., asked for February 17th, 1885, be brought down?

Mr. McLELAN. I am told in the Department that it went to the Department of the Secretary of State for registration. I suppose it will be here at the next sitting.

HARBOR AT RED POINT, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. McDONALD (King's) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to place a sum in the supplementary estimates to construct a breakwater at Red Point, King's County, P.E.I., during the coming summer, with a view to make said place a harbor of refuge for vessels and fishing boats?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. An examination was made of this proposed work some time ago, but it was not sufficient on which to base an estimate. Most likely during the coming summer another examination may be made in order to arrive at an estimate.

DOMINION BUILDING IN CHARLOTTETOWN.

Mr. DAVIES asked, Have the Government accepted any tender for the construction of the new Dominion building in Charlottetown? If so, whose tender, and what is the amount of it? What are the names of the other tenderers, and the amounts of their respective tenders?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Fourteen tenders were received. The lowest tender was that of Mr. T. C. Connor, of Moncton. The contract has not yet been entered into, and therefore it would not be in the public interest to give the figures now.

LEASE OF MILITARY STOREHOUSES AT QUEBEC.

Mr. LANGELIER asked, Whether application has been made to the Department of Militia and Defence for the use of the military storehouses near St. John's Gate, Quebec, for military purposes by a volunteer corps? Why the Government have refused to comply with the said application? Whether the said building is let to the Quebec and Lévis Electric Light Company; and, if so, for what purposes, for what yearly rental or remuneration, and for what period of time?

Mr. CARON. No applications have been made by any volunteer corps for the use of the military storehouse at St. John's Gate, Quebec, for military purposes. This building has been let to the Quebec and Lévis Electric Light Company The lease is a yearly one, resumable without notice at any time when required. The rent is $10 per annum.

SALE OF THE RIVIÈRE DU LOUP BRANCH TO THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether any communication has been received by the Government from Mr. Hickson, General Manager of the Grand Trunk Railway informing them of a misunderstanding now existing between himself and the Honorable Mr. Mitchell, member for Northumberland, regarding alleged services claimed to have been rendered by the honorable member in connection with the sale of the Rivière du Loup Branch of the Grand Trunk Railway to the Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. By no possibility could we have any such communication. What have we got to do with any correspondence or any difference between the Grand Trunk Railway and Mr. Mitchell? The question ought not to have been put. It is a waste of the time of the House.

LAND IMPROVEMENT FUND.

Mr. SPROULE asked, Has there been a settlement of the "Land Improvement Fund" with the Ontario Govern-

ment; if not, what is the cause of the delay, and when is it likely to be settled?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The question of the Land Improvement Fund was brought up at a meeting of the Treasurers of Ontario and Quebec, held at Ottawa last November. The Dominion Government stated that they were ready to close the matter if they had the necessary authority. The Treasurer of Quebec stated that as the question was a legal one, he wished to consult his colleagues, and it appears from the report of the Budget Speech of the Treasurer, recently delivered before the Quebec Assembly, that the question had been submitted to the Attorney General of Quebec, for consideration, and it is still before that Government. It is expected that a decision will shortly be arrived at.

KINGSTON MILITARY COLLEGE GRADUATES IN THE MILITIA.

Mr. KIRK asked, How many students have graduated from Kingston Military College? How many of these at present occupy positions in the active force? How many are at present with the volunteer force in the North-West and what are their names? What positions or rank do these hold in the force now under arms?

Mr. CARON. A very short time ago a return was brought down giving all the information the hon. gentleman now seeks. In any case, if he finds the return incomplete, he will have to put a notice on the paper, because it is impossible to answer a question of that kind without bringing down a return.

IMPROVEMENTS ON THE OTTAWA RIVER.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew), asked, Will the report of Mr. Guerin, chief engineer of the survey of that part of the Ottawa lying between Mattawa and the head of Lake Temiscamingue be laid before the House?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There was a special vote of Parliament for this survey, and the report of Mr. Guerin with that of the chief engineer will be brought down.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew), asked, What is the estimated cost of the proposed improvements at Mattawa, Mountain Rapids and Long Sault respectively.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A dam at Mattawa of a sufficient height to create a continuous navigation to the foot of the Long Sault, a distance of 32¾ miles, would cost $2,594,000, and the advantages to be derived from its construction would be practically *nil*, because the obstruction caused by the Long Sault would still remain. The length of the Long Sault is 7¼ miles, and has a fall of 53½ feet; and a dam at the Mattawa, to be of sufficient height to obliterate the Long Sault, would cost $4,500,000. A dam at the Mountain Rapids would obliterate the Long Sault and make a continuous stretch of navigation to the head of Lake Temiscamingue, a distance of 94 miles, and, adding the distance up the River Blanche, namely, 30 miles, a total of 124 miles. The cost of the structure is placed at $2,100,000. A dam at the head of the Long Sault for the purpose of converting Lake Temiscamingue into a reservoir and raising its level 15 feet above its normal height would cost $1,045,500, supposing the project for which the dam would be constructed to be practicable, namely, the discharge of the impounded water during a low stage in the Ottawa for the benefit of the mills at the Chaudiere, city of Ottawa. Father Paradis' scheme for lowering Lake Temiscamingue 21 feet, and building a dam at the Maple Rapids to obliterate the Mountain Rapids and the remainder of the Long Sault, is estimated to cost $2,656,500.

Mr. SPROULE.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

Mr. JAMIESON. I would like to ask the consent of the Government and the House to the third reading of the Bill to amend the Canada Temperance Act. I find that unless I get the consent of the House I will be obliged to pursue the course I pursued the other day; otherwise the Bill cannot be read the third time this Session. I do not want to be placed in the position in which I was placed the other night of strangling or killing a very important measure for the purpose of reaching this one, and I think it will facilitate the despatch of business very much if the Government and the House would at this stage consent to the third reading. If not, I will be obliged to force my way to a higher place on the paper, and I want to avoid that if possible.

Mr. IVES. We ought to be much obliged to the hon. gentleman for his willingness to spare the other measures before the House if he is allowed to do so.

PROHIBITION OF SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS.

Mr. BEATY moved the following resolutions:—

(1.) That having in view the evils resulting from the ready access to, and excessive use of spirituous liquors, as beverages, it is expedient, with a view of diminishing those evils, that a legislative enactment should be had of a prohibitory rather than a restrictive character.

(2.) That prohibiting the importation, manufacture, sale and use of "spirits" known under the names brandy, gin, rum, whiskey and high wines, or other distilled liquors, for purpose other than for exportation for use out of Canada, medicinal, chemical or mechanical uses, is advisable as a partial remedial measure.

(3.) That as heretofore the distillation of "spirits" has been a lawful business, it is deemed but just that some moderate compensation for injury to real property and plant should be made without regard, however, to prospective profits or remote damages.

(4.) That it is expedient to declare drunkenness from the excessive use of intoxicating liquors, to be a criminal offence, punishable with imprisonment, in cases of persons repeating the offence.

(5.) That an Act based on the said resolutions should be passed, not to come into force until the expiration of twelve calendar months, or until after the close of the next Session of Parliament.

He said:—The necessity of introducing a question of this kind before Parliament is manifest from the very great interest which is taken in the temperance question all over the country and the number of Bills which have been introduced into this Parliament for the purpose of dealing with this important question. The manifest evils which exist in this country arising from the excessive use of intoxicating liquors do not require a temperance lecture in this House for the purpose of demonstrating them. When we look at the number of counties all over the country which are trying to adopt a remedy for the purpose of relieving the people of the serious and injurious results flowing from the use of intoxicating liquors, we can readily see that it is a subject of special importance. Heretofore the discussion has largely been on two grounds, that of total prohibition and that of what may be termed local prohibition. We all understand total prohibition to mean the prohibiting of the use of all kinds of intoxicating liquors including malt liquors and wines. Local prohibition, as adopted under the Canada Temperance Act, is simply an Act prohibiting the sale or barter of intoxicating liquors in the counties or municipalities which adopt the Act. The character of the prohibition which I propose in these resolutions I will call, for the purpose of convenience, partial prohibition, because it is not total, and is wider than local prohibition, and because it does not prohibit the use of a certain class of intoxicating liquors. It prohibits the use of that class which is usually known under the head of spirits, and would allow beer and ale and wine to be used, as at present, under the licensing system. The question is whether this would be a practical solution for the time, at all events, of a difficult question. I think no one for a moment that understands the nature and effect of intoxicating liquors will doubt that spirits are chiefly the immediate cause of

intoxication and of the violence, misery and ruin which result from their excessive use in this country. It has indeed become a saying that whiskey is the curse of Canada. Now whiskey involves the general idea of a large amount of alchohol being used; and when we consider the intoxication of the people at large, we find that it is traceable directly to the excessive use of alchohol. Alchol we know is found in larger quantities in spirits and in smaller quantities in beer and wine; and the question arises, would it not be wise to prevent the ready access of the people at large to spirits, to prevent the easy opportunities for obtaining spirits, so as to meet, to some extent at all events, the difficulties and the injuries which result to the country from the use of intoxicating liquors. The object which I have in view in prohibiting spirits is to prevent the people at large from obtaining spirits readily whenever they choose, so that the intoxicating effects might not be seen or felt by them. Every person who has observed the course of this evil, especially in the cities and I suppose in the country as well, knows that men coming from work, will, on passing a hotel rush in tired and weary, with empty stomachs, and thirsty, for a drink of alcohol; and as tavernkeepers have explained to me, they will close their hands around the tumbler so that the bar tender may not see the quantity they drink, a quantity generally from an inch to two inches in depth of whiskey in one drink. The result is that the man who is tired, and who perhaps has had no food, becomes naturally almost immediately drunk. Now, if, on the other hand, he had not that easy access to whiskey and could only obtain beer, he might have taken two, three or even four glasses, and, as I am told –I know nothing about it myself, having never drunk enough beer to become intoxicated—would not get drunk. I am told by those who deal in liquors, tavern keepers and others, that a person who drinks beer will get sick before he will get drunk. I do not however dispute the fact that a person can get drunk on wine and beer. I think people can and do, but I think it is a self evident proposition that a person will more readily get drunk on spirits than on ordinary beer or wine, and that is the point I make in this matter. It is an important point to determine how far legislation of this character ought to go. While I am probably as strong an advocate of temperance in every sense as any person in this House, I am not an advocate of what is usually termed sumptuary legislation, I am not an advocate of legislation for the purpose of regulating the beverages or the food or the clothing or the social customs of people, or any question of a quasi-religious or quasi-moral character, unless there is the greatest demand, unless there is an absolute necessity for it; and, when any legislation of that character is had, it should not go further than the evil complained of, it should not reach further than it is possible to reach in the first instance, it should be taken at all events step by step, and should not, for instance, go so far, as in this case, as total prohibition until we try a remedy of a more moderate and partial character. Now, if we can allow the people at large to have beverages which contain the minimum of alcohol, we may diminish the evils which result from the beverages which contain the larger quantity of alcohol, and, in doing this, we accomplish this good, at all events, that we enable persons to obtain that which for the most part they are accustomed to—a large number of people at all events—and at the same time we deprive them of that which we know, when they take it, deprives them of their reason, of their property, of their health, and of all the advantages which their families should derive from them. The great evils which are arising from the excessive use of intoxicating liquors all over the country are the only justification why any legislation should be had in a matter of this kind, and the possibility of moderating them by legislation can be the only justification. No person would legislate, I think—I certainly would not for one propose to legislate—for the gentlemen, for instance, who are in this House, for the class of gentleman who are represented in this House, but there are persons who, from their circumstances in life, have not the usual number of luxuries which gentlemen of this class have, and their luxuries are, it may be their beer or their pipe, it may be their tea or their coffee. When we talk of legislating on subjects of this kind we must remember that the time may come when even those gentleman who now enjoy a pipe of tobacco may find legislators proposing that it shall be taken from them. I have heard such things proposed, and I have also heard it proposed that tea and coffee should be taken from persons, because they are a basis on which rises up that character of nerve which ultimately demands a stronger stimulant than is to be found in tea and coffee. We do not know, therefore, how far this kind of legislation may go. It is advocated now upon some platforms that tea and coffee and tobacco should not be allowed to be used in the general sense. It has not become so extensive an advocacy as against intoxicating liquors, but this may be the result in a short time, and we may be asked to legislate in that direction. We should therefore proceed carefully and cautiously, and not extend our jurisdiction in matters of this kind beyond the necessities of the case. Therefore, and that is the primary idea of this legislation, we should direct our legislation to ardent spirits, to prevent their manufacture, their importation, their sale, their purchase, their use. This would have a striking effect upon the country at large. It involves in it the usual difficulties to have it enforced, that it is impossible to carry out a purpose of this description, that no person can be compelled to confine himself to the use of the more moderate liquors when it may be possible that he can reach the liquors containing the stronger elements of alcohol; but, whatever argument may be used for the purpose of promoting what may be termed total prohibition may also be used, I think with greater force, at all events with equal force, when we ask that a proposition of this kind shall be adopted. Whatever arguments may be used against prohibition have less force when used against partial prohibition, because we leave with the people something to use, we leave men some strong drink, though not so strong as to injure them at first use. One effect on this large class of the community which I suppose in legislating we cannot ignore, or which we should not ignore, would be that the hotel business, for instance, could still be carried on quite as effectively as at the present time. There are those hotel keepers —and they have spoken to me since they heard of this proposition—who say they would be delighted to have a law of this kind, because it would relieve them from that class of whiskey spongers who will, when they have access to the whiskey, get drunk, no matter what any person can do. There are those then, and I think there are a very large number of hotel men all over the country, and I have met them, especially those who may be termed the respectable class of hotel men, the responsible class, those who have property, who say: We would be delighted not to be obliged to sell whiskey or spirits because our neighbors do, we would be delighted to have this prohibited, because we could carry on our business, and, as I have been told, could make as much or more money by houses of entertainment which had only beer or wine to sell, than under the present state of things. One tavern keeper of the responsible character told me that he made no money out of spirits, out of whiskey particularly, unless he adulterated it. Others, on the other hand, say that a large profit is made out of whiskey. It is a disputed question, and I suppose those who make a large profit put in the cheap article of water, or it may be something worse, to make it go a long way. The effect of legislation of this character would be not only to allow the houses of entertainment or hotels to be carried on, and I

think carried on with greater ease and success in the general than they are at the present time, but it is a proposition that not only the hotel keepers can endorse and I think to a large extent would endorse and sanction, but it is one which the temperance men all over the country must sanction also. What I claim is that no temperance man can consistently oppose legislation of this character. If he is an advocate for total prohibition, if he is an advocate for local prohibition, he must also be an advocate for partial prohibition, because it goes in the direction of his principle, it goes in the direction of his advocacy, it goes in the direction of his practice. No consistent temperance man, therefore, can oppose this. Hence we have a large body of people, two bodies of people in fact, endorsing this system. and all the moderate men—the men who drink their beer or, it may be, their wine at table, and use it simply as a beverage in connection with food—they would also endorse this proposition. In connection with this subject I am happy to say that only last week, in the city of Toronto, a very large meeting was held, in which Mr. Goldwin Smith presided and made a speech, along with other gentlemen of distinction in that city, urging the very principles which these resolutions involve, and pressing upon the attention of the citizens of Toronto the necessity of legislation of this character. I have had the honor of presenting—as other hon. members of this House have presented—within the last few weeks, petitions asking that legislation should be had prohibiting the sale of spirits, and preventing the adulteration of beers and wines. There is probably, no greater difficulty in regard to the whole question than the adulteration of these beverages, whether spirits, or beer and wine, and whatever legislation might be had of a prohibitory character, there is no doubt whatever of the absolute necessity of some legislation of the strongest and most stringent character against adulteration. Now legislation of this kind would affect property only in the very least degree. It would not deprive the hotel keeper of his property, it would not deprive the brewer, or the dealer in beer or wine, of their property or interfere with them. Besides, I know that in my own city, of the corner grocers who sell beer, wine and whiskey, I do not think there is one-fifth—possibly not one-tenth of all of them,who would not be delighted if they were prohibited from selling spirits. I have conversed with many of them, and I find they do not object to sell beer or wine in bottles or sealed packages; but a large number of them do object, except for the purpose of keeping their custom, as they call it, to selling spirits, which they have to deal out in pints or quarts, from barrels, and hand it to women and children who take it to their homes to drink; and they would be only too glad to give up this system if all their neighbors were obliged to give it up too. But when you ask them to do so voluntarily, their answer is: If I give it up and my neighbor continues to sell, he will get a large share of my custom; therefore I must carry it on the same as he does; I must continue to sell spirits as well as my neighbor although I would much rather not do so, and would be delighted if we were all prevented from doing so. Now, it is also well known that the violence and crime which proceeds from drunkenness are caused by the use of spirits, and not by the use of beer and wine. I suppose that very few would dispute the point that much the largest number of crimes of violence, of assaults, of maiming and murder, arise from the excessive use of spirits; there is a great deal in human nature, of course, but the principal cause is the use of these strong liquors. Now this evil, so particularly marked and manifest, is the one which I wish to reach. It is generally admitted that if people were only able to use beer and wine, drunkenness would be reduced to a minimum; and on this point I have only to appeal to the experience of others, who have told me that those who drink beer do not become violent, but they become sleepy, and after sleeping off the effects, they are as good-natured as ever. However, I cannot say how that is experimentally, but it is said to be the fact with reference to the use of beer. Whether that is the fact or not with reference to the use of wine I do not know; at all events, few people in this country drink wine. They cannot get it on account of the price, and they consequently could not drink a sufficient quantity to make them drunk, because they could not afford to buy it. Now, as a matter of fact, we have in this country a growing interest in the wine trade. I am told there are not less than about 4,000 acres devoted to grape culture in the Province of Ontario; while we know that in France there are not less than 5,000,000 acres devoted to grape culture. When I visited France, so far as I could see, in that country and others which are called wine growing countries, and so far as I have been able to gather from the testimony of others, there is much less drunkenness than in those countries where gin and whiskey are the common beverages. Now in reference to this question I am told by a certain class of persons that the proposition I make will not accomplish the desired effect; that it has already been tried in England and failed. But as I understand the matter, it has not been tried in England. What was done in England was to reduce the licenses, or rather to allow beer houses to sell free, while the gin palaces, as they are termed in England, were allowed to continue to operate as actively as before. Now that state of things is very different from the one my proposition contemplates. I am quite satisfied that in England the experiment of affording every facility for beer drinking and setting up of beer houses, while the common use of spirits is permitted, has not produced the results which we claim my scheme would produce. But this proposition strikes at what I call the root of the evil, and it is a moderate way of attacking that root; it is not a revolutionary way; it does not clash with the common sense of the community at large; it does no violence to the rights of property, and it does not shock the ideas which people usually entertain as the proper sphere of legislation. This proposition reaches a wider class, and would secure larger support. Being endorsed by a greater number of persons, there would be a stronger probability of its being effectively enforced, if it became law. It would also affect property, generally, much less than any other system that can be proposed that would in any degree accomplish the end desired. It would, at least, disturb property to a very much less extent than total prohibition,—it would disturb property even much less than local prohibitory laws, such as the Canada Temperance Act; and it would not disturb trade or commerce to the same extent. I believe there are only nine distilleries in the Dominion of Canada, and the produce of two of them equals that of all the others besides. The Toronto distillery and the Windsor distillery, I think combined, produce as much, if not more whiskey, than all the other distilleries in this country. Now it is true that these nine distilleries, so far as their manufacture is concerned, would be to some extent disturbed by legislation of this kind. But, probably, there is no other manufacturing industry in the country which, according to the value produced, gives employment to so small a number of men as distillers. This proposition would not affect the breweries; nor would it affect the important business of the manufacture of native wine; it would not affect the employment of capital in this direction. I have been told by persons well informed in this matter that hundreds of thousands of dollars have this year been withheld from being invested in the culture of grapes in Ontario, because of the possibility of a law like the Scott Act, which prevents the use of native wines, being adopted throughout the Province. This shows how these different laws affect property, trade and commerce; and a proposition of this kind would not go

to the same extent, because it would not be so wide and large, while at the same time it would materially promote the securing of the beneficial results which we all hope to obtain. Now, the social effects of this would not be so striking as total prohibition, and yet its effects upon the social customs of the people would be of a very striking character, and I think, so far as my observation goes, they would be of a most beneficial character, and that is what we aim at and hope for. If we were able to accomplish a result of this kind by legislation, and prohibit spirits all over the Dominion, prevent their importation, manufacture, sale, purchase and use, we would certainly accomplish a great result in respect of temperance. There are two bodies of extremists in respect to this subject. There are those who think that intoxicating liquors should be freely sold, or at all events not restricted beyond the licensing system; and there are those who favor preventing all sale and use of intoxicating liquors. There stands between these two extreme bodies a great body of the people, so far as I have heard, and so far as I can gather from all quarters, who are willing to endorse such a proposition as I have submitted, because they believe it to be moderate and reasonable, and because they believe it will be effective. Legislation in this direction has not usually proved effective; it certainly has not proved conclusively effective. We know as regards Maine, that there are those, advocates of the Maine liquor law, who think that the law has been to a large extent effective; while there are those, on the other hand, who deny that it has been effective or has produced any good results whatever. In Iowa and Kansas and other States where total prohibition has been put into force we find that it is stated to be a failure; and, at the same time, I am quite prepared to admit that there are many advocates of the total prohibition idea who declare it has produced eminently beneficial effects, as I certainly think in some directions it has done. But as we have not total prohibition, the question is, whether we should not go forward step by step rather than adopt the extreme temperance view and accomplish a great revolution by a single Act of Parliament. If it is found, after a trial of legislation of this character, that it does not produce beneficial results we can either advance or retire. We can go forward or go backward in legislation of this kind. We can go forward and prohibit strong ale and strong wine. If we determine to go backward we could retire to the position we occupy to-day; but at all events we would have had experience and have either demonstrated the utility of legislation of this kind or demonstrated its inutility, and in either case we would be in a better position to know what ought to be done for the purpose of ridding the country of the great evils and misery which result from the excessive use of intoxicating liquor; and we would have this experience to fall back on, which the country has not had up to the present time. A very important inquiry would naturally suggest itself in regard to legislation of this description, whether we have local prohibition or total prohibition—how can it be enforced? If it cannot be enforced, it is useless to pass such legislation. There is, indeed, great danger in making laws which cannot be enforced. I think, however, most laws can be enforced, and laws can certainly be enforced if they have the support of public opinion and are endorsed by the mass of the people. There are, of course, laws which have existed for many hundreds of years in certain countries and have never been successfully carried out. While we have the law, thou shalt not kill, there are persons who kill. While we have the law, thou shalt not steal, there are persons who steal, although an eminent lawyer, who was also a judge, in prosecuting a criminal case condemned the crime and said it had been denounced in thunders from Mount Sinai and had been the law of Upper Canada ever since. People have gone on committing the crime and been convicted. It is not possible, therefore, to completely alter human nature by legislation and to remove those evil passions which, to a certain extent, are hereditary or are acquired by men by some artificial means. I think the difficulty of enforcing laws in this country have been usually of two classes. The first difficulty which, I think, is at the root of the non-enforcement of laws of this kind is this: Take the local option law or the Canada Temperance Act. Whatever value I may attach to legislation of that character, I think that when we throw into the hands of the people the adoption or rejection of measures of this kind, we are humiliating the legislation of Parliament. I would take the responsibility of legislating in this direction to any reasonable extent and press that legislation on the country, and if it went from this House down to the people as a law adopted by Parliament it would have the sanction of the functionaries of the land from the highest to the lowest in administering the law, and it would have, to a large extent, the fear of the people in respect to it. But I do not wonder that the Canada Temperance Act is not a success in some counties at all events, because when a law is enacted by a vote by ballot those who opposed it naturally go to work and do all they can to frustrate the carrying out of the law, and thus show that they held correct opinions in regard to it, and that the law cannot be a success. That is a most natural and reasonable thing to happen, and it does happen as a matter of fact. As to the Canada Temperance Act itself, it is a weak law, however much it may have been effective in promoting temperance sentiment and in agitating the country; the law in itself, I say, is weak and defective, which no one can doubt. Why? It is defective and weak because it simply prohibits the sale of liquor in a particular county. The 99th section prohibits the sale; but you can purchase as much liquor as you please out of the county and bring it in. A man can go out of the county where the Act is in force, and bring in 100 gallons of whiskey and drink it with his neighbors. That is a flagrant defect in the Canada Temperance Act. It does not meet the whole requirements; it does not meet every difficulty. It has its use and it may prevent abuses in some directions; but it does not accomplish the full result. In addition to its endorsement by public opinion and the sanction of the administrators of the law in every respect we ought to have a means of reaching those parties who are guilty of violating the law. Every person knows that scarcely any one, no one I may say, ever keeps a hotel or sells liquor except for the purpose of making money; they do not do it for the love of it. If we can reach by the use of money, the persons guilty of violating the law, then we can to a large extent have the law enforced; and my idea of enforcing such a law is, that the property of a man guilty of breaking the law should be forfeited, as we do in the case of smugglers. If a man smuggles property to the value of $50,000 or $100,000, and his goods are seized because he does not pay duty, he does not meet with sympathy. We should adopt the same principle here, and provide that, in cases of violation of laws of this class, the property of the guilty parties shall be forfeited and confiscated to the Crown. and that the man who brings about the detection of those who violate the law should have, as in the case of smuggling, one-third of the net proceeds of the property. Now, there is not a respectable hotel keeper in Canada, there is not an owner of such a hotel as the Russell, the Union or the Windsor, in this city, or the Queen's or the Rossin in Toronto, or any other hotel of that kind, that would ever be guilty of the violation of the law under such circumstances, because in that case there would always be men who would go and drink the whiskey and would turn around and inform on the hotel keeper, when they knew that they would make several thousand dollars by the process. Some people in talking this matter over with me have said, that is a great hardship; it is a hardship which

should not be inflicted on any man. I ask why should not a man who is guilty of a violation of any law have any punishment inflicted upon him which is necessary to enforce the maintenance of that law? His only remedy is not to be guilty of an infraction of the law. He can simply let it alone. He need not violate the law, and if he does violate it he must suffer the consequences. If a man commits murder he may be hanged, and he knows it; if a man steals he may get imprisoned and he knows it. So if a man violates a law of this character he knows that his property may be forfeited, and therefore the way of reaching an enforcement of the law is to appeal to him upon the same motive which induces men to carry on business—to make money; to say to him if you violate the law you will lose money. Then if a man should violate a law of this kind who has not enough property to punish him in this way, he should be punished by imprisonment—by being sent to prison with or without hard labour; and in doing this you would put such a bane upon such a violation of the law that you would undoubtedly secure the maintenance of the law. The law would enforce its own purpose because those having occasion to break the law would be afraid to do so. Then another point arises in connection with this matter at this time, and that is the question of compensation. Now, if I had to express an opinion upon that subject I would say, that my great difficulty in supporting the Scott Act and which prevented me from supporting it with any great cordiality, though I never opposed it, was that it did not provide for any compensation. I think it an unfair and an unjust and an unreasonable thing that any individual person should be obliged to give up an interest which he has under the law, for the purpose of benefiting the public without being compensated. The extent and nature of that compensation is another question, but the principle of compensation should never be doubted by any Parliament in this country; it should never be thrown to the winds or destroyed, because if we allow such a communistic doctrine to be laid down by Parliament and to be thrown broadcast as seed among the people, that property may be confiscated at the will of a majority, I think we would soon find that our property is held by a very loose title. We should never touch private rights. They should be sacred as liberty is sacred to the law—as a person's own body is sacred to the law, and the principle of compensation is one which should never be assailed by any Parliament. But there may be questions—when the application of the principle may become important—as to determining how far and to what extent this compensation should go. Supposing that spirits were prohibited, the first to be affected by it would be the distillers. Should not they be compensated? I or you may not drink whiskey, or we may not smoke tobacco, but is the man who manufactures that tobacco or that whiskey to be legislated out of his property without being compensated? I would not consent to the destruction of the principle of compensation, which should never be assailed, at all events, by any Parliament of this country. The application of that principle, and how far it should go with the wine distillers of this country, if they were stopped to-morrow, how far they should be re-imbursed for the depreciation of their real estate, or the destruction of their plant, is something that should be determined in a general way, and left to the circumstances and incidents which surround the question. Therefore I would propose, as I have proposed by the resolutions, that the trade being lawful, and one which has been recognised by law for hundreds of years, if we come to destroy it for the general good, the nine individuals who may own this property and who are engaged in the business of distillation, should have such a compensation as is fair and reasonable. They should not be allowed large compensation; they should not be allowed remote damages or anything of that kind, but they should be fairly and moderately recompensed if their business is done away with for the sake of the great good which it is hoped will follow. In this connection there probably comes up a more difficult question, and one which I do not know that I should discuss, because it is a question which belongs to the Finance Minister. If legislation of this character were adopted, the Finance Minister will find his revenue reduced by about $3,000,000. Now that is a serious question at the present time. This kind of legislation should have been introduced a few years back when we had thousands of dollars of surpluses, because then we would have been able to have dispensed with the $3,608,000 which was the amount of revenue which we realised from spirits last year. Now at least $3,000,000 of that would be at once lost to the country, and therefore this is a very important question as an objection to legislation of this character. Without this question of revenue to confront, I do not think there would be any difficulty felt in legislating in this direction, by any person in this Parliament or throughout the country; but here is a practical and serious difficulty in the fact that three million dollars, or some such amount of revenue, has to be provided in some other way. I suppose the majority of this House might be prepared to say that the Finance Minister is equal to the emergency—that he is able to meet the difficulty. If I remember correctly, a speech which he made in London two years ago, he said the difficulty in Canada was not with reference to the revenue, but the chief difficulty was with reference to obtaining the sanction of public opinion; and that if public opinion was in accord with this kind of legislation, and the revenue was reduced, he could meet the emergency by an adjustment of the tariff in a way which would not hurt the great interests of the country. There are many things from which we could obtain a revenue; and he could, at all events, change the relations of this matter, so that this revenue could be derived in some reasonable way. One way in which I would propose to do it, if it is found that license legislation is within our jurisdiction, is, that the hotels should themselves contribute by licenses a large share of this revenue, with the view of also limiting the number. The principle upon which license can be charged to them at all is that they have a monopoly of the trade in the locality in which they carry on business, and that they should pay something extra to the State for it. But that is an important question; and how far it can be met I leave to be determined by those who better understand the financial condition of the country and the mode of taxation than I do. There is no doubt also that if spirits were prohibited, there would be a larger quantity of beer and wine drunk in the country, and consequently increased receipts of both excise and import duties; so that in that way the revenue that would be lost by prohibiting spirits would be made up. There is is a consideration which temperance people dwell upon very strongly, which we hear of on almost every platform, and which I think cannot be ignored or set aside; that is, what the criminal administration of the law costs by reason of drunkenness. I cannot give the statistics, but I will mention one fact. In the Province of Ontario, there are 12,000 criminals sent to prison, of whom 9,000 went there because of the excessive use of liquor. Now, if it could be assumed that not 9,000, but 6,000 out of the 12,000 were sent there because of the excessive use of spirits, what a large saving would result on that account; and that would help to make up for the revenue which would be lost by reason of legislation of this kind, to say nothing of the general advantage which would result to the country from the prevention of so much crime. Now, the only other point which I will call attention to particularly is the case of the drunkard. Whether it is reasonable or unreasonable, I have a well-founded conviction that one of the best remedies for the evils of which we complain is that drunkenness should be made a crime.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. BEATY. And that if the hon. member who says no should get drunk, of which I have no expectation, he should be punished for doing that which he knows, as an intelligent, rational being, he ought not to do. Now, that is the way to meet this difficulty. Why, for instance, should a stigma be placed upon a boy or a youth who steals a jackknife, and he be sent to prison, and that stigma be made to rest upon him perhaps all his life, while, if he gets drunk, the worst result perhaps is that his friends laugh at him. Surely it is a serious matter that a woman who is brought to the verge of starvation because of a drunken husband should be sent to gaol for stealing a loaf of bread, while the husband, whose drunkenness has produced this result, is allowed to go scot-free. Drunkenness is a crime; it is a thing that ought to be stigmatised as a crime; and what would be the effect of so doing? I do not know that the effect would be very great on those who now get drunk; but the effect on the rising generation would be very beneficial. If children were led to believe that drunkenness caused a man to be sent to prison, just as stealing does, would they not look upon it in a different light from what they do now? Instead of making game of a drunken man on the streets, they would tell a police constable and have the man arrested and sent to prison, for the reason only that he was drunk, not that he was disorderly or did some violent act. I say that arrest would impress upon those children an idea of drunkenness which they cannot have now, so long as drunkenness is looked upon merely as a social folly, which persons may get into and may get out of in the best way they can. It certainly seems to me that the offence of drunkenness should be made a crime, although I think punishment, or imprisonment, should not follow, except for a repetition of the offence. In the city of Toronto there are hundreds, certainly dozens, of persons who would be only too glad if they could have their own relatives taken before a magistrate for drunkenness and sent to gaol, where they would know they would be sheltered and protected, and could not commit any violence, as they now can, upon their wives and children. There are hundreds of people all over this country who would be glad to have that power, for the sake of themselves and their relatives and for the sake of society. And why should a man be permitted to get drunk and do violence to his wife and children while he himself goes free? To illustrate this, I may state that the other day a member of Parliament told me of a poor man whose two daughters were sick of typhoid fever. He had not the means whereby to obtain the services of a medical man, and he sold a cow, and with the money he got drunk. Instead of buying nourishment or obtaining medical assistance for his sick daughters he went home and began abusing his wife. The daughters got out of their beds to protect their mother, and both of them died two days afterwards, while that man was allowed to go free—he was only drunk. Not only did the two daughters die from the effect of the exposure he caused them, but the wife also became sick. I say that, under such circumstances, that man should be punished. Although this is called a Christian country, it is said that this kind of legislation should not be pressed on the attention of Parliament. But I say if we have any duties to discharge to our fellow men, we should strike at the root of this matter, and put the stigma of a crime and a disgrace upon an offence of this kind, just as we do upon theft. We should charge this matter right home, and protect the helpless wives and children of those who get drunk. Suppose your neighbor is drunk in his house; he may set fire to his house and burn up yours. What can you do? At present you have to sit by and look on helplessly, whereas you ought to be able to bring the power of the law to bear to prevent your property being destroyed because of that man's folly. There is no reason why this legislation should not be tried, at any rate. I do not propose it, because I think it is in every respect acceptable, but because it is most reasonable and fair and practical; and if it is reasonable and fair and practical, it must be successful. Therefore, I ask the consideration of the House to these resolutions.

Mr. JAMIESON. I must apologise to the hon. gentleman who has moved these resolutions, and I think it is due that I should apologise to the House for disturbing the order of business, but I find that it will be impossible to obtain a third reading of the Bill to amend the Canada Temperance Act without displacing some order. I trust the hon gentleman who has made so able a speech as that which we have just heard, will not feel offended or take it as any act of disrespect to him or to the principles of his resolution, although I do not agree with those principles, that I should move an amendment to his motion. He has made a very able speech; he has taken an opportunity of placing his views before the House and country, and I have no doubt the people will carefully consider the views enunciated by him and the measure which these resolutions foreshadow, and that perhaps by next Session the country and the members of this House will be prepared to pass upon the question. However, I do not think that the hon. gentleman should expect us, at this stage of the Session, to discuss the resolutions he has submitted to the House and to pass upon them; and even if we did, I do not think the hon. gentleman really expects that anything practical can come of it, because it is too late in the Session to base any Bill and carry it through the House on those resolutions. I therefore beg to move that the House do now pass to Public Bills and Orders.

Mr. BEATY. I should judge that is out of order. A motion of that kind should not be put while a measure is being discussed; the hon. gentleman should have waited till the discussion was over.

Mr. SPEAKER. According to parliamentary rule and practice, it is always in order to move the previous question; that the question be now put, or that the House pass to Public Bills and Orders, or to ask for a particular order, as the hon. gentleman who moved this amendment did the other night.

Motion agreed to.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT OF 1878.

Mr. JAMIESON moved the third reading of Bill (No. 92) further to amend the Canada Temperance Act of 1878.

Mr. WELDON moved:

That the said Bill be not now read the third time, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to make the following amendments:—To add the following words at the end of the sixth section: Provided this Act shall not apply to any prosecutions or proceedings heretofore commenced and now pending; and notwithstanding the repeal of the said section, the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, relating to offences, penalties and punishments, and procedure relating thereto, shall, as to all prosecutions and proceedings commenced after the passing of this Act, be in full force. And to add to the seventh clause the following words: Provided that where the information or complaint is laid by any person other than the collector of Inland Revenue, the information shall be laid upon the oath of the party complaining, substantiating the information.

Mr. JAMIESON. I certainly object to this addition to section 7. I do not see any reason why there should be a departure in this case from the general rule. For instance, under the Act which we passed two years ago, it is not necessary that information should be laid upon oath, nor is it necessary, as I understand it, under the law at present in force in the Province of Ontario. And even in any proceeding under the Summary Jurisdiction Act, where it is the intention to issue a summons, it is not required that the information should be upon oath. I should like to know why the hon. gentleman would contend that a provision should be adopted in this measure which has not been adopted in connection with other measures; and, in

addition to that, I think he is a little wrong in reference to the officer. It will be recollected that, by an amendment to the Liquor License Act, if not by the Act itself—I cannot charge my memory with it now—the enforcement of the Scott Act is placed in the hands of the inspectors appointed by the Board of License Commissioners, and it is not now to be enforced by the Inland Revenue officer. I understood the hon. gentleman was going to make a slight change in the other amendment.

Mr. WELDON. I have stated that.

Mr. JAMIESON. For my part, I feel decidedly opposed to the second clause which the hon. gentleman proposes to add. I do not think it is necessary, and therefore I object to it. In the other case I had no objection that this Bill should not be made retroactive.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Amendment to section 6 agreed to.

Mr. WELDON. The second amendment I propose is, that where the collector of Inland Revenue has not laid the information, it shall be substantiated by the oath of the person who lays it. I propose to add to the collector of Inland Revenue, "or the Inspector of Licenses," as under the Liquor License Act of 1883 that officer has a right to initiate prosecutions. Under the Canada Temperance Act of 1878 the collector of Inland Revenue has the right to prosecute; and, as far as officials are concerned, there is no objection to their laying the information in the ordinary way, but I think it is a serious matter when it is laid by other individuals. What is the schedule here? Schedule O of this present Act is:

"The said informant says he is informed and believes that X.Y. unlawfully did sell intoxicating liquor."

And so forth. It is simply the *ipse dixit* of the individual that he is informed and believes. While I presume an official, acting in his official capacity, would not do anything improper, it leaves the power to any individual to make a complaint on his information and belief; and, no matter how much expense and trouble he may put the party to, there is no remedy. And it is important, bearing in mind the different offences enumerated by this Act. The 7th section of this schedule is:

"That X. Y., being a medical man, unlawfully did give a certificate to obtain intoxicating liquor for other than strictly medicinal purposes."

A person having a grudge against a medical man might simply go to a magistrate and say he is informed and believes that this medical man gave a certificate improperly, and he would be put to a great deal of trouble to prove that it was given for medicinal purposes. I contend that, where an individual, other than the officials, chooses to make a complaint, he should substantiate that by his oath, so that, if it turns out either that he did the thing maliciously or without any provocation, proper proceedings for perjury could be had against him. I think a strong distinction can be made between this and ordinary cases, where a party lays a charge for assault, because generally these are personal matters where the party is personally interested, and I take it that, in these cases, no other person can make the complaint; but, as the Canada Temperance Act now stands, any person can go before a magistrate and make a statement that he is informed and believes that so-and-so committed an offence against the Act. Immediately, that person is obliged to defend himself and to put himself to a large amount of trouble, and we know that, independently of the costs which might be awarded to him, he would not be compensated for the trouble to which he is put. It is for these reasons that I move that amendment.

Mr. JAMIESON.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the hon. gentleman who moved that be willing to put the word in the plural, because there is a chief inspector and sub-inspectors. The sub-inspector, certainly, should have the same rights as the inspector.

Mr. WELDON. I have no objection to any person who is qualified by official authority.

Mr. FOSTER. These officials are appointed under the law, and the sub-inspectors are responsible to the inspector.

Mr. WELDON. I have no objection.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. It is proposed to amend the 7th section of the Act by adding thereto the following proviso:

"Provided, that where the information or complaint is laid by any other person than the collector of Inland Revenue, or the inspector or sub-inspectors of licenses, the information shall be laid upon oath of the party complainant substantiating the information."

Mr. FOSTER. That is preferable to what it was before, and yet I have the same objection as my hon. friend who has charge of this Bill, to having that put in. Of course you may say that such an information ought to be under oath; but what ought to be and what is found practicable, are not always the same. There are a great many places where liquor will be sold under the Act, and where it will be well known that liquor is sold, but where it would probably be very difficult for a person to be so sure of it as to take his oath to the information he might wish to lay. I think you will find that it will very seriously cripple the enforcement of the law; and we do not wish that the enforcement should be crippled. If it is not the practice in other laws, I do not see why it should be the practice in this. If we have a law at all, we want one that can be enforced; and I have not found, in practice, any difficulties arising in counties under that law, as it at present stands.

Mr. SPROULE. Then why want the amendment?

Mr. FOSTER. It is not my amendment; it is the amendment of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon).

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This question came up the other day in committee, and the committee seemed to be very favorable to this amendment. The fact is, it would be a great deal better, when a party is not able to make his information under oath, that the information should not be laid at all, than that the liberty of the subject should be infringed upon. A person might desire to lay an information merely for the purpose of annoying a neighbour, or a medical man, as in the case already cited; and if he is a man of straw, without any means, he can make his declaration without substantiating it by oath, and the man informed against is obliged to go before a magistrate and stand his trial on the charge of an offence which has not been committed. It is a great deal better that one or two offenders should go free than that informers should be allowed to annoy citizens, and perhaps cause them to be punished for no offence at all. But if a man takes it upon himself to go and take his oath, you have some guarantee of the truth of the information, because no man will make an oath of that kind without having before his eyes the fear of punishment for perjury. Besides, the informant may be a man of straw—without means—and therefore you cannot reach him; whilst, if he were obliged to make his affirmation under oath, he could be punished in case he was found to have committed perjury, or had laid the information merely for the purpose of annoying a citizen.

Mr. FOSTER. I appreciate that view of the subject; but there is this which lessens, to some extent, the danger the hon. Minister apprehends. The person must lay the information before a responsible party, who is a magistrate—a stipendiary magistrate—or before two magistrates; and if the informant is a man of straw, whom the magistrate

believes to be desirous merely of annoying a person, he will not take his information.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. How is the magistrate to know that?

Mr. FOSTER. The magistrate always sits in the jurisdiction in which the offence is committed, and consequently the informant and witness must be well known to him.

Mr. JAMIESON. My principal objection to this amendment lies in the fact that it is an innovation; that it is not required in any license law that I know of, and I do not know why we should make a departure in the case. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) cited the case of a party who might be assaulted, and he said there was a distinction between that case and the case of a party laying an information for an infringement of the license law. Well, I think the reason is much stronger for requiring sworn information in a case of assault than in a case of violation of this Act, because in the case of assault a warrant can be issued, and if a warrant is to be issued there must be information on oath; but in this case, where there is only a summons in the first instance, I do not see why we should require that the information should be upon oath. As I said the other day, it is a principle of law that a man should not be deprived of his liberty unless upon sworn information. Now, in this case, the first proceeding will be the issue of a summons, and to require sworn information before a proceeding so simple as the issue of a summons would be what I consider an innovation, and I do no see why, in respect to this Act, we should depart from the general rule.

Mr. WELDON. I consider the whole Act an innovation—but, of course, that is not a subject for discussion now. A man lays an information for assault when the offence is committed against himself, but in this case it is a breach against a statutory law, which does not affect the informant; he chooses to lay an information in a matter in which he has no personal interest whatever. And if you read the schedule, you will find that he may go before a single magistrate, and not before a stipendiary magistrate; but when the question is to be adjudicated it must be before two justices, and one justice may issue the summons. The complainant has got to say: I am informed that so-and-so did sell in violation of the Act—and I took the case of a medical man who granted a certificate for other than medical purposes, but merely because some vicious person chooses to do that, the party is brought before a magistrate and put to great annoyance and expense by a man of straw, who cannot be reached and punished. The Act has provided that certain officials have that duty imposed upon them, and it is their duty to take action when their attention is called to a violation of the Act; it is a safeguard and a protection which will enable the Act to be carried out. But if we leave the matter open, we leave parties liable to be made subjects of vexatious proceedings and of blackmail, and allow the Act to be used for purposes which were never intended.

Mr. FOSTER. There are different parties named to enforce the Act. By the law, those appointed are the commissioners of Inland Revenue, but more especially the inspectors and sub-inspectors. But suppose we get inspectors and sub-inspectors who will not do their duty, then the law, if it is to be enforced, must be enforced by private parties; and you are taking away a powerful weapon if you refuse to allow this to be done. If the Government will guarantee that good inspectors will be appointed in all cases to carry out this law, then we might accept that assurance; but it may happen, if another Government should get into power, that inferior inspectors might be appointed, and so we must have this provision to guard ourselves against that danger.

Mr. HESSON. I think the provision is a very dangerous one, and that individuals might travel through the country and improperly lodge complaints and make money out of the action. A person should be compelled to make an affirmation under oath; if not, very serious injustice may be done different parties. The Bill is not safe without the proposed amendment, and I feel that it ought to be permitted to be inserted by those supporting the Bill.

Mr. MACDONALD (Queens, P.E.I). We have had the Act in operation in our Province for some time and have never known the case of a man being blackmailed. The fact is, that the adoption of this amendment will very much hamper the successful carrying out of the Act, and it would be a mistake to adopt it. We know that information is often laid against persons, by reason of the fact being known that certain parties go regularly and get grog at a certain house. While a man may not be able to swear positively that these men get grog there, the case is proved by the persons visiting the house regularly being called as witnesses. It would militate against the successful carrying out of the Act if this amendment should be carried.

Mr. MILLS. The friends of temperance in Parliament can have no desire to have an innocent party troubled with unfair prosecutions. The amendment made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) simply requires that a man should swear that he has been informed and believes certain facts. I can see no possible objection, unless the party happens to be one opposed altogether to taking an oath, to his being required to make such an affidavit. It seems to be a reasonable proposition, and one, I think, which the House will cordially sustain.

Amendment agreed to.

Committee rose and reported.

Mr. JAMIESON moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. BOURBEAU. Before the Bill is read the third time, I beg to move:

That in addition to the persons mentioned in sub-section 4 of section 99 of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, the following persons may grant certificates for medical purposes: The priest, or any duly ordained clergyman ministering to or in charge of the village, parish or township in which the person to whom the certificate is granted resides, and where no medical man resides or can conveniently be found.

I think this amendment should be adopted, because it is well known that in some parishes there are no medical men. In the absence of medical men, I think this power should be granted to priests and ordained ministers. In my own county there are parishes 18 miles distant from any doctor, although they are large parishes, with a population of about 2,000 people. In those cases it would be of great advantage if the people were allowed to go to the priests and ministers and obtain certificates. There is no danger that the priests or ministers would abuse their power. It has been stated in this House that certificates have been granted by doctors, in counties where the Scott Act has been adopted, so that the same person was able to obtain three or four bottles of whisky in a single day, under a certificate obtained from a medical man. I am satisfied that priests or ministers would not give a certificate under which such a quantity of liquor could be obtained in one day. I hope this motion will be adopted.

Motion agreed to on a division.

(In the Committee.)

Amendment (Mr. Bourbeau), agreed to, and Bill reported.

On motion for concurrence in the amendment,

Mr. BURPEE moved that the amendment be not now concurred in, but that the Bill be referred back to the Com-

mittee of the Whole, with instructions to strike out the said amendment.

Mr. IVES. I do not see upon what possible ground the amendment can be objected to. The statement made by the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabasca (Mr. Bourbeau) is strictly true. There are, in sections of this country, numbers of places of large population where no medical man resides, and is it to be said that it is necessary that liquor should be dispensed for medicinal purposes, and at the same time no facilities given for those people to obtain it. There are cases where, I presume, a medical man would say that the procuring of spirits was a matter of life and death, and yet it is to be said that you are to go to a medical man, to the nearest village, which perhaps may be eighteen or twenty miles away, and that medical man may at the time be a long distance in another direction, so that the life of the patient may be lost, simply because the temperance people are not disposed to extend the principle of their own Act. This is not an innovation, but simply an extension of the principle; and unless it can be established that the priest or the minister is a person less fitted for judging as to what is a suitable occasion for giving a certificate, then I say there is no possible objection to adopting the amendment. I am not prepared to take that position, and I believe a necessity exists for such an amendment. I believe it is not an innovation of the law; I believe it is merely an incident of the law. It is merely to enable it to be carried out in places where medical men do not live, and I cannot understand why it should be objected to.

Mr. PLATT. I should like to know just where the medical profession stand, with respect to this matter. If we are to grant certificates simply upon moral responsibility rather than upon professional responsibility, I, for one, should prefer to be relieved of that responsibility altogether. I think the presumption is that medical men grant certificates—I do not like the word; I would rather say prescriptions—because they know liquor to be necessary in a particular case, just as any other drug; and I do not know that this Parliament has any power to grant to priests and ministers permission to prescribe medicines, and not to any one else. This amendment would destroy the whole intention of the Act. The Act means, as I understand it, that upon a medical man's prescription—not upon his certificate—liquor may be used in case of sickness; and I do not know that any other profession would claim to have the same knowledge as the medical profession in that particular respect. I, for one, would rather see the privilege extended to ministers and magistrates, and everyone else, and the medical profession relieved of the responsibility entirely, than to divide the responsibility in the way proposed.

Mr. BURNS. As I understand the amendment, there is no intention of ignoring physicians; but it is simply intended to make provision for cases where the services of medical men cannot be obtained. Such cases are numerous. In the Province from which I come, it very often happens that no medical man is to be found outside of the shire towns. Some of the counties are very large, and people residing at a distance of 60 or 70 miles from a shire town certainly should not be compelled to go to a physician living at that distance, in order to obtain a certificate from him; and I claim that, in many cases, the clergyman of the district is fully as competent as a medical man could be to determine whether a case requires the use of spirituous liquors or not. I think it would be a mistake if provision were not made in the law to enable those gentlemen to grant certificates. They are very often not only the spiritual advisers but also the medical and legal advisers of their parishoners, and are generally in a better position to know their wants than anyone else, and should have the privilege of granting certificates. Holding that opinion, I shall vote for the amendment.

Mr. CASEY. There is certainly a great deal of force in the remarks of the hon. gentleman for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt), and they would be absolutely conclusive if it was proposed to give concurrent jurisdiction to doctors and clergymen. But I do not so understand the amendment. It is to allow spirits, in cases of absolute necessity, to be obtained otherwise than by a doctor's certificate, where the doctor's certificate is not obtainable. I am quite willing that the spirit of the Act should be carried out, and that spirits should be regarded as a drug and should not be obtainable any more easily than any other drug; but we all know that in districts where a doctor does not reside, if there is a drug store, it is easy to secure a drug without sending for a doctor; and I do not know why it should not be possible in those cases to procure alcohol, as any other drug. I speak quite impartially and freely in this matter, because there is no part of my own county where this amendment could possibly apply, as we are fully supplied with doctors; but we must recognise the fact urged upon us by representatives of districts which include portions of the backwoods, who say that the amendment is necessary for their districts. I think we can grant this relief without violating the spirit of the Act, without taking alcohol out of the category of drugs, and without the least fear that the clerical profession, either as a body or individually, will abuse the privilege granted by this amendment.

Mr. BURPEE. It is proposed that in certain back districts the privilege of granting certificates should be extended to ordained clergymen. The fact is, that in some back districts there are neither doctors nor clergymen. Shall we enlarge the privilege to schoolmasters in those cases? If we open the door, we cannot shut it. The wording of the amendment is very vague—"where doctors cannot conveniently be found." Although I am satisfied that the majority of clergymen in this country would carry out the Act quite as well as the doctors, I think it is a dangerous door to open, and instead of being an improvement to the Act, the amendment would destroy its meaning, and I think it should not be carried.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. SPROULE. This amendment, I think, is very much needed, for various reasons. One of those reasons is, that it may occasionally happen that a license will be granted to some person to sell liquor in a township where there is no medical man at all, where the only medical man to be had may live several miles away, and yet there may be ministers and priests within a short distance of where this liquor is sold. Now, for the purpose of allowing persons who may need to use liquor, in cases of emergency, on short notice, to obtain it, I think it is necessary this amendment should be agreed to; but when we consider other features of this Act, other restrictions in it, we find reasons outside of this, which makes this amendment especially necessary. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), when this Act was under consideration last Friday, drew attention to the fact that the veterinary surgeons of the country could not get liquor of any description to use. Now, there is no provision by which they can get liquor at all. The only provision for the sale of liquor to any person, professionally or otherwise, is specified in the first sub-section of the Canada Temperance Act, "when it is used for medicinal purposes," and that clause also says it shall be only used under certain regulations. What are those? "Provided, also, that the sale of intoxicating liquors, for exclusively medicinal purposes, shall be lawful only by such druggists and other vendors as may be appointed by license from the

Lieutenant-Governor in Council;" and then such intoxicating liquors, for medicinal purposes, must be removed from the premises, and such sale to be made only on the certificate of a medical man, who shall specify that it has been prescribed to a person for medicinal purposes. Now, it does not even allow to a veterinary surgeon the liberty of prescribing liquor; it does not allow a medical man to prescribe for use by a veterinary surgeon; it does not allow any other person to give it to a veterinary surgeon; there is no way by which a veterinary surgeon can get it, unless he comes under the clause which allows it to be given for sacramental or for medicinal purposes. In that there is no necessity to state that it has been prescribed for medicinal purposes for a person. If, as it appears to be, it is the disposition of those who have charge of this Bill not to allow an amendment to this Act to admit the proposed clause, I say it is important it should be extended to clergymen. What is the object of preventing the clause being amended? Is it for the purpose of preventing abuse? Abuse by whom? By the very class of men, above all others, who are taking the most active interest in the promotion of the temperance cause, the ministers and priests of the country, the men who are entrusted with the spiritual, the moral and the social welfare of the community; and yet, strange to say, the temperance men of this House cannot entrust them by putting that clause in the Act, because they fear that abuses will spring up under it. I can only say they have less confidence in the ministers and priests than I have From my own personal acquaintance with the ministers of the gospel and the priests in my county, I have never known of a single instance in which I believe one of those gentlemen would be inclined to abuse that trust. But we need not wonder at the objections, for if they will not allow medical men to use it in the legitimate practice of their profession and veterinary surgeons in the practice of theirs, I do not wonder they carry it further, and make it almost like the puritanical laws, so stringent that no person could carry it out. If you make an Act so stringent that it is impossible to carry it out, in the ordinary course of events, instead of having the law respected you bring it into contempt. That is the condition of the proposed Act, as it stands. If there is any legal gentleman or medical man in this House who, on looking over this measure, will tell me it is possible to carry it out in its entirety, as it stands, if not amended beyond the amendments proposed, he must understand it differently from what I do. There is another reason why this measure is defective. Take a village; there may be in it, as is commonly the case in many of our villages, two or more medical men and a couple of drug stores. One medical man patronises one store and the other patronises its rival. One of the druggists has been fortunate enough to secure the license from the Lieutenant Governor in Council, authorising him to sell liquor for medical purposes; the other druggist, if he requires to use the smallest quantity of liquor in making up a prescription, he has not the authority to do so, because he cannot keep the liquor for sale nor sell it in any quantity; and thus, very unfairly, the one medical man may be compelled to patronise the drug store where, perhaps, the interests of the party may be antagonistic to his own. I think this amendment should go further; I believe in the interest of the carrying out of this Act, ministers and priests should have the right, where medical men are not present, or it is impossible to get them quickly, to give a certificate for the purpose of obtaining liquor. You must go further and say that the penal clause attaching to medical men should also attach to them, namely, that any medical man who gives such a certificate for any other than strict medicinal purposes shall be liable to a fine in the first instance of $20, and the second and subsequent times $40. In that you should also include ministers of the gospel, and when you have done that you will only have put them under the same restriction as medical men. I have another reason, which may be regarded as a selfish one, why I believe it is necessary this should be carried, and that is, when the late Dunkin Act was in force medical men, in the county I represent at least, found that they were frequently awakened at unreasonable hours to give prescriptions for liquor in cases in which they had no interest and where they could make no charge. The ministers and priests, who are interested in the welfare of the people, and who are endeavoring to carry out the Act by every legitimate means, should have the right to share this responsibility with medical men, and not put all the trouble on the latter, of giving certificates, for which they can make no charge, and being awakened at unreasonable hours for the purpose of giving them. Let the clergymen share this responsibility. There can be no danger of abuse arising in their hands any more than in the hands of medical men. For these reasons the House should pass the amendment, and also go further, and enable veterinary surgeons to prescribe liquor when they see fit to do so, in the legitimate practice of their profession, and give them the authority to get it at some licensed drug store or any other place.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings), I do not see why the Act should not be also extended to M. P's. It would be very useful to them at election times. Are we to understand that all these priests are pure? Are we to understand that all these ministers are pure? Are we to understand that all these doctors are pure? Are these men not liable to do wrong? Does anyone mean to say that some priests do not drink liquor? Does anyone mean to say that some ministers do not drink liquor? No one will deny they do. And do not doctors drink liquor? And if ministers, doctors and priests believe that liquors are good for their own use, they will not refuse them to parties who say: "Give me a certificate to have a bottle of liquor—just one bottle of liquor." The ministers have preached throughout the country, they have prayed, they have lectured, and they have taught the people to believe that liquor is poison. Then, if that is so, why give them permission to give a certificate to allow a sick man to buy poison? The doctor says what is very true; if he is to be fined $20 for giving a certificate, why should not a priest or a minister be fined the same? It is a difficult thing now to get men to inform, and I am opposed to informers—they have been the curse of my native country—but whom will you get to inform against a priest, or against a minister, or against a doctor, if he gives a certificate? No one will do so. No one wishes to offend his minister, no one wishes to offend his priest, no one wishes to offend his doctor, and the Act will be a dead letter; instead of being a blessing, it will be an injury to the country. If we are to have a prohibitory Act, let us have one that is perfect, let us have one that is right and just and in the interests of the community; but, if we open the door one step after the other, the best thing is to move another amendment, that certificates may be granted by doctors and priests and ministers and veterinary surgeons and M. P.'s, and very soon we will not require to have any restrictions whatever. The mover of this Bill, who has brought it in and got ahead of all others, is willing to accept this amendment, I believe, that the priests and the ministers shall have a right to give a certificate. Where is a priest who has petitioned for it? Where is a minister who has asked for it? We can easily understand why doctors advocate it, simply because it is a benefit to them in their business.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. WHITE. "No?" I will be bound to say that, in any county in Ontario, I will get ten doctors to give me a certificate each for $2 that I am sick. How many civil servants in this city are walking around the streets who go to

physicians and give them $2 to give them certificates that they are sick.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE. Yes; "hear, hear." Who will deny it? I believe the time has arrived in the history of this country and in the history of this matter when the Government of the day should take hold of it and submit to the people a prohibitory Act from one end of the country to the other. I believe there is a great deal to be said on both sides of this question. We find first the municipal councils collecting from the parties who are engaged in the sale of liquors—taxes; then we find the Local Government collecting from them—taxes, and then we find the General Government collecting from them—taxes. They apply this money for public works, to pay the interest on loans, for public improvements throughout the length and breadth of the country, and they encourage these people to build distilleries, breweries, hotels and saloons, and the Local Government and the General Government do not say a word in behalf of these men, and they are getting wiped out on every side, and the licenses are being taken away from them and given to priests, ministers, doctors, and horse farriers, and I suppose to M.P.'s. Why not to M.P.'s? I think the parties promoting this Bill should be honest and sincere and conscientious, and should carry out the Bill as handed to them, and not accept amendment after amendment. I believe we should not give this right to priests, or to ministers, or to doctors. I believe we should curtail this matter, if we are honest to the temperance people.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Burpee, p. 1047.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.)	McCraney,
Auger,	Fleming,	Mulock,
Bain (Wentworth),	Forbes,	Paterson (Brant),
Blake,	Foster,	Platt,
Bowell,	Geoffrion,	Somerville (Brant),
Burpee,	Gillmor,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Huron),	Harley,	Springer,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Hickey,	Tilley,
Casgrain,	Hilliard,	Townshend,
Charlton,	Irvine,	Vail,
Cochrane,	Jackson,	Wallace (Albert),
Cockburn,	Jamieson,	Watson,
Cook,	Kaulbach,	White (Hastings),
Davies,	King,	Wilson,
Dundas,	Kirk,	Wood (Brockville),
Edgar,	Langelier,	Yeo.—49.
Fairbank,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Ferguson (Welland),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Barnard,	Fortin,	McCallum,
Beaty,	Gagné,	McCarthy,
Benoit,	Gault,	McDougald (Pictou),
Bergin,	Gigault,	McIsaac,
Bernier,	Gordon,	McMullen,
Blondeau,	Grandbois,	McNeill,
Bourassa,	Gunn,	Massue,
Bourbeau,	Hackett,	Pruyn,
Bryson,	Hall,	Ray,
Burnham,	Hay,	Rinfret,
Burns,	Hesson,	Riopel,
Cameron (Inverness),	Homer,	Rykert,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hurteau,	Shakespeare,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Innes,	Small,
Carling,	Ives,	Smyth,
Caron,	Jenkins,	Sproule,
Casey,	Kinney,	Taschereau,
Catudal,	Kranz,	Thompson,
Colby,	Labrosse,	Trow,
Costigan,	Landerkin,	Valin,
Cuthbert,	Landry (Kent),	Wallace (York),
Dawson,	Langevin,	Weldon
De St. Georges,	Lesage,	Wells,
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Lister,	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	Livingston,	White (Renfrew),
Dodd,	Macdonald (King's),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dugas,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Woodworth.—86.
Dupont,	Mackintosh,	

Amendment negatived.

On motion for consideration of Bill as amended,

Mr. TOWNSHEND moved that the Bill be not now read the third time, but be referred back to Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to add the following clause thereto:—

In any county or municipality where there is more than one registrar of deeds' office, it shall be sufficient to deposit the notice referred to in section six of the Act hereby amended in any one of such offices, and where, in any county or municipality, a poll has been held under the said Act, which has resulted in the adoption of the petition, and the Governor General in Council has, by Order in Council, declared the second part of the said Act to be in force and to take effect in such county or municipality, the said Act shall be held and is hereby declared to be in full force and effect therein, notwithstanding such notice has not been deposited in each registrar's office; and it shall not be lawful to question the validity of any conviction, order or other proceeding had or taken thereunder, by reason only of such notice not having been deposited in each registrar's office.

He said: I think there can be no objection to this amendment, which provides that, where there are two registrars' offices in any county, it shall only be necessary to file the notice and petition in one, and that in any county where the Act has already been brought into force and the notice has not been deposited in both offices, notwithstanding this omission the Act shall be valid. This amendment is necessary, in consequence of a decision of the Supreme Court of Canada, in which the judges decided that the deposit of the notice in one place is not sufficient. The amendment is to remove a technical difficulty, and I believe there are several precedents for that.

Mr. TROW. I do not see any necessity or propriety for that amendment at all, under the present Act, for the simple reason that where there are two registry offices only one petition is necessary to be signed by the sheriff of the county.

Motion agreed to, and the House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. TOWNSHEND. In the Province of Nova Scotia, there are two registry offices in some counties, and I think almost invariably where the Act has been brought into force the notice and petition have been deposited, not with the sheriff, but in the office of the registrar of deeds; and in consequence of that, under the decision of the Supreme Court, the Act would not be validly in force unless the amendment was passed.

Mr. WELDON. It would be well enough to apply it to future cases but not to cases which have been passed upon by the courts. I think this is *ex post facto* legislation, and unless there is some good reason, we ought not to invalidate what the courts have done. We would be simply making laws which affect past rights, and I think they can only be invaded in case of urgent public necessity.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. It invades no rights. Unless this amendment is adopted the election will have to be gone over again, and that in some counties where the Act has been carried by large majorities, and where the will of the people has been expressed on the particular question of bringing the Act into force. If this amendment is not passed, then, in any county where the notice and petition have only been deposited in one registry office, it can be contested. The law will not be in force, and it will not only involve the failure of all prosecutions under the Act, but will render it nugatory in future; and that might involve the further difficulty of carrying the question right up to the Supreme Court for final decision. There is no injustice done to anyone. I do not wish to apply the amendment to any suit now in court, but simply to say that it shall be brought into effect in the different counties where the Act has been adopted.

Mr. TROW. It can only lead to confusion, where there are two registry offices and only one sheriff to sign the petition.

Mr. DAVIES. The argument of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend) amounts to this: We had an election in Cumberland county, which was invalidated. We did not take the preliminary steps to hold a legal election; we did not file the petitions with the sheriff of the county, nor in the two registry offices, as the law told us to do; but we held a voluntary election, which the courts afterwards set aside, and we now propose to ratify this past election, which was bad in itself, and which the courts have declared to be not binding. He says it does not affect anybody, but surely it affects the interests of everybody who deals in liquors in the whole county. I think he ought to show very urgent grounds to justify this retroactive legislation. I think the principle is very good, but so far as it is attempted to legalise elections which are really invalid, I think it should not be acceded to.

Mr. WELDON. It is not only to invalidate an election, but it is retroactive legislation, and is a proposal to declare valid proceedings now before the courts.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I am quite willing to except any case now pending before the courts. It is quite proper that it should not affect existing rights. But in the case referred to by the hon. member for Queen's, the law has been adopted by a large majority, and I propose simply to remove what is, at the best, but a technical objection, and which does not touch the merits of the question at all. Wherever the people have expressed themselves in favor of this Act, they have a right that it should be put into force. I know that in respect to Nova Scotia there was an amendment passed by this Parliament, last winter, or the winter before, to render the Act effective in another respect. According to law, this Act could only be brought into force at the end of ninety days from the expiration of the time for which licenses were granted. There were no licenses granted at all in Nova Scotia, and it therefore became a question whether the Act could ever be brought into force in that Province. This Parliament amended the Act, and made it effective in cases where there were no licenses granted. Now, that was retroactive legislation as much as the present amendment; and I base my amendment on the action of Parliament at that time. That amendment just as strongly affected private rights as this does. With reference to the argument of the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies), it is well to be wise after the event, but neither he nor any one else was aware of any difficulty until the Supreme Court declared it; not even the officers of the Crown suspected it.

Mr. WELDON. I think the case mentioned by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend) is entirely different. There the parties came forward, and it was not through their fault, but through the fault of the law. Provision was made in respect of counties where licenses were in force, but on the other hand, provision was not made for counties where no licenses had existed. Everybody is supposed to know the law. The law was plain in the case in question. There were two registry offices. Now, what is the object of filing a petition in a registry office? It is to enable the people in a district to ascertain the nature of the petition and the names of those who have signed it. If a county requires two registrars and two registry districts, the parties who go to examine the petition go to the registrar of the district, and the parties go to the registrar's office for the purpose of ascertaining particulars respecting the petition. If a man has to go to another office he might as well file a petition in one county for an adjoining county.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope the committee will not forget that the large body of the people have rights as well as the few in these counties. What are the facts of the case? The law says that this notice must be deposited in the office of the sheriff or registrar, for the purpose of examination by any person. The object of that provision is, of course, to allow any who are interested to examine the petition and see whether the names are bogus or genuine. It is not to be supposed, and it is not in practice the case, that a very large number of electors go to the office in order to look at the names. The attorneys of the two parties generally go there for the purpose of inspecting and finding out whether it be proper or otherwise. So it is not a difficulty, on the face of it—it would be in one registry office instead of two registry offices—on the ground that the people cannot get access to it, owing to the distance from one part of the county to another. In the case in question the notice was given. The people in that county knew where it was deposited. They knew it was there on deposit for ten days. All persons who wanted to look at it had an opportunity of going and looking at it; no rights were invaded in that particular. The hon. gentleman says it was the fault of the people. Not exactly that, because it was not supposed but that if it was deposited in one registry office that would fulfil fully the intentions of the law. In fact, it did so. The people having had due notice given and the public believing that everything was correct—as it was, except on a mere technicality—that all rights were conserved, the people of the county went up to vote, the victory was won, and defeat was acquiesced in. The hon. gentleman then comes in and says we are doing wrong to certain rights, to certain mythical rights. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend) has certainly done the fair thing by agreeing to except any one of those cases in which action is now pending. If there is any case in which an action is not pending, the amendment applies to that only. It is absurd to talk about imaginary rights being invaded when the whole people of the county were acquainted with the real facts, and it is absurd to go to all the trouble of another election and to place the Government to the expense connected therewith.

Mr. DAVIES. The amendment as now proposed reads:

"Provided, that this clause shall not apply to any prosecution heretofore brought or now pending before the court, or in any alleged offeace committed before the passing hereof."

I think if the hon. gentleman will strike out the last two lines of the resolution he will improve it, for as it now reads it does not make sense at all.

Amendment amended, reported and concurred in.

Mr. JAMIESON moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. HICKEY moved that the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to add to sub-section 4, section 99:

Provided, that nothing in this Act shall interfere with the rights or privileges of medical men in using alcoholic liquors when required and kept for professional purposes.

He said: After the generous treatment which the House has given to the non-professional men who have moved amendments, I think I may fairly hope that this will be carried without discussion. Being naturally jealous of the rights of the medical profession, which mean the rights of the people generally, and especially sick people, I think this resolution is of great importance. As the law at present is doubtful in its interpretation, I think the resolution is one which it would be necessary, in the interests of temperance, should be carried out. And though I am jealous of the rights and privileges of the medical profession, I am equally jealous of the interests which are involved in this Bill. I have supported it from the beginning, but I think it is only just to have a Bill which shall go to the people with work-

able machinery, in the way of amendments, and in such a way that none of its provisions should be of doubtful interpretation.

Mr. SPROULE. I think this amendment is one that is very much needed. If we analyse the Act, and see the provisions with regard to medical men using alcoholic stimulants, we must admit that some amendment of the kind is needed. There is only one sub-section of section 99 of the Canada Temperance Act which makes provision for the use of liquor by any person for medicinal purposes, and it makes no special provision by which medical men can use and receive compensation for it at all. Section 99 provides:

"From the day on which this part of this Act comes into force and takes effect in any county or city, and for so long thereafter as the same continues in force therein, no person, unless it be for exclusively sacramental or medical purposes, shall expose or keep for sale, or sell," etc.

And when for medicinal purposes only under certain restrictions, which are contained in sub-section 4 of section 99 of the Canada Temperance Act—

"Provided, also, that the sale of intoxicating liquors for exclusively medicinal purposes shall be lawful only by such druggists and other vendors as may be thereto specially licensed by the Lieutenant Governor in each Province."

And then only on the prescription of a medical man, setting forth that he has prescribed it for the person therein named. Now, I will give an illustration which, I think, will show how this Act would prevent a medical man doing his duty. It provides that only such druggists or such persons as may be licensed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall be allowed to dispense liquor for medicinal purposes. If there is only one druggist in a county, and the Lieutenant Governor in Council does not see fit to license him to dispense liquor, then he cannot dispense it even under the authority of a medical man. If there are two druggists, and neither has a license, although a medical man usually got his prescriptions filled up at either one of these drug stores, there is no power by which he could get the liquor or by which the druggists could dispense it. For that reason I think medical men should be allowed the right, where the circumstances demand it, to use alcoholic liquors for medicinal purposes. When this Act was framed, I think it was framed without having been brought to the attention of the medical profession at all; for if it had been, I think they would have recognised this defect. It was only about the middle of last week that the Bill was printed and distributed to the members of the House, and I, as a medical man, felt it to be my duty to submit the amendments proposed in the Bill to the medical profession of my part of the country. I sent it to them and asked them to look into it, and see if it would interfere with the use of liquor by them in their professional capacity. But only two days, I think, after the Bill was distributed to this House, a motion was made that it be changed on the Order paper, and it was changed before we had time to get any information from these medical men. It was changed on the Order paper last Friday; it comes up for a subsequent stage this week, and we have another motion that it be changed on the Order paper, again, for the purpose of hurrying it through; and we have not had time to obtain the opinion of the medical profession as to the restrictions it imposes upon them in the use of stimulants. I have heard from one or two medical men, and they expressly dissent from it, saying that it is impossible, under the present Act, in many localities, to carry on the practice of their profession, and to use those drugs which they believe to be necessary for the curing of diseases. If this is the case, why pass this Bill and impose restrictions that cannot be carried out? If you make a law so stringent that it cannot be carried out, you only breed contempt for law, and if this Bill is passed in its present shape it cannot be carried out. There is no provision in this Bill to allow a druggist to sell liquor in any quantity, no matter how small. The license to dispense liquor is granted by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. In these days of hot political strife, when the power rests with one political party, unfortunately we do find that sometimes political predilections warp the judgment, and the privilege may be given to parties who are not the best qualified to exercise it. There may be one druggist in a township, and he may be a strong partisan, allied to the party which has not the power, for the time being, to grant a license. In the Province of Ontario, to-day, this power to sell liquor will be granted by the Mowat Government. Suppose two persons apply for a license, one belonging to one party, and the other to the opposite party. The Act says the license shall be granted to a druggist or to other persons authorised by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. Suppose two druggists apply, and the license is not granted to either, but to another person who is thought by the party granting it to be the most suitable, but yet is not a druggist; then we shall find the medical men sending to these druggists who usually make up their prescriptions, but who have not the power to dispense liquor. What are the medical men to do, if we do not allow them to keep or to use the liquor themselves? They cannot practise their profession by using such remedies as they believe to be the best for restoring health. I say it is essentially necessary to give that power to the medical profession. Those who oppose doing so say that abuses will arise. Unfortunately, some medical men happen to abuse that trust; but are the great majority of the medical men of this country to be stigmatised and insulted by being refused the right to carry on their profession as they believe best for the health of the community, because a few happen to abuse the privilege? If it is abused, is there not redress provided by this law, which declares that a medical man who gives liquor for other than medical purposes shall be fined $20 for the first offence, and $40 for each subsequent offence? If that is not sufficient, hedge the law around with what restrictions you like, but only allow the respectable medical man to use liquor, if he believes it is right to use it, or if he finds that in his locality it is impossible to carry on the practice of his profession without having the privilege to use it. If this is not granted, there should be a clause to allow the druggist to use it in making up prescriptions. But if an amendment to that effect were moved, objection would be taken that there was not notice given of it, and it would have to be dropped. When there is a disposition manifested to force this Bill through the House without any amendments, it is only reasonable to suppose that this objection would be taken. Consequently, there is the greatest importance of admitting the amendment now before the Chair, and I hope the House will see the necessity of it. If this Bill had not been changed on the Order Paper, and we had been allowed the opportunity of consulting the medical profession of the country about it, I am satisfied that a very strong opinion would have been expressed by them against the possibility of medical men, under certain circumstances, practising their profession without violating the law. I may state that Dr. Grant, of this city, a gentleman widely known, and I believe very highly respected, as one of the first medical men in this part of the country, when I consulted him, said that it was impossible to carry out the Act in certain circumstances, such as I have mentioned to-night. It is most unjust to stigmatise the medical men of the country, by saying that they are not to be allowed to use any agency in their opinion best adapted for the restoration of health. In view of the facts, that this Bill has been changed twice on the Order paper, that it has been forced through without giving us time to consult the medical men of the country, and that it is impossible, at this stage, to introduce another amendment, to allow druggists to use liquors in making up prescriptions, it is especially important that

this amendment should be carried. Now, I do not think any gentleman in this House has the right to assume that because I speak in this way, I am opposed to the principle of temperance. I think my record in this House since 1878 is sufficient to disprove any such suggestion; for since that time, no matter what amendment has been moved in this House to restrict or impair the Scott Act in any way, I have invariably voted against it, and I think I have fairly assisted the temperance party of the country in submitting their petitions, and endeavoring to carry out harmoniously with them the provisions of the law as it is. I support this amendment, not for the purpose of lessening the restrictions on the use of intoxicating liquor, but because I think it very important that the medical profession should be allowed to keep and use, when the circumstance demand it, such alcoholic liquors as they may consider necessary in the practice of their profession.

Mr. IVES. It seems to me there cannot be any logical objection to this proposition. We purpose to prevent the use of alcoholic liquors as a beverage, but the House recognises the necessity of permitting its sale and use for medical purposes. The machinery which the law has adopted for enabling the public to obtain it for medical purposes and, at the same time preventing it from being used as a beverage, is to license the druggist to sell it on receiving a certificate from a physician prescribing it, and the proposition, as I understand it, is this, that if the physician is safely to be trusted with prescribing liquor to a third party, so as to authorise the druggist to sell it to that party, the physician should also be permitted to mix it himself with the medicine, and give the medicine to the third party who wants it. What the doctors complain of is, that under the proposed law it would be impossible for them to compound drugs into which alcohol enters, but they must send to the druggist for the alcohol. It seems to me there is very little to quarrel about in this matter. If the doctors are to be entrusted with the giving of the certificate upon which the liquor may be sold by the druggists, surely they can be trusted with the amount of liquor necessary to be used in the mixing of their medicines, and that is all this resolution asks. It is plain, if the doctors and druggists work dishonestly together, they can sell a large amount of liquor for beverage purposes; whereas if they work honestly, with a view of carrying out the law, it will be safe to give the doctors the power asked for under this amendment. I am surprised that the hon. gentlemen who are in charge of the Bill are so illogical as to object to their own custodians in this matter; if they make the doctors the custodians of alcoholic liquor, if alcohol can only be given on the certificate of a doctor, why will they not allow the doctors to handle the liquor?

Mr. JAMIESON. When I was spoken to, as the party having charge of this Bill, in reference to the amendment of the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey), I felt disposed, if possible, to meet the views of the medical profession, which, no doubt, is a very respectable body, next, I suppose, to the legal profession; but on talking the matter over with some friends of the measure, we found it very difficult to have this amendment enacted in such a way as to prevent abuse. I have listened very attentively to the remarks of the hon. member on my right (Mr. Ives), in reference to the doctors being custodians of the liquor for medicinal purposes, but the hon. gentleman forgot, however, that a safeguard has been thrown around that. The doctor, it is quite true, prescribes, and the druggist dispenses the liquor, but there is a record kept of every prescription. A book is kept, under the terms of the Act, in which every prescription is kept, and any member of this House can at any time, as it has been done in the past, call for a return. Take the case of permitting the sale of liquor under the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey), and there is no safeguard whatever. It will undoubtedly lead to abuse, for although the medical profession as a rule is composed of an honorable class of men, there are exceptions in it, as in every other profession It has come to my knowledge, and to that of other hon. gentlemen, that in places where the Canada Temperance Act is already in force, medical men have been found so destitute of principle as to sit on the counters in drug stores and sell their certificates for 25 cents each. The effect of the amendment would be that medical men of that character, instead of sitting on counters of drug stores and selling their prescriptions, could invite their friends into their own office and dispense the liquor as they thought proper. I do not say that an honorable medical man would do that, but by this amendment a door will be opened; it will destroy, to a large extent, the efficiency of the Canada Temperance Act, and as the proposer of this measure, having charge of it, I, for one, cannot accept the amendment offered by the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey). I would like very well if we could meet the case of those hon. gentlemen, but I cannot see my way to meeting it without opening the door for abuses that will be very injurious to the operations of the law.

Mr. SPROULE. Under that clause a doctor is fined $20 for a violation of it? Would not that cover your objection?

Mr. JAMIESON. I think not.

Mr. HICKEY. The resolution merely asks that we may be allowed to use alcohol as a drug, and it seems to me quite beyond the jurisdiction of this House to prescribe what medicines the physicians may use. That is virtually what the proposed law declares. It is possible that some medical man might be so low, so utterly regardless of the principles of his profession, as to stoop to the practices to which the hon. gentleman has referred, but I believe they are very rare exceptions, if there are any. Still, the House has given this right to people who may abuse it, because we know that ministers are often fond of dabbling in medicine and making use of their profession and position in society to prescribe and interfere with the doctor's patients; and if it is the case that physicians cannot be entrusted with this drug, no other person should be. The House has no right to say that the doctor must not use certain drugs, if these drugs are used in the country at all; if they were prohibited, of course the medical profession could not object, but as long as they are in use, medical men should have the right to use them, as they have the right to use other poisons.

Mr. FOSTER. The main difficulty has been to so guard the Act that, in counties where it is adopted, it shall not be open to abuse on account of what we consider to be, and what by the Act is stated to be, the illegitimate use of it. What are the facts of the case? This Act came into force in 1879, in the first city in which it was adopted. It has been in force in more or less cities and counties from that time to the present, and yet we have not had any voice of the medical men of these counties before Parliament complaining of a grievance and asking that a grievance should be done away with.

Mr. IVES. Have they not broken the law?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend must have a worse opinion of the medical men than I have, to think they have broken the law.

Mr. IVES. They have used it, and that is a breach of the law.

Mr. FOSTER. But, if doctors are honorable men, and we believe them in the main to be honorable men, if they had found practical difficulties in the way of working this law, we should have had a representation from medical men before this Parliament long before this. Therefore, I conclude that the practical difficulty has not arisen, and that

this difficulty which is made so much of by some gentlemen, is rather imaginary than practical. In the second place, we may say that there is nothing in the Act which touches the use of intoxicating liquors. The Act is simply an Act against the sale of intoxicating liquors, and medical men may keep these liquors by them, may use them in medicating their drugs, in fixing up their medicines, or in any such way, without, in my opinion, any contravention of the law, for the law is simply directed against the sale, and not against the use of intoxicating liquors.

Mr. SPROULE. How can they get them?

House divided on amendment of Mr. Hickey, p. 1051.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Baker (Victoria),	Desaulniers(St. Ma'ice),	Labrosse,
Beaty,	Dickinson,	Landerkin,
Bell,	Dugas,	Langevin,
Benoit,	Dundas,	Lesage,
Benson,	Dupont,	Macdonald (Sir John),
Blondeau,	Farrow,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Bourassa,	Ferguson(Leeds&Gren),	McCarthy,
Bourbeau,	Fortin,	Pope,
Bryson,	Gagné,	Pruyn,
Burnham,	Gault,	Rinfret,
Burns,	Gigault,	Riopel,
Cameron (Inverness),	Girouard,	Rykert,
Campbell (Victoria),	Gordon,	Small,
Carling,	Grandbois,	Smith,
Caron,	Hall,	Sproule,
Casgrain,	Hay,	Taschereau,
Cimon,	Hesson,	Thompson,
Costigan,	Hickey,	Townshend,
Curran,	Homer,	White (Cardwell),
Cuthbert,	Hurteau,	White (Renfrew),
Dawson,	Ives,	Wood (Brockville),
De St. Georges,	Jenkins,	Wood (Westm'lnd)—63.
Desaulniers (Maski'gé),	Kranz,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Forbes,	McMullen,
Auger,	Foster,	McNeill,
Bain (Wentworth),	Gillmor,	Mills,
Barnard,	Gunn,	Mulock,
Bernier,	Hackett,	Paterson (Brant),
Blake,	Harley,	Platt,
Bowell,	Hilliard,	Reid,
Burpee,	Holton,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Innes,	Scriver,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Irvine,	Somerville (Brant),
Cartwright,	Jackson,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casey,	Jamieson,	Springer,
Catudal,	King,	Trow,
Charlton,	Landry (Kent),	Valin,
Cochrane,	Langelier,	Wallace (Albert),
Cockburn,	Laurier,	Wallace (York),
Colby,	Lister,	Watson,
Cook,	Livingstone,	Weldon,
Davies,	Macdonald (Kings),	Wells,
Edgar,	McCallum,	White (Hastings),
Fairbank,	McCraney,	Wilson.—64.
Fleming,		

Amendment agreed to; and House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CASEY. This appears to refer to the rights and privileges of men in the use of alcoholic liquors. We understood it was for medical purposes.

Mr. HICKEY. "Medical purposes" covers the ground. It is just like any other drug. It is a drug, and we should have the privilege of using it as a drug.

Mr. McCARTHY. Where is this clause to go?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. As sub-section 4 of section 99.

Mr. McCARTHY. It had better go at the end of section 99, as an independent sub-section.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). This proposed section is a very objectionable one, and liable to open the way to good abuses. By the law, as it stands, medical men are allowed to give certificates, in the nature of prescriptions, to patients, on which liquor can be obtained from licensed vendors. These vendors are prohibited from selling, unless under authority of such certificates authorised by law. They are made to keep a record of the quantity of liquor they sell, and to keep on file the certificates under which they have sold. This record becomes a check to unscrupulous medical men, who might be disposed to abuse the authority given them. Now, if we allow medical men to sell directly, and dispense from their offices liquors to patients, will it not have the effect of transferring the sale from licensed vendors to the doctors themselves. Where a patient will go and ask for a certificate, will not the doctor say: I have authority to keep and sell the article myself, you need not go to the vendor, come to me and I will furnish it. In this way, all that doctors will prescribe may be dispensed by them without record, without check; and often, I fear, without almost requiring, as a cure, the use of liquors. Medical men, if they choose to do so, will say: We will not give you a certificate; but come in; we are keeping it ourselves under the Scott Act, and we can use it and sell it for medical purposes; and instead of giving you a certificate, of which a record can be kept, we will sell you the liquor ourselves, so that no record can be kept, and nobody will ever be the wiser for it. It appears to me that the effect will be to destroy the efficiency of the Canada Temperance Act to a very great extent. The fact of keeping a record imposes a check upon those who may be disposed to sell in violation of the law—although experience shows that it was not much of a check. The returns have shown that in some quarters a large number of certificates were given, upon which a large quantity of liquor was obtained, and in consequence of that it has been thought advisable to amend the Act, so that if medical men abuse their privileges they shall be subject to a fine. But if, after having done that, this same Parliament says: We will do away entirely with the giving of certificates, I think the effect will be very largely to impair the efficiency of the Act. Of course, I know that all medical men will not abuse their privilege; we know that the great majority of the profession are honest and conscientious men; but there is among them, as in all other professions, a certain number that will take advantage of this opportunity, especially if they find that the Scott Act is in force, and that hotels and saloons are closed, to furnish liquor directly to an applicant instead of giving him a certificate. And what check is there? It is not like the case of a hotel, because a hotel is frequented by the public; temperance men go there as well as people who drink, and they see what is going on; but a doctor's office is frequented only by those who wish to consult him professionally, or for the purpose of getting drink. Now, it appears to me this is one of the worst amendments that has been proposed, and will destroy the efficacy of the Act more than anything else that has been done.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the evils apprehended by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down are not likely to occur at all. There is no medical man who wishes to keep liquor in his practice if he can do without it.

Mr. DAVIES. There are plenty of them.

Mr. SPROULE. My impetuous friend may know more about raising "garden sass" than about the practice of medicine, and he is not very well posted in our line. I have been in the profession for seventeen years, practising constantly, and my experience has been that no respectable medical man wants to keep liquor if he can do without it, because it is not profitable. If he has it, he gives it away without taking money for it. Therefore, he is not likely to keep it, and the abuses of which the hon gentleman speaks are not likely to arise. He referred to the fact that where

the Scott Act was in force this privilege has been abused. But it was an abuse in reference to giving prescriptions, and not in furnishing the liquor. Now, you have provided a penalty, and if a medical man furnishes liquor, except for strictly medicinal purposes, let him be punished for it, but certainly allow him to give it where the necessity of his profession demands it. I can only say that in my section of the country, where I have associated with a great number of medical men, it is a very rare exception indeed that one of them keeps liquor at all, although they keep and sell their own drugs, in many cases. But they do not keep liquor, except they are compelled to, either for the purpose of getting the pure article or for the purpose of having it by them in case they are obliged to take a long journey. Then I may say, you are quite willing to entrust temperance men with the right to give prescriptions, yet you are not willing to trust physicians with the right to use it as a drug in their own practice. I think that is not reasonable, because if there is any guarantee to the right use in the one case, there must be an equal guarantee in the other.

Mr. IRVINE. I had the honor, last year, of stating, in reference to the passage of the McCarthy Act, that this country had made a sad retrograde movement; that there was a time in the history of this country when we had a Government that was a pride to Canada, a Government which placed on the Statute Book an Act which is a credit to the country to-day, an Act which was framed honestly and in good faith, an Act which resisted all the assaults of its enemies, instigated by the present Government of this country. We have to-day, Sir, a scene in this House which is disgraceful to the Canadian people, which is a stigma upon the Canadian people. We have to-day a Government sitting in the place of those who placed the Canada Temperance Act upon our Statute Book; we have gentlemen sitting in their place to-day who, by the most covert and cowardly attacks——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. You must withdraw that expression.

Mr. IRVINE. All right, Sir, I withdraw it. But it is true, nevertheless; we have had an exhibition which is a disgrace to the Canadian people, and I, as a member of the Canadian Parliament, feel sorely over the matter. The Dominion Alliance is a body which deserves public respect; it is a representative body, that does not represent the drunkards that come from the gutters and slums of the cities, but which represents the religious element, led by the clergymen, and representing the men who have built the churches and chapels and school houses and educational institutions. I feel proud to belong to that little band, and that I do not support a Government which has forfeited all the confidence ever reposed in them by the temperance people. They are not representatives of the temperance element of the country. Temperance men will be long in forgetting the manner in which they have been treated. When they approached the Government they asked them to do—what? To do what they have done? They destroyed the Temperance Act by an Act of their own. The Alliance simply asked to amend the Act, by allowing it to remain as it was before the Government Act was passed. What have they done? They have placed their unrighteous hand on the Temperance Act and destroyed its principle. Hon. gentlemen opposite can now do as they please with that Act; it is their Act and it is now under their own control. All that there was in the Act is now taken out. I feel sorely over this matter and depressed. As a member of the Alliance, I, with others, sought the interference of the Government in order to save the Act. Although I did not go with the Committee to wait on the Government—I refused to do so—I was led to understand that the First Minister said that the Act ought to be amended and made workable. We did not want them to do anything except to place the Act as it came out of the hands of the Liberal Government. Instead of doing that, they have taken it on themselves to destroy it. Let hon. gentlemen opposite now lay the unction to their souls, that they have destroyed the whole principle of the Act. Nothing is left that we care for. I do not care much for the matter myself; I do not desire to say anything derogatory to hon. members of this House; but I am sorry the Act was not amended as we desired, and that the Government have undertaken to destroy it.

Mr. DAVIES. I am satisfied that some hon. members who voted in the last division did not thoroughly understand the meaning of the amendment. The language is so crude and vague that it does not convey any meaning and will not carry out the views expressed by the mover. It says: "Provided that nothing hereafter contained shall interfere with the rights and privileges of medical men in the use of alcoholic liquors when required for medical purposes." That means nothing. The object of the hon. gentleman, if I understood him rightly, was to permit medical men to sell liquors at their dispensaries. That object is not attained by this amendment. It does not allow them to sell—I do not know what it allows them to do, but certainly not to sell. Some hon. members were of the opinion that medical men should be allowed to use liquor as a drug, in combination with other drugs, when they dispense medicine. That is not attained by this amendment to the Bill. To hon. members who are desirous of allowing alcohol to be used as a drug, it will not be so objectionable, as it is now an amendment intended to allow the sale of liquors by doctors it will convert every dispensary into a tap-room. A doctor would be allowed to sell all the brandy, wine and liquors he chose. I should much prefer that the selling of wines and liquors be left in the hands of respectable tavern keepers. To place it in the hands of unlicensed men, although gentlemen of honor and standing, would be to give them exclusive power over the sale of an article in which there is a large amount of money to be made. It would pay them to give up their profession and become simply vendors of liquors; and that would be the case in some of the country districts.

Mr. HICKEY. Probably my amendment was not worded as it might have been, in order to express fully what I should have liked to have expressed by it. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) raised the objection that some medical men were so mean that they would become dispensers of whiskey by the glass. If there is a medical man in this Dominion who is mean enough to retail liquor from his office, as the hon. gentleman described, that professional man is mean enough to give certificates to enable people to procure the drug.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a check provided.

Mr. HICKEY. There is no check. It is a very easy matter to prescribe, and say that you think such a man wants a pint or two pints of brandy. It is left to the professional man to decide whether the individual requires it or not. A dishonorable man cannot be controlled by any law.

Mr. CASEY. I think the hon. member for Kent, N.B. (Mr. Landry) has hit upon the weak point in the proposed amendment. Granting that medical men are far above the average in honor and respectability, I do not think this House desires to give them, or any other class, not even clergymen, the right of prescribing liquor without some record of that prescription being kept. We have authorised clergymen, in some special cases, to give certificates to enable people to procure liquor. The law already authorises doctors to give such certificates. In both cases a record is kept. That is a check on the granting of certificates for liquor, and it has been found to act in the case of Halton. There were some cases of fraudulent pre-

scribing in that county, but the facts were published and a return was submitted to Parliament, and the remedy has been very effective. The reputation of a doctor who persisted in issuing such certificates unnecessarily would be inevitably destroyed by the record. But this amendment proposes that instead of prescribing liquor, of which a record is kept, the medical man may give it in practice at his own office, without the knowledge of anyone. As the law now stands, the action of any doctor in prescribing liquor is a public act, which may be known and probably will be known to the whole community. There is the check of publicity, which is the greatest check that can be imposed on any man. If he fraudulently prescribes liquor publicly the act will be found out, but if he does it in the privacy of his own office it will not be found out, and I do not think it is the intention of the House to give any person the opportunity of retailing liquor for any purpose, without the check of publicity upon his actions. With the utmost respect for the medical profession, I think we should not give them any more license in this matter than to the clerical profession, for instance, upon whom we have imposed a check of publicity, when, under certain circumstances, they are allowed to prescribe liquor.

Mr. JENKINS. I see no force whatever in the argument of the hon. member for Kent, because if a medical man is inclined to sell liquor by the glass he can do so now, and there is nothing to prevent him from supplying himself with any quantity; but, under the amendment, he would be under the control of the law and subject himself to its penalties. As my hon. colleague has said, the amendment does not enable the medical man to sell liquor by the glass; there is nothing whatever which enables him to sell it by the glass or in any quantity. I feel sure that this amendment can do no harm, even if it can do no good. I do not think it is called for, but I do not think it can do any harm.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). With reference to what has been said with regard to this amendment, I do not understand, as the hon. member for Queen's has said, that it authorises medical men to sell liquor for ordinary beverage purposes in any form at all. I think there might be a great question whether we would have the power here to interfere in any way with a medical man having liquor in his possession, to be used in the preparation of his ordinary medicines, and the dispensing of them in the ordinary way. For my own part, if I believed that the effect of this amendment was to give medical men the right to sell liquor, simply as liquor, I should be very much opposed to it, for the simple reason that apart from the argument used by the hon. member for Kent, that there is no record kept—there is the other argument, that if a medical man had a direct pecuniary interest in the sale of liquor which he was permitted to keep, it might induce him to give a great deal more than was at all necessary, even for ordinary purposes. But I do not understand that medical men, in the practice of their profession, now sell spirituous liquors or wines for purposes of that kind. If, for instance, a medical man recommends his patient to take a glass of port wine or a glass of ale at his meals every day, for a while, I do not understand that he prescribes and furnishes it out of his dispensary, even when he is in the habit of dispensing himself. In that case the patient or his friends simply go to the ordinary place where he can purchase it, and if the resolutions were adopted that same course would have to be pursued. The object simply is, that the medical men may have liquor to be used in the preparation of their medicines, and may prescribe it in that sense, and that sense only, to their patients. That is as I understand the meaning of the amendment, and if I thought it went so far as to enable them to keep it themselves in quantity, with the view of selling it in its form as a beverage, I would oppose it.

Mr. CASEY.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it is quite clear that under the law as it stands the medical man is entitled to have, as he should have, the power of having in his possession and selling, in compound with such drugs as prevent it from being used as a beverage, alcoholic liquor. The provision of the Act is that no person shall expose or keep for sale any spirituous or intoxicating liquor, or any mixed liquor capable of being used as a beverage. Now, in the original discussion of this matter, when the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey) first proposed it, that was the difficulty which was started by him and the hon. member for Grey.

Mr. SPROULE. Part of it.

Mr. BLAKE. That was the original part; afterwards we got at a little more, but I will take the part first, as I do not propose to take the compound now. The first thing was the compounding. He pointed to ipecac wine and to antimonial wines, and said he felt scruples and difficulties as to whether he would be able to sell these wines under the law as it stood. I say that these compounds, although containing some alcoholic liquor in them, are not capable of being used as a beverage, and that settles that point. Then a little later we got to the point of alcoholic liquor without compound, which is capable of being used as a beverage, and is sometimes, I suspect, prescribed, as is the case of a man who is unfortunately addicted to liquor, who goes on a spree, and wants something to taper off, I think they call it; he may be on the verge of *delirium tremens*, and it is necessary to give him a little liquor to steady his nerves, and so on. There is that class of cases, and others, in which intoxicating liquors, in the form in which they are capable of being used as beverages, may be, and are—I presume, perfectly honestly—prescribed by medical men. Those cases are provided for by the Canada Temperance Act in the 4th sub-section, of the 99th section, which provides that the sale of intoxicating liquor for exclusively medicinal purposes shall be lawful only by such druggists——

Mr. SPROULE. But not by the medical man himself.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not say by the medical men. Only for medicinal purposes. It is to be, in the first place, removed from the premises, so that the druggist is not able even to fill a prescription which is to be drunk on the premises; and in the second place, it is to be made only on the prescription or certificate of a medical man, having no interest in the sale by the druggist or vendor, affirming that the liquor has been prescribed by the person named. You are to have a prescription from a medical man, which is a certificate, who has to affirm that he has prescribed that intoxicating liquor for use. Then, the druggist or the licensed vendor may sell, but he may not sell under any arrangement under which the medical man, who has prescribed it is interested in the sale. Now, we know that the ordinary arrangement is—I do not think it is a very judicious arrangement—that a certain commission is payable by the druggist to the medical man who prescribes; some 20 or 25 per cent. of the price which the patient pays for the prescription is really the property of the medical man, and it was in view of that custom of the profession, I presume, that this clause was inserted, that prevents the medical man from having an interest in this particular class of prescription. Now, you retain that in your law. It is not proposed by the hon. member for Dundas to eliminate that clause, so that a medical man now gives a prescription for intoxicating liquor to be used as a medicine—he gives a certificate which is in effect a prescription—the patient goes to the druggist and the medical man will not get his customary profit or share out of the particular prescription under this law. And while you retain that, and retain, therefore, the affirmation that it is necessary to prevent medical men from being subject to the temptation which would exist

if he had a profit in the sale of the intoxicating drink which he prescribes—while, I say, you retain that, and insist that that is the law, you allow the medical man to prescribe it and dispense it himself, and take the whole profit. Now, I say these two things are inconsistent. It would be very much better to allow the medical man to take the profit of the prescription when it is dispensed by the druggist or licensed vendor, with all those precautions as to publicity, as to written prescriptions, and as to the printed record, as in the case of Halton, of the prescriptions the medical men gave; but, you retain that provision that prevents the medical man getting a profit out of the prescription, because you say that would be too great a temptation; therefore, he shall not have the profit of 25 per cent., but he may prescribe it himself, and have the whole profit. I think the Act will be inconsistent in itself, if the hon. gentleman's amendment is endrafted upon it with this clause in it. I think we had better strike out the provision that the medical man shall have no interest in the sale by the druggist or licensed vendor, and we shall remove the temptation from him to sell it in order to get the profit that he is prevented from getting under this Act. I am afraid that this proposed amendment will produce consequences very much more serious than many hon. gentlemen suppose. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) said he supposed physicians ordinarily prescribed: Oh, you take a glass of port at luncheon, or something of that kind—well, they do not drink much port wine in the country and they do not have luncheon—and, he says, the patient goes and buys it at the store. But under the Act the patient cannot buy it at the store. He has to get it from the druggist or the licensed vendor, and therefore that convenient method of complying with the medical man's advice does not exist in the country districts where the Act is in force. There are those precautions which surround the use of liquor as a drug. I think they were wisely put in the original Act, and I think they will be rendered more than useless by the amendment before the committee; and if we pass it, we had better strike out the profit for the medical man, so as not to subject him to the additional temptation, by saying to him, if you prescribe and dispense you may have the whole, but if you prescribe only, you shall not have the customary share in the profit.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville.) I think the hon. gentleman is overstating the object sought by this amendment. In voting for the amendment, I do so, not that the medical man might derive a profit from the handling or retailing of liquor, but simply that he might be allowed to have a small quantity of alcohol in his medicine chest or saddle bags, to be prescribed to patients in extreme cases. The other object is that they may be able to retain alcohol in their office to use in the preparation of drugs, as medical men have to do when they have to keep a stock prepared for immediate use. I know that most medical men do not now prescribe, and the object is simply to allow them to have a small quantity of alcohol in their offices, in its original form, for that purpose, and that only; and I entirely repudiate the statement that medical men have any desire whatever to participate in the profit derived from the sale of liquors. I say it is a contemptible position to place them in.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I think medical men have a perfect right under the law to use all drugs which are included in our *Materia Medica;* and I find that in our *Materia Medica* we have brandy, rum and wine, all of which we can now keep on our shelves, in spite of the Scott Act or any other Act.

Mr. SPROULE. Under what law?

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Under the Nova Scotia Act; and I think you can do the same thing if it is included in your *Materia Medica*, just as you can keep antimony wine or spirituous drugs.

Mr. HICKEY. The hon. member for West Durham properly stated a great deal of the case, but what he stated as to physicians participating in the profits of druggists is the exception. First-class druggists and physicians do not do that business. For myself, not speaking egotistically, I never received 10 cents from that source in my practice in my life; and I think that is the rule amongst good druggists and physicians throughout the country.

Mr. SPROULE. I would just like to say a few words on the discussion which took place on this Bill last week. The leader of the Opposition said it arose as to the power of a medical man to mix medicines. That was not my intention, and if I failed to make myself understood by the House I shall try to do so now. I have at present in my mind an instance in which two medical men practised in a village where there is no drug store. Each of these men keeps his own drugs. They are obliged to keep sherry wine to make certain preparations and alcohol to make their tinctures; and I said that as there was no drug store within ten or twelve miles, they would have to keep liquor, to attend to that part of their business.

Mr. BLAKE. They have that right.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, suppose a patient is weak and I prescribe 8 ounces of port wine to be given to him, and I direct that a dessert spoonful be given to him every time he shows a disposition to faint, if I received any remuneration for that, I could not dispense it. The hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) says that they have power under the Pharmacy Act in Nova Scotia. We, in Ontario, have not such power, because the provision in the Pharmacy Act was made part of the McCarthy Act, but it is not in the Scott Act. I take the case of two townships; on the west side there is a large village, in which there is a drug store, and on the east side there is a large village, in which there is a drug store, the intervening space being 24 miles. At the centre two medical men are situated; but there is no drug store there, no chance of their getting medicine in the practice of their profession, unless they send prescriptions a distance of 12 miles. It is to meet such cases that I propose this amendment; not for the purpose of allowing medical men to compound medicines, but when they are away at a distance from the drug store where they get their medicines prepared, they should be allowed to keep alcohol on hand, so as to make up their prescriptions.

Mr. BLAKE. The law does not prevent that.

Mr. SPROULE. It prevents their dispensing it.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. SPROULE. How is the medical man to get it from the druggist? The druggist has not the right to sell it to the medical man, except for manufacturing purposes, under the certificate of two justices of the peace, and, in addition to that, on a certificate that it is to be used for manufacturing purposes. The first clause of section 99 of the Canada Temperance Act does not allow any person, medical man or others, to sell it. If a doctor applies to a wholesale man, he can only get it in 10 gallons; and then he has to make the affirmation that it is to be used, not for medicinal purposes, but for manufacturing purposes; and after having made that affirmation, he cannot dispense it in his own office. Hon. gentlemen who argue against this amendment assume that it is for the purpose of violating the law and making a profit. They argue on false premises entirely. It is only introduced because medical men need the alcohol to carry out the practice of their profession, under certain circumstances, when remote from drug stores.

Mr. FAIRBANK. It was fully understood that the proposed legislation of this House on the Temperance

Act would be simply with the object of removing the obstacles that arose in putting into operation the present law, and thus enable the various municipalities that have adopted the Temperance Act to give it a fair trial. While very few counties had adopted this Act, it was allowed to stand as it was. During the past year, however, a great number have adopted it; and Parliament, by its action to-night, proceeds to impair that Act, so that those municipalities that have passed it will find that they are going to work, not under the original Act, but under one considerably amended and impaired. Ever since the House opened we have been flooded with petitions praying that the Temperance Act may not be impaired. Are we to pay no attention to those petitions? and to the vast majority that have declared in favor of this Act? It is well known that many medical men in their practice do not find it necessary to use alcoholic liquors at all; and where stimulants are required, they resort to others, which they prepare and which they say have no reaction. The largest institution in Ontario to-day, the insane asylum in London, excludes alcoholic liquors from its use altogether I will not say that any considerable number of medical men are in danger of abusing its use, but we do know that there is danger. We are justified in contending that there will be instances, should this amendment become law, when medical men will impair the working of that Act and also impair the standing of the medical profession, and it is not in the interest of the medical profession that a doubt should be cast upon it in this direction. I sincerely trust that these municipalities that have adopted this Act will be allowed to give it a fair trial, without being hampered with any such amendment as this.

Mr. BOURBEAU. I think this amendment has not been well defined. I understood it to say that the doctors would not have the right to sell any liquors at all. It ought to be well defined, and I am glad an hon. gentleman is going to present a motion in amendment.

Mr. ALLEN. There has never been a question before Parliament in which the expression of public sentiment has been so strongly shown as on this temperance question. The desire of the country is that no amendment should be made to the Temperance Act, except in the direction of greater prohibition. In the amendment that has been made to-night, to destroy the Act, I hope there will be half a dozen more amendments, which will utterly prevent its working and place the Scott Act in such a position that it will be perfectly useless. By that means we will place a lever in the hands of the temperance people, which will bring round prohibition quicker than anything else in Canada.

Mr. McCARTHY. I propose, to meet the views of the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey), that the following words be added:—

Provided always, that duly licensed medical practitoners may dispense intoxicating liquor exclusively for medicinal purposes; but it shall be the duty of every such practitioner to keep a register of such prescriptions and the names of those for whom they are prescribed, and make an annual return of all such prescriptions on the 31st December of every year, to the collector of Inland Revenue, within whose division he resides.

Mr. SCRIVER. If that is carried, we will have to alter the Act further. The effect of that would be to render it unnecessary to give the power to druggists to dispense medicine. It would place it in the hands of medical men and give them the profit which it was intended druggists should have. The end the hon. gentleman has in view would not be reached by the amendment.

Mr. FOSTER. I can give an instance of what may be, and probably will be. There is, in a county to which I am not a stranger, but which I am not going to name here, where formerely intoxicating liquors were sold, but where now the Scott Act is in force, a certain place where there were taverns which are now closed up, and where there is a doctor who has but little practice and less principle, and who keeps a small drug shop. As the Act stands now, we have some chance to get at him if he should violate it; but if this amendment is passed he can keep his stock of liquor, and any person who comes in and complains of a pain in his toe will get as much brandy as he wants, and this doctor, who has not enough practice to keep him alive, will make a living out of the proceeds of the liquor he sells. That will be done over and over again, and this House ought to pause before passing this amendment. It cannot be passed, in the face of all the petitions we have received this year.

Mr. GILLMOR. I have always been extremely anxious that this Act should be made as nearly perfect as possible, so that it may have a fair trial. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) repeated, some ten or eleven times, that no medical man would take advantage of his position to sell liquor. Now, the Scott Act has been in operation in the village where I reside for some years, and really a great deal of the trouble we have had in the enforcement of the Act, is in consequence of the action some medical men have taken. That is why I dispute some of the assertions the hon. gentleman has made. Much of the difficulty we have experienced has arisen on account of the conduct of some medical men, who will sell prescriptions at 25 cents each, making a business of it, so that every body who wanted liquor could get it by buying these prescriptions. I am persuaded you will injure the Act very much if you allow medical men to keep liquor and dispense it. Now, it is not only druggists, who are appointed under the Scott Act, but the commissioners appointed by the McCarthy Act appoint vendors who are not druggists. There is in the village where I reside one or two now appointed besides the druggists. The hon. member for Grey says there are only two drug stores in two counties in Ontario and they are twenty-four miles apart; that can be remedied by appointing vendors at convenient points where liquor can be procured, and there is no need for the physicians to become rum-sellers themselves. I think it will be very much to be regretted if this amendment becomes law. I think it will be taken advantage of. I am somewhat familiar with professional men, and they are just about like other men. I do not think the are any freer from vices of that kind than other men. But I do say it will be most unfortunate if we pass this amendment, because I am satisfied that some of them will have no hesitation, if they are allowed by law to keep liquor in their stores, to dispense it for other than medicinal purposes. I think it will just about destroy the Act—that is my impression. Let us give that Act a fair trial. The people are determined that it shall have a fair trial, and I think the quicker we can give them a perfect law the better. Let them try and carry it out, and see what they can make of it, and then if it proves a failure it can be repealed. But until that is done, they will not be satisfied.

Mr. WILSON. The chief argument urged in support of this amendment is that the medical profession deem it in their interest, as practitioners, that they should be permitted to keep liquor in their drug stores, or in their offices, in an unlimited quantity. Now, I believe it is the general practice at the present time, in various parts of the country, to use much less liquor in the medical profession than formerly. I believe it is very seldom that any medical practitioner finds it necessary to use spirituous liquors; and, in fact, I believe that the statements made here this evening, as to the absolute necessity of having some alcoholic liquors at hand in case of an emergency, are unfounded assertions on the part of those who made them. The general public would fare much better at the hands of the doctors if

they would use less spirits than they have heretofore done. I believe no constitution is benefited by alcoholic liquor, but, on the contrary, that every person who uses it, even in moderate doses, is more or less injured by it. What do we find some medical gentlemen here this evening saying? That if a person has fainting spells, a wine-glass or dessert spoonful of wine, when taken often, will overcome it. I am not surprised in the least if a doctor gives a patient a table-spoonful or dessert spoonful of wine every few minutes, that patient should have very frequent fainting spells. It is known, if you go beyond a certain extent, spirituous liquors of any description produce a depression rather than a stimulation, and, therefore, they are not required. I shall regret exceedingly if medical men are permitted to use any amount of liquors that they choose, and be compelled merely to make an annual return of the quantity of liquor disposed of, and the purposes for which it is used. Is there any check, is there any hindrance, to a medical man using any amount he pleases? Is there any difficulty in a doctor certifying that he gave A or B a wine-glass full of wine, brandy, gin, or rum? He can easily do so and not violate the law at all. I think the last amendment proposed would have a very pernicious and injurious effect, not only upon the Scott Act, but upon the general public, and I hope those who have any respect for the temperance Act will vote that amendment down. It has also been stated that it is necessary for a medical man to keep spirits in the office in order to make up tinctures. Mr. Chairman, I believe that 99 out of every 100 ounces of tincture are prepared efficiently by druggists, and there are very few cases in any part of the country where it is necessary that a medical man should keep spirits in his office for the purpose of preparing tinctures. I cannot conceive any difficulty in the proposition of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), that perhaps one man might be licensed to dispose of liquors and another refused. It would be a great hardship, in his opinion, if a patient could not obtain a certificate for his spirits. But I do not think any of the difficulties of which he is so apprehensive would arise. It would be very easy for the patient to take other stimulants, that would do him much more good than spirituous liquors. Therefore, I hope, in the interests of the general public, in the interest of the morality of the people, and in the interest, not only of the Scott Act, but of the welfare of the human race, we shall not see placed in the hands of the medical profession the privilege of dealing out intoxicating liquors in quantities such as this amendment would allow them to do.

Mr. McCRANEY. I cannot allow this motion to pass without entering my solemn protest against it. I look upon it as one of the most dangerous amendments that have been presented to this House. In the county I have the honor to represent we have had an experience in this matter that few other counties have had. I can see very clearly that great difficulty will arise if this amendment is allowed to pass. I know that the large majority of the physicians are honorable men, but, unfortunately, there are in every constituency a few men who use liquor themselves; and in my own county I know there are those who have declared that they would do everything in their power to destroy the efficiency of the Scott Act. This amendment would allow them to keep liquor and to open, not unfrequently, private bar-rooms. I trust that this House will vote down this amendment, for it is certainly one of the most dangerous that has yet been presented to us.

Mr. PLATT. There seems to be, on the part of many, a strong objection to the amendment proposed, and unless there can be something said to show the necessity of it, I think the House will be justified in refusing to grant it. I have listened to the discussion and to the arguments used by the promoters of the amendment; but I fail to see that, as last read, it gives any advantage or any power to the physician which he does not now possess, except the power to dispense of intoxicating liquors. That, Sir, I think is a power that, so far as I know, the medical profession of this country have not asked to have conferred upon them. It is a power which I do not believe they wish to exercise; and it is a power they do not need in their professional capacity, and for that reason I shall vote against the amendment.

Mr. BOURBEAU. When the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey) made his motion, I understood that it gave the doctor a right to keep liquor in his house for the sole purpose of mixing his medicines. I voted for it with that understanding, but if it was for any other purpose I would vote against it; but I consider that the motion made by the hon. member for North Simcoe is a great deal worse and should not be accepted by this House, because it will make a doctor a real merchant of all kinds of liquors.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). I understood that the original motion was withdrawn and that this was to take its place.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. LANDRY. It is an amendment to the one proposed?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. If that is the state of things, if this amendment of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), is to be an amendmen to that of the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey), I shall vote for that of the hon. member for North Simcoe in preference to that of the hon. member for Dundas, because it tells plainly what the hon. member for Dundas wants. The hon. member for North Simcoe said: I have put into proper language what the hon. member for Dundas wants. It is an advantage in a Legislature to state plainly what it is proposed to do, and therefore I shall vote for this amendment in preference to that of the hon. member for Dundas, but when it becomes the principal question I shall vote against it.

Mr. LANDRY. I understood that the hon. member for North Simcoe said he did not intend to propose to move this amendment as coming from himself, but as embodying what the others desired, as embodying in proper language that which the others had failed to do. If that be the case, the other motion must necessarily be withdrawn, or the hon. gentleman should withdraw this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I can only put the question as it is before me.

Mr. LANDRY. That is true; but still I think we have the right to know what the question is.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The original motion is moved by Mr. Hickey, and to that Mr. McCarthy moves in amendment. The question is on the amendment moved by Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. SPROULE. As the seconder of the original motion, I understood that, Mr. McCarthy's was to take its place, that it was not to be an amendment, but was to take the place and we were to withdraw the other.

Amendment to the Amendment (Mr. McCarthy) negatived.

Amendment of Mr. Hickey negatived, and Bill reported

On motion for third reading of the Bill,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved in amendment:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House, with instructions that they have power to amend the same by providing that veterinary surgeons, regularly qualified as such, and duly established in practice, may be authorised to grant certificates for intoxicating liquors, to be used as medicine in the practice of their profession.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Lost.

Mr. WHITE. I believe the gentlemen who are in charge of this Bill recognise the importance of this, and are prepared to accept the amendment. I may say that I would have preferred, if the House had not expressed so strong an opinion in the opposite direction, that veterinary surgeons might have been permitted to keep on hand a limited quantity of liquor, for the purposes of their profession, but the opposite opinion of the House was so manifest that I do not think it worth while to take up the time of the House in regard to it. The only question that appears to me to arise is one as to the description of veterinary surgeons. I mentioned, when I was referring to the matter before, that I had a letter from my own constituency in regard to it, and that I wrote to Dr. McEachran, of Montreal, on the subject. The answer I received from the latter was as follows:—

"It is true, that in the practice of veterinary medicine, spirituous liquors are largely used in debilitating disease as diffusible stimulants, in the form of beer, whiskey, alcohol, methylated spirits, etc., and many of the country practitioners prepare their own tinctures. Hence, I believe that an amendment to the Scott Act, making provision for veterinary surgeons, regularly qualified as such and duly established in practice, being permitted to keep a limited quantity of such for their use, is desirable and necessary."

It is quite evident that the House does not agree with Dr. McEachran as to the wisdom of their being permitted to keep a limited quantity on hand, but the precise description of a veterinary surgeon I have copied from his letter. I know it has been suggested that only those who hold certificates from some ordinary college of veterinary surgery should be permitted to grant these certificates, but those colleges are of comparatively recent establishment, and there are, in a good many parts of the country, veterinary surgeons who were veterinary surgeons before the colleges were established, in fact, and I think the words used in Dr. McEachran's letter will amply cover the matter and sufficiently guard it. If the amendment is adopted, we can, when we go into committee, simply add veterinary surgeons to the list of those who are entitled to grant certificates. I also suggest that they be made subject to the penal clause.

Mr. DAVIES. The object of the amendment is, no doubt, to limit it to veterinary surgeons duly qualified under some local law. In some Provinces, and it is so in Prince Edward Island, there is no local law on the subject.

Mr. CASEY. There is a very important difference between the case of the veterinary surgeon and that of the doctor. In the case of the doctor's prescription it is pretty certain that the liquor will be drunk by the patient; whereas, in the case of the veterinary surgeon's prescription, it is not so certain that the beer or spirits will go where it is intended to go. I think it will be absolutely necessary, in all these cases, to have a license inspector go with the owner of the animal and see that the liquor is duly administered to the animal and not drunk, by its owner! This is sufficient to show the absurdity, under a prohibitive system, of allowing veterinary surgeons to prescribe liquor. I do not suppose there is any objection to allowing veterinary surgeons to use tinctures for animals; but to allow them to issue certificates for intoxicating beverages for an animal, which liquors might be drunk and relished by the owner, would be simply to do away with the law entirely. As I heard a gentleman remark privately here: If this amendment passes, every drunkard in the country will keep a cow, and that cow will be very sickly!

Mr. JAMIESON. I think if the amendment is to be accepted it must be simplified in some way, because it is now entirely too wide and general in its terms. The provision will have to be confined to veterinary surgeons holding diplomas for some recognised veterinary college, because I believe there are a great many veterinary surgeons established in practice who do not hold diplomas. In Ontario, I believe, notwithstanding the fact that we have a veterinary college, and those holding diplomas are protected by law, there is no law on the Statute Book providing that a man shall not practice as a veterinary surgeon so long as he does not hold himself up before the public as a licensed veterinary surgeon, when he is not. It may be possible to insert some provision in this Bill with a view to meeting the case of veterinary surgeons; but the clause must be much more restricted than that at present proposed.

Mr. BLAKE. The practical result of this proposition would be that a man would go to a veterinary surgeon and say: My cow is sick and I want a prescription. The veterinary surgeon with perfect honesty, would accept the statement. He would not require that the sick cow should be brought to see him, and he would not require that he should be driven over to see the cow. You know what would happen. The liquor would not reach the cow.

Mr. IVES. The same argument applies to a prescription by a physician for a member of a man's family. A man goes to a physician and says: A member of my family is ill. The doctor does not drive ten miles to see the individual and ascertain whether he is really sick or not. He takes the man's word for it, and gives him a prescription. Who is to know whether the man carries the liquor to the sick person or whether he drinks it himself?

Mr. FAIRBANK. We have already doubled the number of persons who can prescribe intoxicating liquors. We now propose making another addition. If the amendment before us passes, the number of cows in the country troubled with hollow heart will surprise us, and in the end we shall find that so many prescriptions will be given by the various parties from whom they can be obtained that after a time it will be said: Look at the quantity of liquor that is used; you are consuming as much under the Scott Act as you did before.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). I feel that the remarks of the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) cannot be allowed to pass, as they are calculated to reflect on the medical profession. I do not know how prescriptions are given by medical men in the neighborhood to which the hon. gentleman belongs. I can assure him that in my portion of Ontario medical men do not take the responsibility of writing prescriptions for liquors for a man, unless he knows that the man actually requires them. I wish the hon. gentleman to understand that that remark with regard to the profession does not apply especially to Ontario. With reference to the amendment under consideration, it is somewhat anomalous in expression. The law requires that those who prescribe for the human animal, those who prescribe for a man's child or his wife, shall have a certain legal status, and I think it is nothing but reasonable that veterinary surgeons should have some legal status before prescribing for animals. If you allow the door to be opened, and allow men without license the right to prescribe for sick cows, you will find that there will not only be a great many sick cows, but also sick calves, and every man in the country who can tell a cow from a sheep will be a veterinary surgeon.

Mr. IVES. I wish to make a personal explanation. I did not undertake to say that medical men in Ontario, and particularly in that blessed part of Ontario which the hon. represents, would knowingly or willfully give such prescriptions where they should not be given. What I said was, that medical men might be called upon, as frequently they have been called upon, to give liquor to a man—not because he was sick, but because some member of his family was sick, who might be ten or twenty miles away, and I said the law made no provision for paying the doctor's expenses in going to see if this particular member of the family was sick or not, and that it was the practice in Ontario to give the liquor on the faith of the statement made by

the individual in such a case. I say that the same objection applied by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) to the case of a sick cow, would apply in the case of a sick child.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I wish to make a remark or two before the motion is put. I notice there is a disposition to treat the whole matter as if it were a good joke; but it is well to bear in mind, in this connection, the old adage, that a merciful man is merciful to his beast. We know, and we have the best authority for stating, that liquor is used in certain cases by veterinary surgeons, and must, in certain cases, be dispensed by them in the treatment of animals. That fact we know—there is no question about it. Another fact we know is, that under the law as it exists there is no person who can obtain liquor to be used for that purpose. Now, it seems to me, though it may be very amusing to refer to sick horses and sick cows and calves, that we are dealing with a very serious question, and one, I think, that is worthy the serious consideration of the House. If there is a disposition to restrict the amendment in any way, I have no desire to interfere with that idea. My only difficulty about restricting it is, that I know there are a large number of veterinary surgeons—and the remark does not apply only to my own constituency, but to many others, so that I have no personal interest in the matter—there are a great many veterinary surgeons who have long been in practice, who are respectable men in their neighborhoods; who were veterinary surgeons before these colleges became so numerous and influential, and so generally attended as happily they are at this moment. When you find that the practice of veterinary surgery has become so important that now there are colleges, such as the one in Toronto, attended by 200 students, and the one in Montreal, which is also largely attended—I do not know how the matter stands in the other Provinces—but I say that the members of a profession which has secured for itself an actual status in the country to the extent that this profession has, is entitled, it seems to me, to be able to obtain, in an Act of this kind, that which all parties admit is absolutely necessary in the practice of their profession. Now, what is to be done, what particular restrictive words are to be used, in order to prevent the abuse of such a provision, is a matter for the House to consider in committee, if we go into committee; but as I understand the question now before the House, it is rather the question of permitting veterinary surgeons to give certificates for the use of intoxicating liquors to be used in the practice of their profession. If it is determined to restrict the amendment, so that it shall only apply to veterinary surgeons who have a diploma from a college, then it will be better to have it that way than not at all; but it does seem to me that if intoxicating liquors must be used by these gentlemen in the practice of their profession, and there is no provision of the law by which they may obtain it, such a clause should be put in the Act. I do not think that those gentlemen who are in favor of the Bill acted quite fairly to me when, as I understood, they concurred in and accepted this amendment. If they had raised the objection at that time, we might have sat down and agreed to some other form of words, but to raise the objection now, because some hon. gentleman who usually acts with them thought proper to treat the matter as a practical joke, is hardly, I think, treating an hon. member fairly. The point I wish to put forward is to give veterinary surgeons, to whom liquor is as much a necessity in the practice of their profession as it is in the practice of the medical profession, an opportunity of using it in that way.

Mr. AUGER. The Scott Act has been passed in several counties of the Dominion. It has been discussed in several ways, but we have never heard of the necessity of any provision of this kind. In Quebec we have had a local prohibition law for years, and this want has not been felt; there have been no petitions from any class of persons, from these horse or cow doctors, or anyone else, asking for such a law. Now, there may be some cases where liquor is used in doctoring cattle, but I have seen an old man who kept horses for racing, and I have seen him take the bottle and let the horse smell it after a race, but he drank all the whiskey himself.

Mr. JACKSON. I have owned a large number of horses in lumbering for many years, having used from forty to a hundred horses for each winter, and I have veterinary surgeons, or men who profess to know considerable about horses, looking after them, and to my knowledge I have never had any liquor in connection with the feeding of horses. I had one in Michigan last winter, and he uses drugs but no liquor. As far as my experience goes, I do not think it is necessary, and I have had experience with a great many horses.

Mr. CHARLTON. I can corroborate what the hon. gentleman at my right (Mr. Jackson) says. I presume I have had thousands of horses in use, and I have never used an ounce of liquor, and I do not believe it is necessary. I believe if this amendment passes it will open the door for great abuses in the sale of liquor.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentlemen who have just spoken have given us unprofessional opinions about a matter as to which they are not supposed to know. I can say, from my experience, as one who has been either a partner in or the owner of a drug store for a number of years, that I have put up hundreds of prescriptions for veterinary surgeons, and that liquor has been part of the ingredients.

Mr. BLAKE. Part?

Mr. SPROULE. The prescription is put up in a quart of beer or some gin. Now, the graduates of the veterinary college at Toronto are taught that it is necessary to use liquor, and they do use it; and if they do, how can they get it? Some gentlemen say: We have the Scott Act in force in our county, and we do not feel the want of this. If there are any veterinary surgeons in such counties, and they have been using liquor, they have only been breaking the Scott Act. What I say is, make the Scott Act so that it can be observed. Veterinary surgeons will do as they have done in the past—prescribe liquor for animals in certain cases.

Mr. McCRANEY. I was not aware that the friends of the Scott Act had accepted this amendment, or were likely to accept it. I consider that it is a very dangerous one, and I am not aware that the veterinary surgeons have asked for this privilege. The more widely you extend the privilege of granting these certificates the more difficult it is to carry out the law. I consider that it is very unfair to the Scott Act people of this country to pass a law, and then by various amendments to make it difficult to carry it out. It should be the duty of this House, if we are going to have the enforcing machinery of this law, to make that machinery the very best kind possible. Let us give the Act a fair trial, and not try to mutilate it, as has been done this evening. I shall oppose the amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. The question, I suppose, really is whether intoxicating liquor is required for the use of sick animals. I do not think there is any doubt at all that it is very extensively used, and we have the testimony of Dr. McEachran that it is properly used for that purpose. If an animal is ill, how is a farmer to get it? He must either keep a stock on hand—because there is nothing in the Scott Act to prevent him keeping a stock, if it is more than ten gallons—or have some means of getting it in small quantities, from time to time, in case of necessity. I would suggest to my hon. friend whether it would not be better to provide for a certificate by a justice of the peace, as in the case of arts and manufactures, than to drive the farmer, who

perhaps knows as much as the veterinary surgeon, to go and get it from him. That may be avoided by allowing him to obtain a certificate on making a declaration before a justice of the peace. If the farmer finds it necessary to have it, he ought not to be compelled to keep it in quantities, which certainly would not be a promotion of temperance.

Mr. McCRANEY. I have kept hundreds of horses, and have employed veterinary surgeons, and I have never known a quart of liquor to be used.

House divided on amendment of Mr. White (Cardwell). p. 1059.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Dupont,	McNeill,
Baker (Victoria),	Gagné,	Pope,
Benson,	Gault,	Pruyn,
Blondeau,	Gigault,	Rinfret,
Bourbeau,	Grandbois,	Royal,
Bryson,	Guilbault,	Rykert,
Caron,	Hay,	Small,
Curran,	Hickey,	Sproule,
Dawson,	Ives,	Taschereau,
De St. Georges,	Jenkins,	Tassé,
Desaulniers(St. Maurice)	Landerkin,	White (Cardwell),
Desjardins,	Lesage,	Wigle,
Dugas,	McCarthy,	Wood (Brockville).—39.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Geoffrion,	Mitchell,
Auger,	Gillmor,	Montplaisir,
Bain (Wentworth),	Girouard,	Mulock,
Beaty,	Gordon,	Paterson (Brant),
Bell,	Hackett,	Platt,
Blake,	Harley,	Ray,
Bourassa,	Hesson,	Reid,
Bowell,	Hilliard,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Burpee,	Holton,	Scriver,
Cameron (Huron),	Homer,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Inverness),	Innes,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Jackson,	Taylor,
Casey,	Jamieson,	Temple,
Charlton,	King,	Townshend,
Cimon,	Kinney,	Trow,
Cochrane,	Kirk,	Vail,
Colby,	Landry (Kent),	Wallace (Albert),
Cook,	Langelier,	Wallace (York),
Costigan,	Langevin,	Watson,
Davies,	Lister,	Weldon,
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Livingstone,	Wells,
Dundas,	Macdonald (King's),	White (Hastings),
Fairbank,	McCraney,	White (Renfrew),
Forbes,	McIsaac,	Wilson,
Foster,	McMullen,	Wood (Westm'ld).—78.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) moved:

That the said Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of adding the following section:—

The last paragraph of section 103 of the first above cited Act is hereby repealed, and the following substituted therefor:—In the Province of Prince Edward Island, before the stipendiary magistrate for the city or county town, or before the judge of the county court, for the county in which the offence was committed.

Sections 104, 108, 109 and 111 of the first above cited Act are hereby amended by adding after the words, "judge of sessions of the peace," wheresoever the same occur in the said sections, the words, "judge of the county court."

He said: This amendment applies exclusively to the Province of Prince Edward Island, where actions were permitted under the Act to be brought before justices of the peace, and there was also an appeal allowed from the decisions of the justices of the peace to the Supreme Court, which caused a great deal of litigation, which was very burdensome to all concerned. In order to simplify the matter, it has been thought better to have the Act amended, so that these actions shall be tried before the county judge. We have no stipendiary or county magistrate before whom to bring these cases. This is the sum and substance of the amendment, which I think the House will have no objection to.

Mr. McCARTHY.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not know what my hon. friend's object is in moving this amendment. It seems to me it will not work well. As the law now stands, a suit is brought before a stipendiary magistrate of a city or town. There has never been any objection to that; and in the country districts an action is brought before two magistrates, and I have never heard any objection to that. The hon. gentleman proposes to remove the power to try cases from these magistrates, and vest it in the county court judges. The county court judge has no jurisdiction at all in criminal cases. No actions for statutory offences are brought before him. He tries simply civil actions for breaches of account and contract and actions of tort, and I am quite sure the county court judges would not wish to have, in addition to their present business, this thrust upon them. This would not work. In the hon. gentleman's own county it would defeat the Scott Act, because the county judge does not live there. I suppose the hon. gentleman proposes these cases should go before the clerks of the county court, but even in that case that would involve travelling a distance of seven or eight miles, whereas, as it is now, a summons can be taken out before the nearest magistrate, and justice obtained speedily and cheaply.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's). These amendments have been brought to my notice by people interested in the successful carrying out of the Scott Act. They find it at present complicated, by bringing the matter before a justice of the peace and then having the case appealed to the Supreme Court, so that it takes six months to reach a final decision, and the litigation is very troublesome. With respect to parties bringing suits and having to go to Charlottetown, where the county court judge resides, that might be an oversight on my part which could be amended in committee; but if the suits were brought before the clerk of the county court there would be no hardship, because there are six or seven county court clerks, and the distance to reach any of them is just as short as that to reach a justice of the peace. If the amendment should be made in accordance with the suggestions I have submitted, it would meet the views of the temperance people of the Province.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. GIGAULT. (Translation.) I move in amendment:

That the said Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be recommitted to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to embody therein the provisions of Bill No. 112 of this Session, intituled, "An Act to further amend the Canada Temperance Act, 1878."

The Scott Act was enacted for the purpose of consulting public opinion. As it now stands people can only vote for or against total prohibition, and from the speeches which have been delivered this afternoon it appears that there is a class of voters who earnestly desire to establish a system for which the Scott Act does not provide. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty), in a very able speech, has pointed out the advantages which would result from the prohibition of the sale of alcoholic and distilled liquors, and from a legislation authorising the sale of fermented and vinous liquors only. The amendment I now move is for the purpose of enabling the electors to vote for the prohibition of the sale of alcoholic distilled liquors, other than cider, beer and wine, and would also result in reducing the number of licenses to a smaller number than that which now exists. The evils which are complained of with respect to our license law mostly result from the sale of alcoholic distilled liquors and from the too great number of licenses. The amendment which I now propose would enable a certain class of electors to support by their votes a measure which would be in accordance with their views.

Mr. JAMIESON. It will be utterly impossible for the promotors of this measure to allow all the other temperance

Bills which are upon the Order paper to be sandwiched in, in some shape or other, as has been attempted. I do not know whether the Bill will be recognisable at all after it gets through its third reading, but I am quite sure that if the hon. member's Bill be attached, I will not know my Bill. I think the two Bills are quite incompatible. I trust the hon. member will not press his motion, because it will be utterly impossible to get through with the consideration of the question to-night, and I am sure, if he presses this matter, the Bill will be postponed altogether.

Amendment negatived; and Bill read the third time and passed as "An Act further to amend the 'Canada Temperance Act, 1878,' and 'The Liquor License Act, 1883.'"

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12:20 a.m., Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 14th April, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 125) for the prohibition of spirituous liquors.—(Mr. Beaty.)

EXTRA-MURAL EMPLOYMENT.

Mr. CARON moved:

That the Order for the second reading of Bill (No. 87) an' Act to amend the Act 40 Victoria, Chapter 36, intituled: "An Act to provide for the employment without the walls of common gaols, of prisoners sentenced to imprisonment therein," be placed on the Government Orders.

He said: I may say that the promoter of the Bill is my hon. friend the member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland). The Government saw no objection to the Bill, and as my hon. friend feared that if it remained in his name it might not come up in time to have it dealt with this Session, the Government consented to its transference to the Government Orders.

Motion agreed to.

ENQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. McMULLEN. I drew the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to several returns which have been asked for. He told me that one of them was brought down, but I have made enquiries and I find that we have not yet received the return. The Order was made on the 28th of March, 1884, and was as follows:—

Return showing all sums received by the Department of Marine and Fisheries on account of rental of rivers and streams; also showing sums paid into the Department of Marine and Fisheries on account of fines imposed for violation of the fishery regulations, the return in each case to show amounts so received during years 1882 and 1883, with the date received and the names of depositors, and the date on which such sums were deposited to the credit of the Government.

I also drew his attention to a return of some correspondence between the Auditor General and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries which was ordered on the 9th of March last, as follows:—

Order of the House, for a return of all correspondence between the Auditor General and the Department of Marine and Fisheries relating to an Order of this House made on the 28th March last for a return "showing all sums received by the Department of Marine and Fisheries on account of rental of rivers and streams, etc.," or in any way relating to any irregularity or inaccuracy connected with matters of the said Department.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman mentioned yesterday about some returns, and I stated that I had a recollection of submitting the one with respect to the correspondence with the Auditor General. I would ask him if he has yet found that return?

Mr. McMULLEN. That was in connection with a different matter. This one has reference to correspondence with the Auditor General regarding moneys received for the rental of rivers and streams.

Mr. McLELAN. I will make enquiries.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. IVES. A few days ago, when a very considerable time in this House was being spent daily in listening to the cross-examination of the Administration by the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Blake), with respect to the North-West troubles, I ventured to say that while I would not for a moment belittle the gravity or importance of the situation in the North-West:

"It does seem to me that while the Government should take every means to quell the uprising, Parliament, by devoting so much of its time and giving so much prominence to the matter, may impress the world, and intending immigrants particularly, with a false idea of the position of matters in the North-West. I know, as a matter of fact, that the state of things in the North-West is now being used in St. Paul and by the landed interests of the Northern Pacific Railway as a reason to persuade people that they should not go further than St. Paul, and that immigrants intending to go to Manitoba and the North-West should stop on this side of the boundary. Reports are circulated that the whole country is in a condition of war, and that life and property are in danger north of the boundary line. We are certainly giving some countenance to that by our discussions."

For these words I have been accused by the Toronto *Globe* and by all the minor lights of the Grit press of cold-blooded ness and want of patriotism. The Toronto *Globe*, referring to the matter, says:

"Probably more disgraceful sentiments were never uttered in the Canadian House of Commons, or more utterly contemptible reasoning ever addressed to a Parliament."

Well, I have not had to wait a great while for my vindication. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), appreciating the situation, and like a patriot as he is, seeing his questioning was creating a false impression in the country, and was doing no good, but doing a great deal of harm, immediately left it off; and if I needed any further vindication of the baneful effect of what was going on, I have it in a formal resolution passed by the Manitoba Legislature in the following words:—

"That whereas it is believed that the present troubles in the North-West are affecting immigration to Manitoba, this House desires to place on record the fact that there is not the slightest disturbance in any part of Manitoba; and, as the existing troubles is confined to the districts of Alberta and the Saskatchewan River, some hundreds of miles north-west of the settled portion of Manitoba; therefore all who contemplate coming to Manitoba this spring can do so with the most perfect security."

All that I did say and all that I meant to say was that there was no particular advantage in the country or the House going into hysterics over this matter, and that we could as effectually quell the uprising, by being sensible about it; and why I should have rendered myself obnoxious to the charge of cold-bloodedness and want of patriotism, I do not know; but happily my vindication has not been long in coming.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not propose to enter into the question of the newspaper comments the hon. gentleman refers to; but since he has chosen to enlist me as one of his vindicators, I have to say that I thought one of his observations, which he has not quoted, as to its being of little consequence that 12 or 15 men should be killed——

Mr. IVES. I did not say so, and it is not so reported.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, we will see what he did say. I recollect very well what the hon. gentleman said, and I recollect my answering it. I recollect my hon. friend saying that as much was done every month in the United States, or something of that kind. Here it is:

"Now, we should not forget that with our neighbors in the United States a difficulty on the frontier, or the loss of ten or a dozen lives, is, I won't say of daily, but certainly of monthly occurrence, and it does not create as much excitement there as it does here."

And then at the end he says:

"I think we should leave the matter in the hands of those who are responsible to the country, and should go on with our business as if it was not a matter of life and death to the Dominion of Canada."

To which I remarked, having reference to the hon. gentleman's two observations:

"It is a matter of life and death to a good many people."

Mr. IVES. I was right and so were you.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps we were both right, but we did not agree. I wish to say that my course, both when I enquired and when I ceased to enquire, was taken in the interest of the country in the situation in which we were placed, and was not in the slightest degree dependent on anything the hon. gentleman said or abstained from saying; and much as I prize, and highly as I magnify, the importance of this great assemblage of which we are members, my belief is that the public at large on this and on the other side of the water look for their information to the newspapers, which have been full of this affair from day to day, column after column, and make their comments on the information they derive from the newspapers more than from what is said by members even standing as high as the hon. gentleman or as humble as I do.

ENQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to enquire of the Finance Minister whether those returns respecting savings banks which I asked for are in a state of readiness.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I will make enquiries. I had forgotten them during the last few days.

Mr. McCRANEY. Last Session I moved for a return respecting the expense on Rideau Hall. It was partly brought down last Session and I have asked several times for the completion of it. I find that in the expense for fuel and light six years are left out, for furniture two years, and for travelling expenses ten years, and the expenses for Dominion steamers are entirely left out. I should like very much to have this return filled up. I would also ask for the return relating to the cost of new works, repairs, etc., on the Welland and St. Lawrence Canals.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If the hon. gentleman will send me a memorandum of the returns to which he refers I will have enquiries made at once.

Mr. McCRANEY. I have sent a memorandum to the Minister of Public Works, but I will do it again.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General submits to the House of Commons the expediency of granting $700,000 for the purpose of meeting the expenses now being incurred in connection with the troubles in the North-West Territories.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 14th April, 1885.

Mr, BLAKE.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. WATSON. I should like to ask the Minister of Militia if it is the intention of the Department to forward Colonel Scott's battalion to the front. They are a fine lot of men, and I think that they would probably be of more service to the country than troops from the east. They are all in good shape, and are in Winnipeg waiting anxiously to go to the front.

Mr. CARON. So far as the disposition of the troops now in the North-West is concerned, it is left altogether to the Major-General commanding. It would be very unseemly on my part to tell the Major-General whom he is to send to the front. He knows that Colonel Scott's battalion is there, and is under his orders; but I have made it a rule from the beginning of this unfortunate affair not to interfere in any way with the orders the general thinks fit to give.

COLONIAL AND INDIAN EXHIBITION IN LONDON.

Report of Committee of the Whole on certain resolutions on the subject of the proposed Colonial and Indian Exhibition to be held in London in the year 1886, under the presidency of H. R. H. the Prince of Wales (Mr. Pope) received.

Resolutions read the second time.

On motion to concur in the resolutions,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it intended that this exhibition should be a permanent one? I do not charge my memory at the moment with any statement of the hon. gentleman on this point, but it appears to me that something was said at any rate in the English papers some time ago as to the desirability of having this made a sort of permanent exhibition.

Mr. POPE. It is not the intention of the Government to make it permanent. Some correspondence has taken place, but nothing has been done in that respect. I may say in reply to a question put the other day that there are 240 entries so far, that 225 tons have gone forward, and 200 tons more are to go forward.

Resolutions concurred in.

Mr. POPE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 126) to provide for the fitting representation of Canada at the Colonial and Indian Exhibition to be held in London in the year 1886.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK AND ADVANCES TO PROVINCES.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 7) to amend the Act 37 Victoria, Chapter 17, intituled: "An Act to authorise the advance of a certain sum of money to the Province of British Columbia for the construction of a graving dock at Esquimalt, and for other purposes."—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. This is one of the most flagrant instances of the improper headings of Government Bills. The purpose stated in the title is temporary, special and local, and the other purpose is to be of permanent application to all the Provinces. It would save future investigation into the arcana of our Statutes a good deal of trouble if, as this is going to be permanent, we should amend the title so as to indicate the permanent purpose embraced in the phrase "and for other purposes."

Bill reported, read the third time and passed, with the title, "An Act respecting advances to the Provinces."

ANIMALS' CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACT.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 44) respecting infectious or contagious diseases affecting animals.—(Mr. Pope.)

(In the Committee.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It would be as well, I think, if the Minister of Agriculture, as each clause comes, would inform us in what respect it differs from the law as now existing.

Mr. POPE. Yes, I intend to do that. I will point out any changes as we go on. There is very little new.

On section 2,

Mr. POPE. That is a new clause, just naming the diseases.

Mr. DAVIES. Taken from the English Act?

Mr. POPE. Yes, generally, with some little alterations.

On section 7,

Mr. POPE. That is a new clause.

Mr. WILSON. I should like to ask if this clause might not act unfairly in regard to a person selling the hide of an animal which dies of tuberculosis or consumption. That in no way renders the disease contagious by selling merely the hide after the death of the animal.

Mr. POPE. I do not know whether it would or would not. The object is to prevent the spread of disease. Of course the hon. gentleman knows more about that than I do.

Mr. BLAKE. Is this section in the English Act?

Mr. POPE. No, but it is the same principle.

Mr. BLAKE. But if it be the fact that there is no danger whatever in selling the hide of an animal that has died from consumption, there surely ought to be no restraint upon the sale. It is bad enough for the owner to lose the value of the animal without losing the value of the hide, when there is no danger to the public.

Mr. WILSON. I think it is generally agreed that the hide of an animal does not convey the infection of the disease from which the animal may have died; and therefore the sale of the hide can in no way work injury to the public. It does seem to me very unfair that a man, besides losing the value of the animal, should be prevented from selling the hide. I think in the English Act the hide is allowed to be sold.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is a moot point. Very distinguished *savants* claim that the hide may propagate the disease. If the theory be correct that certain contagious diseases are propagated by the multiplication of *bacilli*, there may be danger. I think my hon. friend, the Minister of Agriculture, however, had better err on the safe side, because, if it is found these hides do convey contagion, I think the public would suffer a much greater loss than could be compensated for by the owners of cattle being allowed to sell the hides.

Mr. WILSON. I think the First Minister is mistaken. The theory he speaks of has now been exploded.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is quite a new theory. It is the theory of Pasteur, the great French scientist, who says that the disease arises from the existence of certain *bacilli* in the lungs, and these are the immediate cause of the formation of the tubercles; and thus *bacilli*, being conveyed from one system to another, may thus propagate the disease. I believe Pasteur's theory has been disputed lately. But it is only within a few years that he has put it forward, and it has been widely discussed and generally approved by the profession; although there are very strong opponents to the doctrine, and the hon. gentleman knows that every medical doctrine, particularly when first proposed, meets with opposition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no doubt that the English authorities have paid more attention to the subject of tuberculosis than we have, and if I understood the Minister of Agriculture aright, he stated that the English Act did include this among infectious diseases.

Mr. POPE. I did not say whether they include it or not, but I say this clause is not in the English Act. The other clause is a new one. But I will look into it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a case in which, no doubt, the hon. gentleman has taken the advice of practical experts. I would ask, if before my hon. friend here brought this matter up, his attention was called to this particular matter of tuberculosis?

Mr. POPE. This particular naming of the disease was recommended by Dr. McEachran, of Montreal.

Mr. WILSON. In the English Act is tuberculosis called one of the diseases?

Mr. POPE. I cannot say that it is.

Mr. BLAKE. If we are to legislate in the present state of the want of information as to the real necessity of this measure, I would suggest, at any rate, that the hon. gentleman should take power, by a clause, to relieve the proprietors of those animals in case the result of his further enquiries is that he is imposing an unnecessary disability, an additional loss upon them, from the operation of this Act. It does seem to me that before proposing to add loss to loss, the Government ought to have proceeded upon precise information as to whether the public interest required the addition of that loss to loss, and if they ask us to legislate in a great hurry without acquiring that information, the least they can do is to take power to relieve the owners from the disability which, without clear necessity, it is proposed to inflict upon them.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). I think the opinion of the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) is scarcely up to the general opinion of the medical profession in pathology. I think it is accepted by all recent investigators that tuberculosis in an animal, if the animal is living, is contagious and probably infectious. I think the risk of spreading disease is so great that, for the mere value of the hide, the owner should not be allowed to sell the hide. I think, therefore, that the clause should be left as it is in the Bill.

Mr. WILSON. I am not going to enter into an argument with my hon. friend on this subject. The point raised is this: Is it very likely that the skin of an animal could in any wise induce the same disease in another living animal? I think the best authorities go to show that such is not the case; and therefore there is no danger in the hide being sold. It is a very difficult matter indeed for the veterinary surgeon to say, positively, whether the animal did or did not die of consumption.

On section 13,

Mr. TROW. How does the hon. gentleman estimate the value of an animal, when he states that one third of its value shall be paid, and that such sum shall, in no case, exceed $40. A thoroughbred animal might be worth $1,000.

Mr. POPE. That is a diseased animal. It is questionable whether there should be anything paid at all, and it was thought it was better to offer an inducement to the man to come forward and say that he had disease among his cattle. That was the object of the clause at the time the Bill was passed.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Selkirk). But if the people mention no disease at all, how can the owner of the animal be compensated? Such cases as that have occurred in England?

Mr. WILSON. It does seem to me that if the Government take the responsibility of slaughtering the animal it

would be a very great hardship if the animal was slaughtered without cause that the owner should not be compensated for it.

Mr. POPE. It could hardly happen that there would be such cases as that; the danger would all be the other way.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Selkirk). Well, there have been cases of that kind; those mentioned by the High Commissioner in England.

Mr. BLAKE. I am rather amazed that the hon. gentleman should take that ground, for we heard, until we were almost afflicted with contagious disease ourselves, about what the High Commissioner had done; and what he did was to have the animals slaughtered, and when they were slaughtered it was found that they had no disease.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They were not all slaughtered.

Mr. BLAKE. Several of them were.

Sir JOHN A. MADDONALD. They were condemned for slaughter, and Sir Charles Tupper insisted upon the animals slaughtered being examined, and it was found after examination that there was no pleuro-pneumonia.

Mr. BLAKE. Exactly. Several of them were slaughtered because the officers believed that they were suffering from this disease, but the crucial test of an examination demonstrated that they were not diseased.

Mr. POPE. I really cannot see what the question is that was raised on this point. In the first place the clause provides that in case the owners are reported not guilty of any negligence or offence under the Act and when the animals slaughtered are affected by these diseases, they may be allowed a compensation of one-third of the value of the animal, the amount not to exceed $20, and in every other case the amount shall not exceed two-thirds of the value of the animal, but shall not exceed $40. It seems to me that that is perfectly fair.

Mr. MULOCK. When you look at section 12 it is apparent that there is a great risk of animals not at all affected being slaughtered. By that clause the Governor in Council may cause to be slaughtered first, animals suffering from infectious or contagious diseases, and secondly, animals which are or have been in contact with or in close proximity to a diseased animal, or to an animal suspected of being affected by infectious or contagious disease. In fact the Governor in Council may slaughter any animal for the slighest reason, and even supposing they only looked at an animal suspected of being diseased. Then by section 13 there is compensation of two kinds—a compensation limited to $20 when the owners are reported not guilty of negligence or offence against the provisions of the Act, and in case the animal was affected; and secondly a compensation not exceeding $40 which applies to other cases than those mentioned in the first class. In all cases the value of the animal is to be determined by the Minister of Agriculture. Now, I think that gives a power which the law should not give to the Governor in Council. The country is full of very valuable animals at the present time. There is not a county in the older sections of the country in which there are not animals of considerable value, and it would be in the power of the Government to slaughter any of these—to slaughter any animal which is even suspected of being diseased. I think that is very far from right.

Mr. POPE. What would you propose to do with it?

Mr. MULOCK. It seems to me that if an animal is slaughtered which is not affected by disease the owner should be able to recover a larger measure of compensation, and I would suggest that clause 13 be amended in that respect.

Mr. WILSON.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I think clause 12 might stand if the hon. gentleman would amend clause 13. If the Government slaughter an animal which is found not to be affected by disease there is no reason why they should not pay more than $40. You will find thoroughbred animals in the country which are worth $10,000 or more. One man in my own town has animals for which he gave $10,000 or more. Now would it not be assuredly unjust to pay such a man only $40 if an animal of that kind were slaughtered without reason or excuse. I think if two-thirds of the value were paid in such cases it would be something like justice, but the law as it stands at present seems to be a great hardship.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. One would think, from the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite, that the officers of the Government are going to slaughter these animals for the fun of the thing. The great danger is that there will not be strictness enough. The danger is that for fear of making mistakes, the officers of the Government will pass animals which an examination will show—when it is too late—to have been diseased. Mind you, it does not follow that if a very valuable animal has been in bad company, has been suspected of disease, that it is going to be killed. That animal will be quarantined. The results will be watched, and if there be disease it will become developed. The animal will be segregated from any chance of doing mischief, it will be taken care of, and if the disease develops the animal will be killed. A person having an animal worth so many thousand dollars will take great care, or ought to take great care, that the animal is not exposed to contagion, and if through his carelessness he allows it to go into such places that it may become diseased he should pay for his carelessness in not looking after his own property. The case of the people of this country being obliged to pay the whole fancy value of an animal, whether grade or short-horn or Polled Angus or Hereford, out of the public treasury would not arise unless there were contributory negligence on the part of the owner, or a suspicion of the animal being diseased.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. gentleman speaks of the officers of the Government killing these animals for the mere fun of the thing, but the Government admit that animals may be killed improperly or without reason, as otherwise there would be no such provision as the one with respect to the $40 being paid. It is true that the owners of cattle ought to be very careful, and should bear the responsibility if they are to blame for carelessness, but equally should the Government bear the responsibility if their officers improperly slaughter animals which should not be slaughtered. If an animal is slaughtered improperly, as is alleged to have been the case in England, it is asking too much to ask that a man who is no way at fault should be compelled to bear all the expenses and costs and damages except $40, when that would not be a tithe of the just compensation for the value of the animal. If the officers of the Government are so careful that there is no danger of their killing an animal that they ought not to kill, the Government should not have any objection to sustaining two-thirds of the damages in the event of the animal being improperly killed.

Mr. TROW. I think it is a very reasonable proposition that if agriculturists are so enterprising as to go to the old Country and import thoroughbred cattle at great expense, and the Government should slaughter an animal improperly, the proprietor should be paid a fair compensation for his loss. Now, $20 or $40 are nothing in comparison with the value of the animal in most instances, because men do not go to the expense of importing poor cattle. It is generally the very best descriptions of cattle that are imported, and the owners are certainly entitled to some fair compensation.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Selkirk). I think one of the dangers has not been pointed out. It is not to be presumed that the Minister of Agriculture will give his personal attention to matters of this kind, and the great danger is in the person appointed to determine the value of the animal. When competition in cattle becomes very keen in the old country, men holding such positions have been tampered with, and have been induced to pronounce cattle diseased which are not so. I think that was the case that Sir Charles Tupper referred to in England. If a veterinary surgeon or some person holding a high position were appointed, there would be no difficulty. I know cases of men having been appointed who knew nothing about the matter.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (North Oxford). I think it is a reasonable proposition that some compensation should be allowed; and if it were two-thirds of the value of the animals, the officers would be more careful. Under the present clause the officers might through error or carelessness cause an animal to be slaughtered. We know that mistakes of that kind have been made before in the case of animals supposed to have infectious diseases. I do not think the Government or country would suffer anything, and I think a fair compensation would have a good influence on the officers, in causing them to make careful examinations, so that no trouble or loss would occur. I think the Ministry might agree to this change.

Mr. POPE. I have had a good deal of experience in this matter in Nova Scotia, where we did quarantine and did slaughter, and did pay for an enormous number of cattle—400 or 500, and we stopped the disease, which was very troublesome. It cannot be supposed for a moment that the Minister of Agriculture or his officers would act without consulting, or without being guided by the direction or the advice of a veterinary surgeon. What is done is just what the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Sutherland) says ought to be done. I could not tell whether an animal was diseased or what the disease was, or anything of the kind. If there had been any complaints in these transactions, there might be some reason for the proposed change; but there has never been one complaint.

Mr. DAVIES. The amount proposed by the Bill for compensation does not appear to be unreasonable so far as ordinary cattle are concerned; but the objection taken by some hon. members is that in the case of fancy-priced cattle, a sufficient discretion is not left with the Minister. It certainly seems a very great hardship that a man who loses a very valuable animal should only get $40. While I do not agree with those who say that you should pay a man full compensation for the loss of an animal worth $10,000, I think a possible solution of the difficulty might be found in raising the sum which the Minister might pay, if a very valuable animal were slaughtered, to perhaps $150 or $200.

Mr. FISHER. I think the hon. Minister of Agriculture fails to apprehend the objection taken. The objection I have to the amounts fixed by this clause applies to the case of cattle which have been wrongfully slaughtered—when, by the hasty action of the officers of the Department, an animal has been slaughtered which would not otherwise have been slaughtered at all. Of course, if the animal is diseased, there is no recourse to the owner; and the $20 is only granted when the animal, being diseased, is of no value before it was slaughtered. But I contend that when a really valuable animal has been slaughtered improperly, and the owner has therefore suffered a great loss, the amount here proposed for compensation is wholly and entirely inadequate. The right hon. First Minister said that the great difficulty was that in all likelihood there would not be enough care taken. Now, nobody is more anxious than I am, in view of the condition of our cattle trade, to see that the utmost care possible is taken to secure to our cattle entire immunity from these contagious diseases; at the same time, I think that in such a case as this the danger is rather that the easier mode of procedure might be followed by the officers of the Department. If the officers of the Department are suspicious of an animal, it is not necessary that they should have it slaughtered. They can put it into quarantine and separate it from other animals in its immediate neighborhood, and take such other precautions as may be necessary to find out whether the animal is really diseased or not, and then they will not, perhaps, slaughter the animal unless it really deserves to be slaughtered. But if such a clause as this is retained, I am afraid that the officers of the Department will exercise their power to slaughter animals suspected of being diseased, and though they might be valuable, the owners would have no recourse. I think there should be some arrangement made under this clause by which a larger compensation might be given to the owners of valuable animals. Perhaps if the hon. the Minister of Agriculture would hold this clause over until a later stage of the Bill, he might arrange such a change.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman has not rightly seized the sense of the clause. In the first place the slaughtering is not done by order of the officers of the Department but on an Order in Council.

An hon. MEMBER. What do they know.

Mr. POPE. They take good care to find out; they are responsible to the country for whatever they do. Does anybody in his senses suppose that if an animal has come in contact with a diseased animal, it is not going to be quarantined to see whether it is infected or not before being slaughtered. That is what is always being done and what we are doing every day. The hon. gentleman may have heard of serious difficulty in his neighborhood, but I have not heard of any in Canada. I have had no complaints of this kind, and the law has been in force for 10 or 12 years.

Mr. LAURIER. Did not the hon. gentleman get complaints from the county of Laprairie that his officers were unduly slaughtering cattle which were not infected with disease.

Mr. POPE. No; but I was told on different occasions that there was disease among the sheep in Laprairie, and if steps were not taken to stamp it out it would become serious. I had to take the best measures I could and am now quarantining those sheep. We will cure as many of these sheep as we can and kill those we cannot cure, just as we did in Pictou. Of course you can understand that in a community not accustomed to that kind of thing complaint would be made, but the people at Laprairie in a little time will thank us for having taken steps to kill out this disease at the start.

Mr. CATUDAL. (Translation.) I am very sorry to find that the Minister of Agriculture has not been informed of the complaints made in the county of Laprairie. What happened in that county? In the month of March, 1884, an inspection was made, while the sheep were in the barnyard, while they were dirty. The inspector appointed by the Government, who, according to what is said by every person in the county, is nothing more, nothing less, than an arrant drunkard, visited the farmers, and, probably in order to show that his office was most useful, killed a large number of sheep in that part of the country. It was only when the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Pinsonneault) came home, in the month of May, that he succeeded in putting an end to such an unwarranted slaughter of sheep.

Mr. TUPPER. I wish to bear testimony to the great success which has attended the efforts of the Minister of Agriculture in expelling the cattle disease in the county of

Pictou that puzzled the farmers and many people skilled in veterinary science for many years. The disease had spread to an alarming extent in that county, and it seemed almost impossible to ascertain its exact nature or to prevent its spread. Under the administration of the Minister of Agriculture, that disease has almost been exterminated in the county. Of course as the hon. Minister himself has said, at first the extreme measures resorted to were deemed hard and oppressive in individual cases, but I believe in the opinion of almost all those concerned, and certainly in the opinion of the majority of that county the hon. gentleman has pursued a course which will result very greatly to the benefit of the county.

Mr. AUGER. If things have worked so well in the county of Pictou there are other places in the Dominion which tell a different tale. The hon. the Minister has not yet given an answer in reference to the case in Laprairie.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Agriculture will observe that these sections provide for the slaughter of all animals referred to in the second section of the Bill giving the interpreting clauses, and the same rule of compensation applies in all cases. Now it is to be borne in mind that it is some years since this Act was passed; I do not know when it came into force, but since that time great improvement has taken place in the character of the stock of Canada, and it is in the interest of the country that the improving of our stock should constantly go on. Perhaps seven years ago it might be reasonable to limit the sum of compensation in certain cases to $40, as at that time we had not the class of improved cattle that we have to-day. Within the last few years, however, there has been a great stimulus in the matter of breeding thoroughbred animals, not only horses but cattle as well and, there is a distinct class for such animals. Now, that was not so much the case in 1879; and as we are to-day amending that legislation, it ought to be made to meet the cases of all existing interests. It is a most unreasonable proposition that the Minister of Agriculture should have the power now to enter the yard of any man and slaughter any beast he may deem fit, arbitrarily or otherwise, by mistake or through misrepresentation, and that his appointee should be the only one to say what the maximum compensation should be. I think section 13 should be entirely recast. I think there should be one system of compensation for ordinary cattle, if necessary, and another for thoroughbreds. There can be no question whatever as to the classes, for the animals have their pedigrees, and there is no difficulty in ascertaining the character of the property destroyed. In that way the owners of valuable property will have some little protection. Moreover, it is quite clear that this Act, as originally framed, was hastily framed. The gross amount of compensation applies to all classes If we turn to the interpretation clauses we will find that the term animal means cattle, sheep, horses, swine, goats, and all other animals of whatsoever kind. It appears to me that in regard to the more valuable of even ordinary stock, such as horses, we might have one rule of compensation; in regard to cattle we might have another rule of compensation; and with regard to the smaller and less expensive animals, such as sheep, swine, goats, etc., we might have another scale. Then you have a clause that ought not to be on the Statute Book. I do not think we should assume that the Minister of Agriculture is not going to make a mistake. I do not think we should put on the Statute Book legislation which we are not sure will be abused simply because we may say the Government is responsible. What is the good of Government responsibility to the man whose cattle is unjustly destroyed? The responsibility is that he can complain to the Government or to his neighbors, but what practical indemnity does he receive? None whatever. The answer of the Government is: Here is the Statute, Parliament placed this power in my hands, I appointed some person to look at this supposed diseased animal, he made his report, he slaughtered the animal, I did nothing but what the Act allowed me. I do not think that the owners of property of this kind should be placed in this position at all, and I call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the proposed amendment in the 45th line of section 13. Under the old law the Minister of Agriculture had himself to consider the evidence as to value, and he had to weigh that evidence, and had to give his own judgment as to the value. It is true he had in all cases, I presume, practically to have the evidence of others, but still he was bound to give his own judgment upon the evidence of others. But now he proposes to relieve himself of all such responsibility, and to transfer to a third person, in no way responsible to the country, in no way responsible to any living soul, the right to finally decide what is the value of the slaughtered animal; and, should that man be incompetent, what will be the answer of the Minister of Agriculture? I was informed he was a very reliable and competent person, and I appointed him; I find out now that he is not, but it is too late; he has given his judgment and there is no appeal to me or any other tribunal. Why transfer to an irresponsible person the right to destroy a man's property? It is contrary to all principles of fairness and of justice, and no person in this country owning property should have it endangered in this way. There are many ways to-day by which a person owning this valuable kind of property can have it endangered. I might illustrate to the Minister of Agriculture what he may well know himself. A short time ago, across the American line, there was a conspiracy amongst a certain class of cattle men against another class of cattle men. The breeders of a certain class rose in conspiracy against a rival breed, the Jerseys, and throughout the whole length and breadth of the United States they circulated rumors against the character of the Jerseys. They charged them with being diseased in certain ways, they aroused great excitement against the Jersey cattle, and caused enormous numbers of them to be slaughtered. In fact there was scarcely a head of Jerseys in the United States that was not being decimated in this way. When it was too late, the disclosure came out that a large portion of this attack upon the Jerseys was at the instigation of the owners of rival cattle. We have the same interest here. Human nature is the same all the world over, and people who are fancying a particulur breed may for their own purposes instigate an attack against another man's herd, and the herd is in danger; perhaps it may be injured, destroyed, and finally there is no compensation. That is legislation that I, for one, cannot assent to.

Mr. CASEY. I quite agree with my hon. friend, and I think the interests involved in this Bill, for which interests he and I equally speak, are of such importance as to require some further discussion of this point. It is certainly proper, in the interests of cattle owners at large, that cattle should sometimes be slaughtered in order to prevent the spread of infectious disease. That point, I think, will be admitted by all. It is proper too that, when cattle belonging to any person who has been guilty of an infraction of this Act are slaughtered, he should not get compensation for such killing, but, when cattle which are perfectly healthy and which are slaughtered only to prevent their getting disease and thereby spreading it through the country, are slaughtered in the public interest, I do not see why the owner of the cattle should be compelled to bear such a very heavy proportion of the loss as he is compelled to bear by this section. Everybody knows that valuable cattle, kept for breeding purposes—and these highly-bred cattle are the most liable to disease of this sort—are often worth ten or twenty times the amount put down in this section as the

maximum which their owner is to receive when they are slaughtered. It is bad enough to provide that the owner should in such cases only get two-thirds of the value of the animal, but to provide that that two-thirds should never amount to more than $40 is a monstrous imposition upon the cattle owners of the country; to provide that a short-horn cow, for instance, worth $2,000 to her owner—and many of them are worth that amount—should be killed and the owner should receive only $40 compensation is monstrous. It is not proper, it is not just, and it is not statesmanlike to provide that the general interests should be protected at the expense of the individual in this way. If the public interest requires the slaughter of any of these valuable cattle, I think their full value should be paid for them. I do not see why the owner of the cattle should be compelled to lose anything by the slaughter of these cattle which takes place in the public interest. But, if he is to bear one-third of the loss, if he is to be fined to some extent for the fact that he owns an animal which has to be slaughtered in the interest of his neighbors, why, in the name of common sense or fairness, is the two-thirds to be limited to $40? I do not know what explanation the Minister may have made a little while ago on this point, but I do not see what satisfactory explanation could be made. I do not believe any explanation can be made which would be satisfactory on this point and which would justify the principle of condemning the owner of a valuable animal to lose all but $40 of the value, when the animal has to be killed in the public interest. As the hon. Minister is not impervious to representations, as he seems to be in fact consulting now with the hon. gentleman who has preceded me on the subject, I hope he will receive valuable hints from that gentleman. I hope that the approximation which I see will lead to valuable results, and that he will open his eyes to the fact that by this clause of the Bill he is proposing to inflict an enormous penalty, an intolerable penalty on those who have valuable thoroughbred cattle. It is suggested that the common sense view of this question may be as contagious as the cattle disease in question, and the hon. Minister may catch it in that way in the neighborhood in which he is at present. I think, by the expression of his face, he is beginning to show signs of the infection, and I hope it will come to its proper termination.

Mr. McNEILL. Is not this the common sense view of the question, after all; that the Act has been in operation for ten years and there has been no such evil result flowing from it as the hon. gentlemen opposite now anticipate?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The fact of the matter is, this Act appears to have been in operation, in its present form, for about seven years; and what I want to call the attention of the Minister to is this: he provides, and it has been provided always, that "if such owners or their representatives have been guilty of an offence against any of the provisions of the preceding sections of this Act," no valuation shall be made and no compensation shall be paid to them. It is quite clear, therefore, that it is onl in they case of a perfectly innocent owner that any compensation can be made under this Act. I think there is great force in what the hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) said. Everyone of us knows that the Minister must be armed with very large discretionary powers to be able to stamp out those diseases in the public interest; and I think it is impossible for us to consent to allow these enormous sums to be paid for these very high-bred cattle. I think we might very well take an example from the English statute, which provides a considerably larger limit, a limit, as I understand, of $150 or $200. That would be a great check on any careless slaughtering. Nobody apprehends, unless in such an extraordinary case as the hon. member for York (Mr. Mulock) mentioned—nobody apprehends malicious slaughter; I think that will occur only in rare instances. But there is a possibility of careless slaughtering taking place, and that would be very considerably diminished if the Minister accepted the suggestion of the hon. member for Prince Edward Island and gave the additional valuation he named.

Mr. CATUDAL. (Translation.) The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) says that the Act has been in force for the last ten years, and that there have been no complaints made. If he took the trouble to go to the county of Laprairie, even for a day only, and to speak to the Conservative leaders in that county, he would not come to this House and repeat what he said a moment ago; he would learn that the Government inspector is a bailiff, who knows nothing whatever of the diseases of sheep and other cattle, but who is a good judge of whiskey.

Mr. BÉCHARD. I can corroborate the statement of my hon. friend from Napierville (Mr. Catudal). If I am correctly informed there was, in the county mentioned by him, an inspector of diseased animals, and that gentleman did not appear to know much about his business. I have been told that serious complaints have been made against him by the people there, who claimed that he had caused sheep to be slaughtered which were not at all infected. They contend that he visited them at the close of the winter, at a time when sheep do not look very well, and in cases where the farmers did not take very good care of them, and this inspector, being deceived by the appearance of the sheep, caused them to be slaughtered, which, of course, was a great wrong to the farmers. It is giving an inspector great power to authorise him to visit animals and determine whether they are diseased or not, and great care should be taken in the choice of such persons; I have been told that in the case mentioned by my hon. friend, the inspector totally ignored his duties, and caused a great deal of loss to the farmers. I think that in cases where animals are only suspected of being infected with contagious diseases, the owners should be compensated for their slaughter by a sum of not less than two-thirds, at least, of their full value and not limited to the sum of $40, at the utmost. Suppose a horse worth $200 is only suspected of being infected with a contagious disease, the loss of that horse would be considerable for his owner, and certainly he should get more than $40 compensation.

Mr. CASEY. Before the section passes I would like to know if the hon. Minister is prepared to say what modifications he is willing to make. It seems to me out of the question that this section should pass in its present shape. I am prepared to go even farther than my hon. friend from Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), who spoke of raising the maximum price to $150, and who thought it was not right to allow speculative prices to be paid for high-bred cattle when slaughtered. I know that speculative prices have been paid for short-horns, occasionally, and a few other fancy breeds; but quite apart from any idea of this sort, we know that these thoroughbred, choice cattle, are worth intrinsically a great deal more even than the maximum of $150 proposed by the hon. member for Huron; I think even that would be utterly insufficient payment for many of these cattle if they had to be killed. I am quite unable to see, I confess, why, when an animal is killed for the public benefit, to protect the cattle of one's neighbor, the real market price of the animal should not be paid by the public. When you exact any service from a citizen of any kind you are supposed to pay him full value therefor. When you take away from a man his land for railway purposes, or for military purposes, or any other public purpose, you are supposed to pay him the full market value of that land as decided by arbitration; and I confess myself unable to see why the same principle should not be applied to cattle which are taken and slaughtered in the public interest. I do not see why the owner of those cattle should be fined so heavily as

he will be in the operation of this section, for having been the possessor of a high-bred and high-priced animal.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The difficulty seems to be mostly with reference to the high grade cattle; with reference to ordinary animals I suppose the limit proposed by this clause would be sufficient. But the objection cannot apply with anything like the force that it does with reference to thoroughbred cattle. Now there is in my own riding one of the largest stock farmers, perhaps, in the Dominion of Canada, who has cattle exceedingly valuable, and it does seem to me not wise that the Minister should retain this clause which would prevent him giving compensation in the case of some of those valuable animals having been slaughtered, and which proved afterwards to have been quite well and healthy, the sum of only $40. If the Minister will just look at the 3rd and 4th sections that we have passed he will see what duties are laid upon the owners and breeders of those animals:

"3. Every cattle or farm stock owner and every breeder of or dealer in cattle or other animals, and every one bringing foreign animals into Canada, shall, on perceiving the appearance of infectious or contagious disease among the cattle or other animals owned by him or under his special care, give immediate notice to the Minister of Agriculture, at Ottawa, of the facts discovered by him as aforesaid.

"4. Every owner of such diseased cattle or other animals who neglects to comply with the provisions of the next preceding section, shall forfeit his claim to compensation for any cattle or other animals slaughtered in accordance with the provisions of this Act, and no such compensation shall be granted to him; and every person who maliciously or fraudulently conceals the existence of infectious or contagious disease among cattle or other animals shall incur a penalty not exceeding two hundred dollars."

Now, from these sections it is apparent that if the owner of these animals is cognisant that there is a contagious or infectious disease among them, and if he has not notified the Department of Agriculture, he not only incurs a penalty of $200, but he forfeits any claim to compensation that he would have under the section that we are now discussing. Therefore, when we are speaking of the slaughter of animals that are not affected under this section, they are animals that would be slaughtered in face of the remonstrance, undoubtedly, of the owner of those animals; and, therefore, that having been done, it does seem rather arbitrary that the Government should say: Well, we have done that under the Statute; we will have to pay you the sum of $40, but we will not pay you any more. Of course it is in the interest of men owning very valuable cattle that there should be a very stringent and efficient Act upon the Statute Book, and the hands of the Minister will no doubt be strengthened by them in that regard. I do not desire that the exceedingly fancy prices at which some of the stock are bought and at which they are held and valued to be paid, and I think it would not be safe to say that two thirds of the value so placed upon them should be granted to the owner. But to pay the same amount for a thorough-breed cow or calf as for a common grade animal is not a wise provision. The difficulty might be obviated by adopting the suggestion made by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), by preparing lists giving the different kinds of cattle and placing a certain value on them.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I think the remedy in relation to the finer grades of cattle lies in the direction of providing that they shall not be slaughtered on mere suspicion. That finely-bred animals should be slaughtered on the mere suspicion of an inspector is incorrect in principle. They should be quarantined until the disease is fully developed. Hon. members have called attention several times to the point as to whose interest it is that this slaughtering should be performed. It is really in the interest of the public generally as well as of the owner. A difficulty at once arises in relation to these high grades of cattle, these fancy-price cattle, in obliging the Government to pay for them at high prices. That would be obviated by not slaughtering them but quarantining them until the disease is clearly defined, and not slaughtering them on suspicion.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Would the hon. gentleman be willing to raise the price a little where he has confidence in the breed?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I think the whole difficulty can be surmounted if that portion of the section is struck out limiting the compensation to the sum of $40. It is no answer to the objection to say that a similar Act has been on the Statute Book for 10 years and no hardship has resulted from it. I am not in a position to say, but I am very much inclined to think, that in this climate there has been no need so far of slaughtering animals for the purpose in question. It is quite possible that there has been no need of slaughtering high-priced animals. I think the section as drawn is most outrageous—to use the mildest term possible. Let us see how the matter stands. Here is one farmer who keeps ordinary cattle and invests his surplus money in landed property or in other investments. Here is another farmer who has public spirit enough to import and breed valuable animals and thus improve the whole stock of the neighborhood in quality, and increase immensely the value of the stock in the country. But when the question of compensation comes up the man who invested money in landed property and who keeps ordinary grade stock, obtains two-thirds of their value. $40 will be about two-thirds of the value of a first-class grade cow or steer. But the man who owns cattle of the value of $300, $700 or $800 each, occupies exactly the same position as regards compensation. The Bill seems to be expressly framed for the purpose of discountenancing men who desire to improve the stock of the country and import first-class animals. I hope the Minister will strike out that portion of the section and leave the question of compensation untrammelled, to be determined in each case on its own merits. If $40 covers two-thirds of the value of the animal, let that sum be paid; but if two-thirds of the value represents $200 or $300, let justice be done and the amount paid. I do not think there is the slightest difficulty in dealing with those cases. The time for fancy prices has gone by and none are paid now. The values have come down to a common sense cash basis, and it is the simplest thing in the world to determine the value of an animal now, as there is no danger of fancy prices.

Mr. CASEY. It may be worth pointing out that in my own immediate neighborhood a man who is stall-feeding cattle for the English market has obtained $100 per head for them. So looking upon animals simply as producers of beef, the maximum of $40 is utterly inadequate.

Mr. AUGER. I would ask if I understood the Minister rightly, that an animal may not be killed unless an Order in Council has been passed in each case, or an Order in Council setting out that, in such a neighborhood, or on such a farm, animals should be killed. If it is done in such a general way, a man would have no chance to appear before the Minister and prove that the animal is not diseased; and sometimes as in the case at Laprairie, when the man sent to inspect the animal was a bailiff who knew nothing about diseases, a farmer might, under such circumstances, suffer considerable loss.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) I believe that the hon. Minister of Agriculture ought to pay some attention to the suggestions which have been made by the hon. members opposite. It is a well known principle of justice that whenever property is destroyed in the interest of the public, the public ought to give a compensation to the owner. Now, the Government if they cause to be killed, accidentally though it be, cattle which are not at all infected with contagious disease, should pay the value thereof, otherwise they would inflict on individuals losses which these

individuals would have to sustain in the interests of the public. It is not just to impose on one individual a loss of two or three hundred dollars, resulting from the slaughtering of an animal wrongfully killed by the officers of the Government in the interest of the public. Another point, Mr, Speaker, on which I desire to call the attention of the Government, is the mode of procedure adopted for paying these compensations. When these compensations are determined by that officer, who may be and who generally is the officer who has ordered the slaughter of the diseased animals, it is certain that the valuation is never as high as the real value of these animals, that is to say he never estimates the damages as high as they should be. It seems to me that another mode of valuation might be adopted, for instance, farmers in each locality well posted on the value of the animals slaughtered in the public interest, might be chosen to institute summary proceedings, so that the owners would not be compelled to appeal to the Department of Agriculture, the cost of such appeals being sometimes such as to exceed the amount of the compensation which may be expected by the owners. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Agriculture should establish an easier mode for farmers to obtain a compensation and that such compensation should be proportioned to the losses which they have suffered.

Mr. POPE. I propose to amend the section by pro viding that the amount for grade cattle shall not exceed $40, and that as regards highly-bred cattle there shall be paid two thirds of their value, or not more than $150 for thoroughbred cattle with a pedigree.

Mr. LANGELIER. I think it is important that we should know whether the Order in Council will apply generally, leaving each particular case to the discretion of the inspector, or whether a separate Order in Council should be made in each case.

Mr. MILLS. I am satisfied that if a disease should become prevalent amongst cattle the hon. gentleman will find that this provision of the Act will be very seriously complained of. I know that a large number of the agriculturists of the west have gone into the improvement of their cattle, and many of them have cattle of half a dozen crosses, and though they are not registered as thoroughbred cattle, practically some of them are superior to some cattle that are recognised as thoroughbred stock. For all ordinary purposes they are quite as valuable, though, of course, they do not bring the fancy prices—many of those animals being worth $100 or $200, and the hon. gentleman will find that if he proposes to apply in the cases of such cattle the compensation provided for in the Bill, it would be regarded as no compensation at all. I think he should fix the maximum of grade cattle at double the price he has named, for it is perfectly certain that this provision of the law would not stand six months if disease became prevalent among cattle. I am sure that if the hon. gentleman undertook the slaughter of cattle under this condition of the law, he would soon find that it would slaughter the Government.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). I think it desirable that the hon. gentleman should amend this clause by providing for a greater compensation in the case of animals which have been slaughtered, and it is discovered that they were not suffering from disease. I agree with him that in the case of diseased animals, or those lost by the carelessness of the owner in exposing them to infection, he would not be entitled to compensation, but I think in other cases the owner should be entitled to at least two-thirds of the value of the animal.

Mr. AUGER. The hon. Minister has not yet answered my question, and though it may not be important to him it is important to a great many people. Are those cattle which are to be slaughtered under the authority of an Order in Council, to be killed by virtue of a general Order in Council, or is there to be a separate Order in Council in each case? Is the Government to pass an Order in Council and then send an inspector to a municipality to kill and destroy all animals supposed to be attacked by disease? I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what we are to do if such a person comes to a municipality? Are we to submit to the wholesale slaughter or to stone the inspector?

Mr. GAULT. There is one thing which this discussion has brought out, and that is that the farmers of Ontario are not in as miserable a state as hon. gentlemen opposite led us to believe some time ago. I am glad that these people have cattle worth $5,000 or $10,000—half the price of a whole farm. In Quebec we have also fine herds of cattle, and I know of one case of a man who was offered $1,000 apiece for ten cattle. I am glad to say that there are several farmers who are importing the best quality of stock from Great Britain and chiefly from Scotland—Polled Angus being a favorite breed of cattle with us. I think the sum allowed by the Bill is too small, and that at least $200 should be allowed for these cattle. I know of a case in which I recently had to write to the Minister of Agriculture, with regard to a horse which took the glanders in a stable of 40 horses and it was ordered to be killed. The man made application to the Government, and he was told to apply to the Local Legislature as this Government had nothing to do with the matter.

Mr. AUGER. I have not yet got an answer from the Minister of Agriculture. I put the question in English because I found that he had not answered a similar question by my hon. friend from Napierville (Mr. Catudal) who asked it in French. If we cannot get an answer in either English or French I do not know what we will do, unless we get some one here to ask the gentleman in Spanish or German. I think the question is a proper one and an important one. I know that a great many of my constituents will put the question to me and I do not know what to answer them until the hon. Minister of Agriculture has answered me. As to the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Gault) I do not think he seems to understand the case. There are many horses in the country that are not thoroughbred but are worth $200 or $300, and if the Government should kill them when they are not affected by any kind of disease to pay only a compensation of $40 would be very unjust.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman will see by looking at the Bill that it answers his question. It says the Governor in Council may, from time to time, cause to be slaughtered animals suffering from infectious or contagious disease, and so on.

Mr. LANGELIER. I would point out to the Minister of Agriculture that what the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Auger) asks is whether an Order in Council means an Order in Council in each case, or a general Order in Council giving authority to the officers of the Government to slaughter what animals they choose.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman must see that in case of a disease breaking out in any particular district that place would be declared an infected place, in which the animals will be quarantined. Then the inspector is instructed by Order in Council that those animals that are incurable are to be killed, and that the others will be kept within limits to prevent the disease spreading.

Mr. FISHER. A few minutes ago the Minister, when I was alluding to the discretion of the officers of the Department said that it would require an Order in Council. Now I find that the matter is practically left in the discretion of the officers of the Department, and not to the Governor in Council. It requires an Order in Council to allow the inspector to do anything, but when the inspector goes about

his work it is left in his discretion what animals he shall slaughter and what not. I said that in that case it was necessary that great safeguards should be thrown about the action of the officers of the Department.

Mr. POPE. When a complaint is made, I send an officer to make a report upon it. He makes his report to the Department, and if I am satisfied with his report, I report to the Governor in Council, and in accordance with an Order in Council we deal with the matter. If diseased sheep came from the other side, it was some time before I could find out where the disease was, and we set actively to work to ferret it out. In such cases we had quarantines, which no sheep could go out of or come into. Such as were incurable were slaughtered, and those which were not so were treated and sometimes cured. But I have to take the greatest precaution against these sheep being brought into the market and placed among other sheep, or even being put into a yard with other sheep, so that I have to possess this power.

Mr. FISHER. All that has nothing to do with the question I alluded to a few minutes ago. The hon. gentleman is quite right in the precautions he takes to isolate infected districts, and to prevent disease spreading. But what I was discussing was whether the action is in certain instances in the discretion of the officers of the Department or requires the authority of the Governor in Council; and the reply of the Minister shows me very clearly that the officers of the Department have to exercise their discretion. Therefore every safeguard should be adopted to prevent the farmers suffering an injustice or suffering loss when it is not absolutely necessary that they should suffer. The hon. gentleman has amended this section in the right direction; but I regret to see that he has not gone far enough by any means. The fact of the matter is that, although in a certain degree he has made it better—he has acknowledged that this was necessary—he has not yet come to the principle we are advocating on this side of the House, namely, that when a farmer by the wrong action of an officer of the department, suffers a large pecuniary loss, he should be fairly compensated for that loss. The hon. gentleman instead of giving the farmer $40, agrees to give him $150. That is good so far as it goes, and I am glad he has gone so far; but I do not think he has really met the difficulty at all. If he did not mention the exact amount in the section, it would then be left in the discretion of the Department, or subject to proof by the farmer, what the loss was. There would be no danger of a large amount being awarded when a small amount was due. But yielding what the hon. gentleman has yielded, he has practically acknowledged the force of the argument of this side of the House and of the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont), while at the same time he has not gone as far as the legitimate conclusion to be drawn from those arguments.

Mr. CASEY. This is a beautiful example of how the hon. Minister explains things in spite of himself. His oyster-like policy of keeping his mouth firmly shut until it is, so to speak, pried open, has had the effect of wasting a great deal of time in the House, as it generally does when we are discussing a Bill of his. The postponement of that information invariably leads to further asking for it, and to loose discussion which might be prevented if the explanation was given in time. In regard to the amendment proposed to this clause, it shows that the hon. gentleman sees that the section was wrong in the first instance. That was a considerable distance to have brought him; but he is far yet from having reached the true principle. As the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) very correctly said, when property is destroyed in the public interest, the real price should be paid; and he properly pointed out that the inspector who ordered the destruction, would be authorised under this section to value the property slaughtered, and he cannot be expected to value it at its proper market value. The conclusion is that the same principle should be adopted in regard to cattle as in regard to any other property taken from the public. The value should be settled, and the full value awarded, and that can only be settled by arbitration; and when we reach the third reading I shall propose to add words to that effect to this section if they are not sooner introduced. In regard to the point which has been raised by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Auger) and by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) as to who has the discretion, we have it laid down at last very clearly that the discretion is in the hands of the official on the spot. He is directed by the Order in Council, in general terms, to inspect the cattle or quarantine them, and those which he finds infected he is to have slaughtered. It would appear also that the valuation of the animal is in his hands, an arrangement which is on the face of it unsatisfactory, and which, if practised, will be very unjust to the farmers of this country. The correct principle, as I have suggested, and the only principle which can be adopted with any show of fairness, is that of having the value of the animal settled by arbitration.

Mr. HESSON. It appears to me that there has been a good deal of time wasted over this discussion, and not to very good purpose. Hon. gentlemen seem to have overlooked the fact that whatever the Government have done there have been no complaints. I have not heard a gentleman in this House say that the Government have dealt unfairly in any one case brought before them. I think it is well to have the attention of the House drawn to this fact, that if the Government take the step hon. gentlemen seem to deplore, it is to protect the country and the farmers. It certainly must be of some advantage to the farmer to have a person appointed competent to judge of diseases and to treat them in the most practical and effective way, and that is, to take a diseased animal entirely out of the herd, so that no further risk may be run than is absolutely necessary, and in addition to that the Government pay a portion of the loss. But I just rise to draw attention to the remark of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) that the Minister of Agriculture, when he has a Bill before the House is troubled with an oyster mouth, and that it has to be pried open. Well, the hon. gentleman opposite is not troubled with an oyster mouth. It is open and ready at all times, and at no time more than in this debate.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend says I do not adopt the oyster policy of keeping silent when I should speak. I can return him the compliment. But apart from any joking, the fact remains that we are asking explanations as to the meaning of this Bill which the Minister is supposed to be able to give, and are pointing out amendments we think ought to be introduced in it. In so doing, we are acting, not only within our rights but according to our duty. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) has said there have been no complaints during the years the Act has been in force. That was stated before, and my hon. friend from Shefford (Mr. Auger) and my hon. friend from Napierville (Mr. Catudal) pointed out that in almost the only place in which the Act has been put in force and cattle slaughtered, the complaints made were grave and numerous. My hon. friend from Napierville pointed out that the man appointed to value the animals was a bailiff who knew nothing of the price of stock, that the animals were slaughtered wantonly and recklessly, and that their owners complained seriously of the injustice done them. If, therefore, on the only occasion in which the slaughter clause was put in force, it gave rise to such wide spread dissatisfaction, that in itself is strong evidence of the unsoundness of the principle involved.

Mr. MULOCK. What compensation is proposed in the case of horses, both thoroughbred and ordinary horses?

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). It is necessary to change the wording of the amendment, because the word cattle does not apply to horses under the Act.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) complains that we are using a great deal of time, but the answer is given by the Minister of Agriculture himself, because this Bill has been changed in an essential degree and that in the interests of the farmers of which the hon. gentleman is a representative. The Minister of Agriculture has gone some distance to meet our views and the views of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who have expressed their opinions on this question, but he has not gone quite far enough. He ought, at least, have gone as far as was suggested by the hon. member for Montreal West (Mr. Gault), who, I think, submitted a proposition to the House that ought to have satisfied the hon. gentleman that he would have been, at all events, safe in making the limit at the very lowest, $200. One can easily understand why that should be at least the limit. Had the hon. gentleman consulted the interest of stock-raisers, whose stock is liable to be slaughtered, and improperly slaughtered, he would have accepted my suggestion. What is the meaning of the clause? Two things must occur before the applicant is entitled to any compensation, first the animal must be innocent, that is it must be free from disease, it must have no contagious disease, and secondly the owner of the animal must be innocent, because it is provided that "should the owner or their representative have been guilty of any offence against any of the provisions of the preceding sections no valuation shall be made and no compensation shall be paid to them." So that no compensation shall be given where the animal is diseased except under the earlier part of the clause, and no compensation shall be given where the owner is at fault. It does appear to me extraordinary that the hon. gentleman should take to himself, through his officials, the power of ordering the slaughtering of animals where there is no disease.

The Committee rose; and it being six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I was pointing out, when you left the chair, the principle upon which this Bill was founded. The 13th clause of the Bill, under the first portion of the compensation clause, proceeds upon the assumption that the animal slaughtered is slaughtered for cause, that is, that the animal was affected with an infectious or contagious disease, and in that case it proposes to award compensation to the owner of the animal to the extent of one-third of its value, not in the whole to exceed $20. I have no objection to that portion of the compensation clause, because, of course, if the animal is affected with disease, it is utterly useless to the owner, and I think the Government have acted fairly and reasonably in that respect. The second portion of the compensation clause proceeds, however, upon two assumptions. The first is that the animal slaughtered is not affected with any infectious or contagious disease known to the owner. If the owner of the animal has committed any violation of the statute, he is not entitled to any compensation at all, but if the owner is not guilty of any violation of the statute, then, under this second portion of the compensation clause, he is entitled to get two-thirds of the value of the animal, not to exceed the sum of $40 for grades and $150 for thoroughbreds, according to the amendment. Now, as I have said, that proceeds upon the assumption that the owner of the animal is guiltless, that the animal itself is free from infection of any kind, and that it is slaughtered not because it is infected, but through some misapprehension or error or mistake on the part of the officers of the Department, or rather on the part of the parties employed by the Minister of Agriculture to enforce the provisions of this statute. If that is so, there is no reason why the owner of the animal should not get something more than two-thirds of its full value. The true principle, in a case of that kind, where a man's goods are destroyed without cause and without reason, is that he should get the fair value of the article destroyed. That is not the principle upon which the hon. gentleman is acting with respect to this Bill. The principle is that he shall get some portion of the value. I do not object to that so much either, that the owner of the animal, even in the case where the slaughtering takes place, not by reason of infection, but by the misapprehension or mistake of those in charge of this particular duty, shall get two-thirds of its value. Of course, we know perfectly well that the officers of the Department, or whoever has the supervision or the charge of this particular department or branch, will not slaughter an animal for the mere fun, as the First Minister stated, of slaughtering it. They must be under the idea that the animal is diseased; but it turns out that the animal is not diseased, and, not being diseased, the owner is entitled to the compensation. I do not object so much to the limit to two-thirds of the value of the animal, because I suppose the people who slaughter it do it in good faith, believing there is something wrong with it, and not for the mere mischief of the thing or the mere fun of the thing. But what I objected to in the first instance, and now repeat, is that it is not fair that, where a man's animal is destroyed without reason and without cause, not being infected with any contagious or infectious disease, there should be a maximum limit to the amount of compensation he should get.

Mr. POPE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman has not looked closely into the other clauses, but he will see there is another clause. The animal has been exposed, or has been in contact with diseased animals, and is very likely to get the disease.

Mr. CAMERON. Where does the hon. gentleman provide for that? This clause makes no such provision.

Mr. POPE. Look at the 12th clause.

Mr. CAMERON. But we are discussing the 13th clause. The 12th does not help the hon. gentleman a bit. The 12th clause reads:

"The Governor in Council may, from time to time, cause to be slaughtered animals suffering from infectious or contagious disease, and animals which are or have been in contact with or close proximity to a diseased animal, or to an animal suspected of being affected by infections or contagious disease."

That is true, but the hon. gentleman does not import that portion of section 12 into section 13.

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. CAMERON. No. Section 13, the compensation clause, provides that:

"Whenever the animal slaughtered was affected by infectious or contagious disease, the compensation shall be one-third of the value of the animal before it became so affected, but shall not in any such case exceed twenty dollars."

That does not necessarily or exclusively relate to an animal that has been in contact with diseased animals; that is not the legal construction of it. I challenge the hon. gentleman upon that point, that it is not so limited, and I venture to say that, if he will submit it to the Minister of Public Works, he will not so construe section 13. He cannot so read it. It applies to every case; not to that class of cases provided for by section 12, but to every case. If he desired it to apply to that class of cases, why did he not make it so?

Mr. POPE. It is so.

Mr. CAMERON. It is not so. It applies to every class of cases where the animal is slaughtered without being affected, no matter what the cause or the reason is. I go a step further. Even if his rendition and his interpretation of the compensation portion of the clause is correct, it is no reason why the owner of the animal should be limited to $40 by way of compensation. It is not his fault. The animal may have got into contact with diseased animals without the fault, without the knowledge, without the permission or consent of the owner of the animal. If the Government kill the animal for the safety of the neighborhood, to prevent other animals getting infected, is that any reason why the owner should be put off with two-thirds of its value, not to exceed $40. In addition to that, the hon. gentleman, by this clause, provides that the compensation and the value of the animal shall be fixed by whom? By the hon. gentleman himself, or by somebody whom he appoints. I ask if he ever knew, in any public Bill, where there was to be an arbitration fixing the value of the animal, that the arbitration should be all on one side, that the owner of the animal should not have a word to say as to its value? The hon. gentleman undertakes the office of a valuator, or he sees fit to employ some official of the Department, or some one who is not an official of the Department, to value this animal, and the owner of the animal, the man who is most interested in it, and who knows what the real value of the thing is better than anyone else, has not a word to say, and he puts off the owner of the animal by his own valuation. It may be said that those who are employed by the Department will do justice between the Government and the individual, but we have heard to-day from members from counties where these diseases have prevailed that the Government have not been so discreet, that they have appointed men to make these valuations who knew nothing of the duties imposed upon them. We are told by one member that the bailiff of the division court, I think, was appointed to make a valuation, and it is practically admitted that he knew nothing about it; he was better acquainted with the quality and the value of another article than with the value of the sheep he was called upon to valuate. Now, I say the hon. gentleman should provide that one of his officers should, upon the one hand, be the valuator, and that the owner of the animal, upon the other hand, should be at liberty to appoint a second valuator, and if these two could not agree, there should be a third person called in, and the decision of the majority should be final. Now, the hon. gentleman does not take that precaution. Under this statute he takes the sole power into his own hands. He first slaughters the man's animal, without cause, without justification, and then he values the animal by his own valuator, without giving the owner an opportunity of appointing an arbitrator to cooperate in fixing the value of the animal. Then, after having slaughtered the animal, he gives the owner two-thirds of what his own valuator says the animal is worth. Now, there is another point mentioned by the member for Montreal West (Mr. Gault). Take the case of a horse—and this clause applies to horses. Take a grade horse, worth $200, or $300 or $400. After you have slaughtered that animal, without cause, at the very outside figure, the owner can get but $40. There is a thoroughbred worth, perhaps, $1,000, and the outside sum the owner can get—because the Department, in this section, have unwisely seen fit to take the power to slaughter the animal—all the compensation the owner can get is $150. I trust this Bill will not pass in its present shape. If the hon. gentleman will strike out all the words after animal, that is the words "but shall not in any case exceed $40," then I think it will be a fair and reasonable proposition, because the owner of the animal slaughtered without cause could get two-thirds of his value, without any maximum limit of compensation. But it is said there is fancy stock—that a cow, for instance, may cost $5,000 or $10,000. Well, we know that these are fancy prices, but they are prices of days gone by; and dealers in stock, and those who are engaged in raising thoroughbreds, have had their eyes opened, and we do not find any such prices paid now. Nobody could expect the Government to pay fancy prices for animals that have to be slaughtered, but all the Government would have to pay would be two-thirds of the intrinsic value of the animal, which would be only fair and reasonable. The Minister knows well that a large number of people in the western section of the country—and in the eastern section, too—are engaged in stock raising for the Canadian and English markets; and the effect will be, that if a disease gets among the cattle, all the neighboring animals are liable to be slaughtered at the will of the Minister of Agriculture, and the owners can get no other compensation than two-thirds of the value of the animal, and that not to exceed $40. I do not think the farmers of this country, the stock raisers, will thank the hon. gentleman for the consideration he has shown them in the 13th section of this Bill. Now, Sir, I am satisfied that, although the farmers and the dealers in stock will be quite willing to assume a portion of the responsibility, I think they would be fairly well satisfied if the hon. gentleman would allow them two-thirds of the value of the animal, and I think he would then only be doing justice to those people who have engaged in this business, and who are interested in it to a large extent. As it is now, the whole matter is entirely in the hands of the Minister and his subordinates, and these people have no remedy. There is no appeal from the adjudication of his valuator. He may value the animal at $10, and the owner cannot say a word—his mouth is closed. The official has so determined, and that is the end of the matter. Now, I hope the hon. gentleman will reconsider this matter and will not place the limit at $40, as a maximum value, but that he will be willing to pay two-thirds upon both grade and thoroughbred animals.

Mr. MULOCK. The more I consider the provisions of this clause, the more convinced I am that it is full of objections, and radically wrong, and ought either to be rejected in its entirety or entirely recast. Now, when one reads the whole section—for it is necessary to read it all, fully to comprehend it—what do we find? We find, in the first two lines, that the first step in order to entitle a claimant to any compensation is that the Minister of Agriculture must report that the claimant has not been guilty of any offence against any of the preceding sections in the statute. He cannot compel that report, and, of course, the Minister of Agriculture, feeling himself the embodiment of all that is right, says: I will do what is right. But I think the law should be so framed that people shall be entitled to what is right, even though the Minister may think it is not right. But in this case the claimant must, as a condition precedent to his being entitled to any claim whatever, show to the Government that there has been a formal report presented by the Minister of Agriculture that the claimant has not committed any offence against any preceding section. Now, first of all, let us see what he must compel the Minister of Agriculture to produce. What are the preceding sections which this certificate must certify have not been in any way contravened by the claimant. Now, section 3 reads as follows:—

"Every cattle or farm stock owner and every breeder of or dealer in cattle or other animals, and every one bringing foreign animals into Canada, shall, on perceiving the appearance of an infectious or contagious disease among the cattle or other animals owned by him, or under his special care, give immediate notice to the Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa, of the facts discovered by him as aforesaid."

You will observe there, Mr. Chairman, that the animal may have an infectious disease, but the owner may not perceive it; and, nevertheless, if the Minister of Agriculture at any time afterwards merely suspects

that the animal had an infectious disease, that would be a sufficient excuse for the Minister to withhold a certificate. Further, Mr. Chairman, an owner might not have the charge of his own animals; they may be under the control of third persons, and if the bailiff for the time should omit to give that notice, the principal is assumed to have knowledge of the fact; and, though absolutely innocent of any concealment, still, he has not, technically, complied with the provision of section 3, and the certificate can be withheld. Then, section 4 goes on to provide for the owner suffering a penalty. Now it appears to me that section 4 is the complement of section 3, and if the owner makes default as under section 3, and is fined under section 4, he has thereby rendered all the restitution that should be exacted from him, and in respect to other animals he should have a good claim. Why fine him for the default and at the same time deprive him of the right of compensation in respect of other animals? Moreover, if, at any time in the history of this unfortunate claimant, it should be shown he had made default under section 3, if years were to elapse between this action on his part and the time when the claim arose under provision 13, that original default would still stand against him, and the Minister would withhold the certificate. Then there is section 5, which reads as follows:—

"Every person who turns out, keeps or grazes any animal, knowing such animal to be infected with or laboring under any infectious or contagious disease, or to have been exposed to infection or contagion, in or upon any forest, wood, moor, beach, marsh, common, waste-land, open field, roadside or other undivided or unenclosed land, shall, for every such offence, incur a penalty not exceeding two hundred dollars."

When we turn to the interpretation clause, we ascertain the meaning of an infectious disease, and under the term infectious disease are enumerated diseases peculiar to certain animals only, and other diseases peculiar to other animals only; but yet, under the sweeping provisions of this section, should the owner of an animal, say a dog, which is affected with disease, fail to report that fact to the Minister of Agriculture, that forever would disqualify him from obtaining compensation in respect of other animals, such as horses and cattle, and the like, which may have been destroyed under the provisions of section 13. Surely the Minister of Agriculture does not propose to place proprietors of farm stock in that position? Section 6 provides as follows:—

"Every person who brings, or attempts to bring, into any market, fair or other place, any animal known by him to be infected with or laboring under any infectious or contagious disease, shall, for every such offence, incur a penalty not exceeding two hundred dollars."

It is all right enough, I presume, to punish a person who knowingly brings an animal that is infected with disease into contact with other animals; but, under section 6, if a person brings such an animal, even for the proper purpose of examination, to find out whether it is infected or not, into any place, no matter where, even to the veterinary surgeon's establishment, the person is not only liable to a penalty but, in addition, he forfeits all claim, for all time to come, in regard to compensation for other animals. The committee will see that section 6 is exceedingly wide. It says:

"Every person who brings, or attempts to bring, into any market, fair or other place."

When a man is too poor to have a veterinary surgeon come to see his animals, he is obliged to take them to the surgeon. Then we have section 8, which provides:

"Every person who throws or places, or causes or suffers to be thrown or placed, into or in any river, stream, canal, navigable or other water, or into or in the sea, within ten miles of the shore, the carcass of an animal which has died of disease, or which has been slaughtered as diseased or suspected of disease, shall, for every such offence, incur a penalty not exceeding two hundred dollars."

And then we have section 9, under which it is provided:

"Every person who, without lawful authority or excuse, digs up or causes or allows to be dug up, the buried carcass of an animal which has died or is suspected of having died from infectious or contagious disease (or which has been slaughtered as diseased or suspected of disease), shall, for every such offence, incur a penalty not exceeding one hundred dollars."

Put this case: An animal has been suspected of having a contagious disease; it is slaughtered and buried. Afterwards, it is desired to have a *post mortem* on that animal, to ascertain whether it did die from or whether it had the supposed disease. The animal is dug up for examination purposes, and perhaps it is found that it had not such a disease; and yet the fact of digging up the carcass for a purpose that could not possibly do wrong to anyone, disqualifies the owner from claiming compensation for all time to come in respect of any other animals that are slaughtered. The member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) asks me whether the owner would not be inclined rather to have a *post mortem* at the time of death and before burial. Sometimes that takes place, but we know, very often, even in the case of human beings, bodies are exhumed for purposes of examination; and we know, in the case of an animal supposed to be affected with contagious disease, the burial will follow almost instantly after the slaughtering. Perhaps the officer of the law will come and slay the animal, and the burial will take place immediately, before the owner is aware of the fact of death, and he subsequently will demand an enquiry. Then, for the first time, he is allowed to endeavor to protect himself. It is very likely to happen, in this case, that animals will be slaughtered with undue haste, and the owners will, in self defence, seek to have the condition of the animals enquired into. Notwithstanding all these things that may happen, still for all time the owners of farm stock are to be left in the hands of the Minister of Agriculture. Their rights are to be determined by him. Is that according to our ideas of right? Does he, or those whom he appoints, possess any right to assume to destroy people's property? I question the constitutionality of such a provision; it is contrary to all our ideas of right. The hon. gentleman says he is an impartial tribunal. Perhaps individually and personally he may be so, and I have every confidence in his desire to do right; but I am speaking of the machinery provided by law. Is there any more arbitrary provision on the Statute Book in this present age? I know of none. What are the general provisions that surround an arbitration? A man who owns property, especially when he is dealing with the State in regard to it, is generally treated with far more consideration than where the contest is between two subjects alone. Even if there is a claim between two individuals, and the right has to be determined by some tribunal, the law provides that an arbitrator shall be chosen by each side, and that a third arbitrator shall be appointed. There is machinery for taking the evidence and for providing for an award being made, and for an appeal from the award if necessary. There is an opportunity for the parties being heard in defence of their own rights and property. What sort of arbitration does the Minister propose and offer to the agriculturists of Canada? He proposes to set up his Department as a perfect institution, combining in itself the entire wisdom of the country, and as knowing more about people's property than they know themselves. This Act is to enable the Department to sweep away property from the people if it chooses to do so. Is that the sort of arbitration that the people are entitled to have? Is that the sort of position the people's property is to be placed in? Certainly no man, if he is a free man, should be placed in such a position. The hon. gentleman is to be the individual arbitrator; he proceeds without evidence; he does not even proceed himself to investigate the case. Under this provision, he is going even in excess of the provisions of the Act of 1879, and he will not even take the responsibility of investigating and determining the rights of the parties.

He deems it right to transfer to third persons appointed by him the right of determining what compensation may be allowed. His answer is, of course, that he is a responsible officer, and that the people may punish him. But that in no way compensates the unfortunate owner, whose property is swept away from him. Let us go to section 13. The hon. gentleman declared, in the early part of the afternoon, that not a single amendment to that clause would he permit. He sat there, arbitrarily, with closed mouth, and to every argument advanced on behalf of the agriculturists of this country he had not a single argument to offer in reply. He did not dare—he did not pretend to offer an argument. He simply remained quiet and silent, determined, with the force of his supporters, to put this provision on the country. Is it a fair way for a person to say: I am *going to be a fair, a just, a reasonable judge*; give me this authority? Is that the action of a man who should be trusted with such authority? If he proposed to deal reasonably, temperately and rightly with the people's property, why should he not give his attention to the framing of a law under which their rights will be protected? After obstinately and determinedly shutting his eyes and his ears to all argument, he comes down, towards the close of the afternoon, with certain concessions, and what do those concessions amount to? Those very concessions prove the unsoundness of his position in the first instance. He was not going to concede a single point. He was going to say that the scale of damages in the case of every animal should be the same. For what is comprehended under the term "animal" in this Act? In the interpretation clause, section two, sub-section "*b*," it is stated that the expression "animals" means "cattle, sheep, horses, swine, goats, and all other animals of whatsoever kind." Why, Mr. Chairman, a human being is an animal, and under that classification, he will make us slaughter our own, if they have infection, or lose all claims for damages, and this will serve to show what the absurdity of his Act amounts to. The Minister declared that not one word should be added to this section. He said so by his action, and he said so—if I may so describe it, considering the few words he uttered—by his silence. He had framed his laws in 1879, and he and his officers had looked at it again, and pronounced it perfect. It was brought down to this chamber—for what purpose? To be debated? No; to be ratified. Free discussion or debate upon it there was to be none. He would not discuss its objections; he will not remove them; he would not satisfy us that our grounds are wrong; he would not attempt to convince those who are criticising these provisions that they are neither just nor fair; he would not treat us with that consideration, but he simply says: These words are placed in this Bill, and if I have anything to say about it, these words shall go into this Act. But, having taken that position, he did not hold on to it. Like all persons who are arbitrary and determined, he at last yielded and put himself in a false position. Now, in what position has the hon. gentleman put himself? He says now: I was wrong when I said $40 should be the measure of damages in every case. He says: I said so, it is true; I declared I would not budge from that position, but I have changed my mind upon it, and so far as cattle are concerned, I propose, in the case of those with registered pedigree, to allow compensation to the extent of two-thirds of the value, or not exceeding in the whole $150. First of all, you see he has limited this concession to the case of cattle. Well, manifestly there is no logic in admitting that concession to be inapplicable to other animals of special value as well. That concession is on the ground that there is a certain class of animals, the destruction of which would cause an unreasonable damage to the owners, and as $40 would not be a reasonable compensation, it is desirable to make an exception, and so he makes an exception in the case of cattle. Are there not other animals owned by the people of Canada, the destruction of which would cause to them a large damage—a damage perhaps far exceeding the value of the most valuable cattle of the country. Take the case of the horses of this country. I will not ask the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to anything on this subject, because it is immaterial to him what arguments are advanced on behalf of the agriculturists of the country, but to the intelligence of the House I do appeal on this one point. Speaking, at all events, for the older settled portion of the country, there is not a riding, and I do not think there is a township, in the Province of Ontario to-day where there is not owned at least one, if not more than one, valuable stallion for breeding purposes. I know personally myself many men who have invested their all in stallions. I know that the prices of stallions range up to as much as a couple of thousand dollars or three thousand dollars. At all events, there are hundreds of these valuable pedigreed animals, the destruction of which would simply mean the ruin of the owners. Now, if it is right that the owner of a registered bull, or cow, or calf, should receive compensation, say to the extent of $150, which principle is based, I suppose, on the idea that that is a sort of average value of that class of animals, I say take the average value of the class to which I have been referring, and put in a clause limiting the compensation, but providing a reasonable and fair degree of compensation. Under the Bill the Minister of Agriculture has it in his power to ruin men in every part of this Province. He may tell us, of course, that he does not propose to do it. Well, I as one of the people, as representing other people, do not propose voluntarily to submit the property or the rights of myself or others, or of any I can speak for, to the mere will or whim of any man. I do not propose to trust to the errors or mistakes that any man may make, and thus leave it in the palm of his hand to determine whether or not I or others shall be ruined. Why, Sir, he wants to go back to the old days, before we had any law at all for the protection of people's rights; to the old time when the law was according to the length of the Chancellor's foot; when you got one sort of justice before he had his dinner, and another sort after his dinner. The hon. Minister proposes now to take over to himself the right to ruin people. I spoke awhile ago of the stallions. I may also remind him that throughout the Province of Ontario to-day there are a great many people who import from England, year by year, valuable brood mares, especially of the Clyde kind. It is a common thing to find an animal of this kind that costs $1,000, $1,300, $1,500 or $2,000; and there is scarcely a well-settled county in the Province to-day in which you will not find several, at least, of such animals. Is the Minister of Agriculture to be allowed to appoint some person—and perhaps it may be an unwise appointment—to go to a man and order him to take his horse out and slaughter and bury it? and then, if the man dares to dig up the carcass to examine it, that very act deprives him of all claims for compensation. Now, just look at the provisions of section 12, and what do we find? We find that the Minister of Agriculture can order the destruction of animals in three different cases. First of all, he can slaughter an animal that is actually affected with the disease; secondly, he can slaughter an animal that is suspected of being affected; thirdly, he can slaughter an animal that is supposed to have been somewhere in proximity with an animal that is only suspected of the disease. The First Minister, before recess, said people must be careful. Well, we always understand that people who are the owners of valuable horses and cattle do not wilfully injure the lives or the health of those animals. The rule and their interests are the other way. But take this section as we find it, and what can happen? If a man, driving in the public highway, passes an animal that is even suspected of being diseased, but

which may not be diseased in fact, the very fact of his having gone past that animal, renders his own animal liable to be slaughtered. Is that a proper position in which to place the property of any man? I must congratulate the people upon being so tenderly dealt with by the Minister of Agriculture. They will feel so comfortable to know that he can call upon his attendants to do some shooting here when there is nothing for them to do in the North-West. There will be a new sort of amusement set up by the Minister of Agriculture, who will become a lively sort of character in the agricultural districts of the country; and the more animals he can destroy, the more he will feel that the majesty of the law is being respected, and the effect of his Act being established. Well, if the Minister of Agriculture wishes to be consistent in this legislation, he must go further. If he insists that it is right to extend the principle of basing compensation to some extent upon value, why not provide in this section for such a clause? If compensation is to bear a proportion to the damage done, why not say so, have this section recast as it ought to be, and have a logical scheme provided? If necessary, put a schedule at the end of the Act. Let there be limitations. I do not want the Government to have no control, but let there be a schedule classifying animals, instead of grouping them here in a hotch-potch, senseless way. The hon. gentleman conceded the principle of having compensation bear some proportion to the damage done, when he extended it to registered cattle. On what principle can he stop now at $150 in the case of animals of very much greater value? I am not asking him to legislate for rare cases at all; I am asking him to legislate according to the general condition of our people. We have classes of animals all over the country. Now, let the legislation apply to the great classes, not in exceptional cases, but in the average condition of affairs in the country. I do not think he can consistently leave this section where it is. Then, let me call your attention to the form of the Bill in another respect. The first part of the section says:

"The Governor in Council may, when the owners are reported by the Minister of Agriculture not guilty of any negligence or offence against the provisions of the preceding section of this Act, order a compensation to be paid."

As I pointed out before, the condition is laid down, first of all, that the Minister of Agriculture must give a certificate; and then, for fear that some man might be able escape through this mesh and get justice, or put himself in a position to get justice, another provision is put in at the tail end of the section:

"But if such owners, or their representatives, have been guilty of an offence against any of the provisions of the preceding sections of this Act, no valuation shall be made, and no compensation shall be paid to them."

Well, under ordinary circumstances, I would ask the hon. gentleman who is promoting this Bill to explain why it is that two precautions against the rights of the people being granted are put in. I won't ask in this case, because I know I should not get an answer; at the same time, I submit to the consideration of the committee that these two clauses should both go out, and that a new clause should be put in to this effect: that where a claimant had been guilty of this offence wilfully, then there might be discretion to a certain extent, whereby he might not be entitled to compensation. I have not cast a section, but I submit that many a man may be guilty of some offence under these sections, and yet that offence should not be sufficient to disqualify him for compensation under section 13. Then, I call the attention of the committee to the introduction of the word "representatives," in this section. What is meant by a representative? The Minister of Agriculture, I suppose, would determine the meaning of "representative;" he would be the sole judge of the meaning of that word, and he could decide that a person who was in no way authorised, as a matter of law, to represent the owner, was, in the opinion of the Minister of Agriculture, a representative of this person, so far as was necessary in order to defeat the ends of justice. And the answer would be, that he had proceeded and exercised his best judgment, according to his knowledge, and he was responsible to the country. It will be most satisfactory to the farmers of the country, after the hon. gentleman has had his summer shooting in their barnyards, to know that he is responsible to the people. That will ensure compensation to the man who has been ruined; he will feel thoroughly satisfied that we have done our duty here, that we have framed a just and fair law, a law which fully protects all Her Majesty's subjects, or, at least, as fully as they ought to be protected, against the Minister of Agriculture. I congratulate the hon. gentleman upon this measure. It shows the bent of his mind; it shows the absolute fairness of his mind; it shows that he has the utmost confidence in himself; and who but himself ought to have confidence in himself? He has the best knowledge of himself, and we are not entitled to criticise his infallibility. He tells us by this Act he is infallible, and who but himself ought to know that? I will not question it, therefore; I will not venture on the insufficient evidence that, as a mere observer, I might have to assert my conclusions against the certainty, the accurate knowledge which the hon. gentleman has of his own perfection. Still, it is to be borne in mind that the ordinary public may not be quite so well acquainted with the Minister of Agriculture as we, and they may not be quite so satisfied to risk their property in his hands as is the Minister himself. Therefore, whilst the Bill may, in so far as he is concerned, be a fair one, I submit it is a character of legislation that should never disgrace the Statute Book of the people. We are not here to pass measures of this kind. If, in 1879, such a Bill was passed, the Parliament of 1879 made a mistake, and because they made a mistake in 1879 is no reason why the Parliament of 1885 should repeat the error. At all events, I submit, precedent or no precedent, when the objectionable character of the Bill is pointed out, the Minister of Agriculture, as a repsonsible Minister in a responsible Government, should not force this measure upon an unwilling Parliament, but should provide in this Bill all that machinery which is necessary for the due protection of property. I am not asking to have an appeal after the case has been thoroughly investigated. I know the hon. gentleman personally, and I have the utmost confidence in his judgment; but he ought to remember he will not be there for ever; and if it should happen some people on this side should get into office, the first man, I presume, to ask to have these objectionable features removed, would be the hon. gentleman himself. Then I call the attention of the committee to the 14th line of section 13. Under the Act of 1879, the value was determined by the Minister of Agriculture. He was obliged himself to determine the value, and he could not shelter himself behind other people. It is not necessary that the Minister of Agriculture, in order to deal with this question, should be an expert; it is not necessary that he should have any special knowledge of the value of this class of property. It is sufficient that he should have, as he always will have, intelligence, and be able to weigh the evidence submitted to him. Under the Act of 1879, the Minister of Agriculture was obliged to value this property. No doubt, before coming to a decision, he felt it incumbent on him, in the discharge of his duty, to obtain opinions from reliable parties, and having those opinions he would, in doing his duty, sit judicially on the case, and on the evidence of experts decide the value. But in this case, in addition to all the other objectionable features, he proposes, as a responsible Minister, to escape responsibility by transferring the power to value to a third person. The section reads: "And in all such classes the value of the animal shall be determined

by the Minister of Agriculture;" and with this amendment added, it now reads: "or by some person to be appointed by him." He will tell us, of course, that, after all, the decision of that person is his decision. I say that does not follow at all. His appointee is not a member of this House; he is not responsible to the people; he may be an unknown man; yet as long as the Minister can say I appointed "A.B.," and he informed me as to the value, the Minister's responsibility is ended and he escapes liability. Of course, we would have to hold him responsible for that appointment, but if he says that such a man was recommended to him we cannot object. He would say: I appointed a person who was recommended to me as fit; and the House would say: The Minister has done his duty. Thus the Minister escapes all responsibility once he makes an appointment. Whatever, under other circumstances, should be the provisions of the Bill, in this case there is no possible excuse for such a delegation of authority. The arbitary power the hon. gentleman has taken should, at all events, be exercised by himself, and not handed over to a third person For all these reasons, I cannot give my consent to section 13, as it at presents stands; and I trust that after these explanations, offered to the Minister of Agriculture in the most considerate way, he will see his way to remedy this Bill in the direction I have indicated.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am really sorry that the Minister of Agriculture has not seen his way to give more serious consideration to this question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Louder.

Mr. McMULLEN. If hon. gentlemen opposite wish to make a noise——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Louder; order.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would just say, Mr. Chairman, that I am sorry——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Louder.

Mr. MULOCK. I think, Mr. Chairman, that some of these animals have escaped.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am afraid there are some diseased

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; louder; go on.

Mr. McMULLEN. When you can manage to get order, Mr. Chairman, I will proceed. There is no necessity for my proceeding before that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Hon. gentlemen will please keep order.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would just say that I am sorry that the Minister of Agriculture has not seen his way clear to make some changes in the clause. I think that some very valuable suggestions have been made by members on this side of the House, and I am exceedingly sorry that he has persistently refused to consider any of these suggestions. We are making suggestions simply in what we believe to be the interest of the people of this Dominion. We are trying to aid the Government to come to a conclusion as to what the clause should be. We have pointed out the objections to that clause and have asked the Minister to give his serious consideration to the clause, and see if something less objectionable could not be provided than the clause which he insists upon keeping in the Bill. In the first place, he appoints the person who is to decide whether the animal is affected or not. In the next place, he makes the valuations, or has them made by persons appointed by him. He claims the right of putting a value upon a man's property without allowing him any opportunity of saying anything in his own behalf. I think, if the hon. Minister was disposed to do what is fair and right by the person who is unfortunate enough to have his animal killed when it is not diseased, he should be willing fairly to consider its value, by leaving it to arbitration. I think that would be the proper way of deciding the value. If he would consent to do that, that is one point on which we would agree with him; and we think the public generally would confess that he wanted to do what is fair and just. There is no other Act upon the Statute Book of this Dominion that bears the evidence of one-sidedness as this does in that clause. There is no Act passed by the Legislatures appointed to make laws, which provides that it shall be all on one side, like the handle of the jug—all in the hands of one party. If the value was fixed by arbitration, the party would be somewhat satisfied with the result. Now, if you kill a man's animal, no matter what value you pay him, he will not be satisfied; he will think he is unjustly dealt with, as the price is fixed by an officer appointed by the Crown, with whom he may not be on the best of terms, and he may think that an advantage has been taken of him. The best evidence of fairness on the part of the Government would be to leave the matter to arbitration, and pay the amount the arbitrators declared to be the value of the animal. Have we not had a board of Dominion arbitrators sitting here, month after month, and year after year; and have we not been paying them a large amount of money to settle claims by private individuals against this Dominion? We ask that the same thing shall be done in this case, and that this question, like all other questions, should be settled by arbitration. There is another point to which I would like to draw the attention of the Minister. He is virtually, by this clause, saying to the farmers of this country: You should not own animals worth more than $150; we are not disposed to countenance your raising stock of a greater value than $150; the highest class of animal you should have should not be worth more than $150. The Minister tells any man who is disposed to raise more expensive stock that he should not do it, that they are not willing to allow any value in excess of $150. I ask the Minister of Agriculture if it is right that he should take that stand on this matter, if it is fair to the agriculturists and breeders of this country? Is that the encouragement the hon. gentleman is disposed to give to the agriculturists of this country? Is that the position he is prepared to take with regard to stock, that he will not allow them more than $150, no matter how valuable they may be? It is a very ridiculous and absurd position for the Minister to take. I have been rather amused and rather disappointed with the course the hon. Minister has adopted with regard to this whole discussion. He appears to treat members on this side of the House with continuous contempt. He will not consent to answer a question or to open his ear to any remonstrances we make. He simply sits still, and keeps his mouth shut, and makes no reply, and gives no satisfaction to anyone. It is a very singular thing, in my mind, that the hon. gentleman should not only occupy the position of Minister of Agriculture, but should fill the double position of Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Railways. In my humble opinion, it reflects very little credit upon the balance of the following of the hon. gentlemen that they have no better or more intelligent gentleman to fill that place. If the qualifications possessed by the hon. gentleman are the qualifications necessary to make a successful Minister, I am not surprised that the hon. gentleman should continue in that position. It was remarked by the hon. gentleman who just sat down, that if an animal got into a barnyard, where there was an infected animal, owing to its being in close proximity to it, it would have to be shot. Any number of animals are passing up and down the country by railway trains, and, if a lot of animals run past a car in which there is an infected animal, they must all be shot, according to the principle laid down in this Bill, no matter how valuable they might be, and then, of course, it affects the sum that the man should get for his animal. I look upon this matter as a very important one. I repre-

sent an agricultural constituency, and I offer the few remarks I make in the interest of the people I represent. I am quite sure that the hon. Minister of Agriculture is anxious that the representative of every constituency should have an opportunity of presenting his arguments, and I am quite sure the hon. gentlemen opposite hope that they will make an impression. Well, if we have got to talk long enough to make an impression, judging from the impression we have already made, I am afraid it will be seven o'clock to-morrow morning before we can bring the Minister of Agriculture to his senses. He seems determined to resist every evidence and all advice. But although the hon. gentleman positively refuses to listen to us, it is, nevertheless, our duty to present our arguments; and although we may possibly be throwing them away, we will still be doing our duty to our constituencies and endeavoring to serve them to the best of our ability. I have listened to the discussion so far, and I have been impelled to believe that an injustice is being done to the people of this country and to the cattle raisers, by this 13th clause; and I am surprised that the Minister of Agriculture will persist in refusing to make the slightest concession. It was only after he was positively driven into a corner that he consented to make one alteration. His whole course upon this question has reminded me of a man, a dealer in patent medicines, who once got elected as judge in a certain county in one of the United States. After he got elected, a friend advised him as to the best course to pursue in giving his judgment upon any question, and he told him this: "When you are giving a decision, never give the why or the wherefore; if you do, you are sure to get into difficulty." The Minister of Agriculture is determined not to give the why or the wherefore for this Bill. Well, Sir, we shall try our best to show him that he is wrong, that he is doing an injustice, and after we have done so, we shall have the conscientious conviction that we have done our duty.

Mr. AUGER. This is a very important question——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. AUGER. I suppose, from the noise hon. gentlemen opposite are making, that they are celebrating the result of the election to-day in Lévis. I do not suppose that we shall be able to please the hon. gentlemen opposite, especially the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson). For the last seven years the Government have been putting their hands into the pockets of the people and taking millions out of them, and when we, on the Opposition side of the House, complained of the way in which the money has been spent, we have been accused of being unpatriotic. And to day, when the Government comes and asks for authority to kill our cattle, and we raise our voice in protest, the hon. member for North Perth, who is not a farmer, gets up and says: We talk too much, that we ought to imitate the example of the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Well, as I said, we cannot please our hon. friends opposite, but we can do our duty in protesting against this Bill, and our duty we will do, and if the hon. gentlemen opposite are not willing to listen to us, and persist in trying to interrupt us, we are ready to listen to their music till next fall, if necessary. But remember this: You have, by your National Policy, protected every class in this country, except the farmers, and now when we are asking a little protection for the farmers, you are making such a noise that we cannot be heard. Well, if you do not want to hear us, the time will come when you will have to hear the farmers in spite of yourselves. The hon. members on this side of the House seem to be somewhat discouraged at being able to make so little impression on the Minister of Agriculture. But they are mistaken; they did make an impression upon him before six o'clock, and he has consented to one amendment to his Bill. That amendment is that for thoroughbred cattle which are not diseased, and are slaughtered by mistake under the provisions of this Bill, Government will pay as high as $150 in compensation. Well, I suppose that the hon. gentleman does not raise thoroughbred cattle, and no member of his family does either, because if they did he would have brought in quite a different measure. Now, Mr. Chairman, let us just look at the Bill as it stands. The hon. Minister is willing to pay two-thirds the value of a $60 horse. Now, Sir, there are not many farmers in this country who keep $60 horses, but they will, if your National Policy goes on much longer. Then all that class of horses worth more that $60, and up as high as several hundred dollars, the farmers have got to lose. Why is that? If it is right to pay two-thirds the value of a $60 horse, and if it is right to pay a certain amount in compensation for the loss of thoroughbred cattle, why is it not equally just and right to compensate a man for the loss of a horse, or a cow, which may be worth $100, or over? The fact is, your principle is wrong. You want to deny the people justice, and to tyrannise over them. The hon. Minister of Agriculture does not deign to make any reply to our arguments. Well, we remember that the other day, when the leader of the Opposition asked him some question about railways, he did not seem to know much about railways, and to-day, when we are discussing a question relating to his own Department of Agriculture, he does not seem to know anything about that either. Now, we know that in the county of Laprairie complaints were made of grave abuses that had been committed by one of the hon. gentleman's officers. An action was taken out in the name of the Government, but the action was dismissed, and then the farmer, a man named Moquin, sued the Government for damages and the matter was settled. All that took place, and yet the hon. Minister of Agriculture knew nothing about it. I suppose he was taking a trip on the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, I can assure the members of this House that the farmers cannot be trifled with much longer. We are asking protection for the farmers. If you come to my barnyard and kill a horse or a cow that is not affected with any contagious disease, you ought to pay for it, and if you are not willing to pay for it you ought to have let it alone in the first place. If the animal is suspected of being diseased, let it be quarantined until cured, so as to prevent the contagion from spreading; but if you kill it without being certain that it is diseased, you ought to pay for it.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am sorry to notice that the Minister of Agriculture seems to entertain a supreme contempt for the opinions advanced by this side of the House. I think, Sir, he is treating the Opposition members, in the course of this debate, with scant courtesy. It is his duty to make this Bill as perfect a measure as possible. It is his duty, as a Minister of the Crown, to listen to all the suggestions made by hon. members; but, on the contrary, he has treated the suggestions made from this side of the House with a measure of contempt that is almost insulting to the members who have addressed themselves to the character of this Bill. It may be charged that the Opposition are guilty of factiousness in the discussion of this Bill. Such is not the case. It is an important measure; it is a measure involving very important principles; it is, in point of fact, a confiscation Bill. It is a Bill that tramples upon the rights of a great class of the people in this Dominion—the agriculturists. Their interests, in the course of this debate, have been treated by hon. gentlemen opposite with derision. I hold that the Government have no right to adopt provisions such as are contained in this Bill; that the Government have no right to destroy or make away with private property, as provided in this Bill. I notice, with respect to the laws of the United States in regard to epidemic diseases among cattle, no such high-handed measure as that contained in this Bill. I see, for instance, that in the statutes fo-

1883, appropriations are made in the case of epidemic, and the following provisions are made:—

"The President of the United States is hereby authorised, in case of a threatened or actual epidemic, to use a sum not exceeding $100,000 out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in aid of state or local boards, or otherwise, in his discretion, in preventing and suppressing the spread of the same and maintaining quarantine at points of danger."

Under the operation of the United States law, no such high-handed measures as are proposed in this Bill are permitted. The authorities of that country, the Secretary of the Treasury, and those acting under authority, are not permitted to take possession of private property and to slaughter cattle on suspicion that they are infected and exposed to infection. Provision is made for the quarantining of cattle, and provisions are made for the destruction of those cattle by the consent of their owners. Under the arrangements proposed in this Bill, the Minister of Agriculture is himself to say, or some creatures appointed by him are to say, whether cattle exposed to infection are infected, and the Bill gives the hon. gentleman the power of slaughtering cattle and destroying private property on mere suspicion, without any process of law or reference to any authority or arbitration. Such a provision is monstrous; it is an infringement of the rights of the agriculturists of this country, and it should not be permitted by this House to exist as a statute on our Statute Book. The 12th clause provides:

"The Governor in Council may, from time to time, cause to be slaughtered, animals suffering from infectious or contagious disease, and animals which are or have been in contact with or close proximity to a diseased animal, or to an animal suspected of being affected by infectious or contagious disease."

The authorities, under this Act, are liable to be mistaken, and that circumstance should be guarded against. It is certainly not in the public interest that if an animal has been slaughtered, and afterwards it is proved not to have been infected with any disease, that the owner should not be liberally treated. The owner, I say, should receive full compensation, and the provision that in such a contingency he shall receive but a proportion of the value, is to give the Minister power to confiscate private property at his pleasure. It may be that he will not act to the detriment of the public interest; but it is a mere matter of forbearance or of judgment on his part if that is the result. It places such power in his hands that the agricultural interests are really at his mercy. The Bill requires modification; the powers granted to the Minister are too large; they are powers which do not agree with a free form of Government, such as exists here, but they pertain to a paternal or despotic Government, and are entirely foreign to the genius and principles of this country. I hold that the Minister of Agriculture should have modified this measure, and if he does not he will hear from the agriculturists of this country in due time. It is a measure that demands modification. Its provisions are entirely wrong. Many of its provisions are monstrously unjust.

Mr. JENKINS. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) said it was a difficult matter to get the Minister of Agriculture to open his mouth. This difficulty reminds me of a gentleman who was going home from a party. He was quite overcome, and people came along to pick him up. One said the poor man had got a fit. A cabman, who happened to be coming along, thinking he would get a job, smelt his breath and said: "I wish I had half his complaint." I wish the hon member for West Elgin had only half the Minister's complaint. One would suppose, from the arguments brought forward by hon. gentlemen opposite that the Minister of Agriculture was, by this Bill, intending to ruin the stock-owners of this country. So far from that being the case, I think the Minister of Agriculture and this Bill are the very best friends the stock-owners could have. Suppose we had no such Act, and we were in the condition of the United States. In the first place, our

European market for beef would be stopped; in the second place, farmers and stock-owners would have no protection against an epidemic, and in such an event each farmer would suffer a loss ten times greater than that under our present system, and he would obtain no compensation whatever. In discussing this question we should think a little as to what we are about. Suppose an extensive epidemic prevailed among cattle in this Dominion, it would entail a very large expense, under even the moderate rate of compensation provided by this Act. We should take that point into consideration. Further, we should take into consideration the fact that if stock-owners obtain anything like full value for their stock they would be very much less careful about infectious diseases; and in that way an injury would be done, not only to themselves but to neighboring farmers, because the disease would attack other stock in quick succession. It is just like over-insurance. If a man's property is over-insured, the man is not half so careful as if he has only a small insurance. I think the Minister should be very careful not to give too large compensation. The figures named are quite sufficient. One would suppose, from the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, that nothing was more certain than that there would be an epidemic of glanders, and that all the stallions in the country would be destroyed, and compensation would have to be given. I have four valuable stallions, and I do not feel the least uneasiness in regard to this matter. I have not the smallest idea that my stock would be injured by this Act; and, in fact, I look upon it as a protection, that the Government is taking steps to protect our stock from epidemic disease, and I think this Act is just exactly what the farmer requires, neither more nor less.

Mr. McLELAN. I wish to call the attention of the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to one point. He complains of a provision which has been on our Statute Book since 1879, and which has operated to the protection of the stock of this country, and in contradistinction to this he holds up the statutes of the United States as being more liberal and less despotic. But the hon. gentleman should have at the same time compared the results of the United States with the results in Canada. Upon the facts which have been made out in that respect every beast which the farmers of this country export to England, the great beef market of the world, is worth from £3 to £5 sterling more than those exported from the United States under a policy and regulations which he wishes us to adopt. We must judge of an act by its fruits, and these are the fruits of these two policies; so that when the hon. gentleman is arguing for the omission of this provision from the Act he is not arguing in the interests of the country. Every hon. gentleman who has spoken on that side has advanced arguments in direct opposition to the interests of the farmers. I see that the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) is shaking his head. Why, his proposition was that every beast which was to be slaughtered should be slaughtered under a separate Order in Council.

Mr. FISHER. No, no.

Mr. McLELAN. He wishes a report to be sent to the Minister of Agriculture when a certain beast is infected. A description of that animal would have to come down to the Government, its color, its age, and so on, and these particulars would have to go into the Order in Council; and supposing the description did not quite correspond with the animal, it would have to be returned for amendment, and in the meantime, while all this was being carried out, the cow would die and the farmer would get nothing. So with another hon. gentleman, who wishes to have an arbitration about the value of the beast. He would not accept the valuation of any man on that subject; he must have arbitrators to call in witnesses and examine them as to its value; and before all this could be accomplished the animal might

die, and all this work amount to nothing. All their arguments tend, if they were put in practical operation, to put the interests of the farmer in danger, while the provisions which have been embodied in the Bill, which have been in operation since 1879, have worked in the interests of the farmer, and where it has been necessary to put the law in force to prevent disease spreading in the country, to the great loss and ruin of the export trade, they have operated well and to the advantage of the farmer. I think the good sense of the House and the country at large will adopt these provisions as being in the true interests of the farmer and the country.

Mr. FAIRBANK. In the story told by the junior member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Jenkins), we recognised an old friend whom we were pleased to meet, and in his remarks we got, for the first time this afternoon, a "smell of the breath" of the ministerial side of the House. For the first time we heard something in the way of argument, and by those arguments I think the entire case under consideration was given away. He spoke of persons receiving pay for animals which were of no value, but the point for which we contend is payment for animals which are not affected. One provision of the Bill provides for animals which are affected, and I have yet to hear any objection from this side to that provision. What is objected to is, that the owners of animals which are not affected, but which, in the opinion of the officers, should be slaughtered, under the authority of the Bill, should not be properly compensated for their loss. The proposition is that no animal, no matter how valuable, shall be paid for to a greater extent than $40. That was the first proposition. The amendment goes a little further, but it only applies to a particular class of animals; it does not meet the case. I would not for a moment underestimate the value of stamping out, in the quickest and most effective manner, any infectious or contagious disease. The interest we have in maintaining our export trade in cattle is altogether too important to limit the power which may be exercised in defending it; it is important in every sense of the word and in everything to which it applies. It is very important to the agriculturist, and it is particularly important to the Minister of Railways, who, at the present time, holding a double office, knows the requirements for exchange, the requirements for money, as well as any man in the House. He knows the demands for railways thoroughly; he knows they can only be met by selling our products abroad. We cannot afford by any means to risk the exchange which we are getting by the sale of our animals. The Finance Minister well knows the importance of this trade—the importance of keeping up "prosperity" by selling our products, such as cattle; and I do not know to what extent it may possibly go if the expenditure continues at the present rate. To meet the demand for money, if this expenditure goes on at the present rate, we may require not only to sell all our cattle, but our clothes also. Now, it will not be for a moment maintained that the Minister of Agriculture, burthened with the charge of two Departments, could give any considerable personal supervision to this matter. His Departments are large and long; he has to attend to the immigrants, to the railways, to the entire Agricultural Department. He must rely entirely upon the men he appoints, and those men will be about the average; some of them will be excellent, others indifferent, and some, very likely, positively bad. And where it comes to a question of dealing with the people's property for the public benefit, it is absolutely necessary, I think, to provide that they shall be adequately compensated. The propositions made would not for one moment deprive the Government of any necessary power; it would be injudicious to do that. The hon. member for Queen's says it would not do to offer too great an inducement to persons, in the way of price, forgetting that this applies only to animals that are not affected. There is no risk whatever of having to pay extravagant prices for animals that are killed, because there is no necessity of slaughtering them. The proper course, as I said before, to take in this regard, when animals have been exposed and it is not decided that they are affected, is to place them in quarantine and wait the result. The term used is "proximate to other animals." That is an indefinite term. But further on, in section 20, we may find its meaning indicated. That section defines an infected district as including all the lands and buildings adjoining thereto, any portion of which is within a mile of the infected district. From that we may gather the meaning of the term "proximate." Of course, limits must be set; this boundary may be a highway. Let us see how it would work. The man who happens to be just within the boundary may find that his animals are slaughtered, and he get perhaps 2 or perhaps 10 per cent. of their value. Are they slaughtered in his interest? The animals of the man across the way are not slaughtered. He derives benefit quite as much as the other. Now, the settling of these boundaries is indispensable; but it does not necessarily follow that we should give power to do injustice. If the public interest demands that animals which have been exposed shall be slaughtered, then let the interest which demands it pay for it. It is a serious matter to persons largely interested in stock to be exposed to the actions of, perhaps, an incompetent officer. We have heard of such this afternoon; and it is not impossible. I have seen public officials exercise a tyranny which was terrible to bear. It has occurred under other Departments, and it may occur under this, and to provide against it does not expose the Government to any undue claims or to be victimised by overcharges. They have the remedy at all times in their own hands, to preserve the animal that has been exposed until it is decided whether it is diseased or not; and if it is diseased, then the compensation is very moderate indeed. I believe the safeguard which is asked for would not embarrass the Department, and would not in the slightest way injure our cattle trade.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). I have no desire to prolong this discussion, but I have a suggestion to offer which may, perhaps, overcome the difficulty my hon. friends on the other side of the House fancy they labor under. The difficulty only seems to be in the case of animals of special value, and I would suggest the following addition, by way of amendment to the clause:—

Provided, that in case of animals of special value, and condemned by the Government inspector as diseased, or suspected of being diseased, the owner may file a protest against such slaughtering, and the Government inspector shall take notice thereof and order the animal to be quarantined for treatment; in the case of the death of such animal or the undoubted development of disease, necessitating, slaughtering, or in case of no disease appearing the expenses of such quarantine and treatment to be borne by the Government, but in case of the recovery of the animal after treatment, the expenses to be borne by the owner of the animal.

This will protect a man against his valuable animal being slaughtered unnecessarily, and it will protect him if, on a *post mortem* examination, the animal should be found not to be diseased. I submit that for consideration.

Mr. FISHER. I had not the slightest intention of taking any further part in the discussion of this section; but, in consequence of the words of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I feel that I owe it to myself to correct his misstatement of what I said to the House a few minutes ago. I alluded certainly to the Order in Council, but I had no recommendation to make in regard to it, one way or the other. I was simply trying to find out, from the rather confused statement of the Minister of Agriculture, what that Order in Council was required to be, and what the effect of it would be, and to show the Minister of Agriculture, if it were possible to show him, that the Order in Council simply gave the discretion to his officials. I confess I admire the chivalry of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in coming to the assistance of his colleague,

whose silence has perhaps rendered such assistance necessary on the part of some of his colleagues. Had the words of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries been as golden as the silence of the Minister of Agriculture, they might have done something to assist him; but if he can only argue the question by misstating the arguments of the opposite side of the House, I think it would be better for him, the next time he feels like trying to assist his colleagues, to remain in his seat.

Mr. LISTER. I have listened with a good deal of attention to the debate on this Bill; and the more I have heard from hon. gentlemen on this side, the more I am convinced that this Bill is a very bad measure indeed. I do not believe the Minister of Agriculture ever read it. It is somewhat marvellous that a Minister charged with the introduction and passage of a measure of this importance would remain in his seat all evening, and refuse to give any explanations as to its provisions. There are very few hon. gentlemen in this House who do not owe their election to the farmers of this country. This Bill is of vital importance to that large class of our population, and I think that if the farmers of this country, if the constituents of hon. gentlemen opposite, had been here to-night and seen the pandemonium that was taking place in this House over this measure, the attempt on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to stifle discussion, very few of those hon. gentlemen would come back here. I say it is not creditable to this House, in view of the fact that the galleries are filled with people, that hon. members should make such a display as they have made to-night, and I trust that so long as I have the honor of a seat here, such a scene will never be repeated. What is sought to be done by this infamous measure, for I cannot give it any other term? It is sought to give the Minister of Agriculture for the time being the absolute right and power to destroy the property of the farmers of this country, whether that property, the animals mentioned in the Bill, be infected or not; and it is sought to give him that absolute, despotic power without, on the other hand, giving to those men the compensation to which they are entitled. It is a cardinal principle in every country such as ours, in every country having representative institutions, that when the State requires the property of an individual, or when the State requires to destroy the property of an individual, that individual shall be compensated. The State has the right to take a man's land, it has the right, under certain circumstances, to destroy his property, but having exercised that right, in either case, it is bound to compensate him, and this Bill is for the purpose of taking away from the people this right to compensation which they now enjoy. This Bill, as I have said before, has been prepared by somebody who has not given it consideration. It has certainly received no consideration at the hands of the Minister of Agriculture, and I believe very little else does that goes to the Department. What does this Bill propose to do? It proposes to create a number of crimes; it makes a man the subject to penalties of $200 and $100 for several offences under this Act; and if a man has ever committed one of the offences provided for by this Act, he forever forfeits the right to compensation, because the right to compensation is dependent upon the fact that he has never violated any of its provisions.

An hon. GENTLEMAN. No.

Mr. LISTER. I say it is; I have read it, and you have not. That is the effect of section 13. Section 5 says:

"Every person who turns out, keeps or grazes any animal, knowing such animal to be infected with or laboring under any infectious or contagious disease, or to have been exposed to infection or contagion, in or upon any forest, wood, moor, beach, marsh, common, waste-land, open field, roadside or other undivided or unenclosed land, shall, for every such offence, incur a penalty not exceeding two hundred dollars."

If we turn to the interpretation clause, we find: "The expression 'animals' means cattle, sheep, horses, swine, goats, and all other animals of whatsoever kind." If one of the hon. gentlemen opposite should happen to have a scurvy cat in the House, he will be liable, under the provisions of the Act, to a penalty of $200; not only that, but he will forfeit forever the right to have compensation under this statute. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to look calmly at this matter. Because the Minister of Agriculture introduces this Bill is no reason why it should become law. It is no reason at all; it is the best of reasons why it should not become law. The hon. Minister, I do not believe, has ever read the Bill, and therefore cannot explain its provisions, and he had to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to get up and make the explanations the hon. gentleman himself should have made. This Bill is drawn in a most inartistic style; every provision of it is objectionable. Every provision of it gives the power to that man, whoever he may be, the acting Minister of Agriculture, to exercise powers which should never be given to any man in a free country; and hon. gentlemen opposite will find, if they force this measure through the House, they will have to answer for it to the people. After the elaborate and able speech of my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock), I should have thought the Minister of Agriculture would have at once withdrawn his Bill; but unfortunately for himself he was not listening to that speech. That speech was so convincing that I am satisfied it would have convinced even him to that extent that he would have withdrawn his Bill. If the hon. Minister does not know anything about the measure himself, he ought to listen to what hon. gentlemen on this side have to say, because they can give him some insight into it. The Bill is bristling with penalties:

"Every person who brings or attempts to bring into any market, fair or other place, any animal known by him to be infected with or laboring under any infectious or contagious disease, shall, for every such offence, incur a penalty not exceeding two hundred dollars.

"Every person who throws or places, or causes or suffers to be thrown or placed, into or in any river, stream, canal, navigable or other water, or into or in the sea, within ten miles of the shore, the carcass of an animal which has died of disease, or which has been slaughtered as diseased or suspected of disease, shall, for every such offence, incur a penalty not exceeding two hundred dollars.

"Every person who, without lawful authority or excuse, digs up, or causes or allows to be dug up, the buried carcass of an animal which has died or is suspected of having died from infectious or contagious disease (or which has been slaughtered as diseased or suspected of disease), shall, for every such offence, incur a penalty not exceeding one hundred dollars."

Then, as I stated a moment ago, the Bill goes on to provide that when the owner is reported by the Minister of Agriculture not guilty of any negligence or offence against the provisions of the previous sections of the Act, he may be ordered compensation, but the Minister must certify that the owner has not been guilty of any offence under the preceding sections of this Act. If such owners, or their representatives, have been guilty of any offence against any of the provisions of the preceding sections of this Act, no valuations shall be made and no compensations shall be paid to them; so that if a man unwittingly committs any offence against those preceding provisions, he is for ever debarred from claiming compensation, should the Minister of Agriculture think proper to have his cattle shot.

Mr. MILLS. Or hanged.

Mr. LISTER. Or hanged; it does not say how they shall be destroyed. It is somewhat surprising that the Minister of Agriculture has not deigned to give an explanation of this Bill to the House. I hope, before it is passed, he will say something about it. I hope he will not take to himself the right to destroy the farmers of this country. If he does take that right, I sincerely trust that he will give them fair compensation, at all events. If it is in the interest of the people of the country that certain animals should be destroyed, if it is for the common weal, then, in all fairness and justice, the man whose property is taken and destroyed should be com-

pensated. I do not object to the Government taking such precautions as may be necessary in the public interest to prevent the spread of infectious diseases. I think such a course is what we have a right to expect from the Government, and I would heartily approve of any just measure tending to curtail or bring within the smallest possible limits any infectious disease which may break out in this country, and in that way protect the people; but I protest most solemnly and earnestly against legislation which gives the Minister the absolute right to destroy another man's property, and does not provide for giving that man the fullest and most ample compensation.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh!

Mr. LISTER. I think that the price the Bill provides will be quite sufficient for the calf that just bellowed. We have a right to ask ourselves why it is that the Minister of Agriculture has not explained this Bill. If he does not give us an explanation, we have a right to suggest to ourselves, at all events, what may be the possible reason. Has the Minister been down at Lévis lately, I wonder. We give him $8,000 a year to stay in Ottawa, but rumor says he has been down in that constituency. I wonder if he has carried it. But, in all seriousness, this Bill ought not to be rushed through this House hurriedly. This is too important a measure to be hastily legislated upon. This is altogether too important a measure to be talked lightly about. I suppose there are probably three millions of people in this country who depend upon agriculture for their support, and I say that, when any measure comes before this House affecting their interests, nearly or remotely, it is the duty of hon. members of this House to give it that careful consideration which becomes legislators at all times.

An hon. MEMBER. Ah!

Mr. LISTER. There it is again. I regret exceedingly that no hon. gentleman on the other side of the House—and I am sure there are many of them well informed on this subject—has felt it to be his duty to get up and put the other side of the question. It speaks very strongly against this Act that no hon. gentleman, except one from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Jenkins), has been found here to get up and defend this piece of legislation. That itself ought to be a condemnation of the Act. If it was a just measure, would we not find hon. gentlemen opposite popping up, two at a time, so that the Chairman would have difficulty in deciding who had the floor. But not a man got up, except the islander, not one, and of course his story was all right, but it was not exactly to the point. How is it that no gentleman on that side of the House has said anything in defence of this Act? The Minister has not defended it. He says he can, but he has not, and the Minister of Marine, as soon as he said a few words, cut away. He did not want to be replied to at all. If this measure is a proper measure, why is it that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House do not attempt to defend it? Why is it they do not attempt to show that it is a proper measure, that it is a measure in the interests of the farmers of the country? That, I submit to this House, is the strongest proof, is the strongest reason it is possible to give, that this is an indefensible measure. Hon. gentlemen, perhaps, will vote upon this subject; but ought they not to exercise that right that they have, as members of this Parliament, to get up here and pass their opinion upon every Act brought into this House, if they think proper; and is it not the strongest possible reason for thinking that the legislation is bad when no hon. gentleman on that side of the House can be found to defend it?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LISTER. You may well say, "hear, hear."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LISTER. You may well say, "hear, hear." I would suggest, in view of the fact of these interruptions, that this Bill should be made to apply to donkeys as well as to all other animals.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. member for Lambton would be the first one slaughtered.

Mr. LISTER. I am surprised at the hon. Minister wanting to take so much power. He has never had the reputation of being a very despotic man, and he has not the reputation of being a particularly good lawyer, and I do not know that he possesses any peculiar qualifications which fit him to decide whether a man is to be paid or not. Yet this hon. gentleman, with no qualifications whatever for this purpose—and, if he had all the qualifications that man could be endowed with, I would oppose it still; but with absolutely no qualification whatever—seeks to take to himself the right to decide absolutely, without appeal, the question as to whether a man should be paid or not, and how much he should be paid. He does worse than that even, because he proposes by this Bill to depute that to somebody who may be thoroughly and completely irresponsible—a bailiff, perchance a drunken bailiff; some of them may be that; I do not know—he proposes by this Bill to depute the functions that belonged to himself to somebody who may be thoroughly irresponsible and incapable. Is that consistent with the age in which we live? Is that consistent with everything that we have been accustomed to look upon as right and proper in this free country—that a man's cattle may be shot, killed or destroyed, as may be thought proper, and that the whole thing should be left to the Minister of Agriculture to decide, and that there shall be absolutely no appeal from his decision? A more preposterous, a more monstrous proposition, I never heard advocated or advanced by any man until to-day. The idea of entrusting the Minister of Agriculture—I am not speaking so far as the present incumbent is concerned, but any Minister of Agriculture—with the powers that this Act proposes to confer upon him, is something which I do not believe can meet with the approval of the people of this country. Yet he seeks to take, to take to himself, the absolute right to pass judgment upon all cases of this kind. The Minister will get a reputation for being despotic if he insists upon this section being kept in the Act. Then, as to the question of compensation, why should not a man be paid the value of his cattle taken and destroyed for the public good? Is this Dominion so wretchedly poor that it can go to a poor man's farm in the Province of Quebec, and perchance take the widows only cow, or some poor farmer's sheep, and destroy them, and give only $40 in compensation? I think it is a dishonest act. Perhaps a farmer may have only a horse or two, or a poor widow have but one cow, but by the order of the Minister of Agriculture the animal is destroyed, and all the compensation he proposes to give is the paltry sum of $40. Perhaps he may destroy a farmer's herd of cattle, still he will pay a sum not exceeding $40 per head. There is to be no appeal. The Minister of Agriculture is to pass judgment, and his judgment is like the law of the Medes and Persians—you cannot appeal against it. You can go to no other authority, because the hon. gentleman tells us by this Bill that he is the highest authority in this Dominion of ours. Are we going to submit to this?

Mr. FARROW. Yes.

Mr. LISTER. I know you will submit to anything, but I am not addressing myself to you. I do not intend to address myself to an hon. gentleman who says that the National Policy makes the hens lay more eggs. Now, Sir, are you going to submit to this? Is this House going to say that the Minister of Agriculture may shoot down your

horse or your cow, or your neighbor's horse, and your neighbor's cow, and to pay only the paltry sum of $40 for them? I think not.

An hon. MEMBER. Hurry up.

Mr. LISTER. Time was made for slaves, not for free men. The hon. Minister of Agriculture says that this Bill shall become law. I say it shall not become law, if I can prevent it. The hon. gentleman will bear in mind that there are laws on the Statute Book providing for just such matters as this. In the Province of Ontario we have a law whereby the owner of a dog which kills sheep has to pay for them. If the owner is not known, the damages are estimated in another way. The justice of the peace does not take it upon himself, although the case is decided before him, to fix what the value shall be; but the damages are properly estimated by valuators, and the owner of the sheep receives two-thirds the value of the animals killed. We call upon you to estimate these damages in the same way. I ask the Minister of Agriculture if it would not be infinitely better to say that, in all cases of this kind, if there is any suspicion whatever of the animal being affected with a contagious disease, would it not be better to quarantine that animal at once? If it becomes necessary to kill it, then let the damage be assessed and two-thirds the value paid to the owner. What difficulty is there in the way? Why should you limit the amount of damage? Why should you, on the merest suspicion, shoot my horse, and say I shall only receive, perhaps, not half its value? Is there any fairness, any justice in that? I think I hear the farmers of the country responding that there is not. I hope the Minister of Agriculture will reconsider this matter, as he has done once before. The hon. gentleman said that he would have no amendment, that the Bill must go through just as it stands; but he has taken one amendment, and I think he will take more of them before he gets through. But rather than be forced into that position, I think he ought gracefully to say: I will withdraw this Bill altogether and have a new one prepared, more in accordance with what is fair, and just, and right to the people with whom we are dealing. If he insists upon passing this Bill as it is, I can say to the hon. gentleman that he will have more to answer for than he has any idea of at present. I tell him that a Bill of this kind, a despotic power of this kind, is something that is not relished by the people of this country; and if hon. gentlemen opposite insist on forcing this obnoxious piece of legislation through the House, they will find some difficulty, on a future occasion, in explaining why it was done. Mr. Chairman, I hope this Act will be altogether withdrawn. It is better to leave the law as it is than to have such a measure as this on the Statute Book. I hope that hon. gentlemen opposite will also oppose this measure. I believe if three-fourths of them were to get up and oppose this Bill, the Minister would withdraw it.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). It seems to me that the arguments which have been adduced in regard to this measure by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have been offered more to the country than to this House. They imagine that they have discovered in the provisions of this Bill something upon which they can appeal to the farming community of the country against the present Administration. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has spoken of the Minister of Agriculture in a somewhat contemptuous manner; he has spoken of him as not being a lawyer. I believe that hon. gentleman himself is a member of the legal profession, and as such, I presume, he knows what statutes are upon the Statute Book of this country. Now, Sir, if he would take the trouble to look over the statutes that have been in force since 1879, he would find that all these provisions to which he has just taken exception have been in existence since that time. It seems to me somewhat singular that hon. gentlemen opposite, in their new-born zeal for the people of this country, should have discovered, some six years after the passage of this Act, that it was detrimental to the interests of the farming community of Canada. Sir, I dare say there are a great many hon. gentlemen opposite who think that they could discharge the duties of Minister of Agriculture with greater advantage to themselves, at all events, if not to the country, than the hon. gentleman who now occupies that position. But, Sir, the wisdom of that hon. gentleman in placing that law upon the Statute Book in 1879, and which has operated so beneficially to the farming community of this country, is evidenced by the fact that the farmers of Canada have an advantage in the markets of the older countries which that great country to the south of us does not possess. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been cavilling at the action of the Minister in submitting to this House a consolidation of an Act that has been in existence since 1879, with the few amendments which he proposes to make to it; and, so far as I have been able to gather from their observations, no exception has been taken to the additions which the hon. gentleman proposes to make to that Act, but all the objections have been taken to the provisions that existed in that Act, and that have been in existence since that time. I believe such an Act as the Minister proposes is absolutely necessary in the interests of the farmers themselves. I know, of my own knowledge, that in many localities, and especially in the Ottawa district, the disease known as glanders or farcy is very prevalent. Horses go to the shanties during the winter, and the disease is communicated to them without their owners becoming aware of the fact. Every hon. member who knows anything of the farmers in Ontario—and I speak only of the farmers in that Province—will admit that there is nothing more obvious than that farmers will not communicate information with respect to diseases prevailing among their neighbor's herds. It is absolutely necessary that such an Act as the Minister proposes should be maintained upon the Statute Book, with the few additions which the hon. gentleman proposes to make to it. It may be said, as hon. gentlemen opposite have said, that in cases where cattle are proven not diseased, but suspected only of being diseased, the compensation is not so great as it ought to be. I am convinced that the Minister and his agents, whoever they may be, throughout the different parts of the country, will see that discretion will be exercised in ordering the slaughtering of animals not infected. But suppose a few of those animals should be slaughtered; suppose that one out of 100 or 1,000 animals, not infected, should be slaughtered, the loss to the farmer would be infinitesimal compared with the door that would be opened to unjust and improper demands being made on the Minister and the Government, if it were provided that the full value of the animal should be paid in case it was discovered not to be diseased. We all know how valuable those animals would become if it were known that the value placed on them by their owners would be paid by the Government in such cases. Inasmuch as no complaints, or very few complaints, have been made of the operation of the law since it has been on the Statute Book, that is one of the strongest arguments which could possibly be adduced that the original Act of 1879 should be maintained by the proposition now submitted to the House. I do not think it requires any defence on the part of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. The Minister of Agriculture fully explained it, both on the second reading and in the House to-day. If hon. gentlemen opposite are so obtuse that after an Act has been on the Statute Book six years they are unable to understand its provisions, then I think it is utterly impossible for the Minister or for any member on this side of the House to explain it to their satisfaction.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). I agree with the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, that this is an Act which is very necessary in the interests of the farmers of this country. I pointed out, before the House rose at six o'clock, a few objections to the wording of the clause under discussion, and I believe the Minister should make the change which is referred to. I move:

That all the words after "animal" in the 11th line of the 13th section be struck out, and the following substituted: The value to be determined by arbitration as follows: the Minister of Agriculture shall appoint an arbitrator, the owner of the slaughtered animal shall appoint another arbitrator, and the two arbitrators shall appoint a third arbitrator; and a written award of the arbitrators, or a majority of them, shall be final and without appeal.

The provision thus made for compensation would be for not more than two-thirds of the value thus established before the arbitrators. That arrangement would be a fair one and would meet the case.

Mr. WATSON. This is a very important Bill and will have important results on the country. Manitoba has an Act on the Statute Book which is very stringent in respect to contagious diseases, and I rise to call the attention to some of those provisions which might be beneficially introduced into this Act. In that Province there is a more liberal allowance made for animals destroyed in the way set forth in the Act under discussion. It does not limit the amount to $40, but it states one-third of the value of the animal. We should not limit the amount to $40, because prices vary in different Provinces. For instance, the average price of a farmer's horse in Ontario would be, probably, $125. The average price in Manitoba would be from $200 to $250. I do not, therefore, think it would be fair that the amount should be limited to $40. A change might be made in this direction, and I will read the clause relating to it as contained in the Manitoba Act:

"Provided, however, that if the owner of such animal has reason to believe that such animal is not affected with glanders or farcy, he may deliver a notice in writing to that effect to the veterinarian, and the veterinarian shall thereupon place the animal in quarantine, pending the decision of Her Majesty, who shall hear such evidence as may be submitted by the veterinarian and by the owner of such animal, and thereupon shall, if the evidence shows the animal to be affected with glanders or farcy, order the veterinarian to destroy such animal."

I believe that is a better provision than that suggested by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland). I do not think it desirable to have too much machinery to carry out an Act of this description. I believe, with the inspectors appointed and the right to appeal to a justice of the peace, the animal in the meantime to be kept in quarantine, the arrangement would be better than having an arbitration. All this red tape business tends to make an Act work hard in any country. If the hon. Minister sees that, and will adopt any such amendment, I shall be pleased.

Mr. COOK. Some time ago, when the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) introduced a Bill to take away from the Minister of Agriculture the right to decide on patents, I strongly favored the Minister of Agriculture in that respect. In that case the Minister of Agriculture had the evidence under his own eye, and could give a fair decision, if he had the capabilities and the will to do so. In that case the Minister of Agriculture gave a decision which was very acceptable to the people of the country. In that case the Minister of Agriculture was putting down a great monopoly; he had to decide in a question of a great monopoly, and probably in any case which would come under his jurisdiction, with respect to patents, of any importance, it would be a great monopoly, and I was content to leave with him the power to adjudicate upon matters of that kind. Now he is taking another tack, and endeavors to become a monopolist himself against the farmers of this country. If I understand the duties of the Minister of Agriculture, it is to look after the interests of the agriculturists of this country; but instead of looking after the interests of the agriculturists of this country, he is endeavoring, if contagious disease comes into the country, to ruin the agriculturists.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Louder; louder.

Mr. COOK. I think you can hear, if you take the wax out of your ears. I was going to remark that if the Government or the Minister have to appoint inspectors, they had better appoint inspectors to preside over the members of this House, for they have an infectious disease at the present time. I have a great respect and veneration for the Minister of Agriculture, and I feel hurt at the humiliating position in which he is placed. He sits there like a block of stone or a block of marble; he does not rise to make any explanation. He does not rise to defend himself against the remarks which are made from this side. He does not attempt to fight for himself. Is it possible, as an hon. member on this side stated, that he knows nothing at all about the provisions of this Bill, that he has never read it; that it has been handed to him, and that he has placed it before this House, thinking that he had that mechanical majority behind him who would vote it through without discussion? I have no doubt that he had that idea, and I have no doubt that will be the result. I have no doubt they will vote it through, but there will come a day of reckoning. There is a day coming when some of these hon. gentlemen, representing constituencies where there are agriculturists, and they will ask them why it was they voted for such an iniquitous measure. Well, Sir, we have the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) rising in his place and endeavoring to defend the Minister of Agriculture. He talked about glandered horses up the Ottawa. Well, everybody knows that you may have glandered horses wherever horses are, but the hon. gentleman does not appear to be aware that in Ontario we have a provincial law, which provides for the destruction of those animals; so the argument of the hon. gentleman, who represents an Ontario constituency, falls to the ground. He should have looked up the law in that respect, and I supposed he would have known all about it, but if he did he should have had the fairness to state it to the House.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). We are not discussing Ontario politics just now.

Mr. COOK. The First Minister, some time ago, met a number of licensed victuallers at the Opera House. One thousand licensed victuallers met him there, and what did he say to them? He said, if prohibition is the result of the present temperance movement you shall have compensation. What is he doing in this case? They propose to give the liquor men of this country what they declined to give the farmers.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

Mr. COOK. They allow the men who dispense whiskey, but they say the honest yeomanry of the country shall be debarred from the privilege of compensation in a matter of so great importance as this. Then, Sir, the question arises as to contagious diseases. Who is to be the judge of the contagious diseases? Will the hon. Minister of Agriculture, sitting in his place in his Department, decide if an animal in any part of the Province of Ontario has a contagious disease or not? I should like to know if he is to judge of matters of this sort? I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he would consider a wolf in the tail of a cow a sign of contagious disease? He has been Minister of Agriculture for years; he has been occupying a high and lofty position, and now he must make it a mighty position, by taking to himself all the honor and power and position; that he should relieve the Governor in Council of all responsibility in the matter. One hon. gentleman spoke of hollow horn, and I would like to know if the hon. Minister considers that an infectious disease? Who is to decide upon matters of this kind?

Some hon. MEMBERS. You; you.

Mr. COOK. I am rather surprised, and I must tell my hon. friend that I shall withdraw my confidence from him. I shall not give him the confidence in the future which I have given him in the past.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. COOK. Any man is allowed to speak twice, and an Irishman is allowed to speak till he is understood. I say I have given him my confidence in the past, in reference to the Patent Act, but I shall withdraw it upon this question, and I do not think I shall give him my confidence hereafter. I tell you, Mr. Chairman, there will not be so much laughing and crowing among these gentlemen when they go to the country. They will play a different tune; they will play on a different string, when they approach the farmers' house; and when the wife of the farmer stands at the door, she will say you must not come in; you sacrificed my husband's property and that which gave me my pin money—the butter and the milk of the cow. Of course, no doubt, she will retain the eggs that are going to be increased and enlarged by the National Policy, as the hon. member for North Huron (Mr. Farrow) told us. She will even be deprived of the buttermilk, because they will not give compensation for the loss the farmer sustains by the killing of his animal. I am sure that after I sit down, and after the plain statements that I have made, the hon. Minister of Agriculture will withdraw the Bill altogether. I only appeal to his sympathies, so that he will express them, and the people of the country will get the benefit. It was stated that the National Policy was going to give the farmers advantages. The National Policy never gave the poor farmers any advantage. Anything they got was a disadvantage and on the wrong side of the ledger; it was the manufacturer who got the advantage, although I am sure the manufacturers of lumber did not get it, as the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) would state, if necessary. I make one more appeal to my hon. friend, the Minister of Agriculture, and I hope, though I may withdraw my confidence from him to-night, that I may not lose the privilege of still calling him my hon. friend. But I want to make one more appeal to him. I appeal to his conscience and honor, and I believe he has honor still. They may say what they like, but I believe there is a feeling within the breast of that man yet, and I believe he will express it before this thing is over. I hope he will withdraw the Bill, or amend it so that it will not be a burden on the farmers.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Ferguson) rose to move his amendment, I was just on the point of rising to propose one to this effect:

That the 13th clause be amended, by striking out all after the word "animal" in the 11th line, to the word "dollars," in the 12th line.

The committee will see that the effect of this would be to place all who might be so unfortunate as to lose animals in this manner on the same footing, so that each should receive the fair two-thirds value of the animals so destroyed. I have full confidence in the Government, that they will do what is right in the matter of determining what animals shall be destroyed, and also in the mode of determining what compensation shall be given. I am willing to leave that in their hands. I believe that before they sacrifice any animal they will take the advice of the best veterinary skill that can be procured, and I believe also that they will endeavor honestly to ascertain what the fair two-thirds value is. What I want, if possible, is to hit upon a way by which all classes shall stand on the same level. I have stated before, and I may state again, that we have three different classes of cattle raisers in this country. We have those who are contented with raising what are generally known as scrubs, and the limit fixed in the Bill is more than sufficient compensation for an animal of that description.

Then we have what might be called high class grades, and $40 would not, in many cases, be a fair two-thirds value of such an animal. We have also those who breed the best cattle that can be bred in the country, the value of which ranges from $200 or $300 up to $800 or $1,000. Now, why should one class of the community receive a certain percentage of compensation and another class only a very small compensation. The thing ought to be made fair in some way or other, and the only fair way I can see—and I hope the Minister will amend the Bill in that way—is to place all parties on the same footing, and compute the fair two-thirds value of the animal that ought to be sacrificed. In the constituency which I have the honor to represent, we have some of the best breeders in the Dominion. We have Mr. Gibson, one of the best and most successful cattle breeders in the country, and we have others who are following in his footsteps very rapidly. Now, why should not these men, some of whom have ventured their all in animals of that kind, and some of whom have even gone into debt to purchase them, have the same meed of compensation as the man who has not done anything to improve the breed of cattle in the Dominion? This is at best a very arbitrary Act. The fact is, it is a matter of despotism. I do not mean to say that it cannot be justified, but I submit that it can only be justified on one consideration, and that is the public good. On no other consideration can such an Act as this be justified. What I want to draw the attention of the House to is this: That in all our dealings of this kind, wherever public property is sacrificed or taken for the public good, except in this solitary instance, so far as I know, the law makes full provision that the party shall be fully compensated. So far do they go in this respect in Great Britain, I am told by those acquainted with the facts, that where property is taken for the public good, they not only ascertain the full value and pay that, but they add 50 per cent. to that amount. I do not ask that anything of the kind should be done here; we are willing to accept two-thirds of the value; but we want all parties to be placed on the same footing. I was very much surprised to hear the statements made to-night, in answer to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He claimed, if I understood him rightly, and I think I did, that the immunity from disease of our cattle and other animals in this country was to be traced to the Act passed in similar terms to this in 1879, and he compared with it the condition of things that obtain on the other side of the line, where these diseases are prevalent; and he pointed to the fact that while our animals were allowed to be taken to any part of Britain, animals from the United States were scheduled, and were compelled to be slaughtered at the point were they were landed. Now, I think I never heard a more silly argument in this House. The legislation on the subject has nothing whatever to do with the matter. If we enjoy immunity in this respect, we owe it to the latitude in which we live. The climate of this country is peculiarly favorable to health and longevity in animals, while in the United States these diseases are very prevalent and very fatal. And it may come to be a practical question with us before very long. We are to remember that American cattle are kept out of this country; but I saw a statement in the papers the other day that our Government in order to procure food for the troops now in the North-West, are going to allow cattle to come in from the United States. If so, it is quite possible that in that way these diseases may be brought in, and that this matter may become a practical question for us. However that may be, the Acts we have on the subject have no more to do with the immunity from disease we enjoy than the moons of Jupiter have. I do not wish to occupy the time of the House any longer. I wish again to express the hope that the Minister of Agriculture will take the farmers' interest

into serious consideration and amend the Act in the direction I have indicated.

Mr. COLBY. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has discussed this question with great fairness and decidedly in contrast with the levity which has characterised the remarks of other hon. gentlemen opposite. This is indeed a very important question. This Act is one that is purely in the interests of agriculture, in the interests of the farmers of this country; it is an Act which has been administered by the Minister of Agriculture for a period of six years past. During that period no complaint has been laid before this House by any member of this House of the ill-working of this law; no petition has come up from any section of the Dominion for a change of this law in any essential particular, and this law has been administered, these obnoxious provisions of the law have been most thoroughly administered in certain sections of the country. In the county of Pictou, if I am not mistaken, notwithstanding the fact that it lies within the cool latitude that the hon. gentleman has just spoken of, there was a large infected district, in which several hundred head of cattle had to be taken and put in quarantine, and I believe a large number of them had to be slaughtered under the operation of the Act. The most rigorous provisions of the Act were enforced in the county of Pictou, and I have yet to learn that any single complaint has come up from that county or any other part of the Dominion about the ill-working of the Act. There are certain things in which we ought to let well enough alone. With this Act, which is specially in the interest of the farmers, which is designed for their benefit exclusively, which is being thoroughly enforced by the practical man at the head of this Department for close on seven years past, it has been so enforced that it has brought out from no part of this Dominion any complaint. I think it would be unwise to tamper with it; I think we should leave it as it stands on the Statute Book, until the time arrives when some practical ill results flow from the operation or administration of the law. I think my hon. friend who spoke with such fairness just now was quite mistaken when he said the existence of the law on the Statute Book had nothing to do with the admission of our cattle into England, without being slaughtered at the port of arrival. But for this law they could not be so admitted; unless we had such a rigorous law as this, by which disease can be stamped out in a most efficient and peremptory way, our cattle would never have obtained such admission into the English market. It is because the British Government is impressed with the idea that this law is honestly, conscientiously and rigorously enforced, that we obtained the immunity which is so beneficial to the farmers. Hon. gentlemen opposite have attempted, in one way or another, to throw imputations on the Minister of Agriculture. I venture to say there is not a reading and intelligent farmer in the Dominion, whatever may be his politics, or wherever he may live, who does not know he owes a debt of gratitude to the Minister of Agriculture for the manner in which he has enforced this law and for the excellent law that stands on the Statute Book. And for hon. gentlemen here, who know very little of this matter, which has been the subject of most anxious consideration on the part of the Minister of Agriculture and his Department, which has been the subject of most exhaustive discussion with the Imperial authorities, from time to time, to rise now, as if it were a new matter, an unusual matter, as if the Minister of Agriculture were an autocrat who was grasping for unheard of power, and was going to cause all kinds of disaster to the flocks and herds of the country, is too ridiculous in an intelligent, practical Parliament like that of Canada.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White), who spoke on this subject, began by saying that our arguments were addressed more to the country than to the House, and that we were seeking an opportunity of making capital in the country. Every one knows the arguments brought forward in the debates in this House are more generally addressed to the country than to the House; we have not much hope of changing the views of hon. members on anything that can be considered party questions but on questions not purely partisan we do talk to the House as well as to the country, expecting to influence the views of hon. members. The hon. gentleman said we were watching our chance to make capital to the country. If there has been a chance of making capital out of the country in this Bill, it is the fault of the hon. gentleman who has it in charge. There was no intention or desire on our side of the House to obstruct the Bill; we only wished to discuss it. But the Minister who has it in charge refused to discuss it at all. He has taken refuge, as he generally does, in a sort of sulky silence, in the hope that the discussion on our side of the House would give way before the India rubber obstacle of his stolidity, and that the Bill would go through easily. I hope he has now seen what a mistaken plan he has adopted, of getting legislation through this House. I hope the stolid plan, the sulky plan of pushing Bills through the House, which is adopted by him alone of all his colleagues, will be so discredited from this time forth, that not even he will venture to take it up again. I might have some hopes of his conversion if he would, even now, at the eleventh hour, deign to discuss the amendments that have been proposed to this Bill, and deign to give arguments in favor of what he has proposed. The hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White) and the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), both say this Bill must be all right, because no complaint of the law has been made. But why has not complaint been made? Simply because the law has been very seldom enforced. The hon. member for Stanstead quoted the case of Pictou county, and said that no complaint came from Pictou. Well, the only other place where the law has been put in force, as far as we have heard in this debate, is Laprairie, and we know from the hon. members from Napierville (Mr. Catudal) and Shefford (Mr. Auger) that grievous complaints were made in Laprairie.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. CASEY. Hon. gentlemen opposite may seek to drown my voice by their uncouth noises; they seem to be troubled with the foot and mouth disease, but they need not imagine that they are going to succeed in stopping debate. I say that in half the cases mentioned to us where this law has been enforced there have been grievous complaints. The hon. member for Stanstead went too far; he says the law should not have been touched at all, because there was no complaint. If so, why did the hon. Minister of Agriculture bring in a Bill to consolidate it? I admit the changes made are very few. It is not a consolidation; it is a reprint of the law, with one or two very slight amendments, and the Minister of Agriculture is taking credit for having consolidated the law, when he is only making a reprint and some trifling amendments of an Act which he introduced in 1879. There is one point which has been very fully discussed and on which we must really have some utterance from the hon. gentleman in charge of this Bill, who I hope has not quite lost his tongue, and that is the question of arbitration. That is involved in the amendment of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), and is a principle on which I think everybody in the House who has not chosen to take sides on this question from a purely party point of view must agree. I have no doubt that the hon. the Minister of Agriculture sees that it is fair, and I have no doubt that he would agree to insert a provision of this kind if he did not feel so cross, from the fact that his Bill has not got through as fast as he wished it to get through. I hope he will so far allow

his reason to get the better of his feelings as to agree to an amendment in that sense. (This promises to be a fairly long Session, and I will call the attention of those gentlemen who have commenced to wear out their boots already, by this ridiculous practice of rubbing them against the sides of the desks, to the fact that their boots will be utterly worn out, and they will be put to the serious expense of buying another pair before they go home.) I think, that in reference to the arbitration, there is practically little difference of opinion in the House, whatever difference of voting there may be. But there is another point which has been gradually developed in the course of this discussion, and upon which we have gradually got the information that various Provinces have laws on this subject themselves, that there are provisions for the slaughtering of infected or even suspected cattle—in Ontario and Manitoba at least. I do not know how it stands in the other Provinces. We have not heard from them all, but in those Provinces, at all events, there are provincial laws on this subject, and it is a point we ought to consider, how far this slaughter clause interferes with the right of Provincial Legislatures to deal with questions of property and civil rights. These questions are undoubtedly within their control, and how far this slaughter clause interferes with them is a question which deserves consideration. We admit that the question of quarantining imported cattle, and inspecting cattle which are taken through the country by through lines of railway, and the shipment of cattle, and all such questions, are evidently within the control of this House; but how far a slaughter clause is within our control has never been decided. This point was raised when the Bill was introduced by the same hon. Minister in 1879, and was discussed for some time and overruled by the majority of the House at that time, who were not much disposed to consider constitutional questions in the flush of their success. But it is time for them to consider them now. There is a strong feeling of provincial rights in all the Provinces, and the risk of interfering with those rights, in a matter which concerns directly the property of the great bulk of the people in all the Provinces, is a risk we should not lightly or carelessly run.

An hon. MEMBER. Bah!

Mr. CASEY. Where is that little baa-baa-black-sheep? I should like to see it. Or perhaps it is the little lamb that Mary had! With regard to the question of arbitration, I propose to move the following amendment:—

That all the words from "dollars," in line 43, to "by him," in line 45, be left out,——

These are the words enacting that "the value of the animal shall be fixed by the Minister of Agriculture, or a person appointed by him,"——

and the following inserted: And the value of such animal shall be ascertained by three arbitrators, one of whom shall be appointed by the owner of such animal, the second of whom shall be appointed by the Minister of Agriculture, and the third by the two so appointed, and these arbitrators shall estimate the value of such animal at the price they think it would bring if sold under a forced sale.

I adopt here the same principle of valuation which is usually adopted by loan companies intending to lend money upon land, taking the value if it were sold at a forced sale. I think that is a fair principle to apply in the case of an animal. The amendment of the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Ferguson) is, to some extent, a good one, but I do not think it goes fully into the case. I think, however, it is very proper that the owner of a suspected animal should be allowed, by filing a protest, to save himself from having it summarily slaughtered, and should be able to have the health of the animal tried in quarantine. I may remark that this discussion, which was one-sided so long, is now becoming general. Although the Minister will not discuss it, his friends are waking up and discussing it, and are offering valuable suggestions; for both the hon. member for Renfrew and the hon. member for Leeds did make valuable suggestions in regard to the Bill. I hope other hon. members will discuss the Bill, and that they will put aside this childish noise-making, and the equally childish attempt to pooh-pooh the question, and will come down to a discussion of the Bill and its amendments, and they will find us quite willing to take the same course. I am sure I speak for the whole of this side of the House when I say that we are ready to discuss this Bill when we can get it discussed. The debate has been one-sided, because they would not discuss it. They would only howl at it, and scrape their boots at it. We are willing, if they will discuss this Bill, to meet them half way, and allow some progress to be made with it, but we will make no progress with it so long as the purely obstructive India rubber line of policy is adopted.

Mr. SPROULE. We are treated to-night to one of the parodies of debate in Parliament, to one of the anomalies we find occasionally in this House, when hon. gentlemen are disposed to retard the work of the Session. For three hours and a-half we have had a debate, almost entirely on one side, by hon. gentlemen who are, at the same time, declaring that this Bill is hurried through at an unseemly and rapid rate. The Minister of Agriculture is abused, in the first instance, because he will not defend himself; then he is abused by another because he sits still and allows the debate to go on, and by a third because he is hurrying the Bill on. One says he will not defend himself because he cannot; when he gets up to defend himself, another attacks him; and when he sits and allows the debate to go on, he is abused because he will not say anything at all. It is said that the farmers of this country are going to be injured by this measure. Who are the parties who must be benefited by this Bill? Is it not the farmers? For whose benefit is it introduced? Is it for the benefit of the Minister of Agriculture, or for the benefit of the lawyers, or of the professional men of this House? It is almost solely for the farmers. Who is the Bill introduced by? The member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) says it is introduced by a man who is totally unfit for the position, who is totally unfit for anything of the kind. I would like to ask the farmers of this country if they would not prefer to trust an honest farmer like the Minister of Agriculture, a man of extensive experience, sooner than any lawyer in this House, in reference to their interests? I think they would. This measure is introduced by a gentleman who has lived amongst the farmers, the very class that are most benefited by this Bill. One hon. gentleman said it was one of the strangest Bills ever brought into Parliament, and that he would advise the Minister to withdraw it. Who would suffer by the withdrawal of this Bill? Would it be the professional members of this House? Would it not be the farmers, the very class whose cause these gentlemen profess to espouse to-night? Suppose the Act of 1879 had not been passed, what would have been the position of the farming community? The result would have been that our cattle would have been scheduled in England, and therefore would have to be slaughtered as soon as they were landed, instead of being allowed, as they are to-day, to be sold in the open market. I believe the farmers are able to appreciate the benefits they will receive from this Bill, and they cannot be hoodwinked by the parody of debate that has been carried on here to-night by men professing to speak in their interests. Who are the men who sat in judgement on this Bill in 1879? The hon. gentlemen who are condemning it to-night are only condemning the judgment of their own friends who sat here then. They are simply condemning the intelligence of their leader at that time, the intelligence of all the hon. gentlemen who were then representing the Opposition in this

House who allowed this Bill to pass through Parliament at that time without raising any of the unseemly objections that hon. gentlemen have raised here to-night. Some of the amendments are sensible and wise. An hon. gentleman who sits on my right spoke in a very courteous and gentlemanly manner, and the amendment he offered was a fair one. But when hon. gentlemen say that the hon. Minister who introduced it is entirely unfit to do so, or to superintend its operation, I think it is an insult to the intelligence of the agriculturists of this country. Then, how is that Bill to be carried out? The hon. gentleman from Lambton (Mr. Lister) says: Are we to empower the Minister of Agriculture to shoot down our cattle? I ask, is that the ordinary way of doing things? Has it not been usual, when diseases have occurred in this country, in the past, to employ veterinary surgeons to examine the cattle? Is it not upon the advice of professional men that these cattle are dealt with? Is it upon the judgment of the Minister of Agriculture, who is not a professional veterinary surgeon, that an animal is declared to be diseased. No; the Minister will employ professional men for this duty, like Dr. McEachran, of Montreal, Dr. Coleman, of Ottawa, and Dr. Smith, of Toronto. Are these men not capable of ascertaining whether an animal is infected or not? Are these animals going to be shot down without any examination? No; certainly not. Now, every little objection that the ingenuity of those gentlemen could devise against the passage of this Bill has been raised. What is the law for? It is for the purpose of meeting the emergencies that arise in the ordinary current of events, not the hundred and one unlikely things that have been alluded to in this debate which, in all human probability, will never arise. Another hon. gentleman says: What does it apply to? It applies to animals. Then he went on to show what is understood by animals; and another hon. gentleman said: We do not know but that it may apply to ourselves as animals. Well, I can only say that if you apply one test, that which is so characteristic of one class of animals so prominently paraded before this House to-night—mules, with their kicking characteristics—you might apply it to a number of hon. gentlemen who are opposing this Bill. The Bill of 1879 was introduced and passed specially in the interests of the agriculturists of this country, and that is the very Bill which these hon. gentlemen accepted then, and are now opposing with such vehemence. I say they are doing what will react against them when they go back to the farmers and endeavor to justify the unseemly conduct that they have displayed here to-night.

Mr. CATUDAL. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, after having heard the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) I am really surprised that he should make such a statement as he has made in this House. He stated that the Bill now before us was introduced in the interest of the farming community, and was introduced by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, who, himself is a farmer, but a farmer who will never be affected by this Bill. Such farmers as the hon. Minister of Agriculture are, I believe, very few in each of the counties which we have the honor to represent here.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. CATUDAL. (Translation.) If the hon. members opposite cannot understand, they ought to go to the telegraph office and read the statement of the voting in the county of Lévis, I think that that will make them understand a little. Mr. Speaker, acoording to the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) the law has worked admirably until now. Praises are coming in from all parts, and he gives as an instance the county of Pictou; that county, he says, is fully satisfied with the present law. If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, why does the Minister of Agriculture come to-day before us with a proposition asking for a change, if the law has worked so well? But, I believe that if the hon. member for Stanstead and the hon. member for East Grey, had gone in the counties, which, up to this day, have been submitted to the operation of that law, they would certainly not have come before this House to-day and stated that such a law has given the greatest satisfaction to the farmers. The county I have the honor to represent here, is at the present time under the law of quarantine. We have no right to sell our sheep without leave from the Government inspector. I suppose the hon. gentleman who has hissed me is satisfied with the result of the election in West Northumberland, but, on the other hand, how does he like the result of the Lévis election? As I said a moment ago, the county which I have the honor to represent, is under the operation of the quarantine law. Farmers are now forbidden to sell their sheep without a permit from the inspector, and yet we see Americans coming daily into the county to buy sheep from these farmers. The law, as it is, prohibits the sale without a permit from the inspector. It is also said that in England they do not want to receive our sheep, because the sheep are infected with the disease. How is it that this disease exists in that county when we never sell sheep either in Montreal or elsewhere for the English market? All our sheep go to the New York and Boston markets. This law, Mr. Speaker, is thoroughly unjust. It is unjust because it takes from people the property which belongs to them without giving a compensation for the full value thereof. I believe that every member of this House who represents an essentially agricultural constituency ought to oppose this law; and I may add that the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Pinsonneault), a neighboring county to that which I represent, has told me what I have just stated, that is to say, that all the farmers in his county are totally opposed to that law. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I deem it my duty to record my protest against the measure which is now submitted to the House.

Amendment negatived on a division.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (North Oxford). With the permission of the committee, I beg leave to withdraw my amendment. The hon. Minister of Agriculture informed me that he intends to make certain changes in the Act on the third reading.

Mr. POPE. Yes; I said I would try and meet his views.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. CHARLTON. Perhaps the Minister would let us know what the arrangements are that have been made between himself and the hon. member for North Oxford.

Mr. POPE. The amendment I undertook to consider was respecting horses exclusively.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the Minister should give the committee to understand what changes he proposes to make on the third reading. There have been other objections than the one with respect to horses. Is he going to take the whole clause into consideration?

Mr. POPE. No; that is the only change. I will state to the House briefly why I propose to accept that amendment. In the first place, the House will understand that the object of this Bill is merely quarantine, and to prevent our cattle from being scheduled on the other side. In Ontario they have already passed an Act, by which they regulate their own affairs, and if I am called upon to send veterinary surgeons into that Province, I shall have some misgivings about jurisdiction, which question was raised by my hon. friend. In no case have I ordered an animal to be killed in any Province except it were necessary to protect us from being scheduled; otherwise, I have in no case ordered the killing of an animal or interfered with civil rights. I have always endeavored to do all I could to prevent diseased cattle being brought into the country. I paid particular atten-

tion to these two points. If I have not succeeded, it is because I had not the ability to do it. But I have watched the subject as carefully as I could, and, I believe, to the satisfaction of the people of this country. Now, just one word with respect to the farmers. I cannot believe that the farmers of this country are going to listen to anything that has been said here to-night by hon. gentlemen opposite, in criticism of this Bill. I believe the farmers of this country know that I have been looking after their best interests, and especially after the best interests of the stock owner; that I have been protecting those interests and have been giving them a market on the other side of the Atlantic. I have not lost a single opportunity of furthering the interests of the cattle trade. I have devoted myself to that task, knowing as much about it as most people, being as largely interested and mixed up with the cattle interest as most men here. I believed I could do that work with as great facility and as much knowledge as almost any member in this House. If I have failed to reply to every remark bandied across the floor to-night, it is not because I am afraid to meet hon. gentlemen opposite. When the hon. member for Huron moved an amendment, did I not accept it? I am ready to consider amendments proposed by such members as the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) and the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland); I shall be pleased to discuss them in the spirit which those hon. gentleman displayed; but I decline to answer such insinuations, such abuse, if you please, as has been cast across the House this evening. I leave the farmers of the country to judge me, to judge whether I have done my duty to this country or not. I am willing to leave myself in their hands, and I believe the country will approve the course I have followed.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. ARMSTRONG moved in amendment:

That clause 13 be amended by striking out all the words after "animal," in the 11th line, and ending at "dollars," in the 12th line.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CATUDAL (Translation). Moved in amendment to section 13.

That whenever it shall be found that an animal so slaughtered was not affected by any contagious disease, the owner of such animal will be entitled to obtain the full value thereof.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MULOCK moved in amendment that the following proviso be added to section 13:

Provided, that in the case of any animal of the value of $250 or upwards, supposed to be suffering from any infectious or contagious disease, the owner thereof may require the same to be quarantined instead of being slaughtered, and thereupon the Government shall cause the same to be quarantined, and the same shall not be slaughtered, except upon its being established by expert evidence that it is suffering from such infectious or contagious disease.

Amendment negatived.

On the section as amended by the amendment proposed by Mr. Pope,

Mr. MILLS. I think the word "may," at the commencement of the section, should be altered to "shall," as otherwise the Government might grant compensation in one case and not in another. And it seems to me that the law ought not to give a discretion if compensation is to be given at all. All parties should stand on precisely the same footing, and if one party is entitled to compensation, another party, under exactly the same circumstances, should be equally entitled to compensation. It should not be a matter of discretion, but of right, if it should exist at all. The word "shall" should be there.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The word "may" means "shall," when it stands for the Crown.

Mr. POPE.

Mr. MILLS. No; the hon. gentleman will see that the word "may" is permissive, and it is discretionary with the Government to say whether or not they shall do it.

Mr. DAVIES. The interpretation clause says nothing about the word "may" having a certain meaning when applied to the Crown. The word "may" has a certain meaning, and it is permissive, and in this case it is used in that sense.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is customary, in drafting laws, when an order is given by the Crown, for the word "may" to be used, and it means "shall."

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman will find nothing of the kind laid down by any court.

Mr. MULOCK. In certain legislation which took place last Session, certain duties were cast on the Governor in Council and directed to be performed by him, and the word "shall" is used. I refer to the Act amending the Consolidated Railway Act.

Mr. MILLS. I think the hon. gentleman should agree to insert the word "shall." The principle is perfectly clear; and if we are to have Government by law, and that should be the rule on the parliamentary system, it is necessary that this change should be made.

Mr. POPE. Of course it is intended to be obligatory, but I will enquire into it before the third reading.

Mr. WELDON. If it is intended that the rule shall be general as to the compensation of these parties, the word "shall" should be used and not "may."

Section as amended, agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman will save time by making the change.

Mr. POPE. I say I do not intend to make the change to-night, but I will enquire into it before the third reading, and if I find it is proper to make the change, I will make it.

Mr. WATSON. I move that the following clause be inserted between sections 13 and 14:—

Provided, however, that if the owner of such animal has reason to believe that such animal is not affected by glanders or farcy, he may deliver a notice in writing to that effect to the veterinarian, and the veterinarian shall thereupon place the animal in quarantine, pending the decision of a magistrate, who shall hear such evidence as shall be submitted by the veterinarian and by the owner of such animal, and thereupon shall, if the evidence shows the animal to be affected by glanders or farcy, order the veterinarian to destroy such animal.

I think that if such a clause were inserted it would not provide for any red tape or arbitration, but would simply allow a person having the animal to appeal to a magistrate, and if the evidence showed an animal to be affected after being placed in quarantine, it should be destroyed.

Amendment negatived.

On section 14,

Mr. FISHER. The Minister of Agriculture said that when we reached the point where his own name is substituted for the Governor in Council, he would explain the reasons, and I think this is the place.

Mr. POPE. It was because there was a necessity for acting more quickly than could perhaps be done by an Order in Council. Anyone can see that the clause is one which can be easily carried out by the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. COOK. Then the hon. gentleman intends to remain at Ottawa while his colleagues are sojourning at the seaside, and attending to the duties of the whole Government.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to ask an explanation with regard to this clause. If it is taken in connection with a portion of the clause we have just adopted, I think it will

require an explanation. This paragraph would permit the Minister of Agriculture to appropriate any animal imported into the country which is supposed to be affected by a contagious disease. He orders it to be killed and afterwards he reverses that order, and reserves it for experimental practice, to see whether it can be cured or not. Now, supposing the animal afterwards is proved not to be affected with a disease, what is to become of it? Does the original owner get it?

Mr. POPE. In that case, of course, he would get it. But it is unlikely an animal would be reserved for this purpose if he did not positively have the disease, as it is for a scientific purpose these investigations take place.

Mr. McMULLEN. Who is to pay for the doctoring, and care, and feeding of the animal during the time the Minister of Agriculture keeps it?

Mr. POPE. As Minister of Agriculture, I would see that it was paid for.

Mr. McMULLEN. If the animal is kept for a considerable time, and the owner put to any inconvenience, is he to be allowed anything for that inconvenience? Supposing the animal is imported and kept in quarantine for a month. You might keep it for three months. Supposing the man is put to the inconvenience of this thing, who is to pay him for the damage and the loss he has sustained?

Mr. POPE. I would like the hon. gentleman to tell me who is to pay anybody. Any creature diseased, on coming into the country, is liable to a three months' quarantine. Everybody understands this, I believe; but, as I said before, in the particular case of an animal that is diseased, or required to be slaughtered for experimental purposes, the Government, of course, may take the responsibility of retaining the animal.

On section 17,

Mr. WILSON. Perhaps the Minister might here offer some explanation as to the parties he selects to perform the duties of inspectors. It is certainly a very important service, and I am apprehensive that other than veterinary surgeons are selected for this office. It seems to me that the owners of stock would be placed in a very awkward position, indeed, if they were compelled to have their cattle inspected by an incompetent person. Therefore, I would like to know from the Minister whether proper and efficient persons are appointed to perform these duties.

Mr. POPE. I think the hon. gentleman will agree with the appointments made. There is Mr. Smith, of Toronto, Mr. McEachran, of Montreal, and Mr. Couture of Quebec. As I said before, I am not looking after the diseases scattered throughout the country. The attention to the public health devolves more upon the Local Governments, and I trust to them, unless something occurs which might cause us to be scheduled, which I must attend to.

Mr. WILSON. Am I to understand that at points other than those mentioned by the hon. Minister there are no local agents to report in case diseases spring up, unless attention is called to them by persons living in the locality? Or are there parties whose duty it is to look after cattle *in transitu* or imported? I think it is the duty of the Minister to make some provision, so that we may not have diseases existing for a length of time before they are brought to the notice of the Government.

Mr. POPE. We have no inspectors, except at ports where we have quarantines and where cattle enter the Dominion. We have no others.

Mr. WILSON. For instance, at a place where there is a very large amount of traffic, and where stock passes from one part of the United States through Canada to some other part, the Minister will find, if he calls to mind, that he has some parties who have been appointed by the Government to ascertain if any diseases should spring up during the time the cattle are *in transitu* through Canada. He will find that such a man is appointed at St. Thomas. What I want to know is, if there is any one appointed there to look after stock passing through *in transitu*.

Mr. POPE. There is no one appointed there, at the expense of the Government. He is appointed by the Government and paid by the railway. He is not a veterinary surgeon. Neither does he look about the country there. His duty is to see that the cattle passing through *in transitu* do not come in contact with our cattle.

Mr. WILSON. Then it is evident to me that this man has not been appointed on account of his suitableness for the position. Diseases might spring up, and cattle passing through that section might contaminate other cattle there, because the cars are left for some time at the station; and yet the Minister of Agriculture is so regardless of the interests and the welfare of that section of the country that he appoints a man who is inefficient, when he could as easily have obtained a man who would be competent to perform the duties, and to report to the Government, if necessary, as to the origin of the disease. I say that this is not in the interest of the locality or the country; and I have heard many complaints of that man's unfitness, not by my own political friends but by the political friends of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. POPE. Make your complaint and submit it to me, and I will investigate it.

Mr. WILSON. If the hon. gentleman investigated it, he would do a great deal more than he has done this evening, with reference to this Bill.

On section 19,

Mr. AUGER. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture to provide for inspectors in the rural districts, and authorise the local officers, such as the mayor or reeve, to make the report to the Minister of Agriculture; because in country parts, if there are no inspectors, and diseases break out, what are we to do?

Mr. POPE. I receive information from anybody, and if there is a serious outbreak, I attend to it. Otherwise, if I interfered with the local authorities, the Provinces might complain; and I carefully refrain from infringing upon their ground.

Mr. AUGER. We have no law in the Province of Quebec to deal with these cases, so that this law does not give us the right.

Mr. POPE. You have the right, and if you make a report I will investigate it, you may depend upon it.

On section 24,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Some of the Local Legislatures have made enactments on this. There would appear to be some considerable danger of complicating the jurisdiction under this Act.

Mr. POPE. There is no danger, because I do not interfere with anything they do within their own Province.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). You have the power.

Mr. POPE. If I find something there that is going to affect the trade of the country, I must take the power; I must have the power of superseding any orders of anybody else. As a matter of fact, I have never had to, except in Pictou, and in some places in the neighborhood of Montreal lately.

On section 31,

Mr. WELDON. This provides that a copy of the declaration of the inspector shall be conclusive evidence. The copy should be certified by the inspector, and the clause should be amended to read: "A copy of the declaration of the inspector certified by him."

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 32,

Mr. WELDON moved, in amendment, that in sub-section *a*: "By the production of a copy of a newspaper containing a copy of such order or regulation," be struck out, and that sub-section *b* be altered to read: "By the production of a printed or other copy of such order or regulation, certified by the Minister of Agriculture."

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 38,

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I think, if the hon. gentleman will consider the effect of this clause for a moment, he will see the propriety of changing it. This is taken from the 38th clause of the old Act, and there are a great many very serious changes in this new clause, differing very materially from the 38th clause of the Act of 1879. In the Act of 1879 it is provided that "any person who obstructs or impedes an inspector or other officer acting in execution of this Act, or of any Order of the Governor in Council thereunder, and any person aiding or assisting him therein," shall be guilty, and so on. Clause 38 of the new Act provides that "every person who obstructs or impedes an inspector or other officer acting in execution of this Act, or of any order of or regulation made by the Governor in Council, or the Minister of Agriculture." Under the old statute, a man was liable to be proceeded against for any violation of the statute itself; but, under the new Act, the hon. gentleman permits a man to be proceeded against for a violation of his own departmental order. I want to understand why he makes that change. And he goes further. There are provisions in this clause which I do not think ought to be in any statute, and I am not aware that they are in any statute. At the present moment, I recollect no law which enables a man to proceed against a person who has committed a violation of the law in the mode in which the hon. gentleman permits his officers or others to proceed against the person who violates this section. For instance, in the first place, he allows a man to be arrested without any information. The inspector, or the other officer in execution of the Act, may, for any violation of the statute, or of any order of the Governor in Council, or of any departmental order thereunder, arrest a person, and may detain him, as I read this section, without any information being laid or warrant being issued. Surely the hon. gentleman does not intend that, and he does not intend, surely, that a man should be liable to arrest without an information and without a warrant, for a mere violation of a departmental order.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman will see that this is in particular with regard to ships—boarding ships, and so on. It has to be done promptly.

Mr. CAMERON. But this does not affect ships: "Every person who obstructs or impedes an inspector or other officer acting in execution of this Act." It does not signify to what extent he impedes him in his duty under this statute, and if he impedes him in the discharge of his duty at all for violation of any departmental order of the hon. gentleman, he is still liable to be proceeded against; and not only is the man himself liable to be proceeded against, but any person whom he calls to his assistance. It may be a servant, or some person who is casually passing; it may be a man who knows nothing as to whether the person is violating the statute or an order of the Department, he is liable to be proceeded against under this clause, without an information and without a warrant, and is liable to be arrested. Then, further than that; not only can the inspector or the officer arrest this man who violates the statute or the order of the Department, but the inspector has the power of calling somebody to his assistance, who is given the same powers as the inspector. It is an extraordinary proposition that these powers should be vested in these officers, but it is still more extraordinary that they should be vested in any person the officer may call upon to assist him. The hon. gentleman will see that he may be a wholly irresponsible person, some casual person who is, perhaps, passing by; but he is allowed by this Act to deprive a man of his liberty, to incarcerate him and keep him until he is brought before a magistrate. I am sure, if my hon. friend will consider the effect of that provision, he will not put that power in the hands even of his own officer, much less in the hands of any person whom this officer may call upon to assist him.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The words "or any person whom he may call to his assistance" might, perhaps, be taken away, without injuring the Bill at all.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Surely the hon. gentleman would not allow a subordinate officer to arrest a man without information.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That was the old law.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). No, it was not; because the old law only enabled the arrest of a person for violation of the provisions of a statute; while this law enables the inspector, or the officer of the Department, to arrest him for violation of an order of the Department, and to deprive him of his liberty, without any person laying a charge. Now, we know the law is that an officer, in the discharge of his duty, and for the preservation of the peace, can arrest on view; but this enables the officer to arrest and that not on view; the inspector may not be present at all when the offence is committed, and the third person who makes the arrest may not be present. I think the whole of this 38th clause ought to be recast, or else the hon. gentleman should leave it as it is in the old statute. A violation of this statute may lead to a fine of $20, though the offence may be very trifling. Some meddlesome official that may be appointed in some outlying district would have authority, under this clause, to deprive a man of his liberty, and I say it is a dangerous power to give, even to an officer, and much more dangerous to some wholly irresponsible person.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The clause is the same as it is in the old law, except it is framed with more care. But the words, "any person who he calls to his assistance," may be taken away—not because the person might not have the right to arrest; because a person whom an officer calls to his assistance may make an arrest, as well as the officer. These words are surplusage, and may be left out. The clause is exactly the same; the regulation is made by Order in Council, so it amounts to the same as the clause of the old Act.

Mr. DAVIES. No, it is a regulation of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. But it is obstructing the execution of this Act, and the authority putting the Act in force may be a regulation issued by the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It is an entirely different clause: "Any person who obstructs or impedes an inspector in the execution of this Act, or of any order or regulation made by the Governor in Council." That is all right; but then it goes farther: "Or any order or regula-

tion made by the Minister of Agriculture." Now, that is what I object to. I say a man should not be arrested for the violation of a departmental order. I say that under the common law no third person, and nobody else but the officer, can arrest on view, except in cases of felony. Now, here he allows some third person to arrest, who may not have seen the offence committed at all.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Who is the third person?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Somebody that the inspector may call in.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is exactly what the Minister of Agriculture says might be struck out.

Mr. WELDON. Is the Secretary of State willing to have that struck out?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes.

Mr. WELDON. I think the last part of that is very objectionable. I do not believe in any man being detained without a warrant; and when he is arrested, the party arresting should take him forthwith before a justice of the peace and detain him not longer than twenty-four hours. I do not think it should be in the discretion of the party to keep him.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This is where the old clause is improved. At all events, the detention will never be more than twenty-four hours.

Mr. WELDON. But when he undertakes to deprive a person of his liberty, I want him to do it according to law.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is not a novel thing to arrest a man for obstructing or impeding the execution of a statute. Of course, the law makes a certain act an offence, and if it is an offence, the offender may be arrested *de visu*. That is perfectly well known. The officer will not have time to go and find a magistrate.

Mr. WELDON. I do not object to his being arrested, but it should not be in the discretion of the party making the arrest to keep the prisoner as long as he pleases.

Mr. POPE. No longer than necessary.

Mr. WELDON. Who is to decide how long a time is necessary? I should say that where the inspector undertakes to deprive a man of his liberties—rightly or wrongly—he is not to judge of that—he should take him immediately before a justice of the peace.

Mr. POPE. That is what it says.

Mr. WELDON. No; it is not. It gives the man discretion to keep the man twelve or fifteen hours.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. freind knows that if an officer of the Department detains a man longer than is necessary to bring him before a magistrate he is responsible therefor.

Mr. WELDON. I think in the Fishery Act it says that the offender shall be brought "forthwith" before a justice of the peace, to be dealt with according to law.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Even then he may have kept him two days.

Mr. WELDON. That is true; but, I think it is a step in the right direction. No man has a right to be deprived of his liberty half an hour without process of law.

Mr. MILLS. That is not a legal phrase, and the phrase suggested by my hon. friend has been over and over again interpreted. There are decisions upon it, and we know what it means.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I suggest that the clause be amended, by stating that the offender shall be taken forthwith before a justice of the peace.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 46,

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I think this is a very dangerous power to give to justices of the peace. Under this statute, fines to the amount of $200 can be imposed, and several important questions may arise; and yet it is provided to allow these questions to be disposed of by justices of the peace. It would be far better if the hon. gentleman provided that all the penalties under this Act can be recovered before a court of competent jurisdiction, on the complaint of any resident of the county where the offence is committed. I am not aware of any law where justices of the peace are given jurisdiction to the extent of $200 in civil matters. This is not a wise and judicious section.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The jurisdiction of justices of the peace will afford more protection, I think, than that of any other court. Cases will come, moreover, not before one justice, but before two justices of the peace.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). We know the class of men of which justices of the peace are generally composed; that they are not particularly well posted in the law; that they do not make themselves well posted; and they are not the kind of men before whom large and important rights should be tried. They do very well for small matters, and to impose small fines.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Two justices of the peace, or a stipendiary magistrate, have the power of imposing higher fines than those that are specified in this Bill.

Mr. WELDON. Justices of the peace have power to try cases respecting seamen's wages, when the amount is up to $200. But we might, in this case, as is provided in the Seamen's Act, give a right of appeal. I think that in this case there should be no doubt in the matter, and I think provision should be made for the right of appeal. It does not say that the provisions of the Summary Jurisdiction Act shall apply, and therefore I think that a very nice question might arise.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There is certainly no provision for the collection of these penalties before a justice of the peace, for it does not say that they shall be recovered in the same way as penalties are recovered under the Summary Jurisdiction Act; and, besides, as the hon. member for St. John has said, there is no power for appeal—no redress in that way.

Mr. DAVIES. There is no jurisdiction given here. If you sue under the jurisdiction set out in this section, you must set out that jurisdiction in every stage of the proceedings, else when the judgment is given there is no right of appeal. The object could be attained by adding "and the procedure of the Summary Jurisdiction Act shall apply in any prosecution in any penalty."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It might stand as it is for the present, and the Minister will see to it, and perhaps have the language amended, as it is the intention to have it passed under the Summary Jurisdiction Act.

Mr. WATSON. Before the committee rises I would ask the Minister if it is his intention to place an inspector at Winnipeg. It is a very important point, as a great many cattle are shipped through there from the American side?

Mr. POPE. It is not our practice to place inspectors, except on the frontier.

Mr. WATSON. Have you one at Emerson?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. Who is he?

Mr. POPE. I forget his name at the moment—you must know him.

Bill reported with amendments.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1:05 a. m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 15th April, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORTS ON PRIVATE BILLS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved:

That as the time for the reception of reports from committees on Private Bills expires to-day, the same be extended to the 1st day of May next.

Mr. BLAKE. According to ordinary rules, we ought to be prorogued by then.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not think there is any special rule for that.

Mr. BLAKE. Ordinary rules I said.

Motion agreed to.

INSOLVENT CORPORATIONS.

Mr. EDGAR moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 127) to further amend "An Act respecting insolvent banks, insurance companies, loan companies, building societies, and trading corporations." He said: This Bill is a very short but somewhat important one, and I would ask the attention of the First Minister to it. It is the same as the Bill No. 66 on the Order paper, and is simply for the purpose of applying to the winding up of insolvent banks and companies, a provision which has been placed in all Insolvent Acts relating to individual traders, that is, that the employés of insolvent shall have a preferential lien for their wages. It was omitted from the Act respecting the winding up of companies. I think it is a very proper provision to apply to them, and unless the Government will put it among their Orders, it will hardly be reached this Session. Perhaps the First Minister will look at it and see if that can be done.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

Mr. MITCHELL. The right hon. Premier, some days since, informed the House that he would be able to tell what course the Government was going to take with regard to the Order of the House for a list of the Grand Trunk stockholders. Would he kindly state now what course the Government intends to take?

Mr. WATSON.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid I must be guilty of laches—or rather, I have been so much occupied in other matters, that I am not able to answer the question of the hon. gentleman to-day.

Mr. MITCHELL. I suppose we shall have it ere long, though?

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. KAULBACH. Before engaging in the Orders of the Day, I would ask the indulgence of this House for a few moments, whilst I bring to its notice a statement that appeared in the issue of the Ottawa *Free Press* newspaper of the 7th instant, which is as follows:—

"NOVA SCOTIA VOLUNTEERS.—A 'DUDE' COMPANY WHICH DIDN'T PASS MUSTER.

"HALIFAX, N.S., April 7.—Corporal guards of the new battalion were all day yesterday busy drumming up absentees. It is curious that the 66th, which should have a strength of about 400, have difficulty, with all their recruiting, in obtaining 150 effective men for their contingent in the composite corps, particularly after their officers being so anxious to tender the services of the battalion as a whole. The dude company, composed exclusively of gentlemen's sons, were all disqualified but six. When the old 63rd paraded yesterday they turned out with full ranks, and the men were selected at once without difficulty. Forming into three companies, they wheeled into line, and, numbering off, the left hand man shouted exultantly 'fifty' amid a cheer from all around. They were then addressed by their colonel and officers, and unanimously pronounced the strongest feature of the composite corps. The garrison artillery had also no difficulty in selecting their quota of able drilled men The battalion will be in marching order to-night. A section of the community urge against the Blue Noses going to fight those they consider far more Canadians than we. There was some talk of raising a volunteer contingent among the stalwart men of Lunenberg County, but the stolid Dutch descendants there unanimously opposed fighting unless necessary for their homes. Many hold bets that our company will not proceed at all."

I would have referred to this immediately after it came to my notice, but anticipating the arrival of the 66th *en route* for the North-West, and desiring to obtain particulars, I thought proper to delay. I must say I was sorry to see in this newspaper, recognised as the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, these uncalled for and untruthful statements respecting the 66th Battalion of the active militia, Halifax; and not content with defaming them alone, it must satiate the feelings of its followers still further, by casting a slur upon the 75th Battalion under my command, and the two companies of garrison artillery commanded by Captains Brown and James, respectively, referring to them as "Dutch descendants," and unanimously opposed to fighting unless necessarily for their homes. Now, Mr. Speaker, as a Nova Scotian, knowing as I do the Halifax 66th Battalion, having seen them in drill and on parade, I can state in justice to that battalion, that as respects physique, general appearance and drill, I believe it to be as good, and the pluck and martial ardour of the officers and men as great as any regiment in Canada, able and willing, with the exception of some few, perhaps, to endure the fatigue and exposure on the long line of march, to the blood-stained soil, that marks the sacrifice of their fellowmen at the hands of a ruthless rebel; and ready at any time on the bugle sound "Charge!" for the nervous stress, strain and din of battle. The same can be said, and said truthfully, of the 75th Battalion, without an exception, and the two companies of garrison artillery referred to, comprised, as the Grit press sneeringly remarks, of "Lunenburg Ducthmen." I might state that realising the inconvenience and loss that would offer to the fishermen of Lunenburg enrolled in this battalion, at this season, the commencement of their boat fishing, and the sacrifice to their fleet of fine fishing vessels, were the fishermen called upon for active service, I brought it to the notice of the Minister, who at once took in the position, and acted accordingly. To prove the loyalty that exists in the hearts of the people of Lunenburg as respects the rebellion in the North-West, I would

state that I was offered only a day or two ago, by a worthy citizen of my county, a volunteer company to be attached to my regiment ready for the call of duty. The offer was presented to the Minister of Militia and Defence, and this is his reply:

"Very much obliged for offer of services, at present it is not considered advisable to organise any new corps. If the necessity requires, will be happy to favorably consider application."

Does this show lack of loyalty, or place the Dutchmen, as the Grits call them, at a discount? If it is intended as a slur upon my people, I am happy to say I am proud of the nationality, and would consider that I would be recreant to the trust reposed in me, as the representative of a people whom I respect and hold very dear were I not to resent it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman's remarks are a little irregular and I must call him to order.

INSOLVENCY BILL.

Mr. EDGAR. Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to draw the attention of the Government to the report of the Committee on Bankruptcy and Insolvency. The Bill has been distributed and perhaps the Government can say now whether this very important measure will be taken up this Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not yet able to answer that question.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE.

On the Order being called for second reading of Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise—(Sir John A. Macdonald),

Mr. BLAKE. I hope the hon. gentleman does not really propose to read this Bill the second time to-day without having given us any notice of his intention. I enquired last night what Government measures were intended to be brought forward to-day, but the hon. gentleman had left the House, and his hon. friend beside him (Sir Hector Langevin) said that he did not know.

Sir JOHN. A. MACDONALD. If I remember aright the hon. gentleman said that we had too long delayed bringing the measure.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, I said so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That was some little time ago; the Bill has been in the hands of hon. members since, and I do not see how their ability to discuss the matter can have decreased by the fact of the interval of time which has elapsed since the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. BLAKE. The House knows what this Order paper is and what the discharge of our duties necessarily is. It has always been recognised as reasonable that the Government should, at any rate the day before they proposed to bring on an important measure, intimate their intention to the House. That is the course pursued, and as a rule it is a necessary course. On this occasion, however, the hon. gentleman did not leave the information which was essential in order that the answer might be given, and it seems to me this period of the Session might be a fair intimation to us, not that he was going, but that he was not going on with the measure. It is a very long Bill; we have plenty of measures before us to consider; and of course we do not desire to prepare for the discussion of a measure unless we have some information that it is going to be brought on. On former occasions, in reference to Bills involving great principles, the hon. gentleman has freely recognised the principle of giving the House some information of the day on which he proposed to take it up.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Had I been in the House I would have given the information. However, upon the remonstrance, I may say, of the hon. gentleman, I will go on with it to-morrow.

CANADA CIVIL SERVICE ACT.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved second reading of Bill (No. 31) to amend and consolidate the Canada Civil Service Acts of 1882, 1883 and 1884. He said: I have already explained the amendments to the Act. The object of bringing the Bill before the House was not so much that the changes to be made in the Acts are important, because they are not very important, as to put the Bill in a condition so that it will be a part of the general consolidation of the statutes which is to be brought before this House this Session. I will not take up much of the time of the House but will briefly go over a few of the provisions of the Bill. The hon. gentlemen will see that the changes have been indicated in italics so as to facilitate the reference to former Acts, and to facilitate the reading of the Bill, and thus save time. In clause 3, we intended saying that the civil service shall include all those officers that are mentioned in the schedules referred to in the clause, and some others who might have been or may be appointed by Order in Council, and that the civil service will be composed of them and of such other officer or employés as may be brought by any Act under the provisions of the Civil Service Act. It is intended gradually to bring into the civil service, all those officers appointed in the Territories, who may not be, up to the present time, members of the civil service, who may have been appointed by the necessities of the moment as officers, and are not in the service. Clause 5, only says that the Governor in Council may, from time to time, make rules and regulations respecting appointments and promotions of officers in the civil service. In the old time, it was the Board of the Civil Service which was charged with preparing those rules and regulations. Since then, the Treasury Board have here and there passed a few regulations, and to simplify matters it is intended that all these rules and regulations shall henceforth be made by the Governor in Council. I have already mentioned before this House, and it has been discussed at length, the change intended to be made in the Civil Service Board of Examiners. That board shall be directly under the supervision of the Secretary of State, and each member of the board shall receive a salary of $600 instead of $300, which he receives at present. The travelling expenses will henceforth be paid according to the general Order in Council regulating the amount to be paid for civil servants travelling on duty. The Board of Civil Service Examiners may have a secretary appointed by the Governor in Council, and that secretary, if he is not a member of the board, can receive a salary of $1,000 a year. I have stated that now—and by the Bill it is allowable to be so—the secretary of the board is one of the members of the board. As I stated on another occasion, it has been intimated to me that perhaps the present secretary of the board, Mr. LeSueur, might, on account of his health or on account of the increasing duties of his office as commissioner, be prevented from acting as secretary. If we were under the necessity of appointing a secretary for the board, he would receive $1,000; if not, the secretary by Order in Council receives a salary of only $700 above his salary as commissioner. Parliament voted last year the necessary credit, and the Government has appointed, a few weeks ago, a clerk to the Board at a salary of $500, the present Bill giving power to appoint him as a civil servant of the third-class that is, from $400 to $1,000. Clause 12 of the Bill provides

that, in the future, no new deputy head of a Department shall be appointed except when such office has been created by a special Act of Parliament. I must say that clause 21, which was intended to put the minimum of the salary of the second class at $1,000, will be withdrawn, and the salary, which is now at a minimum of $1,100, will remain as before. Section 24 provided that the minimum salary of a messenger, packer or sorter shall be $300 per annum and the maximum $500. This clause was intended to allow the Minister to appoint a messenger at the minimum figure, and, if found better, in the interest of the service, not to allow to that messenger the statutory increase of $30 a year. I do not think I shall adhere to that section, but shall leave it as it is now, that the salary of the messenger shall be $300 to begin with, increasing by $30 a year to a maximum of $500. The 25th section provides that the salary of a clerk on his appointment shall be the minimum of his class, except in the case of third-class clerks, who may receive, in addition to that minimum, the amount which is allowed for optional subjects for which they might have passed an examination, limited to four in number. That is to say, a third class clerk might be appointed with a salary of $600, if he is so well qualified as to have been able to pass satisfactory examinations on four different optional subjects, those subjects being, amongst others, stenography, type-writing, composition in the language different from the language of the applicant, book-keeping, and précis-writing. There are six or seven optional subjects, but the $50 allowed for each shall be limited to four optional subjects. In section 38, in addition to the persons who may be admitted to the service without the examination required before entering such service, are named the inspectors in the Customs Department, and the assistant inspectors in the Inland Revenue Department. The hon. Ministers at the head of those Departments will explain the reason which has prompted the Government to make that exemption. The 40th clause provides a little change with regard to promotion examinations. It has been found, and I think in this House hon. members have expressed the opinion, that old officers in the public service ought to be exempted from some of the difficult examination papers that were submitted to them, and to which they were obliged to answer satisfactorily before they can be promoted, after long years of service. It is obvious that those subjects, which a young man just out of school is apt to well remember, or which he is alive to in leaving the college or the academy, might have been forgotten by an officer after several years' service without depriving him of his usefulness as a public servant; and in some cases it was found that a promotion that might have been well deserved otherwise had been prevented or stopped by the officer not being able to pass an examination on some subjects which were not difficult for a young man out of school, but which were very difficult for an officer who had something to do besides study those general subjects in the execution of his duties as a clerk. To remedy this the clause enacts that examinations shall be held on the subjects that fit the candidate for the duties of his office, but still, not to lose sight entirely of the general knowledge which a public officer should always preserve, and which might be found to be not only useful but necessary to him in the discharge of his duties, the Government by an Order in Council have selected a few general subjects upon which the officer seeking promotion will have also to be examined. I must say that these subjects have been limited to those a knowledge of which is always considered necessary in an officer of the service, and which those officers ought always to be conversant with if they have not completely neglected to acquire a knowledge of what it is their duty to know. Section 47 regulates the system by which an officer can permute from one Department to another without being subjected to an examination, if he has already passed his examination, or from one division to another, without examination; but providing at the same time—and I suppose my hon. friends opposite will not object to it—that such transfer shall not be made the excuse or pretence of increasing the salary beyond the ordinary increase provided by the statute. In clause 48 there is a new disposition by which it is provided that if, out of necessity or owing to pressure of work, the head or deputy-head of a Department has to take into the service a person or persons who have not already submitted to the required examinations, the time of their employment shall not exceed the period between the day they enter upon their service and the date of the next examination; that is to say, that no persons shall be employed in a Department unless they have passed the examination; and in case they have been taken through necessity, without that examination, they shall immediately qualify and pass their examination at the next opportunity occurring after their entrance into temporary service. We all know that in the Departments the Ministers are not allowed to employ, even for temporary work, even for day's work, such as copying—they are not allowed by the general rule to employ any person except those who have passed the examination qualifying them to enter the service. But as it is obvious that circumstances may arise when the work would be pressing, and if no one could be found at hand to do that work, it is provided that persons may be taken to do such temporary work without having submitted to the examination, but such persons shall be obliged to undergo the next examination. These and other general features of the Bill will clearly show the House that it it is not the intention of the Government to facilitate the exercise of favoritism in the Civil Service, but to employ, as much as possible, even for temporary work, only those persons who have duly qualified themselves as civil servants. The other day we had occasion to discuss, in this House, the 2nd sub section of section 52, which provides that if an inferior officer does the duties of his superior officer for a space of more than 3 months he shall be entitled to the difference between his salary and the salary of the superior officer whom he replaces. We have added, as I then stated the words: "during the absence of such officer, or by reason of his demise." The balance of the clause is the same as the law stood before. Clause 53 provides that an officer who has resigned, after being in the service, can reenter the service if found qualified; or if it is found desirable, he can be allowed, by Order in Council, to re-enter the service, but not in a class superior to the class he held when he resigned his position. Clause 54 provides that in case of money being voted by Parliament for work to be done, or for employés to be appointed, that money shall not be considered as claimable by the party in favor of whom it was voted unless an Order in Council shall have been passed, in addition to the Parliamentary vote, applying that money to the persons indicated in the vote of Parliament. The last clause provides that the Secretary of State shall lay before Parliament a list of all the civil servants in Canada. This, Mr. Speaker, must not be construed as adding to the expenditure of the Civil Service for this reason: Two years ago, I think, by vote of Parliament, a complete list of the officers employed in the service was ordered by the House containing the name, age, date of appointment, nationality, religion of each officer, and the locality from which each officer came. That list was printed, and the type has been kept standing, so that, without any additional expense, the necessary change can be made each year out of the standing type, and we can thus have annually a complete Civil Service list, which would be more convenient than adding every year to the return of 1883, a new list of the civil servants. These are the only changes which have been introduced into the Acts as they now exist. The position of the

different clauses has also been somewhat changed, but with the unimportant changes and additions, which I have just mentioned to the House, the Bill is a repetition of existing Acts. I need not, Mr. Speaker, take up any more time of the House. As I stated before, the changes are not very important, and upon those which might suggest discussion, that discussion has already taken place in this House.

Mr. CASEY. I regret that I did not know this Bill was coming up to-day, or I should have had something to say in regard to the principle of the Bill. The principle which, I suppose, ought to be discussed on the second reading, is, as the hon. Minister has stated, just the same as that of the previously existing Acts; and I do not know that there is much to be said in criticism of the principle of this Bill that could not have been said upon the existing Acts. I wish to say something in regard to the principle of both the existing Acts and the present Bill. I regret deeply that the hon. gentleman and the Government have not seen their way to introduce something approaching to a competitive system—that system which has been in practice in England for so many years and with such happy results; and which has been adopted in the United States, that country which is supposed to be the home of patronage, the special habitat of the spoils' system, and where it has worked successfully the last few years. I had hoped to have seen a change looking in that direction, if the hon. gentleman proposed to bring down any Bill on the subject. As I have not had notice that this Bill would come to-day, I shall have to defer to a later occasion what I intended to say, and what I still intend to say, in respect to the principle of the Bill, and to present arguments in favor of the competitive system.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time; House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 3,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it the intention of the Minister to give the Governor in Council power to bring in by Order in Council a number of other employés not now under the provisions of the Civil Service Act, because that would appear to be the meaning of a portion of this section? To bring in a number of employés who are not now entitled to superannuation, and which would involve a large and additional charge on the public revenue, should be done by Act.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The intention of this section is to allow the Government to bring into the Civil Service officers in British Columbia and the North-West Territory, who are not in the Civil Service; and it is not to create any new offices.

Mr. BLAKE. If that is the intention, would it not be better to express it? Under this clause the hon. gentleman has taken power for the Governor in Council to place any one in any Department of the public service in the Civil Service. It is an absolute discretionary power. If there is any special reason applicable to officers in the North-West Territory and British Columbia, let us deal with them to the limit required. But you may take the railway service, the outside engineering service, certain servants of the penitentiaries, who are not under the Superannuation Act, and place them in the Civil Service in that regard. The hon. gentleman must know there is very strong objection to the system of superannuation throughout the country, and to propose to take power to place employés *en bloc* under the Superannuation Act is a proposal which should not be made.

Mr. MILLS. Looking over this Act hurriedly I observe there are several instances where power is given to the Governor in Council where it should not be given. There is no doubt whatever that cases occur in administrating public affairs where it is impossible to foresee what will be required to be done, and a certain discretionary power must be given to the Governor in Council. But, as experience plainly shows, at a certain point the functions of the Governor in Council to act legislatively ought to come to an end, and whatever the Government desires should be proposed to the House in the form of legislation. The provisions of this section and of section five are objectionable in this particular, and, at all events, whatever the Governor in Council may do in this direction, the Order in Council ought to be laid on the Table of Parliament and be subject to its approval.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. As I have already stated, it is not intended to bring any person under this except those already in the service. I desire that employés in the North-West Territories should be placed under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. BLAKE. There is no provision in this Act that all public servants, who by Act of Parliament are brought into the public service, shall *ipso facto* fall within the privileges of the Superannuation Act. So I do not ask for a limit in that direction. But I ask the committee to limit the discretion of the Governor in Council.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The point is that in the Acts relating to the North-West Territories, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) knows, it is provided that such officers as are required shall be appointed by the Governor in Council; but hitherto we have thought it not desirable to bring them into the Civil Service as permanent officers. We have retained the principle laid down in the Act that they shall be removable at once, without their possessing the status of civil servants. I think the time has not yet arrived when that provision should be altered, either in the Indian Act or the Dominion Lands Act.

Mr. BLAKE. That does not seem at all unreasonable, and I am not objecting, but I think the propositions introduced should first of all limit the area to the North-West Territories of this exceptional power of appointment. In the second place I think it should say persons of the same class as those which are now by Act of Parliament in other parts of Canada made part of the Civil Service. If he puts in those two things he will have the whole discretion.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have no objection.

Mr. MILLS. As the hon. gentleman has intimated, those persons holding offices in the North-West Territory should not be permanently included in the Civil Service because their appointments are in their nature temporary. Take for instance, the appointment of a land agent at a particular place. After all the lands are disposed of and there is no more work for him in that capacity, there is no reason why he should longer continue in the Civil Service. When he accepts the position he knows that, and therefore you would not include such a person in the list of permanent officials and give him any claim on the Government.

Mr. CASEY. I think the point referred to is an important one—that we should have here a definition of the classes of officers who are to be brought within the Act. I think the wording of the section would—though I do not suppose that was the intention—include some individual officers and employés and bring them within the Act when other officers of the same class would be left out. I think the Act should specify clearly what classes of officers should be brought within its scope.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would suggest a remedy which I think would please the people of this country that, in place of getting legislation from year to year in amendment of the Civil Service Act, which in my opinion and the opinion of

others should never have been brought into existence, the Government should repeal the Act; it would be the most popular thing that they have done for a long time. I am satisfied that the feeling of the country is that they have tolerated this Civil Service Act—that they have put up with it and they cannot see any object in maintaining such an Act. If these additional amendments give the Governor in Council power to superannuate a particular class I think the sooner they are wiped out the better, for I do not think they will do any good. Abolish the whole thing.

Mr. CASEY. Does the hon. gentleman say we should have no Civil Service Act at all, or is he objecting to this particular Act, which is a proposition I can understand.

Mr. MITCHELL. Well, if the hon. gentleman would make a good system——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Hon. gentlemen will please confine themselves to the clause under discussion, as we cannot now go into the merits of the Bill. The principle of the Bill has been accepted and I intend that hon. gentlemen shall confine themselves to the particular clauses which are under discussion.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is very desirable, and I will endeavor to confine myself to the clause. Will you tell me which it is?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. It is number three.

Mr. MITCHELL:

"The Civil Service, for the purposes of this Act, includes and consists of all classes of employés in or under the several Departments of the Executive Government of Canada, and in the office of the Auditor General, included in the schedules A and B to this Act, appointed by the Governor in Council or other competent authority before the first day of July, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-two, or thereafter appointed in the manner provided by the Civil Service Act from time to time being in force, and such other officers and employés as the Governor in Council or any Act may bring under the provisions of the Civil Service Act."

Now, Mr. Chairman, it affords me great pleasure to find that the old adage of new brooms sweeping clean is being so wonderfully and ably demonstrated in the course pursued by your honor, in calling me to order for so slightly departing from the rules. I entirely approve of the course you have pursued in calling attention to the matter; but still I would say this, that it is customary to allow a little latitude in discussions like this in committee. I know it is useless to oppose anything that this Government brings in in the way of a Civil Service Act, especially when they have English precedent for it. I did not intend to oppose this particular clause of the Bill but to make a remark in reply to the hon. gentleman who asked me if I opposed any Civil Service Act. I would not oppose an Act for the purpose of regulating the Civil Service, but I do oppose a Civil Service Act which is surrounded by all these examinations and this enormous class of officers—this system of examination which I hold does not give the people of the country at large a fair opportunity. It confines the selection for the Civil Service of this country largely to one class. I may state, in conclusion, that I will vote against the Act and every amendment to the Act, and I will be glad to see those recent amendments abolished.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is not the intention to extend at all the provisions of the Civil Service Act in regard to such officers as those in the North-West Territories, unless they would be entitled to be brought under the Act if they were in other parts of the country. On the suggestion of the First Minister I would add these words:

And such other officers and employés in the North-West Territories holding positions which if held in other parts of Canada would bring them under the provisions of the Civil Service Acts, etc.

Mr. MILLS. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman go a little further and provide that all such Orders in Council shall be laid before Parliament during the early part of the Session.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is done by another part of the Act.

On section 5,

Mr. CASEY. I think this clause is too wide altogether, I do not know why it should be here at all. This Bill lays down the lines on which rules and regulations must be made for appointments and promotions in the Civil Service, and yet this clause provides that the Governor in Council may make other rules and regulations.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am willing to add "in comformity with the present Act."

Mr. BLAKE. What is it wanted for?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. With regard to a number of the details in examination, the rules and regulations used to be made by the Board of Civil Service Examiners. Since that time the Treasury Board have made some rules and regulations, which did not appear to work satisfactorily with those made by the Civil Service Examiners themselves; and this clause is merely inserted in order to avoid difficulties of that kind, to authorise the Governor in Council to make rules and regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of the Act.

Mr. CASEY. I understand that the hon. Minister wants to give power to the Governor in Council to make provision with reference to the details of examinations such as are made by the Civil Service Examiners?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Partly that.

Mr. CASEY. Why not leave it to the Civil Service Board?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I will give one instance. We might reduce the number of subjects on which clerks should be entitled to receive $50 additional. The regulation with regard to that has already been made by the Civil Service Board, but altered by the Treasury Board. It might be left in the hands of the Government, and not to a special board.

Mr. CASEY. There is the question of policy involved. I think the nature of the examinations should be decided by the Government. But the question of all the details connected with these examinations should be left to the Board of Examiners. Such matters as the method of conducting the examinations the Government should not interfere with; they are purely technical matters for the examiners. I think the hon. Minister's intention would be carried out by expressing it thus:

The Governor in Council may, from time to time, make rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this Act, respecting the appointments and promotions of officers in the Civil Service.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is exactly the same thing. I would move to add, after the word "regulations," the words, "not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act."

Mr. CASEY. There might be regulations not inconsistent with the Act, but not intended to carry out its provisions—regulations relating to matters of detail which this Act does not concern itself with, thus trenching on what ought to be left to the Civil Service Examiners.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is very necessary at times that the Government should interfere. Little difficulties may abide, which cannot otherwise be overcome. For instance, a candidate may present himself for examination. His papers are sent to him, but by a clerical error or something of the kind, part of the papers fail to reach him; and when they are collected, it appears that he has answered all the papers given to him, but that something is missing. In that case, the Civil Service Examiners are in a difficulty, because they are obliged to report that the candidate has

not answered all the questions, though it was not his fault; but they do not feel that it is in their power to do anything to reject that candidate. So that we are obliged by regulation to say that that does not invalidate that candidate's papers, but that he should be allowed to pass his examination on the other papers at a future period. There are a number of little details of that kind, and provided this section is not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, I do not think my hon. friend should object.

Mr. CASEY. The case the hon. Minister states is one that certainly would require the intervention of somebody, but I think it would be met by giving the examiners themselves the power to deal with it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not think so.

Mr. CASEY. I think in a matter of that sort, the Government should not interfere but should leave to the examiners themselves the power to deal with it. It is just such a question as gives the Government an opportunity of interfering with an object. A case might occur where the candidate might be the pronounced friend or the pronounced opponent of the Government, and we know that Governments will interfere in such cases. To keep that temptation out of the way of the Government and prevent it from being charged with interference from a political motive, it would be better to clothe the Civil Service Board with the power to deal with such cases, and leave the clause in the shape I suggest, giving them the power merely to carry out the provisions of the Act. That is the usual form in which such clauses are couched, and the Minister will find it to be the most convenient way.

Mr. BLAKE. There are two divisions in this clause. The clause deals with the appointments and promotion of officers in the Civil Service and all other matters pertaining thereto. What the hon. gentleman has stated as his reasons for requiring this power given the Governor in Council comes under the second head embraced in these general words, "and all other matters pertaining thereto," and deals with questions as to accidents, we may call them, which may happen in the conduct of the examinations. To touch this matter first, I am strongly of the opinion that it is better for the Government service that the matter should be managed by those who are appointed to be the examiners. Let general regulations be made applicable, not to a particular case but to all cases, if you please, general regulations of the Governor in Council which will show the principles upon which the Board of Examiners are acting in all cases. Let these regulations be brought down before us so that we shall see them, but let them be wide enough, either by the Act or by the regulations, to enable the examiners themselves to deal with the specific cases. I have known of cases in my experience in which it was stated that the examination paper was illicit, when the fact of the matter was that it was a very hard examination paper which the applicant would not be very well able to answer at the time, and it is requisite there should be those who are conversant with the tricks of the trade who could deal with the particular cases which occur. For the Government, by Order in Council, to intervene in a specific case and decide whether the candidate shall be permitted to be examined again and on what terms, is worse than absurd. A general regulation ought to be made; and if there be any cases which cannot be provided for, it is better by general regulation to put these unprovided cases in the hands of your examining board to be dealt with on general principles to be laid down by them, rather than expose the Government to the unnecessary labor and other and more serious inconvenience which belongs to their intervention in a matter so peculiarly delicate as this. The law which the hon. gentleman proposes goes much further than that; he has given us an instance, as he says, under "the other matters pertaining thereto" which render this desirable, but the law goes to all matters respecting the appointments and promotions of officers as well as examinations, which, indeed, are touched only by the general words. Now, I have heard it stated that the standards have been altered on occasions; that there have been examinations of individuals by special order of the Government. I do not aver these things because I have not absolute knowledge of them, but I have been told so; and I say that if there is any intervention of that kind, it is an intervention which is of a most vexatious description, and which ought not at all to be admitted by the Government or tolerated by Parliament. If the examination is to have any force or effect at all, it must be understood by the examiners that they are not to be interfered with in the discharge of their duty by the Government or anybody else, and that their verdict is to be practically final as to the result of the examination. Give them power to remedy the defects or the casualties that may arise, but let them do their duty. If there is to be any intervention in any particular case, or if there is to be any general regulation, that ought to be ordered to be laid before the House we ought to see what are to be the principles of the conduct to be followed. So much as to the examination; but the clause goes a great deal further, it empowers the Governor in Council to make rules and regulations respecting the appointments and promotions, and the hon. gentleman has not stated any particular in which his experience has proved to him that this power is required. The power is very wide; we supposed that by the Act he had made regulations as to the appointment and promotions; one of the great benefits of the Act are supposed to be that by a general law we had sufficiently provided for this. I quite agree that the skill of the hon. gentleman, as that of any other man, may be inadequate to provide for all possible contingencies, and there may be some residuum of unprovided cases which it may be necessary to deal with, but a general rule which says the Governor in Council may make general rules and regulations respecting the appointments and promotions of officers is, on its face, very objectionable, because it seems to say to the officers who are to be appointed, the terms and rules and regulations are in the hands of the Government after all. I should like to get from the hon. gentleman more of his experience of the practical difficulties which necessitate this clause and necessitate it in these very ample terms.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We do not intend to do anything else but what the hon. gentleman has pointed out. There are now, and we desire there should be in the future, some general rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of the Act, and at present the Government have under consideration rules or regulations generally for the carrying out of this Act. We have this power, we were not obliged to ask it, and we might exercise it, but I thought it was better to put in the Bill exactly what we were doing. I have a letter in my hand which says that at some time the intervention of such rules or regulations might be necessary. An Order in Council has been passed regulating the percentage of points that would be exacted for promotion examination to arrive at a second or a first class clerkship or a chief clerkship. Well, one instance, I think it is the only one, has occurred in which the Government interfered by Order in Council with the rule and regulations for a special case, and it is this: Last year there was a very strong expression of opinion about the difficulties or technicalities of problems which looked, as it was said in this House, more like puzzles than problems, and upon that promotion examination the very best officers of some of the Departments would have had to be left out entirely in spite of the requirements of the service except for this, that we thought that the grade or the number of points was too much extended, and we accordingly adopted a rule, for the first time, but which

hereafter is to regulate the examinations, not for one special case but for all cases. We had to pass that since last Session. And I must state that, on that occasion, for one or two officers, we passed a special Order in Council saying that the number of points required in that examination—it was arithmetic—should be reduced, I think, from 25 or 20 to 15. As I said, it might be necessary to change it I do not say it would be desirable to change it for a special case; it is not undesirable; but it might be desirable to pass a rule or regulation to that effect, and we do not want that to be passed by any examiners, but for the Government to have the responsibility of it. There has been no case within my recollection except that one, and I would be the first to oppose any encroachment by the Government on the duties of the Civil Service Examiners, and I think that justice will be rendered to the head of the Department over which I preside by saying that, in every case, I have stated that the examiners, who are well qualified to perform their duties, should be supported. With the single exception I have pointed out, it has been carried out, and it is the intention of the Bill to have it carried out. Those regulations will be made by the Governor in Council, and we want them to be so made with the responsibility of the Government. I intend to add that these rules and regulations shall be laid before Parliament within the first fifteen days of each Session. I think it is a good suggestion, and I am ready to make it because I want Parliament to know what is done.

Mr. BLAKE. I am very glad that the hon. gentleman accepts that point. Does he see any objection to inserting the word "general" before the words "rules and regulations?"

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have no objection.

Mr. BLAKE. Then another suggestion. The Secretary of State has properly inserted the words "not inconsistent with this Act." I propose to add "as to unprovided details respecting the appointment and promotion of officers," so that it may clearly appear that you do not get power to override the Act in any way.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I would have no objection, but I do not think it is necessary.

Mr. BLAKE. It shows that it is as to details, that you are not interfering with the general question.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I may say that I intend to lay the regulations before Parliament before the Session is over.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman says they have already passed not only general rules and regulations, but, in two cases, special orders which were not rules and regulations at all. If they had the right, under the law as it stood, to pass those general rules and regulations and to make special orders in special cases, there is no necessity for this clause. On the other hand, if there is a necessity for this clause, they had not a right previously to pass general rules and regulations or the special orders to which he referred. I cannot let the occasion pass without saying, with regard to these special orders, that I do not think any circumstances could justify that particular kind of interference with the action of the examiners. It is quite proper, if the percentage required is found to be too high, to reduce it in all cases, but in this particular examination it seems the standard was found too high for those two individuals in particular, and in their particular case the standard was lowered from 25 to 15 per cent. The Minister did not tell us whether these were the only two persons who failed to come up to the 25 per cent. standard. If they were, although an irregularity was committed, there may have been no particular injustice to any individual, but, if more than those two succeeded in getting 15 per cent. and not 25, then there was an unfair interference to the detriment of the others. It was just such interference that this Act was intended to prevent, and that this clause should be framed to prevent. I think, with the amendments to which the hon. gentleman has agreed, such interference would be impossible in the future.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before that clause is adopted, I would like to call the attention of the Secretary of State and also the Finance Minister to this: As well as I recollect, in former times those questions came largely under the purview of the Treasury Board, and it appears to me that this is a class of questions on which the report of the Treasury Board ought to be had. Now, I understand the Secretary of State is to become a member of the Treasury Board, by one of the Acts now before the House, and it appears to me that, in a clause of this kind, which gives general power, it would be better that it should read "the Governor in Council may from time to time, on report of the Treasury Board," do so and so. We all know, at least I break no official secret in saying, we all know pretty well that the Treasury Board would be much more likely to sift these questions than the general Committee of Council can be, and I think it is not desirable that these matters should be left solely, as I take it this would practically involve, to the discretion of one member of the Government. The tendency of affairs is, of course, always that each member of the Government shall be more and more supreme in his own Department, but, although that is perhaps inevitable, I think that, in matters affecting all the Departments, as the Civil Service undoubtedly does, the intervention of the Treasury Board, if ever, would be particularly useful. I should like to hear not only the Secretary of State but also what the Minister of Finance thinks on this subject.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Of course the Governor in Council will consult the Treasury Board in matters pertaining to the Treasury Board, and, in matters concerning the examiners, will consult the Board of Examiners. It is for that purpose that it will be made general, but the Government will take the advice of the Treasury Board and of the examiners in matters pertaining to them respectively.

Mr. BLAKE. Still, there is no doubt that, in practice, unless the hon. gentleman's Cabinet is in this particular, as I admit it is in other particulars, a very exceptional Cabinet, matters of detail which require special information, comparatively minor matters but still matters of importance, are run by a member or two. There is not the opportunity of mastering and there is not the time for discussion in a large meeting of thirteen or fourteen persons; and, for my part, though I may be called revolutionary in that regard, while in matters of large consequence involving large principles, I like to see, if there is to be an executive authority, the authority of the Governor in Council exercised, in matters in which the Council has to depend practically upon one man, and cannot look into the subject further—I will give an instance, the appointment of a large number of comparatively minor officers—I think it is a better security that the Minister himself shall have the power, because the Minister then has the responsibility. The board is the screen for the Minister if the matter is filtered through the Council. I admit that, if you are passing only general regulations that involve only general matters of principle, it may not be ill that the Council should pass upon them; but, if any question of detail are involved as to particular examinations, I think you would have a more general sifting of it if the sub-committee of the Council, the Treasury Board, was responsible than if the whole Council was responsible; you have a more practical attention given to the matter.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. And so it will be, and so, I think, it must be. At that time there was a permanent sub-committee

of the Council for the Civil Service. That sub-committee has disappeared now; but the greater part of their duties are now performed by the Treasury Board. We could not give it any other shape than the shape I have given it in the Bill. It will be done in this way: We were obliged to mention the Governor in Council, though in fact, as the hon. member has mentioned, it is better that it should be done by the Minister or by a board; and in those cases a part of the work will have to be done by the Treasury Board, and a part of it by the Board of Civil Service Examiners.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That being the case, I do not see that there is any serious objection to inserting the words "the Governor in Council may from time to time, on report of the Treasury Board."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is an objection. It is better to put it in this way.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not see where the objection comes in, unless, indeed, it be meant, practically, that the Secretary of State shall run the service on his own account much more than at present. The hon. gentleman is making the Secretary of State an *ex officio* member of the Treasury Board, and that being so, I think we ought to include "on report of the Treasury Board."

Mr. MULOCK. It seems to me that this clause is altered even more than the Secretary of State desired. In the 5th section it reads: "The Governor in Council may from time to time make rules and regulations."

Mr. CHAIRMAN. That has been changed. It reads, as amended:

"The Governor in Council may, from time to time, make general rules and regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, respecting the appointments or promotions of officers in the Civil Service, and all other matters pertaining thereto."

Mr. MULOCK. That removes my objection.

Mr. CASEY. I desire to ask the hon. Minister, under what authority the rules and regulations hitherto made by the Council, and the special orders to which he refers, have been made?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Under the general authority of the Government for administering the public affairs, and no other.

Mr. CASEY. I do not think the general authority of the Government administering the public affairs, entitles them to interfere with the provisions of an Act of Parliament.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not admit that. The Government has the right to execute what the statute requires by Order in Council, and in this case we did it.

Mr. CASEY. I am aware that Governments frequently do things that the general authority of Governments does not authorise them to do, but I did not expect the Minister would tell us that so plainly.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. For that I claim absolution. It has been done.

Mr. CASEY. It is, then, a *fait accompli.*

Mr. CHAPLEAU. And the hon. member should not complain; it will not be done any more after this clause becomes law.

Mr. CASEY. No, but I certainly supposed that the hon. Minister, when confessing to these things, which are an infringement of Acts of Parliament——

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Oh no, I did not say that.

Mr. CASEY. Oh, yes, they were, because he says he made particular orders with regard to individuals, which were undoubtedly an infringement of the Act. I supposed, in confessing to these acts, he would have claimed some authority under this Act, or some other Act; but since he has put it on the score of the general powers of Government and admitted the *fait accompli*, that is all I wish.

On section 6,

Mr. BLAKE. I see there is some change—"from time to time" is added, and so on. Now, if I rightly recollect, the original clause which this is intended to alter, was introduced with reference to a proposed reorganisation of the Civil Service. It was thought proper that the Governor in Council should have power to make a scheme for the reorganisation of the Civil Service; and that scheme having been made, from that time out, I presumed, the alterations in that scheme occasioned by the increasing exigencies of the public service would be practically provided for by Parliament, by the proposed votes in the estimates, or by other parliamentary authority from Session to Session. Now that was not an unreasonable proposal, and the Government, upon the report of a commission upon that subject, and taking the whole question into account, wished to lay down a scheme, and we gave them that authority. But what the hon. gentleman now proposes to do is to insert these words "from time to time" so that there shall be at all times, and all the time, a power in the Governor in Council to go on determining an increase of officials provided that the total amount of the salaries of the whole number shall in no case exceed that voted by Parliament for the purpose. Now that special provision was put in in reference to the first reorganisation. We gave a very large vote for the Civil Service. The Government said to us that they wanted to distribute that money in accordance with the scheme that they were going to make; and therefore they took this very wide power of naming as many men in each Department as they thought, under the new scheme, would be proper for the efficiency of the service, with the sole limitation that all the money they spent on salaries should not exceed the total amount already granted them by the votes. That was well enough for that occasion, but I do not at all agree that it is well to make that permanent from year to year, "from time to time," and that the Government should say: We have the undisputed authority ourselves—for we have satisfied Parliament that $100,000 or $1,000,000 divided into so many salaries, for so many men, are required for the public service—we have authority ourselves to add 10 or 15 employés to some Departments more than we have asked Parliament to pay for if we find that we can lop off 10 or 15 employés from any of the other Departments. I think they ought to provide the number of officers each Session, the system having been once established, that is required for the public service. I do not mean to say, of course, that in any particular emergency Government has not ample authority to employ temporary officers—of course they have the authority and nobody quarrels with them; but to place men on the permanent staff of the service from time to time, provided only that the whole amount shall not exceed the sum voted for the whole salaries of all the officers, was not intended, and is a dangerous innovation. I do not make any observations on the 2nd sub-section of section 6, because that will have to be discussed by itself.

Mr. CASEY. I think in addition to the objection I pointed out, which I understand to be the one my hon. friend mentioned as to allowing the Government to distribute the moneys amongst the different Departments as they please, that there are other objections. That objection itself was a very strong one. Parliament is supposed to know what it is doing when it votes a certain sum of money for paying salaries in any particular Department; but as I understand this clause, it would allow the Government to alter that distribution afterwards and give less to one Department and more to another, as they please. That is an entrance for a considerable abuse, for it is quite possible to appoint a larger

number of officers in any Department that the appropriation for that year would be sufficient to pay. It is quite possible to take men into the service, who are very pressing for occupation, with an understanding something like this: "We shall not be able to give you much money this year, only the savings we can effect in the Department; but next Session we shall come down to Parliament and point out how we were compelled by the necessities of the service to take in 5, 10 or 20 men; that we were only able to give them trifling salaries in the meantime, but now we ask the House to vote supplies sufficient to pay those men properly whom the exigencies of the service have compelled us to employ. We shall ask the House also, seeing we were not able to pay them proper salaries last year, to grant a vote sufficient to recoup them for the deficiency in salary during that year." That would be a very plausible way of putting the matter to the House, and it would probably pass without notice. Parliament should not only have the right of saying how much money is to be spent in the Civil Service and also in each Department, but to determine how many men should be employed in each Department. We are in the habit of getting detailed statements in the estimates of the salaries to be paid to so many first-class clerks and so many second-class clerks and so many third-class, and we should not break up that habit. We should not only know how many men are to be employed, but how many of each class. The appointment of those men even on temporary salaries and the fact of their being placed on permanent service lays the country under an obligation to continue them in office and to pay them for the future, and the Government, in exercising the power to decide the number of men to be employed, practically places Parliament under an obligation to pay them so long as they remain in the service. This is practically a provision to allow the Government to increase the estimates for each Department at their own discretion.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman has misunderstood the clause. It is the intention that each Department shall not exceed its own vote. I move that the clause be amended by making it the collective amount of salaries to each Department.

Mr. BLAKE. There are different, separate and independent branches of Departments. There is the Marine and the Fisheries and the Indian and Privy Council.

Mr. CASEY. Why not insert the word "branches?"

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There are two or three Departments under one Minister. There is the Department of Fisheries, the Department of Marine, the Department of Interior, the Department of Indian Affairs. These are separate Departments, but two of them are under one Minister. According to the law they are separate Departments; and to use the word "branches" would not answer.

Mr. CASEY. If it is understood that large branches legally and technically constitute different Departments, that section as proposed to be amended meets my objection.

Mr. BLAKE. It does not remove my objection wholly. I admit the amendment is an improvement to the clause as originally proposed, but it is an improper innovation. The clause as it stood was originally a temporary clause designed to give an elastic power to the Governor in Council to meet a particular exigency. That exigency was this: It was stated by the Government to Parliament, and Parliament accepted the statement, that the Civil Service of this country required to be reorganised, and the Government having had a commission on the subject, and having obtained a theoretical organisation from that commissioner's report, and having submitted that theoretical organisation to Parliament, and Parliament having in a general sense approved the scheme, it gave the Government power to reorganise the service in general accordance with that scheme. For that purpose it gave them power to deal with the question of salaries and with the question of numbers; but it was not intended to give even to the Department still less, of course, as the hon. gentleman has conceded, to the service as a whole, power to the Governor in Council from time to time during the recess to decide what should be the number and salaries of the officers in the Departments. There is an estimate for each Session. The Minister of Finance brings down an estimate of the sums that are required for the salaries of permanent officers. We deal and discuss them, and ask the reasons why these salaries and numbers are necessary. If the Minister wants to make an addition to the Department the appointment made should be an intermediate appointment, one of a temporary character to meet the needs of the service, and the question of a permanent appointment should be submitted to Parliament at its next Session. I do not dispute that the Minister must have some discretionary power to employ a clerk when it may be necessary; but he should not have the power to place him on the permanent staff. Parliament determines in the estimates each year what the staff is to be for the ensuing year, and that should not be altered at the discretion of the Governor in Council during recess. If a change is required it should be the temporary stopping up of a gap until Parliament meets again and a change is proposed. I want to know why a clause, which was temporary in its nature, and which was designed to meet special circumstances and conditions, should be made permanent.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is intended that the amount voted by Parliament for each Department shall not be exceeded. The clause is inserted merely to do this; in my Department I intend during the course of next year to determine the number of officers required—and I may make a reduction of one or two officers—in fact, to determine the theoretical organisation of the Department. There is no danger of Parliament allowing the people's money to be expended without its authority. And the necessity, or rather the opportunity, of making a change at certain times was that which moved us to ask from Parliament that such a provision may be embodied in the Bill. At certain times it might become apparent to the head of the Department, or to the Government, that certain changes should be made in the Department, or that they might be made from time to time, or once a year, though the date is not determined. The Minister may see, or the Government say, that the number of officers should be so and so. The salaries of the Department have been voted by Parliament, and more than that, there is a clause by which no special amount of increase in any way can be paid unless the salary is clearly fixed by the estimate, and the sum apportioned in each particular case. This would only determine what should be the number of officers, and at the next Session Parliament would decide whether those changes would be authorised, and they would decide also the payment of the different officers which might be determined upon during the vacation.

Mr. BLAKE. My notion is that the case mentioned by the hon. gentleman is one which is easily answered. He says the intention is that the Government should effect the reorganisation of the Department, or the actual work of the Department, by reducing the staff by one or two officers. I tell the hon. gentleman that according to my notion the proper way to do this is to bring down the reorganisation of the Department in the estimates for that year.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I cannot do that, because at the present moment it does not depend on my will.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman says he intends to do it, and he knows that if he intends to do it he would do it, else he would say that he intended to attempt to do it. I

have no objection to give the Governor in Council power to reduce the number as it exists—as we pass it in any year. My apprehension is of a different kind altogether. The good intentions of the Secretary of State—which I hope will not go to pave the floor of that place which is said to be paved with good intentions—I commend him for: I would be sorry to say a word which would hinder his execution of them; but I do not know that it is necessary for this clause to pass in order that he may relieve the office of one man, if he finds that he can do it, if he has superannuated a man or put him in another department, or got rid of him in some other way, and does not want to fill the place until next Session, and then say, I do not want to employ a man in that place. I have no objection to agreeing that the Governor in Council from time to time may determine the number, not exceeding the number voted by Parliament. But what the hon. gentleman wants to do is to get power to increase the number voted by Parliament.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If it does not increase the salaries.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; but this committee knows, I think, enough of the operation of the Civil Service Act to know that although he will not increase the salaries in that year, and perhaps not increase the number, he will increase them the very next year. They know the $50 increases, and if you have two third-class clerks instead of one second, or two whose aggregate salary this year is no more than one the other year, next year there will be $100 increase instead of $50, and they also know that there will be applications for promotion and increased numbers on the staff. Now I do hope, as the hon. Secretary of State does not want the clause in order to keep offices which he has power to fill, unfilled and as there can be no objection, if he does think he wants the clause, to give him power to reduce the number of officers, or to make changes without increasing the number, that he will agree not to take the power of increasing the number of officers Parliament has voted. I say it would be objectionable to give the Governor in Council power to put on the permanent staff of the Civil Service more men than they have asked Parliament to vote for in the year. If he finds that an emergency requires more men let him take them under the general powers, which the hon. gentleman has remarked upon, as temporary officers, and come to us without their having acquired a status; but do not let us give them power to increase the numbers by 10 or 12—one in each Department would give 13 new men—to increase by the number of 13 the men entitled to $50 increases, and to superannuation and then come down the next Session and say, I submit these new men who have been appointed by the Governor in Council who has done it according to the authority of the Act you passed last Session.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman is obliged to put forward a suppositious case in order to make a point against this provision of the Bill; but he forgets that if the Government had any such intention as he attributes to them they might very easily evade them, as he knows, by the law as it stands. It is not our intention to increase the number of officers necessary for the service, but if we had such a bad intention it could be accomplished by the law as it now stands. The power which is asked for is a power which has been exercised, and which will be exercised properly, and it is a power which is not a dangerous power, provided we do not increase the salaries of each Department of the Civil Service.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman says the power has been exercised properly. If that is the case there must be some authority for exercising it, and we do not want the power at all. But the mere fact of this clause being inserted, as it is in this Act—and I know it is in the old Act—shows that there was authority needed for the exercise of that kind of power, and therefore previous to these Acts it cannot have been exercised properly. But the hon. gentleman says it is not the intention to take advantage of this power to increase the staff unnecessarily. Well, in the first place it was not the argument of my hon. friend and leader that an unnecessary increase would be made—that was not the gist of his argument. He says this clause was only required for the purpose of making an increase which might seem to the Minister perhaps to be necessary. In the second place, whatever may be the good intention of the hon. gentlemen we are not to take it for granted that every other Minister in his place will have the same intentions. We have to frame an Act which will be a check on a Minister who may happen to have bad intentions. Supposing—as an hon. gentleman in front of me says—that I should happen to fill that place myself, I think my hon. friend would admit that there might be some necessity for a check upon my actions. The great point that has been indicated by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has not yet been answered; that this power of increasing the numerical strength of the Department, although leading to no important increase in the cost of the Department itself for that year is sure to lead in the near future, perhaps in the next year, to an increase in the expenditure. And it is not only in the way of salaries that that expenditure will be increased. We have had within the last two years a very clear and convincing proof that the numerical increase of the members of the service leads to expenditure in other ways than mere salaries. Why, we began a year ago and are still continuing a large building facing this building which is rendered necessary solely by the numerical increase in the different Departments, and that building will cost a considerable sum of money. We have notice therefore that the increase in the number of clerks, even if it should not lead to an increase of salaries, even if you could get 2,000 men for the pay of 1,000, or 1,000 for the pay of 500, would lead to an increase in the way of providing accommodation for these men. The conclusion therefore is inevitable that the power to increase the numerical strength of the Department, even if the expenditure in salaries is kept for the current year within the appropriation of Parliament, inevitably leads to large future increases of expenditure, not only on account of salaries, but in the way of accommodation for the men appointed, and therefore the increase of the numerical strength of the Department is a pecuniary matter which should be under the direct control of Parliament.

On section 6, sub-section 2.

Mr. BLAKE. I make the same observation with reference to this. The original clause was designed to deal with the whole reorganisation of the civil service then in contemplation, and on the theoretical organisation of the service it was expected that there would be a number of supernumerary clerks. What was intended was that those then attached, in excess of the number allowed by the theoretical organisation, should remain as supernumeraries. Now, it is possible that even at this day there are still supernumeraries over the thoretical organisation. I do not know how that is. In arranging the theoretical organisation, you decided how many men would be necessary to work the Department, and you found that there were some men still in who were not up to that calibre, and therefore you had to turn them out or keep them in in some shape or other. Instead of turning them out you took the power to keep them as supernumerary clerks. Since that time there has been a considerable increase in the staff; a considerable number have been added each year. The additions would be made in the first instance from the supernumeraries. I should have hoped, therefore, unless the supernumeraries possessed the same vitality which the pensioners of the war of 1812 seem to have, that—what with the natural casulties to which flesh is heir, what with the sweet

retirement the Superannuation Act allows, and what with the opportunities the increase in the permanent staff gives the Minister to convert supernumeraries into permanent clerks,—the necessity of this provision would have disappeared. But it has not disappeared, and if there are still a considerable number of supernumeraries, I would like to know how many there are in each Department to whom this provision applies, which we thought would have been got rid of, instead of, as would appear, being crystallised into permanent shape.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not know the condition of things in any of the other Departments.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I am under the impression that when we adopted the theoretical organisation, there were, in one or two of the Departments, three first-class clerks. Then it was provided that two would be sufficient to be appointed permanently, and the third was considered a supernumerary. I think that is the state of things at the present moment; and if that be the case, the section is not of great importance. We have not increased the number of supernumeraries, and therefore I do not see that this section is necessary to be inserted.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not want of course to embarrass the service; but if this clause is necessary by reason of there being some persons placed in that rank, the hon. gentlemen might keep it in such a shape as just to answer that necessity. By the language of the first sub-section, it is a thing that goes on from year to year, forever—it has additional vitality.

Mr. CASEY. It says that whenever any change is made, these arrangements will come into force.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When the theoretical organisation was adopted, this provision was necessary, and these officers were made supernumerary, and they had no increase, in accordance with the general provision of the Civil Service Act. If this section were dropped, that would not prevent the provisions of the law being maintained and applied to these persons. I do not suppose the supernumerary clerks now in the offices could be interfered with, because so far as they are concerned, the law would remain, and they would be kept as supernumeraries and paid accordingly. Therefore I do not think there would be any harm in dropping that sub-section.

Mr. BLAKE. I would venture to suggest to my hon. friend to let it remain for the present, and to give it some further consideration. I think it should either be dropped if it is not wanted, or limited if it is still wanted.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I thought this clause might apply to a case that may arise in my own Department. But I will leave it for the present, and consider whether it should be changed.

Mr. CASEY. I do not understand my hon. friend on this side to object to the promotion of present supernumeraries, but to object to the appointment of future supernumeraries.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Surely my hon. friend would not object to my taking an officer from a certain rank, where he is not needed, and placing him on the list of supernumeraries, without giving him an increase of salary.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman, when he deals with this clause before the House, will give us a statement of how the arrangement has actually worked in the various Departments and how it stands to-day, and what his real object is if he thinks it necessary to amend the clause.

On section 7,

Mr. CASEY. In regard to this an explanation may come in. The hon. Minister has told us of a couple of modes in which men could be promoted who would not be promoted in the ordinary course of the Act. They are now occupying positions, and are classified in a way they would not be if the provisions of the Act had been followed. It is proposed by this clause to crystalise that action, and to confirm them in positions they have obtained by a very peculiar method.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is only to remove a few exceptions. For instance, last year an employé by the name of Dixon in the Department of the Interior had to be voted a sum of $125 to make up his salary as first-class clerk, though by the classification that existed before he was receiving his salary under his class. Though he was of a certain class, he was receiving a salary under it; and the Minister wishing to keep him in the class he occupied by the Act that formerly existed, we were obliged to make a special vote for him. We want the first-class to be first class, and the second-class second-class, and so on, so that no one will receive a salary over or under his class.

Mr. CASEY. What is the meaning intended to be conveyed by the latter words of the clause "he shall remain classified in the respective class in which he is serving." Take the case of a second-class clerk who is now doing the duty of a first-class clerk.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have taken a note of that. An employé acting momentarily as a first-class clerk might claim that class although he was only a second-class clerk. I will make the clause read: "the respective class to which he is appointed."

Mr. BLAKE. If a person is lawfully classed at present, under the law, in a particular class, no doubt he will continue to be so classed without your puttingin this clause; if he is not lawfully classed of a particular class within this Act, then we are putting him by means of the Act in a class to which he does not lawfully belong. He has been unlawfully placed in that class, and although it may be well enough that we should pass an Act of Parliament to do so, we should understand the case. The hon. gentleman said something about voting additional salary, but that did not seem to me very well to bear on the case. "Any person who is a member of the Civil Service at the time of the passing of the Act shall remain classified in the respective class to which he is appointed." Now, if he was lawfully appointed at the time of the passing of the Act to a first, second, or third class, of course he will remain so; if he was not we are putting him into it although he was not lawfully appointed, and we ought to know for what reason.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What might arise is this. Take the case of men who are serving, I suppose, in a higher grade than that for which they have passed their promotion. If this should pass in its present shape, all those men would immediately become classed in a higher grade without having undergone any promotion examination at all. That is not probably the intention of the Secretary of State.

Mr. CASEY. Tell us what is the special object of the clause.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We will suspend that clause.

On section 8,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This will practically cause the increase of a new officer. At present one of these three officers must be the secretary. By altering the law and making it discretional, one of the three may be the secretary, and I take it for granted the result will be three officers and almost inevitably a secretary as well.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. I think there is an important point left out of this clause. I have frequently declared and must do so again that the Board of Examiners should be distinct from the Civil Service. The board is sufficiently under the control of the Government already by being appointed during pleasure without placing them more under the control of the Government by declaring that they may be also members of the Civil Service and liable to forfeit much more than their $600 a year given them under this Act if they should happen to displease the Government of the day. I contend also that members of the Civil Service are not the men best qualified to conduct preliminary examinations of this kind or the sort of examinations required for promotion. We all know that the material for examinations, in so far as they are at all technical, in so far as they relate to the affairs of a Department, is provided, not by the Board of Examiners, but by the heads of the Departments. The board are not supposed to know the special qualifications required for promotion in, for instance, the Inland Revenue Department, or the Surveys branch or any scientific Department, or in the hon. gentleman's own Department. If there is any special qualification beyond the literary knowledge required for promotion into a Department, the papers must be and are made out in the Department itself, and therefore there is no reason for having examiners in the Civil Service to conduct the promotion examinations. Even if that were a reason, it is clear that the three members of the board can only belong to three Departments, and can have no special knowledge of any but their own Departments. There is a strong argument against the board being in the Civil Service, because it puts them completely under the control of the Government. The hon. gentleman smiles at the idea, but I am not accusing him of wishing to bully the examiners by any means; I am simply laying down the principle that it is not wise to take the board from the Civil Service, and though the hon. gentleman may be very careful and impartial he cannot tell what his successor may be disposed to do. I would therefore ask the hon. gentleman to amend this clause by adding after the word "members" the words "none of whom shall be members of the Civil Service."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I said "hear, hear," to the hon. gentleman's remarks, because I could not understand why the nefarious influence of the Government over a public officer in the service will be so bad and yet disappear completely the moment the appointment is made outside the service; because if outsiders be appointed, they will have to be appointed by the Government, and they will come under the same influence as members of the Civil Service, with this exception that they would be entirely dependent for their position on the Government, and they would cost about double the cost of members of the service. I do not understand how the independence of a man like the Librarian, for instance, or of Mr. Thorburn, is impaired because we add to his trifling salary another small salary, or how we would have a more independent man if I chose the first outsider and gave him a salary, if it were only $600. The motion of my hon. friend would have for its result a higher salary and not a more independent examiner, and perhaps a less qualified man than we have.

Mr. CASEY. It is a question what salary you would have to give to an outsider. Several of us have expressed our opinion, from some knowledge of this subject, that outsiders could be had for $600 a year or less. That can only be decided by attempting to find out what an outsider could be got for, so I will not argue it any further. But the Minister says: Do I suppose the independence of the Librarian, for instance, would be affected by his adding to his already trifling salary——

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I said, any more than anyone else.

Mr. CASEY. Of $2,400, I believe it is at present, though I do not know what it is to be when the coming changes are made in the organisation of the library. Would the independence of the Librarian be affected by adding to his trifling salary of $2,400 another trifling salary of $600? The inference is this. If the Librarian, in his capacity as examiner, should happen to displease, I will not say the Minister himself, but some successor of his, if he should happen to displease that successor in his capacity as examiner, he is liable to lose not only the $600, but the $2,400 also. He is liable to lose $3,000 by an act displeasing to the Minister, in his capacity as examiner, and therefore, the higher the officer in the service whom you choose as examiner, the greater salary he has at stake and stands to lose if he displeases the Minister of the day by his severity in the examination of some friend of the Minister's or by undue lenity in the examination of some opponent of the Minister. Therefore you have a double pull over a member of the Civil Service when he is appointed examiner. Going on to the point that the Civil Service examiner from outside would be also appointed during pleasure, I admit that he would, under the provisions of this Bill, but that is one of the provisions I object to. We have not, I think, come to the section stating the tenure of office. It is stated somewhere, I think. I object *in toto* to having the examiners, if they are to be permanent officers at all, if they are to form a Civil Service Board in the sense which is generally understood, appointed during pleasure. The Civil Service Board in England are appointed on the same tenure of office as judges. They are to exercise judicial functions, and they are appointed during good behavior, as the judges are, and that is the only way in which they can be appointed if they are to be made permanent officials. Of course, we have been arguing already this Session that distinguished men might be engaged temporarily to provide papers for a particular examination and be paid for that year only. That is a very different thing, but, when you engage men permanently to discharge judicial functions, and to some extent to control the destinies of the service, they should be appointed on the same footing as the Auditor General, for instance, holding office during good behavior, not responsible to the Government for any act involving an exercise of judgment and not a dereliction of duty. I intend to move an amendment in that sense either here or later, whenever it appears most convenient.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The later the better.

Mr. CASEY. I do not see in any other part of the Bill any statement of the tenure of office by these examiners. I had better therefore put in the amendment here as to how they shall hold office. I will add it to my other amendment.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not desire to detain the committee, because there is no use in doing so at this stage, but I wholly agree with the view, and I hope the Government will consider the question before the third reading, that the examiners ought to hold office during good behavior. I believe it is really well deserving of consideration by the Government. In England they hold office during good behavior. You have that analogy. What is the reason? We know the system of examination is different, but the reason for the examiners holding office during good behavior is that the public may have an assurance that they are not unduly controlled by the Government in the discharge of their duty, and that reason will exist here. At this moment you have on the Table a Bill in which you propose to establish a set of officers to deal with another important function, and you are trying to induce the country to accept that because they are to hold office during good behavior. Why not make these officers hold office during good behavior, so that it may be known by the public that they exercise their duties free from any governmental influence? It would not do, if you did that, to appoint

civil servants. If a civil servant was in a more or less dependent position—I do not use the word invidiously—if he was under the restraints, obliged to the subordination, dependent to a considerable extent for promotion on the good will of the Government of the day, and that is his main object, he is dependent, although you may give him an independent office of $600 a year besides, and therefore it would follow from the necessity of the case that, if the examiners are to be made independent, they should not be hereafter members of the Civil Service. I pray the hon. gentleman not now to announce a final decision, but, in the interest of the Government itself, and in the interest of this system, which I do not think much of, being non-competitive, to consider this question.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I may as well state that we do not intend to change what has been done, but to leave it as it is The Civil Service system is under progress of improvement, and, up to the time when it comes to be a perfect machinery, I do not think it is desirable that these officers should be in such an independent position as the Auditor General is. It has been found necessary here and there that the action of the Government should be an interference, not with the duties of the examiners generally, but to have what the wish of Parliament was publicly expressed to be felt, and I think it is desirable that, up to the time when we have brought the Civil Service to perfection, and I do not pretend that we have, it should not be changed. I do not think there has been any complaint on this subject. We may let it remain as it is, and no one will suffer.

The Committee rose; and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 31) to consolidate the Canada Civil Service Acts.

On section 8,

Mr. MULOCK. The first clause of section 8 deals with the matter of examinations. Before recess I observed that the Secretary of State appeared desirous of considering, in a reasonable way, as he always does, suggestions for the further improvement of this measure, and therefore I venture to renew some suggestions I made to him on a former occasion. I hope, after the delay that has taken place, he has been led to see the matter in the way I indicated. I do not know whether he knows my views on this point. Perhaps he may have some suggestions to make.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I know what your views are. My views have not changed.

Mr. MULOCK. Then I must point out and extend my protest against a provision of this kind. It is proposed in this section to create a board of examiners, for the present to be three in number. We know very well that the number will never become less than three; but, with the excuse afforded by the increasing number of applicants, the Government of the day will be importuned, from time to time, to increase that number. Now, I think it is to be deplored that there should be any unnecessary permanent additions to the Civil Service of the country, and I think that the system here recommended is calculated to develop in the direction I refer to. If we look at the numbers that have submitted themselves for examination since the Act was in force, we find that in 1882, when it began, there were over 500 applicants; in 1883 the number had increased to a little over 1,000; and in 1884 to over 1,100. I do not know whether the three examiners were appointed in 1882 or not, but with the increasing number of candidates, there must be an increased number of examiners, or a radical change in the system. Now, if the hon. Secretary of State will consult the examiners, he will be told by them—if it requires any information to convince one of that point—that it takes a certain length of time, which they have measured off, I presume, to examine each paper of a candidate. Now if we take 1,000 candidates and consider the number of papers which they must present, it is easy to see that the time necessary for three men to examine these papers must be very considerable, and as the numbers increase, the time required to make the returns will also increase. Now, there have already been very considerable complaints throughout the western part of this Dominion, at least, as to the delay on the part of the examiners in making the returns. I do not say that the delay was attributable to them—I presume, under the present system, it was unavoidable delay, and that they could not read the papers any faster. But if the number of candidates increases, the delay will increase, and in fact the end of it will be that we will not have the returns of one examination made known, perhaps, much before the commencement of the next examination. Now, I propose to remedy that, and I have made a proposition which I regret to learn now from the Secretary of State he does not propose to adopt. The proposition I made is not an untried one; it is not a mere experiment. It has in support of it the endorsement of very considerable portions of the Province of Ontario. I understand that even in the hon. gentleman's own Province the same system prevails as in Ontario for the examination of students—not, it is true, for the purpose of qualifying for the Civil Service, but still a provincial examination of the pupils attending the public schools. In the Province of Ontario we have a board of examiners, but their duties are confined to the preparation of papers, and the general conduct of examinations; but the work of examining the papers and the personal attendance at the examination are conducted in the localities where the examinations are held, by persons appointed for that purpose, and for that particular examination. Now, in proof of the beneficial effects flowing from that system, as I mentioned before and repeat now, we can point with satisfaction to the general endorsement of that principle by the people of Ontario; and I have been informed, since the last debate, that the same style of examination prevailing in the Province of Quebec is generally accepted as a satisfactory system. Now, what are the advantages to flow from the system proposed by the Govenment in this Bill? None whatever. You have a certain number of fixed officials, and we know what that means. They begin their term of office with a certain salary—$600 apiece. One of them is made secretary, and he has an additional salary of $700. But what will be the certain results of this, as regards a charge upon the public funds? These three examiners will, in a year or two, come to the Secretary of State and point out that, whereas, when they took office with a certain salary, the number of candidates was so many; now, they will point out, the number has increased, as it must necessarily increase in the country; they will ask for a corresponding increase in pay, and the hon. Secretary of State, or his successor, will come down to the House, and recommend the adoption of his report, and give them more pay. Well, they will get their salaries gradually worked up, and when they have got them as high as the House is likely to raise them, we will be told that the labors devolving upon them are onerous, and too much for them to discharge efficiently, and we will be asked to appoint some more examiners, and finally these three examiners, with which we start to-day, will become a large staff of examiners, permanently fastened upon the Dominion. Now, I submit that this is certain to become in time a most expensive system to the Dominion, and one from which we will not be able to withdraw, except at considerable cost—and in time, of course, we shall have to retire them. All this can be

avoided if the Secretary of State will only profit by the experience of some of the Provinces, and to some extent frame his system in view of that experience. When we were discussing this matter before, the objection was raised by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster), who advocated that the persons who read the papers should be the same persons who set the papers, assigning as a reason that the examiner who prepared the papers would better understand the drift of the questions, and would therefore be better qualified to interpret the answers. Now, whatever force there may be in that objection, as regards higher work, no such objection can possibly have any force when we consider the entirely rudimentary character of this examination. If we look at the character of the questions that are submitted to candidates, we find they are of the most elementary character. Take the last report of the examiners, for the year just closed, and opening at random on page 5, we will see what style of questions are submitted. The first question is on penmanship, if we can call it a question: "Copy the subjoined extract;" and there is an extract from some author which he is asked to write out—a pure examination in penmanship. The next question is on orthography, and here are some misspelled words given, and the candidate is asked to rewrite these words and spell them correctly. Then, further on we find another question in penmanship. Some copy is given, which the candidate has to rewrite. At page 7 there are some other words misspelled, which the candidate has to rewrite correctly spelled, and there are some slightly harder tests in the matter of orthography. Then we come down to the examination in arithmetic. Of what does that examination (page 7, third paper) consist? It consists of the first four rules of arithmetic—addition, subtraction, multiplication and division.

Mr. BOWELL. Is not that necessary?

Mr. MULOCK. I am not saying it is not necessary. I am simply showing the elementary character of the test to which candidates are subjected, and I think anyone can see from these examples that there is not the slightest difficulty in finding any number of persons competent to pass upon the merits of these questions, in any part of this Dominion where it is likely candidates will ever present themselves or examinations be held. If we go to the qualifying examinations, what do we find? English grammar: The uses of certain words are asked, and there is something about adjectives. I am looking at the first question of each paper, and I presume all the questions are pretty much the same. The first question in the 7th paper is a question to divide up a certain sum of money, £. s. d., among a certain number of people. Then we have a paper on geography. The first question is a very elementary one.

Mr. HESSON. We can all read that for ourselves; it is all on record.

Mr. MULOCK. A man may be able to read, and yet not profit by his reading.

Mr. HESSON. Yes, read and profit thereby. It is wasting the time of the House.

Mr. MULOCK. We have a censor in this House. There is no one quite so wise as the hon. gentleman who has just spoken.

Mr. HESSON. This House sits here at a cost to the country, and we can read these documents for ourselves.

Mr. MULOCK. I presume this candidate is above all examinations, Civil Service and otherwise. He is all perfection; he does not require to pass any examination; nor do his friends find it necessary; they are able to find their way into the Civil Service, I am told, without passing even this little elementary examination.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman is wrong there. They passed, and passed with credit, too.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not wasting the time of the House.

Mr. HESSON. Yes, you are.

Mr. MULOCK. I am addressing myself to the subject under discussion, and I am advancing nothing but what seems, to my judgement, to be a reasonable and proper argument, wholly applicable to the point under discussion. I submit that if my arguments had weight with this House, it would be of advantage to the country. It would be of advantage, also, to the service, and conduce to economy, and I trust economy, at all events, will be considered by the Secretary of State in this matter. This, as I was saying, when I was interrupted by the polite and accomplished member, was a sample of the questions submitted to candidates, and I mention it to show the character of the examination. The first question in the 8th paper, which was on geography, was: Name and define imaginary lines round the earth. Next we pass to the subject of history. In British history the first question was: Name five of the most important events in British history. There are some subordinate questions in regard to Canadian history. Then we pass to other papers, until we reach the paper on composition, and so on. I ask hon. members whether it would not be a very simple matter to have a number of points throughout the Dominion, far more than there are at present, if they were necessary, to which we could send the questions prepared and place them in safe hands. Let those questions be handed out to candidates on a given day, and the answers read and values assigned, the returns to be made to the central point, and thus the results of the examination be made known to candidates and the public. It must be borne in mind that these are not competitive examinations. No relative standing is given to the candidates. It is true that a standing may be given, to some extent, when the question of appointment or promotion arises. Inasmuch as there is no relative standing given, at all events, with respect to the preliminary examination, I see no reason why the system I have mentioned should not be adopted. It would prove of great service to the country. At present, examinations are held only at certain principal points; but under the scheme I have sketched they might be held in every county in the Dominion, and thus much money and time would be saved to the candidates themselves. However, as I see the hon. Minister smile, I suppose, like his colleague, he proposes to continue the centralising policy of the Government. For these reasons I think the Secretary of State could very well modify this clause, to some extent at least. If the hon. gentleman does not see his way to do so, I may, while in committee, or at all events I shall, at a later stage, take the opinion of the House on this question, for we are making a great mistake in creating this new board to be an additional incubus upon the tax-payers of the country.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). When this question was under discussion in another shape, a short time ago, I took occasion to follow the same line as that adopted by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, in condemning the expense connected with the existence of a board of this kind. I believe that in the Province of Ontario, and from what the hon. gentleman has said, I am convinced that Quebec is similarly situated, the ordinary high school examinations would meet every case, as regards the primary examinations for candidates for the Civil Service. I took some little trouble to obtain a copy of the papers that are set for the examinations for entry into the high schools, and I found

those are invariably more difficult and the papers more numerous than they were at the examinations that appear in the report of the Civil Service examiners for the primary examination for the Civil Service. When those high school examinations embrace the same subjects, when they are more difficult in character, it certainly should follow that as regards qualification of candidates those who pass examinations for entry into the high schools are quite as competent as those who pass the preliminary examination before the board of examiners; and there is an additional fact which must not be forgotten. The cost of the examination for entrance into the high schools, throughout the Province of Ontario, is only 75 cents per pupil, while here it was demonstrated, by a statement made recently, that the cost of these examinations was something like $6 per candidate. Now, undoubtedly the committee should hesitate before adopting the scheme, and should, at this stage of the Bill, make some effort to remedy a state of affairs which, as has been shown by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, threatens to be a serious cost to the people of this Dominion. I am sorry that the Secretary of State did not adopt some of the suggestions, which were made in the kindliest spirit, before recess. I think myself that the whole tenor of this Bill is of a very undesirable kind, and I think the clause before us has the effect, not in relieving the Administration of the responsibility of making appointments to the Civil Service, but to make these appointments as much under the control of the Government of the day as ever they were, while at the same time apparently removing the responsibility from the Administration. Now, I believe, with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), in his statement this afternoon, that it would be much preferable to remove a Bill of this kind from the Statute Book entirely than to pass it in its present state. We know that a majority of the commission, on whose report the Bill was drafted, of which this clause forms a part, recommended an entirely different course of procedure. They recommended that the English course be pursued; that the Civil Service should be independent of the Government of the day; that their position should be held by them much in the same way as the positions of the judges are held. Yet, we see that the tendency of this clause, and others which must necessarily be considered in conjunction with it, is still further to give the Administration a more absolute control than ever over the appointments. I have here copies of the examination papers in the second forms of the high schools of Ontario. They embrace something like eleven subjects, including drawing, Euclid, physics, literature, junior Latin, and English history, besides the supplementary subjects which are embraced in the examination before the Civil Service Commission. Now, if that is the case it shows conclusively that the examination is not one which should cost the amount of money and require the machinery which is provided for in this Bill. It appears clear to me that if the machinery which is already available throughout the Province of Ontario for the examination of teachers is not adopted, much simpler machinery than is provided here could readily be provided, and it would readily meet all the requirements which are necessary in order to pass the examination for the Civil Service. There is another matter in the same connection to which I wish to draw the attention of the committee. It was mentioned by the hon. the Secretary of State, before recess, and it is quite within the scope of this clause, and it is this: that complaints had arisen as to papers having been lost in transmission from the places where the examinations were held to the commissioners here. I cannot understand, from my reading of the Bill, how such a difficulty could have arisen, or how such a loss could have occurred. As I understand, wherever the commissioners do not appear in person they appoint substitutes, who preside at the examination, and these papers, whenever they are worked out within the time provided by the regulations laid down, are put into the possession of the presiding examiner. Under these circumstances, it appears to me that the fault must remain with the administration of the service, and that it is not one that can be treated by the parties undergoing the examination as an excuse for any consideration being shown them. Now, Mr. Chairman, if these facts are as I present them, I believe we are undertaking a very costly machinery; we are undertaking a work, the magnitude of which has been very evident in its growth within the three years in which it has been in operation. It is a work which we must realise is still in its infancy, and which, after all, is not by any means securing to us any of the results which we had hoped in seeing these examinations provided for the candidates who are desirous of becoming members of the Civil Service of the country.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I cannot approve of the system upon which the board is constituted at present, and I presume that under the Bill the board will be constituted as it already exists; it will allow the Minister to select as members of this board members of the Civil Service. I believe the system is a bad one, because if a member is taken from the Civil Service where he has his duties to perform, his appointment will destroy his efficiency in that branch of the service. On the present board we have the Librarian. If his time is fully required for the office of Librarian his time should be devoted to that work. It is well known that the duties of that position are comprehensive; they are extensive, and I presume it would require the whole time of the Librarian to be devoted to the work of the Library, instead of his being taken away and drafted into some other branch of the service. I believe that is a bad system, and one that is calculated to impair the efficiency of the service. We did hear, awhile ago, that the Library was to be supplied with another Librarian, who is to be appointed. Is that one of the results of taking up the time of the Librarian in those extra-judicial services required on the Board of Examiners? Now, we find that the Librarian has $2,400 a year; and we find that he got last year $300 for his duties as examiner. I do not think that any of that sum was deducted from his yearly salary; his pay was going on and extra pay was allowed him. He was also allowed $144 for mileage. Now it does appear to me that the system is not right; that this tendency to centralise power and influence in the Crown is not right, and that it is contrary to the well-understood wishes of the country. Now, I have an idea that our teaching system is a good system; I believe it is a wise system; I believe in every Province of the Dominion it is well conducted. I believe the management of our school boards is as good as it can possibly be, and I believe that if we trusted the examination of our Civil Service to the school authorities the work would be much better done, and would be attended with much less expense. I think it is a reflection on the scholastic authorities to say that they are not competent to perform this work, which is entrusted to members of the Civil Service, at the risk of impairing their usefulness in the walks of life in which they are engaged in the Civil Service at present. It cannot be denied—I do not think the Secretary of State would deny it—that in every part of the Dominion of Canada there are many gentlemen well qualified to examine candidates for the Civil Service. The member for North York (Mr. Mulock), has read an examination paper submitted to the candidates for the Civil Service examination last year. Why, Sir, it would be almost an insult to any teacher in the common schools to say that they were not qualified to examine these candidates. It would be a reflection on their honesty to say that they could not conduct the examinations quite as honestly as they are conducted under the present system. There is

the possibility that under the present system favoritism may be shown. Under the school system the examinations would be entirely free from favoritism. Nothing but merit, and merit alone, would be acknowledged by those boards. There would be no party bias influencing men, and every candidate who presented himself would be examined upon his merits. Now, I think these examinations could be conducted under that system with very little expense. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), objects to this discussion. He objects to any discussion that tends to lessen the expenses of this country. I am astonished that any member of this House should find fault, when just criticism is being made of a measure, when the object of that criticism is to save the money of the people of this country. Now, last year $4,661.64 were expended for examining these candidates for the Civil Service. I believe the work could be done for one-fourth of that sum, if it were left to the teaching body of this Dominion. It should be entrusted to them; and, if it were, the results would perhaps be more honest than they are at present. I certainly will protest, and strongly protest, against this system of having everything centralised here, and of conferring all these powers upon the Crown. I believe it is a bad system; I believe it should not be extended; I believe this power should be conferred upon the teaching authorities of this country; I believe they are competent, they are honest, and they would discharge the duties required in a better manner than they can possibly be discharged under the present system. I believe the cost would be minimised; I believe the expense would be trifling; and the hon. Secretary of State will be remiss if he does not submit the examination of the candidates for the Civil Service to the teaching authorities of this country. The present system is a most vicious system, inasmuch as it allows the Minister to appoint those already in the service to conduct the examinations. Who can tell the results to the interests of the library that may happen while the Librarian is away attending to the examination of these candidates? I do not for a moment doubt the ability of the Librarian to conduct them, but I object to the principle of taking him from his other duties, where he might be so usefully employed, as a man of ability, in many ways, in extending the usefulness of the Library, and in making its usefulness felt in the country, instead of being taken away to examine candidates in these questions which were read to us to-night by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). I think it is out of keeping altogether with the position of the Librarian. I believe it is injurious to the service; and I hope the Minister will well consider and weigh the effects of taking any member of the Civil Service from the duties he is expected to discharge in keeping with the salary he receives, and giving him extra judicial duties, which can be discharged at very much less expense than at present. Now, I find that on this board there is another member of the Civil Service, and he also gets, in addition to his salary, $300 as an examiner, and also some travelling expenses. Now, all these travelling expenses could be done away with, every one of them, if we had the papers submitted to the school boards. The expenses would not amount to more than a trifle; and I will not submit to have a measure of this kind passed by this House without protesting against it in the strongest possible language, because I believe it is wrong. If the duties of the Library require a Librarian, he should be there during his whole time. If he is required only for a part of the year, then it should be so defined, and for the rest of the year we should not be expected to pay him. I do not think he should be paid for two offices, if the one office is sufficient to keep him occupied. I think it is a wrong principle, and I hope it will not be continued; and I think the examination of these candidates could be conducted at much less expense, with greater efficiency, with perhaps greater regard for justice and fair play to all those candidates, by allowing the school authorities throughout the country to examine them. They have shown by their studies, from the highest to the lowest departments of learning, that they are well qualified to discharge those duties, and I trust such will be left to them, instead of the Government taking persons from the Civil Service, multiplying their offices and lessening the efficiency of the different services to which they belong under the present regulation.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have not learned much, since the other day, by the discussion. I suppose it is quite parliamentary to waste time in the discussion of a question, as it is unparliamentary to say so. I have not the right to say it, but the least I can say is that I have the right to think it, and I do believe it. I believe we have been wasting time in this discussion—wasting time in abusing the Librarian for having been a long time away from his duties, for he has not been. My hon. friend says the Librarian has no time to correct the examination papers. All the year round, except during the Session, he has from 4 o'clock in the afternoon until 10 o'clock the next day, and I suppose if he likes to use his spare time to do that work he has a right to do it. But it is a waste of time to discuss this any further, and I hope the House will continue to approve the position the Government has taken, that the three examiners are well qualified. That they are in the service of the Government does not disqualify them as examiners, because they would be Government employés if they were taken from outside. Their independence is not diminished, and there is nothing wrong in this aspect of the system we have. The hon. gentleman, like his predecessor in the discussion, has said that those examination papers could and should be corrected outside by others. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), the other day, said no, so as to have regularity in the examination and uniformity in the knowledge required for the service, and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was right. For the uniformity, for the regularity, for the impartiality of those examinations, they must be had at a central board; and as I said before, there must be a central board for the promotion examinations, and the same board for examinations for promotion as that for the preliminary and qualifying examinations. One or two hon. members said that those examinations were too easy. Last year there was a spontaneous explosion, I might say, of opinion in the House that the examinations for entrance to the service were too difficult, too puzzling; that they were outside of the range of knowledge necessary for a good employé. We have met these hon. gentlemen as well as we could; the examiners have done their duty, in that as well as in other respects, by putting the examinations at a level which is sufficient to qualify a good civil servant. We were told that if those examinations were made all over the country, they might go quicker; and the hon. member for North York suggested we might have examinations in all the counties of the Dominion. I know that we might send out papers to every county for the use of those who wanted to be candidates, but that would entail the employment of 210 sub-examiners, at $5 a day each. Hon. gentlemen said that was not too much for a work lasting a day or two; and only two days—that would be $2,110 of cost, instead of about $957. Thus, when the thing is reduced to calculation, everybody will see that the present system is the cheapest, unless the House wants to decide that the Government should not pay $5 a day to sub-examiners, and we might deduct a little from off that, but outside of that there is nothing to be deducted. I cannot see any good reason to change, and I think it is a loss of time to repeat arguments that have already been repeated three or four times.

Mr. CASEY moved that after the word "members," on the 30th line, the following words be added: "who shall hold office during good behavior."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have already said that these officers hold office exactly as do the clerks in the different Departments hold their appointments, and the choice we have made in the appointments to this board prove that the Government does not intend to remove the members of the board for nothing. It would be very bad policy for the Government to appoint a board of examiners that would be completely independent of any action of the Government. It is necessary that they should be under the supervision of the Government, not as regards their proceedings, but that they should remain as they are. The Government having the responsibility of the action of the examiners, should retain the former to replace them if found necessary. A good officer has the responsibility of the Government to assure his continuance in office, and these officers will not be kept in office if they do not their duty. What has been going on well before should be allowed to go on well hereafter.

Mr. CASEY. That is just where I have to differ with the hon. gentleman—on the question of principle. I think it is absolutely necessary to any fair Civil Service examination that the examiners should be independent of the Government, and the Minister has given no reason why they should be under the supervision of the Government or subject to dismissal for cause. Of course the Government will not dismiss them for nothing. Nobody ever imagined that; but what we are afraid of is, that the Government may sometimes dismiss them for something, for doing something or failing to do something which the Government wished them to do. The only reason for having these examinations at all is to prevent the Government from taking into the service inefficient men. The examination is the test of efficiency, and in order that this test should be had fairly, the court must be absolutely free from control by the Government in their actions. Otherwise, nobody will have the least confidence in their decisions or expect to find those decisions impartial. We have had the confession to-day from the Minister himself that the Government had interfered with the board of examiners by making them pass men they refused to pass because they were incompetent. He says the Government will not do it again, but as they did it without authority once they may possibly do it again. The certificate of the board of examiners should be final, not subject to alteration by the Government or anybody else. The decision they come to should be a final and conclusive decision, not subject to revision by anybody. Failing that, a board of examiners at all is a perfect farce. The Minister drew a parallel between the examiners and the heads of Departments; he says they both hold office on the same terms. It is quite proper the head of a Department should hold office during pleasure, because he is the mere instrument of the Minister for carrying out his wishes, and should be dismissed when he fails to do so. But the board of examiners are not meant to be the instruments of the Minister's wishes. They are put there as a check on the Minister, just as the Auditor General is put as a check upon the expenditure of the Ministers, and for the same reason that the Auditor General is not removable at pleasure, the board of examiners should be irremovable.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I challenge the hon. gentleman or anybody else, to say that for the last two years, and I speak only of that time, because I have only been in the office that time, there has been a single instance in which favoritism on the part of members of the Government has called the attention of the public with regard to those examiners. The contrary has been the case. I might quote, for example, my own Department. The son of one of the best and oldest employés in my Department has been twice refused for entrance examination, and it is so well known that the Minister has no interference with the duty which devolves on the examiners that I did not hear of it till the other day, and then through a stranger. I challenge any one to say that favoritism has been shown. The examiners themselves are men of such standing that it is not likely they would lay themselves open to any such charge.

Mr. CASEY. I am not saying anything against the examiners. I am only saying that they were interfered with, and my only witness is the hon. gentleman himself, for he told us that they had been interfered with.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister must allow me to speak while I am speaking. The hon. Minister did say, before dinner, as you will see by the *Hansard*, that in two cases where men had tried the examination for promotion and failed to get the 25 per cent. required by the Board of Examiners, he interfered, or the Government interfered—I do not remember whether it was himself, personally, or the Government—and passed an Order in Council directing the examiners to pass these men or to lower the standard to 15 instead of 25. He said that, as he will remember.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No; I did not say that at all.

Mr. CASEY. Well, it will be seen when the *Hansard* appears to-morrow. I would like him to state what he did say.

Mr. MITCHELL. I disagree with the hon. member for West Elgin.

Mr. CASEY. I was about to say——

Mr. MITCHELL. Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, I think I have the floor.

Mr. CASEY. I only sat down——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. member sat down for a moment to allow the Minister to explain.

Mr. CASEY. I only sat down to give the hon. the Minister an opportunity of making a statement which he did not think fit to make. We cannot send for the shorthand notes of the reporter, so we must wait until the *Hansard* is printed, but my recollection is, that the hon. gentleman stated that the Government had interfered and reduced the standard in the case of two gentlemen who tried to pass the examination and failed. He said: Perhaps we had no right to do it, but we did it. *C'est un fait accompli.* If I made some slight error in quoting the remarks of the hon. gentleman, I would like to be set right, but that is the drift of what he said. And that one instance, I think, is quite sufficient to prove my contention, that these gentlemen ought to be beyond the reach of interference by the Government, by Order in Council or by direct influence upon themselves. I also remember another phrase made use of by the hon. gentleman, which struck me very much at the time, and it was, that it was necessary sometimes to use influence on the examiners to see that they carried out correctly what was laid down in the Act; that it was necessary to supervise them, to see that they did what was laid down in the Act. On the face of it, that seems a perfectly fair statement that the Government should direct these men in the discharge of their duty and in the interpretation of the Act. But, when we come to consider that these men are put there to be a check upon the Government themselves, to be a check upon Ministers, you see the falsity of the assertion that the Government should direct them in the way of checking the Government's own action. I think, therefore, the apparent reasonableness of this argument disappears when you look into the real facts of the case. I urge, as strongly as possible, the adoption of the amendment. It may not be carried, and it is not worth while to divide the committee, but I will bring it up at a later stage.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not at all agree with the position taken by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey). It is known that I am opposed to this Civil Service Act *in toto*. I have already stated so. I am opposed to this system of examination. I am opposed to this blindly following of English systems, because we have had this imposed upon this country because it was established in England, and it is not congenial to the sentiments or to the institutions of the people of this country, and I believe, if the matter was to be dealt with over again, and the gentlemen around me were to throw off the thraldom of Government influence and party influence on the one hand, and gentlemen opposite were to throw off the thraldom of party influence on the other, they would not pass the Act to-day; but I am entirely opposed to the course taken by the hon. gentleman from West Elgin. He wishes these examiners to be the masters of the Government and the masters of the people. He says there is a precedent. He says we have made an Auditor General practically the master of the Government and independent of the Government. The case is entirely different. The Auditor General stands as the officer of this House, between the Government and the House, to see that nothing is done by the Government in the way of passing money orders or warrants that are not strictly sanctioned by the House, and therefore the case is entirely different. What is the fact about these examiners? If we make them independent of the Government we would have a lot more masters, a lot of people who would set public sentiment at defiance and public opinion at defiance, and the Government at defiance. There is one thing I find about this Act very repulsive to me. It is that this Act confirms what was done by the last Civil Service Act, which was a great mistake; that is, it has placed the deputy heads in a position which makes them independent of the political heads who are over them, and gives them an influence by which they can control or thwart, by direct or indireet means, the wishes of their superiors. We know that we have, in this Civil Service here in this city, deputy heads who pay no more regard to the representatives of the people than to the men who walk along the streets, the men who clean the streets, who meet them in a manner which is neither civil nor courteous, and they have an influence and a power by the Civil Service Act, of which this is an amendment or consolidation, and this Act perpetuates it. I do not want to see the examiners placed in the same position as the deputy heads and the Auditor. I think the objections of the hon. gentleman from West Elgin have no weight, and I shall therefore oppose them.

Mr CHAPLEAU. I desire to make an explanation in reference to the remarks of my hon. friend from West Elgin. I stated that the Minister—and I referred to myself—had never interfered with the duties of the examiners, and I challenged any member of this House to find a complaint that I had interfered. My hon. friend says I admitted before that we had interfered with the duties of the examiners. My hon. friend did not remember what I said. What I said was this, and it will be in the *Hansard*, because I said it, that the only instance that I knew of, was last year, after an expression of opinion in Parliament, when not less than half a dozen members said that in the promotion examination old civil servants had been examined on questions that were equivalent to puzzles, that were too difficult for old public servants, in a general examination outside of the duties of the office. We thought we were carrying into effect the will of Parliament in asking that, in these promotion examinations, the number of points in arithmetic should be reduced. It was not an interference with the duties of the examiners; it was carrying out the will of Parliament, as expressed here. My hon. friend said that he wanted these examiners to be perfectly independent, perfectly immovable. That is contrary to the Democratic ideas professed by my hon. friends on the other side. I should not be surprised if we did not pass this week without a strong protest from them against the appointment of officers to hold office during good behavior. I would not like that my friends should be asked to vote and give their opinion on the opportuneness of appointing examiners who would be masters of the Government.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad we agree so well as to our recollection of what the hon. Minister said. His restatement agrees with my recollection of what he said, and it is evident from that that the interference occurred, although he says the intention was to carry out the will of Parliament. My recollection as to the will of Parliament was that some half dozen members pointed out that the papers were very like puzzles, as he says; but, for this reason, because some questions in these papers were supposed to be unfair, I do not think he was justified in interfering and changing the standard of an examination *ex post facto*, and I do not think that half a dozen members express, in any official way, the will of Parliament. That is expressed in the Act, and I do not know any other way in which their will could be expressed, with regard to the examinations.

Amendment negatived.

On sub-section 2, section 8,

"The Board of Examiners shall be supervised by the Secretary of State."

Mr. CASEY. What does that mean?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The Department of the Secretary of State will have general supervision of the board.

Mr. CASEY. The examiners have certain duties laid on them by the Act, and if they do not perform them, they are liable to dismissal. I do not see what supervision they require, unless there is to be interference with their action.

Mr. BLAKE. This is an extraordinary proposition. I do not understand it, unless it be to tell this board that they are to be under the control, in a very pointed manner, of one of the Ministers of the Crown. The hon. gentleman says it means that they are to be attached to the Department of the Secretary of State.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have no objection to substitute another word.

Mr. BLAKE. As the clause reads now, they are to be put in a position of exceptional subordination to the Secretary of State.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is not intended.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman is good enough to say it is not, but I have just as good a right to interpret the language as he has. I say the language is language which he will not find with reference to any other officers having duties and functions of this kind to discharge in the service of this country, or in any other Act of Parliament—to state that they are to be supervised by one of the members of the Government.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend, who is a master of language——

Mr. BLAKE. That is not the point.

Mr. CHAPLEAU——instead of getting into a passion, might have suggested a better way. As I understand it, at least, the words do not mean that to me. I have no objection to using other words.

On sub-section 3, section 8,

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). If clause 2 is adopted, there is very little value in this clause. If they are to be under the direct supervision of the Secretary of State, it appears unnecessary that they should be governed by such rules and regulations as the Governor in Council may pro-

vide. If the word "supervision" here has the ordinary meaning, the board is given over completely to the control of the Secretary of State.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is the old clause.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I am aware of that, but the committee will recollect that the second clause of section 8 is not by any means an old clause. The Secretary of State has admitted that, practically, the term is ambiguous, yet he did not justify to us the amendment, as I really expected he would, or I am satisfied some one on this side of the House would have pressed the matter more closely. If he means that the board shall report to the Secretary of State, it becomes an entirely different matter, and the clause following that which is now under discussion is of more importance; but if they are to be placed under the supervision, as the term is ordinarily understood, of the Secretary of State, the clause we are now discussing has much lesss value—if it has any value whatever.

On sub-section 5, section 8,

Mr. CASEY. What occasion have the examiners to travel? As I understand it, the papers are sent down to the local examiners, and the answers are sent back to the board here.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They have no occasion to travel, and they will not travel. As far as expense is concerned, I may explain, as I explained once before, that when the Act first came into force it was necessary that one of the examiners should proceed to the place of examination, in order to show the local examiners how the work should be done; and even now, in places where examinations are held for the first time, it is necessary that one of the examiners should go and assist in getting the work started. But as soon as the system is in good working order, I am sure the examiners would prefer remaining here. When they travel, the rate is fixed by the Order in Council, and that is the reason why I have proposed this amendment. The rate fixed by the Order in Council is $3.50 per day, and that is not an inducement for people to travel.

Mr. CASEY. Is that over and above their railway fare?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. I admit that when the Act first came into force it might have been necessary to instruct the local examiners how to proceed, although it is so simple a matter that even that should scarcely be necessary. But by this time I should think the Act would have got into good working order, and the duties of the local examiners are so simple that I do not see what further assistance they can require. They have merely to get the candidates together, and see that they work independently of each other, and then send the answers into headquarters. There may be some reason for travelling which I cannot see, but as long as this clause is here the objections to travelling will be very much lessened, and trips will be made and expenses incurred under this clause, the necessity for which I cannot see.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. When an examiner visits a place, of course he saves the services of a sub-examiner. As I said before, when we consider all the examinations and promotions that have taken place, and when we have only expended some $300 during the year, it must be admitted that we have practised economy.

Mr. CASEY. I am not saying they have been extravagant.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Are the travelling expenses contemplated in this clause such as are paid under Order in Council to other civil servants travelling?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes, $3.50 a day.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex).

On sub-section 6, section 8,

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I wish to draw the attention of the Secretary of State to the advantage that would result from using, in as many instances as possible, the local examiners who preside at the examinations for school teachers throughout the Province of Ontario. I think there would be a decided advantage in doing so. Their experience in examining is very great, because it is a large part of their business, and I fancy they would give a good deal of satisfaction, in the majority of cases. I am aware that in some instances such a course has been followed. I should like it made a practice, in as many cases as possible, because the advantage will occur to every hon. member as being very decided. I also draw attention to a fact to which I made reference the other night, and that is, that complaints have been made that examinations have, in some instances, been very loosely conducted. Whatever the examinations may amount to, we all must certainly wish that fair play be shown to all who present themselves. I mentioned an instance that came under my own observation—I mentioned it as nearly as I could, without giving names, and I know the Secretary of State would not wish that to be done—in which one of the parties who presented himself for examination stated that the examinations were very loosely controlled; that copying was very general; and as a result, of course, complaints arose. That is one of the features of the case, which I fancy I need only mention to induce the examiners and sub-examiners to give more attention to it than probably has been the case heretofore. I am aware I was met with the answer that, in all similar examinations, some difficulty arose; but I can only say that the same gentleman who made complaint in this instance had undergone the examination required for teachers' certificates. And in comparing one with the other, he said that the care and supervision exercised in the examination for teachers' certificates were very much greater, and consequently the results were much more satisfactory. It would be a pity, whatever little value the examinations may have had, if they should be spoiled by a want of care and close supervision on the part of those who have them in charge.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The reason why some of the head examiners had to travel was because something wrong had occurred in some instances. I must say, however, the supervision in this respect has been exceedingly close, and at every examination we find that the abuses are diminishing rather than increasing with the number of examinations. The penalties imposed by the examiners on candidates who have been guilty of such actions have had a very good effect. It has happened that in one or two instances some of the candidates have copied from others. Both were punished and both were prevented from receiving certificates, and it will probably be a long time before they obtain them.

Mr. FOSTER. The point raised by the hon. gentleman is an important one, and though I do not think it necessary to give advice to the Minister in regard to it, yet probably a suggestion might lead to even greater circumspection than prevails. I can corroborate, from my own observation, the statements just made, that at examinations candidates have copied from others, and persons who have been detected have been punished, by both being excluded from receiving certificates. The suggestion I rose to make was this: I think it would be well if, particularly in the case of sub-examiners, young, smart men should be obtained. It takes a man with two eyes in his head, and those two eyes constantly employed, to prevent a dozen or twenty persons from doing a little talking or copying. The other suggestion was this: I think this occurs because of the limited space in the rooms where the examinations are often conducted. You take twenty or thirty persons in a room, where they have to sit very closely

together, and no man will be able to prevent such improper actions. It is false economy to save a little under that head and lose it in thoroughness.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Another word in this connection. Those acquainted with this matter know that, on an average, the school rooms—and it is generally in those, or in buildings of a similar character, that such examinations take place—will not conveniently contain more than twenty-five or thirty candidates in one room, with security against copying. That fact is based on experience, and my deduction is drawn from the regulations which prevail in regard to the examination of teachers in Ontario. If that is the case, it appears to me that in the majority of instances where examinations have been held within the past year, more than one sub-examiner was absolutely necessary to preside. The rule, in the Province of Ontario, for teacher's examinations, is to require a certain amount of room for every candidate, and that room is equal to the desk room usually appropriated to four scholars. In a room that would ordinarily accommodate sixty, you cannot examine more than twenty-five candidates with perfect safety against copying. It occurs to me, then, that if the policy of holding examinations at many places is continued, a greater number of sub-examiners will have to be appointed; and, if that be the case, I certainly think the suggestion of the hon. member for King's, N. B. (Mr. Foster), is a good one, that young, active men, with their full capacities should be preferred for such appointments. I would, at the same time, speak a word in favor of gentlemen who, in Ontario, have occupied the position of inspectors of schools. I think in London the Government have secured the services of one of these gentlemen. He is one of the Board of Examiners for the county of Middlesex, and has other gentlemen associated with him. He has five others associated with him, and has a much larger ground to go over and a much larger number of papers to supervise. It becomes absolutely necessary that those acquainted with the system and the requirements of examinations should have preference when nominations are to be made.

Mr. BLAKE. I will give the hon. Minister a suggestion, which has been found very effective in an institution with which I am connected, and that is, to establish a fire in the rear. One of the examiners was seated behind the student and another in front of him, and it proved very difficult to know when the eye of the inspector behind was looking at a particular person. It was found the most effectual protection that could be adopted.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I will consider the suggestion.

On sub-section 7, section 8,

Mr. CASEY. There have been objections raised to this subsection, and it has been thrashed over very thoroughly. I think that this third-class clerk, who is to hold a certificate of having passed the qualifying examination, should not be attached to the Secretary of State's Department, but should appear on the books as an employé of the Civil Service Board, so that in that case the whole thing would be seen at a glance, especially as this clerk's salary would go up $50 a year.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It was so last year, and I thought it would be as well to attach him to my Department; but I have no objection in making the change suggested.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it would be better.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It was only as a question of economy that it was fixed in this way, as his salary as a third-class clerk was only $600 a year.

Mr. FOSTER. Is all the time of this clerk taken up with the duties of the Board of Examiners, or has he leisure for a large part of his time?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. His time is pretty well taken up, but it was the intention to utilise him in the Department of the Secretary of State, when not occupied with matters of the board.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman can supervise him.

Mr. MULOCK. What are to be the duties of the secretary, and what are to be the duties of the clerk?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I find, by the report of the secretary, that he has received more than 7,000 persons during the course of the year at his house, asking for information, making enquiry for papers and so on. Certainly the secretary will have his hands full of work during the whole of the ordinary Civil Service year, and he cannot dispense with the assistance of a clerk, during a great portion of the year. If the secretary was an outsider, and not a member of the board, we might, perhaps, dispense with the third-class clerk, but not otherwise.

Mr. MULOCK. Are the offices to be public building at present being erected in Ottawa?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No; the clerk is in rooms occupied by the secretary; as we could not find rooms in the public buildings, we have rented rooms outside for the commissioners and the secretary, and the clerk will be there. When there is no work in his office he will be sent to work in my Department.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I would ask the Secretary of State if the $1,000 mentioned here as the salary of the secretary includes his salary as a member of the board, when he is a member of the board?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If he is a member of the board, he receives $700, and, if an outsider, $1,000.

Mr. MULOCK. I have understood that one of the examiners has an office for the discharge of his duties in the Geological Survey building. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No; there are three rooms, one large and two small, for the officers of the board.

Mr. CASEY. Where are they?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not know; they have been selected by Mr. LeSueur.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it would be convenient if these offices were near to the office of the Secretary of State, otherwise there would be a great waste of time.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I know that, and we expect, in the course of time to have rooms for them in the departmental building.

On section 9,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. In line twenty-one, instead of "are held" I propose to substitute "shall be held."

Mr. WATSON. I think it is very important that this board should always hold sittings in Winnipeg. It is a long way west, but there are great complaints from the Province of Manitoba about the Civil Service positions in that country being mostly held by people from the east, which is rather annoying to them. If the board would always sit in Winnipeg, there might be some men who would have an opportunity of passing an examination and qualifying themselves for positions in the Civil Service.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Does the hon. gentleman want the board to sit there?

Mr. WATSON. I mean the examiners.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The examinations are conducted there twice a year.

Mr. WATSON. I suggested that they should always hold examinations there, as they reserve, by this clause, the right of holding them there.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They are held there, and will be every year, if not twice a year.

Mr. MULOCK. I notice that since the board was established they have held two examinations a year. I do not know whether the Minister has considered if it is really necessary to have them twice a year. When we look at the work of the board, we find that, practically, they have held four examinations a year—two examinations proper, one in May and the other in December, and supplemental examinations after each of these, thus giving four periods of the year when candidates could pass the Civil Service examinations. It appears to me that this is not necessary, and that one examination a year, with a supplemental one, if you like, would entirely meet the wants of the case. I would further ask whether it would not be possible to have a fixed period each year for the holding of these examinations. At present they are held at uncertain periods, and that must, to a certain extent, embarrass the candidates. I think it is reasonable that there should be, as near as possible, a fixed period, and it would be well to have regard to the courses in the public schools. When we look at past practices in this respect, we find that examinations have been generally in the spring, in the month of May, and then in the fall, from September on to November, with no very definite period fixed. You might provide that the examinations for entrance should be held at a fixed periods each year.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I perfectly agree with my hon. friend, and it is the intention to do this. I intend to make a rule exactly in the manner my hon. friend suggests, and to adopt a fixed period, notice of which will be published in the *Official Gazette*, and we may be able to dispense with part of the advertising. As to holding the examinations only once in the year, it would be pretty long for a young man to wait for twelve months, from one examination to another. Moreover, it has been found inconvenient to obtain good accommodation for the examinations when we have had two a year; and if we had only one a year, the number of candidates would increase that difficulty. I think semi-annual examinations for entrance into the service, followed immediately by promotion examinations, when required, promotion examinations being, however, held only once a year, and also at a fixed period, would, I think, suit the necessities of the case.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I am rather of the contrary opinion. In the majority of instances, at least as far as my knowledge goes, these examinations have been held in some one of the schools throughout the country. The schools are vacant during the months of July and August, and that would be a very convenient time for holding the examinations. Besides, those who go up who have been attending school in the meantime, are fresh from their studies, and fresh from such examinations as may have been prescribed for them under other regulations, whether for school teachers or otherwise. I know that in the west, last May and November, it was extremely inconvenient, in some cases, for those who happened to be teaching to find time to present themselves for examination. In some cases they had to find substitutes, and I presume the same thing happened in other parts of the Dominion. When there are something like five or six thousand teachers in the Province of Ontario, and their ranks are kept up by means of examinations that take place only once a year, it is quite possible that when there are only about one-twelfth of the number presenting themselves for the Civil Service, one examination in the year will be sufficient. If there was no other reason for holding the examinations less often, the fact that the expense would be somewhat lessened is a material consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. Another suggestion occurs to me, outside of the money consideration, and it is this: It seems that each year the number of those who present themselves for the Civil Service examinations is increasing. Last year, I think, seven or eight hundred were passed. It cannot be possible that so many each year can be taken into the service, and the accumulating number looking for appointments causes two effects. It causes extra pressure on the Government for offices, which may result, as all Governments are human, in an over-supply of officials; and it produces a good deal of dissatisfaction throughout the country, as young men pass the examination with the idea that within a reasonable time it will be supplemented by an appointment. I do not see the necessity of holding the examinations too frequently, if the number of passed applicants is more than sufficient for the needs of the service.

On sub-section *a*, section 10,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Looking at the old Act, I see that some rather important words are omitted. There, in addition to what we have here, is this phrase: "or until he has obtained the certificates required by this Act." It seems to me the old Act is better than the new one in this respect. By the powers taken here, a man might be said to have passed the requisite examination, and yet not obtain the certificates from the examiners. It appears to me it would be better to restore these words. They would do no no harm, at any rate.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I suppose they have been omitted because they are surplusage. If a candidate has passed the requisite examination he is entitled to his certificate.

Mr. CASEY. I think the phrase is not mere surplusage, but that it is intended to require that the candidate shall produce his certificate, which is the only evidence that can properly be given of his having passed the examination.

Mr. BLAKE. I am disposed to agree with the hon. Secretary of State that it was absurd to put that in the other Act.

On sub-section *b*, section 10,

Mr. WATSON. I would like to call the attention of the Minister to a case in particular, in which this clause was not observed. It is that of an old gentleman in the neighborhood of 55 years, who was appointed two years ago as collector of Customs at the outport of Portage la Prairie. That must have been contrary to the Act. That gentleman is very pleasant, personally, but as regards ability he was not qualified, and I may further say he was not the choice of the people there. Unfortunately, however, the man who had been appointed and recommended by Mr. Ryan, when we first applied for an outport, had not passed his examination, although he was far better qualified than the gentleman appointed. He was not informed of the necessity of passing the examination until almost too late, when the appointment was made. I may mention the name of the gentleman in question, Mr. David Marshall. He was appointed collector of Customs, I do not know for what reason, in preference to a younger man, unless it be that he was a particular friend of the Minister of Customs.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman, of course, has a right to speak on the matter he has brought up, but it does not touch the clause we are now discussing. I will refer him to section 38, and in that he will find that the appointment was made in accordance with the Civil Service Act.

Mr. BOWELL. I may further state that the clause we are on now has no reference whatever to the outside service, so that it does not at all apply to the clause cited by the hon. gentleman. I do not propose to discuss the propriety or impropriety of this clause, but I can say to the hon. gentleman that he is altogether mistaken as to the qualifications of the gentleman in question. He was well

qualified, and a more energetic man is not to be found between Ottawa and Portage la Prairie.

Mr. WATSON. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I may say that I know the gentleman in question is not qualified. Whether he passed the examination or not, I do not know; but I know that when he came up first he could not make out a return at an outport, and I know this from the man under whose instructions he was placed. He would not allow the man who had been in charge of the outport to return to Winnipeg, but returned himself, and stopped at Winnipeg a week or two to get instructions, and even then he could not make out the papers properly.

Mr. BOWELL. I was speaking of him as a business man, and I did not say that he knew how to make out the returns. There is scarcely a man appointed to a position of that kind, unless he is taken from the service and has had experience, who is not placed in some other office at first to learn the routine, and if that is not done the inspector or some other officer is sent to teach him. Had the gentleman to whom the hon. member refers been appointed, he would have had to receive the same instruction.

On section 12,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This clause would clash with the organisation of the Departments that now exists, and I must ask to suspend it or drop it. It might interfere with the present organisation of the Departments, in some of which are some deputy heads.

Mr. BLAKE. We had that up a little while ago in the discussion of the Bill, and we were told they were separate Departments; that although they might be under one Minister, they were separate Departments entirely. Does the hon. gentleman mean there are Departments in which there are separate deputy heads?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Take the Department of Interior. I think the Director of the Geological Survey is a deputy head. The Commissioner of the Mounted Police is a deputy head. My attention was drawn to this by a member of the Government. We might only have to change some words, so as not to take away the effect of the clause, which cannot remain as it is.

Mr. BLAKE. With reference to the first example the hon. gentleman gave, he is in error. It is true that the Minister who lately presided over the Department of Interior said the other day that when Mr. Russell, having been a deputy head, was restored to the position of chief of the survey branch, he retained his rank, but that the fresh incumbent, Mr. Deville, was simply to be in the position of chief clerk. The case of Mr. Russell, he said, was exceptional, and such a thing would not occur again. Unless we have promises of this kind, I am much afraid that, with the numerous sub-divisions created, we will be getting numerous deputy heads. I was not aware that Mr. White had reached the position of deputy head. If that be so, it is well that we should know it, and by what process it is so? This clause has not been proposed without some intention. I would presume that it was in order that the Government might be saved pressure; I presume it is because there was such a continuous pressure upon the Government which, as the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), says, is human, and I dare say some of those who press upon it say it is inhuman, to increase the rank and increase the number of deputy heads, that they want to put the clause in the Act of Parliament. But I have not that confidence in the humanity or public virtue of the Government, and am opposed to placing any obstacle in the way of the Government to protect themselves against that pressure. If the clause requires modification to make it consistent with provisions which Parliament has given authority to, that will be a reason for changing the clause, but I hope the hon. gentleman will not withdraw the clause.

Mr. BOWELL. There are one or two Departments which have two deputy heads at the present time. Take the Department of the Interior, which has been already referred to. The Indian branch was originally attached to that Department.

Mr. BLAKE. But it is a separate Department.

Mr. BOWELL. I am aware of that, but it does not help the hon. gentleman at all. The Indian branch of the service was placed under the President of the Council, and Mr. Vankoughnet appointed a deputy head. Mr. McGee though termed clerk of the Privy Council, his rank is equivalent to that of a deputy head, so that virtually, and in fact, there are two deputy heads under one Minister and one Department. If you go to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, there are two distinct deputy heads, one presiding over the Marine branch and one over the Fishery branch, Mr. Smith and Mr. Tilton. The statute defines what Departments are.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The statute says there shall be a Department of Marine and a Department of Fisheries.

Mr. BLAKE. That is quite true. We had this discussion on another clause, and hon. gentlemen cannot blow hot and cold. We were told each of these was a separate Department; that the Department of Marine was one department, that the Department of Fisheries was one department, that the Department of Indian Affairs was one department, and so forth. It is quite true that the Department of Indian Affairs is by statute capable of being attached to any Minister. It is at the moment attached, by Order in Council, I believe, to the President of the Council. He is also Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. He has two distinct Departments, the Presidency of the Council and the Superintendency of Indian affairs, so that there are not two deputy heads in the Department of the Council at all. Nor, according to the theory in which we use the word department, as it has been explained to-day by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Public Works and the Secretary of State, are there two in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. There is a Department of Marine and there is a Department of Fisheries, under the control of the same Minister. They are two different Departments, and they are not branches of one Department, as has been explained by the hon. gentleman's three colleagues, in the course of the discussion this afternoon.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman will remember that it was on clause 6, where he proposed to say "each Department," I proposed to say "each branch," and he explained that it was not necessary, because they were legally and technically separate departments.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is what we say still. I do not propose to press this clause now. If I withdraw it, I will explain the reason, but it clashes with the organisation of the Departments.

On section 13,

Mr. BLAKE. I rather understood, though I may be wrong, that this clause also partook of the character of a clause I criticised a little while ago. At the time the Government were establishing the organisation of the Civil Service, they called upon us to trust them—I was not disposed to do it, but I could not help it—with the fixing of the salaries of the deputy heads upon the reorganisation. That was part of the scheme; they determined it, and Parliament has approved of it. I did not understand that it

was proposed to leave the Government power to alter that determination from year to year, or from time to time, and so give a constant element of fluctuation on the one hand and of pressure on the other, in reference to the salary of the heads of the different Departments. The duties of the heads of the different Departments, and the responsibilities appertaining to them, are well known now. The salaries have been fixed, and I think they ought not to be changed without the assent of Parliament. I think, if any proposal to alter these salaries is made—and I am not saying that it may not be proper at some time to make an alteration in them—it ought to be made to Parliament, and ought not to be left in the hands of the Executive.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not see what change there is. The minimum of the salary is fixed and the maximum is fixed, and no doubt any proposal to fix the salary of a new incumbent will have to be brought before Parliament, and the sanction of Parliament must be given to it. There has never been any law which said that a deputy head should necessarily be placed at the minimum. It is not the law, and has not been the law and has not been voted.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the passage of the old Civil Service Act for the reorganisation, the salaries of the deputy heads were fixed at $3,200, according to my recollection. There was one old officer, if I remember rightly, Mr. Page, and one only, who had received for many years a somewhat larger salary, I think $4,000, and his case was treated as exceptional; but the law provided $3,200 as the salary of the deputy heads of the Departments. It was upon the occasion of the Government proposing to reorganise the whole service that this clause, lasting in its nature, was introduced, and with a view to that reorganisation, they said: We are going to reorganise the service; we are going to determine what the number shall be in each Department, and what the salaries shall be, including the salaries of the deputy heads, and we desire to have this elasticity in making the arrangement. They got it; they made the arrangement; they determined the different salaries, they have been standing since that time, and now the hon. gentleman proposes to retain and make permanent that clause, which would enable him to increase the salary of any existing deputy head by Order in Council, not only in the case of a new deputy head, for if one was appointed it would only be by Act of Parliament, and the Estimates would declare what his salary would be, but now, by this clause, he could increase the salary of any existing deputy head receiving $3,200, or any other sum less than $4,000 up to $4,000, because the Governor in Council is to fix it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This was the law. We have left the law as it was, and I do not think any Act of Parliament has interfered with the law as it was.

Mr. BLAKE. I think he is in error in saying it is the law as it was. It is not the law as it was before the Act for the reorganisation of the service. It was upon the occasion, as I have stated twice, and do not want to state more than the third time, of the proposed reorganisation that the Government asked *pro hac vice*, for that occasion only, the power to fix the salaries according to the duties and responsibilities of the office. They got the power and they fixed the salaries. What I object to is, that now they are taking the power exclusively to increase these salaries. I say that, if they want to increase the salary of a deputy head now receiving less than $4,000, they should come to Parliament and ask it.

Mr. BOWELL. If a salary is raised, the Government must come and ask for a special vote in the Estimates to pay, it, and no salary can be raised and paid unless they come and ask for an appropriation under the Civil Service Act. Surely that is asking Parliament, unless the hon. gentleman wants the Government to come down first with a Bill or a resolution declaring that the salary shall be raised from $3,200 to $3,500 or to $4,000, the maximum laid down in this Act; but every single increase to any deputy head must, under the present Audit Act and Civil Service Act, be placed in the Estimates. I may tell the hon. gentleman that the Deputy Minister of Finance has always had $4,000, and he receives, in addition to that, some $200 as secretary of the Treasury Board, which gives him $4,200 per annum, and that is stated distinctly in the Estimates laid before the House.

Mr. BLAKE. That may be so. I am not criticising the salary of any one officer in particular.

Mr. BOWELL. I thought he said that only one of them received $4,000.

Mr. BLAKE. I said there were some, of whom I remembered one.

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Page is not a deputy head.

Mr. BLAKE. The same officer. Then the argument is still stranger. I am not objecting to a variation of the salary; I am not objecting to any salary in particular, but I am objecting to the system. I say that under the combined operation of the 13th clause, and the clause we have passed a while ago, allowing the salaries to be fixed, provided the collective vote is not increased, it would be possible for the Governor in Council to raise the salary of the deputy head, if he chose to do so, and pay it out of the sum which was voted for the salaries in a particular Department, if there was money enough in the total vote to pay that amount; because we have a clause here which allows the Governor in Council to alter the numbers, provided the total vote for the Department is not increased. Then we have another clause, allowing him to alter the fixed salaries of the particular officers if he has got the money, and if he is allowed to alter the salaries by the combined operation of the two clauses, we cannot prevent it.

Mr. BOWELL. If the hon. gentleman ever gets into the Government, and attempts to do anything of that kind, he will find that the Auditor General will call his attention to the fact that a special amount was placed in the Estimates to pay a certain officer, and he will not go a dollar beyond it. If the Governor in Council declare by Order in Council that the salary of a deputy head shall be increased, the Auditor General will not pay that until the appropriation has been made by Parliament. If, through economy or by the death of any officer, there is a surplus left of the amount voted for that special Department, you can, under the clauses to which the hon. gentleman referred, appoint another officer to fill the place, and thus expend the money that is at his disposal. But I can assure him that he cannot carry out, under the Audit Act, the principle he has laid down.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If clause 58 is interpreted as the hon. gentleman says, no increase whatsoever, and no extra remuneration of any kind, except the $50 statutory increase, can be paid, even to deputy heads, except it is specially voted by Parliament. But the salary is to be fixed. If a deputy head should die we have to make an appointment, and the Government must retain the power of making the appointment and determining the salary. But from one year to another, the Auditor General, and rightly enough, would not sanction the payment of any additional salary to a deputy head without a vote of Parliament.

On section 14,

Mr. CASEY. What other duties could be assigned to a head of a Department, except to oversee and direct the officers and clerks of the Department, and have general control of the business?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There might be some others. The Governor in Council might think proper to impose some other duties upon the deputy head.

On section 16,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is not this slightly altered from the old Act?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. One line has been omitted.

On section 17,

Mr. CASEY. There is an increase here.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). There is an annual increase provided of $50, which I think is a change from the Act of 1882. That says that the minimum salary paid to a chief clerk shall be $1,800, and the maximum $2,400.

Mr. BOWELL. So does this.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). The old Act makes no provision as to the annual increase of $50.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend has not read the amendment to 46 Vic., chap. 7, sec. 5.

Mr. BLAKE. This has been amended by providing for the annual increase of $50.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It has.

Mr. BLAKE. I shall take an opportunity, on the third reading of the Bill, of discussing the general question of the statutory increase of $50.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are there promotion examinations for all the grades, as high as chief clerks?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Of every grade, up to chief clerk.

On section 18,

Mr. BLAKE. Would it not be as well, with regard to first-class clerkships, that a provision should be made as to the necessity of a first-class clerkship for the proper performance of the public business in a Department? Although I am about to call the attention of the House to the system, which I think erroneous, of establishing the public service, I am not confident that I shall be able to prevail upon the House to adopt my views; therefore, I am desirous of taking what precautions can be taken now to obviate great present evils. Among those are the constant pressure for promotions, which are not always absolutely required. The Government and Parliament have seen the importance, with respect to chief clerkships, of requiring a report from the deputy head, stating that a chief clerk was necessary for the proper performance of the public business. I do not see any objection to instituting just the same safeguards in connection with first-class clerkships, because I think we are getting too many first-class clerks.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not see any necessity for such a change. We have made that provision with respect to chief clerks because they rank next to deputy heads. It was necessary to take that care for officers who are semi-deputy heads; but I do not think these restrictions should apply to first-class clerks. On the same grounds, it might be argued that a similar provision should apply to second-class clerks.

Mr. CASEY. I do not see why it should not. When we come to vote these sums in the Estimates, Ministers will be called on to state why there is an increased number of clerks in the different Departments. Hon. members will then expect to know the reason, and I do not see why we should not require a report from the deputy that the needs of the Department require additional clerks.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The appointment must be made on the deputy setting forth the reasons for it.

Mr. BLAKE. That is the difficulty. In one case the reason has to be given. In another case the additional precaution is taken of a certificate, that an additional chief clerk is necessary for the work of the Department. I do not think I could fairly ask, under this system, that this certificate should be applied to second class clerks, because the system is one which contemplates promotion to a certain extent. I consider that you should carry that check one grade lower, and let the Civil Service understand that first-class clerkships are not to be a matter of right, to be obtained by a promotion examination, and because a man has been so many years in the public service; because, under such a system, you are increasing the number of first-class clerks for the benefit of the officers and not for the benefit of the public, while at the same time you are making it a public charge.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I see the necessity of a certificate in the case of chief clerks, which operates in the direction of limiting their number. After a number of years an efficient clerk passes through the grades of third, second and first-class; but after he reaches the last named class a certificate from the deputy is necessary before he can rise to a chief clerkship. I do not see there is any necessity to make a change.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister has given no reason why a clerk should graduate into the position and therefore into the salary of a first-class clerk, unless it is certified that there is a necessity for his services in the Department.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is exactly what the hon. gentleman who has just sat down has stated. I cannot be more convinced by the hon. gentleman repeating it.

Mr. CASEY. The hon gentleman has given no reason for continuing the Act in its present state.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I say that in the ordinary course a clerk proceeds from third to second, and from second to first-class; this is the regular promotion, and then a certificate is needed before he can advance to a chief clerkship.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). There would be some advantage in obtaining a certificate, setting forth the necessity of making appointments to that particular class. We all know the reason which is frequently given, when the estimates for Civil Government are considered, is that the large sum is due to so many increases which have to be granted under the provisions of the Civil Service Act. If that be the case, now is the time and this is the opportunity for bringing the matter within the control of Parliament. If that reason is no stronger than the mere fact that the law allows it, the opportunity ought to be taken advantage of now to change the system, and I think the reasoning of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) is very forcible. I cannot myself conceive why some statement of appointments to first-class clerkships should not be required. I realise the reasoning of the Secretary of State, but that cannot be, of course, unless public exigency demands the increase. There is no reason why, because the stepping stones have been provided, because the clerk has reached a particular rung of the ladder, that the demands of the public service should not be considered.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The promotion from the third to the second, and from the second to the first, goes without saying. For any higher rank the deputy has to make a report, concurred in by the head of the Department, setting forth the reason for creating the office, and that reason would be the proper performance of the duties of the

Department. I think it is not necessary to create additional special machinery with respect to first-class clerks.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). There is another point to be considered in connection with this matter. When a clerk has passed certain steps in the Department, and has been for over twenty years in the Department, that factor should have some weight. The mere fact of a civil servant having been a long time in the Civil Service, without any other fact, ought not to be sufficient ground for promotion.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is not.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). What other provision is made here?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If the hon. gentleman will read the section he will see.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the distinction between the duties of a first-class clerk and a chief clerk?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is the difference between a superior and an inferior officer.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think that fully explains the distinction, and it does not sufficiently justify the increasing number of new officers. The Government to-day is overrun with clerks, with heads, sub-heads, assistants and deputy assistants, of one kind or other; and now we are proposing to confirm this same system. The deputy heads are the most independent persons in the public service. They are more independent than the Government of the day—than the highest officers in the land. Governments come and go, but deputy heads stay on for ever. They are independent, to some extent, of public opinion. It is proposed now to go further and allow deputy heads, if they desire to be relieved of their duties to any extent, to have their importance enlarged by having further assistants to relieve them of their work, and glorify them. It is proposed to allow them, on their own recommendation, to create new officers—to recommend (which practically means to appoint) new officers under them. I will read the language:

"A chief clerkship in any Department shall only be created by Order in Council, passed after—

"(*a*.) The deputy head has reported that such an officer is necessary for the proper performance of the public business in the Department, stating the reasons on which he has arrived at that conclusion."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That position is agreed to by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MULOCK. I am arguing from my own standpoint, and I do not think that this is a question of Opposition or Government. At all events, I have my own views on all questions. I say it appears to me that this is giving another inducement to another officer, a deputy head, to relieve himself, at the public expense, of certain of the duties which are assigned to him. He is understood, by the power conferred on him by this clause—he is in fact invited—to hand over a large portion of his duties to a deputy to himself, whilst his salary goes on increasing until it reaches a maximum. He may recommend—and if he does, it will be difficult to show that his recommendation is not correct—that a portion of his duties, for certain reasons assigned in his report, shall be handed over to another, and how is the head of the Department to know whether or not his recommendation should be acted upon? I think it is quite inconsistent with the public interest that a man appointed to discharge public duties should have power to recommend the delegation of a certain portion of those duties, and that he should be the sole judge of such a diminution of his duties.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is rather difficult to suit hon. gentlemen. On the one hand, I am told that unless the deputy head should make a recommendation, stating special reasons, such an office should not be created, and on the other hand, the hon. gentleman says that it is too much to ask a deputy head to make such a special report; it is giving him too much patronage and power. Is the hon. gentleman ready to say that it shall be done without any recommendation at all?

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman does not apprehend my point. The man in charge of the work, the deputy head of the Department, originates the proposition to relieve himself of a portion of his duties. If it is proposed to create another officer, let the Minister himself take the initiative and enquire in the Department. One source of information would naturally be the deputy head, but I do not think the person whose duty it is to discharge certain offices should be the first one to originate the addition to the staff.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I understood the hon. gentleman very well, but I always thought that owing to the fact that the deputy head, who remains at his post, and is a good public servant, though Governments may change with the politics of the country—I believe that the fact of his making the recommendation, or of requiring a report from him, would be a check on political appointments, as his work goes on, notwithstanding changes, and he knows the Department thoroughly. If the hon. gentleman desires that I should make the proposition, that the recommendation of the deputy head is not necessary perhaps he will accept it, but I do not think this side of the House will.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not say that the deputy head shall not be referred to, but I think the motion should originate with the proper head of the Department; and, if you like, you may provide that no Order in Council shall be made without such recommendation.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Do you mean that the report shall be made by the Minister, and concurred in by the deputy.

Mr. MULOCK. I did not say that his concurrence was necessary or not.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My hon. friend will see that it does not follow that if a deputy makes a report the Minister will accept it. He will see the reasons for and against, and if he does not concur in the report he puts it aside and will not bring it up. But I think that the deputy head, who is constantly at his office, who sometimes passes through three or four Administrations, is better qualified, as a rule, than the Minister, to say whether such an officer is required or not. Then the Minister must enquire, he must take the responsibility, and afterwards he will have to come down and defend the action of Council and his own action, and show why the office is required. This plan has worked well up to the present, and if the hon. gentleman looks over the offices created in this way—first-class clerkships—he must see that the power given by this clause, which is the same as in the previous Act, has worked well, and that very few of these offices have been created. As a rule, when an office of that kind becomes vacant, it is filled by promotion, and few new ones are created.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think the deputy head should be the one to originate a policy or to make recommendations of this kind. The head of the Department is the one responsible for the efficiency of the Department, and if this provision is acted upon we may have this state of affairs. The deputy head—who may be indiscreet—may make a recommendation that a certain portion of his duties should be transferred to another; the head of the Department may differ from him, and thus we would have a conflict of authority. It must be so, if the deputy head recommends a certain thing and the Minister differs from him. In such event, of course, there is no appointment, and when anything goes wrong the deputy head will shield himself by saying: I made the recommendation, but it was not acted upon; and so there will be friction in the Department.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If the hon. gentleman proposes it, I will vote with him, but I am afraid we will find ourselves in an imposing minority.

Mr. MULOCK. I think the head should be responsible as he is, in all well managed institutions.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. So he is here.

Mr. MULOCK. And everything of the kind should originate with the head of the Department. Let the recommendation come from the Minister, but let it be endorsed as you think proper.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The deputy head has the knowledge of the details of the Department and the Minister has the responsibility. So the deputy head initiates the recommendation, and it is endorsed or concurred in with the responsibility of the Minister, where the responsibility is

On section 23,

Mr. MULOCK. I see that the annual increase of $50 is applicable to all these different classes, from the chief clerk, who commences at $1,800, down to the third-class clerk, who commences at $400. Should not the increase be graded in some way, having regard to the relative salaries at which they begin?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Would the hon. gentleman propose to make the increase $100, when the salary is $1,500 or $1,800.

Mr. MULOCK. We can grade downwards, from the $50.

On section 24,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is no provision here for a regular increase in the salaries of messengers. What is the Minister's intention?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I stated, when I introduced the Bill, that my first intention was, by this clause, to try and get more efficiency in the service of the messengers, by leaving the question of the annual increase entirely at the will of the Minister. But I think, on the whole, as we have made no changes in the case of others, it might be as well not to make any change with respect to them, and I therefore propose to insert the words, "with an annual increase of $30, up to the maximum of $500."

On section 25,

Mr. BLAKE. Is that the old provision?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No, it is a new provision, and it is for this purpose: Formerly, third-class clerks could be appointed at any salary up to the maximum; but under this clause we have put the Government under the obligation of appointing at a minimum of $400, except, of course, in case of optional subjects. The next paragraph provides, however, that lower grade officers may, after qualifying examinations, be appointed third-class clerks, at the salary they enjoyed at the time of such appointment; for instance, letter carriers can go by length of service, without having any qualifying examination, up to $650. It would not be just, because we have limited third-class clerks to a minimum salary on their appointment, that a permanent employé of a lower grade, having obtained a higher salary by length of service, should be appointed a third-class clerk at a lower salary than he has succeeded in obtaining.

Mr. BLAKE. The meaning is, that provided the salary he was receiving at the lower grade employment at the time of his promotion is not to be increased when he gets into the third-class.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is it. For instance, it is intended that a letter carrier superintendent, whose salary can be raised to $800, may be appointed a third-class clerk, after passing the qualifying examination, at $800.

On section 30,

Mr. STAIRS. I beg to call the attention of the committee to an amendment I would suggest, namely, that a class of officers in the outside service, who are classed as lockers, should be transferred from the qualifying examination to the preliminary. My reason is, that the men who are generally appointed lockers are a class of men who find it almost impossible to pass the qualifying examination. The men qualified for this examination are generally young men, fresh from school or college, who, although they may be admirably fit for appointment as clerks, are not a good class from which to select men to fill such a position as that of locker. For the position of locker you do not require a man of great education, but rather a man of force of character, who is able to resist pressure which may be brought to bear upon him by the different merchants whose goods are in bond.

Mr. BLAKE. He may have a good deal of character, even if he does pass the examination.

Mr. BOWELL. I take a different view to that taken by my hon. friend, as to the qualifications of locker. A locker should be able to take charge of books, in which he must keep a record of the goods in bond and of the permits, and then make a return to the collector. The lockers in the first instance were appointed on their passing the preliminary examination, but after some experience we found it necessary to put them in a class where they must pass a qualifying examination, and the qualifying examinations are not of such a character that men who can take charge of a large bonded warehouse could not pass them.

Mr. STAIRS. I still differ from the Minister of Customs. I feel that under the qualifying examinations he will not obtain first-class men as lockers. The class of men suited for this work are such men as retired sea captains and mates, estimable men, with much force of character, and I feel quite sure he will not find these men able to pass the qualifying examination. The hon. gentleman has not had trouble in Halifax, because he has not appointed a locker there since the Bill was in force; but I venture to say he could not get in Halifax any man to pass the examination who was a fit person to be a locker.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). It may sound a little peculiar for two Government supporters, one on each side of the House, to pour a broadside into him, each in his turn; but I must say that I endorse the opinion of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs). I find, out in Victoria, the same trouble there; the men who pass the qualifying examinations are rather above the position of lockers or tide-waiters or such positions, and they go in at once for positions which entitle them to a much higher rate of pay than even the maximum pay attached to the position of locker, and I would like to see that position restored to the preliminary class in which it was before.

Mr. BLAKE. I hope this is the last shot in your locker.

Mr. BAKER. No, it is not the last shot in my locker as the leader of the Opposition will find out some day. He will find the cable is not run out to the clinch. He understands that.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Explain.

Mr. PLATT. I wish to suggest an amendment to this clause. I would suggest that you amend it by inserting the word "permanent" after the word "no," in the first line. The object of this amendment is to reduce to a minimum the apparent value or importance of this preliminary or qualifying examination. The object in doing that will be evident to this committee, from the fact that we have already learned from the discussion and from the reports laid before us that a very largely increasing number of candidates are coming before the examiners at every examination. We have now, I presume, a very much larger

number who have received certificates than will find places in the public service for many years to come, and the number is increasing. An inducement is held out to young men to pass this examination, and as soon as they have passed it they feel they have a claim upon the Government of the country for a position in the Civil Service. I can see no objection whatever to the Government making appointments provisonally, or probationary appointments, as the Act will term them, and allowing the young men to pass the examination during the probationary period of six months or a year, as the case may be. This will place all the young men in the country on the same footing as to entering the Civil Service. Besides, it seems to me a hardship that a man should pass the examination and then be placed on probation, and perhaps after three months be rejected, so that the time spent in his examination is lost. I do not believe we should continue to stimulate and encourage young men to qualify themselves for this examination. I do not look upon it as a laudable ambition for a young man to strive to get into the Civil Service, though it may be a laudable ambition to pass all the examinations he can. Many members of this House must recognise the fact that every Session brings numerous applications for the examination papers, and the rules and regulations and the report of the board, and so on. I have ten times the applications from my own county this Session that I had last. We are paying for the examination of scores of young men who will never get into the service, and we are increasing the expense to the country in another direction. We know that the more candidates apply to the Civil Service examiners, the greater number of successful candidates there will be holding certificates, and then there will be a greater number of applications. The greater the number of applications the greater the number, probably, of civil servants; and the greater the number of civil servants, the greater will be the number of superannuations. It extends all through. There is increased expense in the examinations, in the Civil Service, and in the cost of the superannuation list. There is this fact, too, which I consider more important, that it is creating a large class of young men throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion, who feel that they have a certain claim upon the Government for positions in the Civil Service, and I do not by any means think that their desire for office will prove a very valuable acquisition to them. I consider that no greater misfortune can befall a young man than a desire to live upon the Government of the country, a desire to obtain a livelihood in the Civil Service of the country, supported by a feeling that he has a claim upon the Government. He is likely to be, to all intents and purposes, a useless member of society. I know of no more useless member of society than an office seeker, who is claiming patronage from this politician and that one, hoping that some day he will be accepted in the Civil Service and live a life of ease, and by this examination, which is encouraging young men to enter into it, we are raising up an army who cannot all be put in the Civil Service, but who think they have claims upon it and who rely upon it. We are creating an army of office seekers, who will not be a very great acquisition to society or the country. I think the amendment which will place all on the same footing should be adopted.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The amendment suggested by my hon. friend would not do. We would have to change the Bill altogether. All appointments are presumed to be permanent, and clause 48 prevents a Minister from giving temporary employment to clerks, unless they have passed their examination, and if they cannot be found, and the pressure of business requires their appointment, they must pass at the very next examination.

Mr. PLATT.

Mr. PLATT. I see there is a clause which provides that a man shall not receive a permanent appointment unless he has served a probationary term of six months.

Mr. BOWELL. That is a confirmation of the appointment.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That means that the appointment is made, but it is confirmed after a probationary term.

Mr. PLATT. It is not permanent until it is confirmed.

Mr. BOWELL. It may occur that, although you have a young man who has passed a creditable examination, he may be perfectly unfit for the work he is called upon to perform. In fact, that often occurs. Anyone who has had anything to do with school boards knows that some of the teachers who have passed the most brilliant examinations have been utter failures as school teachers, while those who have just passed the ordinary examination and got third-class certificates have been eminently successful. It is the same in the Civil Service; so the provision was made that, after the appointment of any one to the service, if it should be proved during the first six months that he was unfit for the position to which he was appointed, you would not confirm him, but would send him adrift or reduce him to some other position which he might be fit for.

Mr. PLATT. My suggestion offers the opportunity of making that discovery before you subject him to the examination.

Mr. STAIRS. In the case of a tide-waiter, promoted to be a locker, must he pass the qualifying examination?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. He cannot be appointed to a third-class clerkship, or a position equivalent to it, without passing the qualifying examination.

Mr. BOWELL. The position of a locker is a higher position than that of a tide-waiter. The maximum of a tide-waiter's salary is only $600. If he is made a locker, he can go as far as $800.

Mr. STAIRS. But will he have to pass the promotion examination or the qualifying examination?

Mr. BOWELL. The promotion examination.

Mr. STAIRS. If he has to pass the promotion examination, it is very unfair.

Mr. GAULT. I do not think it is necessary that a locker should pass the qualifying examination. All they want is good common sense, after passing the preliminary examination, and I should like to see them placed with messengers, and so on.

Mr. BOWELL. You would not put your book-keepers on a par with your messengers.

Mr. GAULT. They are not book-keepers, are they?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; they must keep books.

Mr. GAULT. Very simple books.

On section 35,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We are now preparing special regulations which will be published, I hope, during this Session; we are to publish a list, according to the rules and regulations prescribed by law.

Mr. BLAKE. We have already passed a general provision, that the whole conduct of business, in fact all matters, shall be according to the rules and regulations made by the Governor General in Council. If it is simply a matter of detail, connected with the preparation of this list, that will be accomplished under the power we have already discussed at some length.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I dare say it might be.

Mr. BLAKE. I think we had better strike out those italicised words and put in something else. I think that

the list ought to be published in the *Canada Gazette* forthwith. I am quite convinced that the former clause gives to the Governor General in Council full power to make all regulations required, with reference to this as well as to other details. I propose that we insert the words, " shall be made out and published in the *Canada Gazette*."

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I would like to ask the Secretary of State how are those persons, who have undergone an examination and have failed, to know that they have not passed successfully, and to know wherein they have failed ?

Mr. BLAKE. By the clause, as we are now altering it, the names of those who have succeeded will be published in the *Canada Gazette* at once.

Mr. BAKER. I am aware of that, but many people living as far off as British Columbia, for instance, never see the *Canada Gazette*.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Immediately after the result of the examination is known, the secretary of the board sends a notice that they have passed successfully.

Mr. BAKER. That is not the point. I wish to know how those who have failed to qualify are to know that they have failed, and wherein they have failed. I am speaking generally, because there are several officers who have gone up for a promotion examination, and up to the present moment they do not know whether they have passed or not. There is one old gentleman in my constituency, sixty-one years of age, who has been asked to pass a school-boy examination. The Minister of Customs knows that for the last twenty-four or twenty-five years he has been successfully performing the duties of chief clerk and receiving a salary of $1,800. He has satisfactorily performed his duties, not only to the collector of Customs, but to the Minister of Customs, yet he has to go up at that advanced age, and pass a school-boy examination before he can get promoted to the position of surveyor, without which he cannot get an increase of $100 a year. He goes up and attempts to pass an examination, and perhaps gets caught upon some little technical subject, that has nothing to do with his professional duties ; and up to the present moment he has not been notified whether he has passed or not. I certainly think that the proper officer, whoever he may be, should notify him if he has failed, and forward him a copy of the report of the examiners, to show wherein he had failed, so that he may qualify himself for subsequent examination, if he wishes.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). There is some reason in what the hon. gentleman has just said, because a man who has failed to pass gets no intimation of the result of the examination. There is, in addition, the fact that he may feel himself prejudiced in this examination. It may not be of so much consequence to a young man, coming up in the expectation of getting an appointment in a Department, if he is not notified, but in such a case as the hon. gentleman has mentioned, the want of notification may be of considerable injury to him. I think there should be some arrangement by which, on the payment of a fee, the unsuccessful candidate should be allowed to enter his protest and have his papers reexamined. Some such provision as that is made with reference to the examination of school teachers, and I think the case mentioned by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Baker) is a sufficiently grave one to warrant a provision being made to meet it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is always a standing tribunal for appeal, and certainly, if 211 members in the House of Commons, are not a good medium through which a man can make complaints that he has been wrongly treated by the Board of Examiners, I do not know what better tribunal could be instituted. If we publish a list of the names of those who have passed, those whose names are not published will know that they have not passed. When a candidate has failed, and if he wants to know wherein he has been deficient, he is always afforded the information.

Mr. McNEILL. I would go farther than the hon. member for Victoria. I think it is a very great hardship, indeed, that the man who entered the Civil Service before this Act was placed upon the Statute Book should be prevented from having that promotion which he believed himself to be entitled to, until he passes the examination required by this Act. When these men entered the Civil Service they did so believing that if they showed proficiency in the discharge of the duties imposed upon them they would receive promotion in due course ; and I say that it is a great hardship, a great injustice, that men, perhaps old men, should find that all means of promotion are closed to them, simply because they cannot pass some examination, which is to them a very difficult matter, while to a schoolboy, fresh from school, it would be a very simple matter. We all know very well that the failure of a man to pass such an examination is no test whatever that he is not fit for promotion, and if it be no test, under those circumstances to which I have referred, in regard to a man who has been long in the service and who has become aged in the service, I think, on its face, it is very unjust to old civil servants to make them subject to such a test. The House should seriously consider whether old and faithful servants of the country should not be relieved of an obligation of this kind, that was thrust upon them without any notice of it whatever being given them, and most unjustly and wrongfully thrust upon them. I think those men have a perfect right to obtain promotion if they conduct themselves properly and show proficiency. Now, this right is taken away without any notice whatever. The Act is retroactive in its effect, and is most unjust and unfair to many thoroughly deserving civil servants.

Mr. FARROW. I quite agree with the remarks of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill). Great injustice has been done to men who entered the Civil Service years ago, and who have proved themselves very efficient officers, by their being compelled to undergo an examination before they can be promoted. I will give an illustration. In 1872, when the new school law came into force in Ontario, the old teachers, some of whom had taught for nearly a lifetime, were granted a permit to take out a certificate in the county where they had taught. I was very glad to see that the present Minister of Education, when revising the school law last Session, made provision that those teachers who had certificates should have them extended to the whole Province. I think the Minister acted rightly, and the country is of that opinion. On that principle, I say the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) is quite right in what he suggests, that civil servants who have proved themselves efficient officers ought not to be required to submit to examinations under this Act, but should be promoted, without being called upon to pass.

Mr. MULOCK. With respect to the remarks of the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Cameron), that in certain cases candidates should be allowed to appeal from the finding of the examiners, that is a request which should hardly be conceded. The proper thing is to appoint proper examiners. To what tribunal would you appeal? It must be to the same judges who sat in the first instance, and they are not likely to overrule themselves. If a mere mistake had been committed, no doubt the examiners would correct it ; but that is a very different matter to appealing from the decision, on the ground that an improper judgment has been rendered.

Mr. BAKER. The point I wish to establish is this: Certain officers in the Civil Service go up for promotion examinations, and do not receive any information from the

Secretary of the Civil Service Board as to whether they have failed, and if so, in what subject.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That will be done.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 42,

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). There ought to be some provision made, by which candidates would receive advantage from passing an examination; in other words, appointments should be made from those who have passed the examinations, and those who have passed most successfully should have the preference. I move that the following words be added:—

And appointments shall be made from the three highest names on the list.

Mr. McNEILL. That is the introduction of the competitive system.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that in our examinations the candidates who pass are not arranged in order of merit. It is quite true that the ideal expectations of the friends of competitive examinations have not been wholly realised, but a great improvement has been effected.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There is a general list prepared, of candidates who have passed the qualifying examination and are ready to enter the Civil Service.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not suppose that the question of competitive examinations is exactly before the committee at the present time, but I may say that I took a great deal of interest in the question when I was in England, and I have maintained that interest since, and I cannot accept the view of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. No doubt, of late there has been an improvement in the Civil Service, and there has been an improvement in the system of examination, irrespective of competition altogether; but so far as competition itself is concerned, it has been a great failure. I think that the men who have come out at the top of the list in competitive examinations have not by any means proved the best qualified to fill the office.

Mr. BLAKE. That will, of course, often happen, and I agree with those who declare that the fact of a man coming out first on the list is not to be accepted as a reason that he is fitted for the Civil Service at all. I am entirely with the probationary examination; I am entirely with the view of giving the utmost freedom to the Minister to say to a man that because you have passed an examination you may not be fit for the Civil Service at all. There are qualifications for offices in the Departments which you cannot find out by any written examination, or guarantee by any amount of learning, but the great advantage of an examination, is that it gives you those irrespective of political proclivities who are approved, as far as written examinations will enable you to approve them, as the highest in attainment, and give them an opportunity of proving for themselves in the service that they are suitable clerks.

Mr. McNEILL. I quite admit that under a strict pass examination you are relieved of the obligation which is almost necessarily imposed on you, under a competitive, to appoint certain men——

Mr. BLAKE. The other enables you to choose your friends.

Mr. McNEILL. I agree that there is that objection, but there is objection to everything in this world, and there are certainly great disadvantages in competitive examinations.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I realise some of the difficulties which exist in the working out of this clause, but still the Governor in Council, under this Bill, has a good many prerogatives, and there may possibly be found some means of engrafting this principle on the Bill. I realise the objections raised by the hon. member for Bruce, as to the departmental value of the men who pass highest. I realise that it is not an absolute assurance of a man's capacity for a position that he has passed the examination. But there is no provision made here whatever, for apparently the Minister, if he is to do other than show his partiality for some one, is to throw the names in a hat, and pick out the first one that comes. Now, I think some more definite proposition could be adopted, and the commissioner will recollect that it by no means secures the appointment to any one of the individuals named as the first three on the list. It simply secures the temporary appointment of one of them, and if, with the fact that they had the best educational qualifications, they had not the best adaptability to the position, it is competent for the Department to say: You do not suit, and we will have to pick somebody else. Now, I am made aware that no average standing is accorded those who passed, but I think some provision of this kind should be made. Of course, it introduces the competitive principle, but if it is not to be altogether a haphazard arrangement, why should we not recognise that principle to some extent. If a vacancy occurs, to which an appointment is to be made, the names are taken indiscriminately; no reason whatever, other than that which gave value to the examination, is taken as the one for making a new appointment. I think the competitive principle could be recognised here without destroying some of the other principles to which hon. gentlemen opposite are determined to adhere. I would, of course, prefer that an independent commission, with other details not embraced in the Bill, should be recognised as the mode of examination and appointment to the service; but that principle is not adopted, and if this one change was made, I believe a good dead of the pressure which was suggested by the hon. member for King's, as always following the candidate's securing a certificate, would be avoided, and some considerable advantages result. Of course, it implies that the examiners would have to determine the marks made by each candidate, but that is not very difficult. The greatest difficulty I see is that the values given at one examination may differ from those given at another; that is, while some examiners may have given values to a paper, different papers may themselves have different values at different examinations. But in the examinations for school teachers, which have been made the basis of the argument in many instances to-night, the teacher who passes in 1882, and secures a certificate and a relative merit, may have passed a much less severe examination than he who passes in 1884. I have known repeated instances where the examination papers were set so very hard that the examiners were forced to allow a larger number of marks in consequence of the acknowledged severity relatively of the two papers; but if the examiners gave the relative marks of each subject, the amendment would be reasonably workable.

On section 38,

Mr. BLAKE. I think the hon. gentleman will see that the 38th section should be divided into three and not four sub-sections, the first two as printed being really the first sub-section. As to the second sub-section, I believe the hon. gentleman promised an explanation to some of his colleagues. We were promised some explanations with respect to sub-section 3.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The explanation is that inspectors of Customs and assistant collectors of Inland Revenue have been added.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In the Act at present, the collectors of Inland Revenue are exempt from the examination. In this the collectors are left out, and assistant collectors substituted, as being exempted instead of the collectors.

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. gentleman explain why that change has been made?

Mr. COSTIGAN. My reason for recommending it was this: That the collectors of Inland Revenue require more technical knowledge than officers of equal rank in any other branch of the service. I prefer that assistant collectors, after being under the control and direction of experienced collectors, should be promoted. Their experience will make them efficient officers, and I think the service will gain.

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. gentleman kindly state what are the number of collectors and the number of assistant collectors in his Department?

Mr. COSTIGAN. There are fewer assistants than collectors. I cannot give the exact numbers.

Mr. BLAKE. I was, of course, very much opposed to this clause when it was introduced, and it has been enlarged and changed every Session since. The reason was given, on one occasion, with commendable frankness, that it was necessary to have prizes for old war horses, and it was essential that there should be a little freedom on the part of the Government to reward their friends. Now, I have been accused sometimes of saying some hard things about the Civil Service. But I want to say that my belief always has been that one of your greatest chances of getting faithful service from the civil servants is by not disappointing their just expectations of obtaining promotion in the service; and I believe you can do no greater injury to the *morale* of the service than by interfering with the system of promotions, so long as it is promotion by merit; I do not mean promotion by seniority; I mean by merit. The hon. gentleman has indicated that he has felt it expedient that the collectorships should be filled under the precautions of this Act, and he very properly proposes to exclude them from the class to which appointments may be made without regard to the provisions of the Act. I am entirely with him, but I would like him to go a step further. I would like him to do the good thing he has agreed to do, without doing the evil thing which he proposes to substitute for it. He says it will promote the efficiency of the service to make this change, that is, to strike out "collectors" and put in "assistant collectors;" but would it not promote the efficiency of the service a good deal more if he would leave out both "collectors" and "assistant collectors," subject to the provision of the law? He may be effecting an improvement; but would it not be better, having found that collectors should be appointed under the rules, he should continue of the mind he was of last year, that assistant collectors should be appointed under the rules? Why should he, with one hand, constrict, and with the other hand, relax the bond? I hope my hon. friend, if he will allow me to call him so, after the passage the other day, will be altogether virtuous to-night.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think the hon. gentleman admits that the change is an improvement. If assistant collectors were appointed by promotion in all cases, there might be increased efficiency. But, the old war horses referred to by him, the hon. gentleman will admit, are not of one party alone. This Act will be in force when the other party come into power, and the war horses of that party will then get the benefits of the Act. I close the door to some extent, and I think there is no doubt that the change, whereby the position of a collector—which is a very important position, requiring a great deal of technical knowledge and training—is filled by promotion, is an improvement, so far as the efficiency of the service is concerned. An assistant collector may be appointed without the examination, as the collector may be under the present law; and when he gets the experience under the training of the collector, he may then become an efficient collector.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has the inspectors of Weights and Measures, and the preventive officers; there is his supply of war horses.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). If the Minister of Inland Revenue would continue this elimination of those who, he says, it is not necessary should pass the examinations, by removing the inspectors of Weights and Measures, this would give the Act more uniformity than it has at present. In addition to that, I wish to draw attention to sub-section "*b*" of the clause, and suggest that under that, in the 21st line, the words "any other" be added. I think the Secretary of State will recognise the advantage there would be in spreading all these appointments all over the Departments, instead of confining them, as in this particular section, to the particular Department in which the service may be required. It seems to me that the service would be materially improved if, before any Department went outside, they should enquire inside of all the other Departments to ascertain whether in any one of them there is not some one who would fill the existing vacancy.

Mr. CASEY. I cannot let this clause pass without some general remarks upon the subject of promotion which it opens up. We see here that all the prizes of the outside service are taken out of the field of promotion and put into the class of offices which the Government may dispense as it likes, the "war horse" class, as it has been dubbed. It might be permitted in the Militia Department to have a provision for the war horses, but I do not think that in the Civil Service at large there should be such a provision! Anything tending to limit the field of promotion directly tends to lower the whole service. The appointment of outsiders does not secure generally as efficient officers as if the appointments had been filled by promotion from amongst those in the Department, accustomed to the duties. That is admitted on all sides; yet, by this clause, we not only run the risk of getting inefficient officers, but also discourage efficiency, by taking away from the officers below all stimulus to application, industry and effort. In private corporations, commercial corporations, where there is the stimulus of promotion, not only are efficient men obtained for the higher positions, but men of better average capacity are induced to enter the service of these corporations than can be induced to enter the Civil Service. There is nothing in the Civil Service to induce an enterprising, capable young man, who has any ambition to enter its ranks; he has no such prospect of becoming relatively well off, not to say wealthy, and of obtaining social standing, as he would have in the professions and in business; because, although his initial salary is comparatively large, he has no certainty of promotion for merit. He has simply the certainty of going up at $50 a year, until he attains the maximum salary of a first-class clerk, if he lives long enough. I think it will be admitted that the loss of patronage occasioned by giving up the control of these particular offices will be much more than compensated for by the greatly increased efficiency of the employés. In the case of the postmastership of this city, which became vacant some time ago, we have an instance of the abuse of patronage. The office for some time remained vacant; there was a gentleman already employed there, at the head of the staff, who was generally admitted to be well qualified for the position of postmaster, who had worked his way up gradually to the position of head clerk, and who was recommended by some members of Parliament for the postmastership, yet that office has been filled by a gentleman who, although he cannot be called a war horse, having never taken any active part in politics, is an outsider. I refer to Mr. Gouin. He is not a retired politician; he has never been in Parliament, and must have owed the influence which gave him that appointment to personal friendship with some of those who had the ear of the Government arising from his

previous occupation as proprietor of the Russell House. This is a striking example of a class of cases in which the logical and proper system of promotion has been laid aside, in order, not even to favor a broken down war horse, but simply a friend of some politicians. This Act also relieves the inspectors of Weights and Measures from examinations, a class of officials who were, until it was passed, subject to examination, and who should be still subject to examination. The duties of inspector of Weights and Measures are very delicate. They require a very considerable amount of what you might call technical knowledge, some of which cannot be obtained without practice in the testing of weights and measures, but most of the knowledge required is comprised in ordinary school education; and beyond doubt, no person should be appointed, even temporarily, as inspector of Weights and Measures, unless he showed himself possessed of that education which ought fairly to be expected of him. In the case of the inspector appointed in my own county after the change of Government, there was, I think, no pretence that he had any special qualifications, and I do not know whether he possesses even now the technical knowledge or the mathematical knowledge requisite for his post. He does not seem to inspect many weights and measures. I never hear of him in that direction. I do not know exactly what he does, but I think it was rather a scandal that, after turning out his predecessor, a gentleman who had passed his examination and had got a very complete knowledge of his work, this man should be put in his place, without even the formality of passing an examination. I am sorry to see a retrograde step of this kind taking place in the Department of Inland Revenue, which has hitherto, under Ministers of both parties, been the Department, perhaps, of all others, in which the personal efficiency of the officers was most insisted upon, and the principle of promoting by merit most strictly carried out. I hope, on further consideration, a change will be made in this.

Mr. BLAKE. There has been no statement made with reference to the inspectors as yet. Perhaps the hon. gentleman who is acting for the Minister of Customs might make it.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). Do you wish me to speak on my own behalf, or on behalf of the Minister of Customs?

Mr. BLAKE. In whichever way he thinks he can speak best.

Mr. STAIRS. If the hon. gentleman refers to the inspectors of Customs, I can state that the practice of the Government in this respect has been somewhat different from the powers they have here. The last appointment in Halifax was made from the Custom house there, and the gentleman appointed has made a very efficient officer. I think some remarks that were made about the pressure put on the Government by these officers is rather exaggerated. I refer especially to the better class of officers, and I think there is not so much pressure and there are not so many people looking for these offices as the public imagine. I know it was so in this case, and there have been many other cases in the same way.

Mr. BLAKE. As the law stood, that was the course that would properly be taken.

Mr. STAIRS. No; I think not.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; the inspectors are about to be placed in the category in which there is freedom of action by the law we have now before us.

Mr. STAIRS. I was under the impression that it had been so previously. Perhaps I was mistaken. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. BLAKE. This is to enable the next inspector of Halifax to be appointed in another way. They were good while they must.

Mr. CASEY.

Mr. STAIRS. I think the hon. gentleman must not put that construction upon it. I think there was no intention, in that case to do otherwise at the time. I do not believe that any other appointment would have been made, even if this had been in force at that time.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps not. I may say to the Minister of Customs that an ardent admirer of his, sitting near him, offered, when the occasion came, to explain his part in this procedure, with reference to the inspectors; but, upon being asked to come to the scratch, he seemed rather as if he had not another shot in his locker and we did not get the explanation. Perhaps the Minister will supply the deficiencies of his deputy.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). There are some things you cannot do in this world without a proper power of attorney, and I did not happen to possess the document.

Mr. WOODWORTH. He was not the chief baker on that occasion.

Mr. BOWELL. As he did not come to the scratch, I thought perhaps it was because the hon. gentleman had cut his nails too closely while I was out. The only explanation I have to give is, that it is thought proper to place the inspectors in the same position as the collectors of Customs, and for the same reason, perhaps, as the hon. gentleman has given. He spoke of old war horses and persons it was desired to appoint to positions, who have, I may say, won their spurs. I have no further explanation to give. To be serious, however, in the case of the gentleman who has been appointed to that position, he is one who has been a very long time in the service.

Mr. BLAKE. In Halifax?

Mr. BOWELL. No; in Halifax it was the chief clerk, Mr. Hill, who was appointed.

Mr. BLAKE. I was not taking exception to any of the appointments.

Mr. BOWELL. I may refer to the remarks made in reference to the collectors a short time ago. My experience is that a collector who has a thorough knowledge of the business of the day, as it is transacted now, at all events, those who have been appointed during my tenure of office, have proved to be the best collectors in the service. I may instance the present collector of Montreal, who was formerly a member of this House, whose thorough knowledge of all mercantile transactions, and the fact of his having kept himself well posted, to use a familiar term, in the manner and mode of doing business, fit him peculiarly for the position, which is more administrative, probably, than executive. I may add this reason: A gentleman who has gone into the Civil Service and has been confined to his desk, merely going through the routine of that branch of the service to which he has been allotted for years and years, seldom keeps up with the advanced mode of doing business of the age, and the result has been, many times, when you have selected a man like that, that he has not proved as good a collector or servant for that particular position as a man who has a thorough knowledge of business, and the mode and manner in which business is done at the present day; because, we all know that it is changing and varying with almost every season, and the man who was in business eight or ten years ago would have to adopt another policy altogether in the present day.

Mr. GAULT. I desire to endorse all that has been said about the collector of Montreal. It is admitted on all hands that he is the most able and efficient collector that has ever been in that port, and he has given every satisfaction to all the business men of Montreal. Mr. Ryan is at his work every morning at nine o'clock, and he never leaves until the last clerk has gone. He has a thorough knowledge of his Depart-

ment and, I think, knows every man in it. He is there late and early.

Mr. BLAKE. I am glad to hear such a good account of our late friend and colleague, Mr. Ryan, who, as we know, was a merchant, and I am ready to admit that a good man may occasionally be appointed under this system, but it is not always so. In fact, I am afraid, most generally it is not so. I have known of a lawyer being appointed to a very important collectorship, who had not much acquaintance with trade, but who had the good fortune to be an old war horse, who wanted a berth. And he got it, and I believe there has been a good deal of trouble in consequence of his administration, and while the hon. gentleman may be able occasionally to fill a berth of this description as efficiently, possibly, sometimes more efficiently, than he would if the rule was observed, I fancy, on the whole, the results will be what the motive has indicated, that is to say, a subordination of the efficiency of the service to the desire to provide for an old war horse.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I desire to ask for information. I find the expression "preventive officer," in the Inland Revenue Department. In the schedule of pay I do not find the expression at all, and I want to know where he comes in for pay. What is a preventive officer? Of course, I know what preventive means, but what is a preventive officer in the Inland Revenue Department? I am asking for information. In schedule B, I do not find "preventive officer" mentioned at all, nor do I find it under the head of Customs or Inland Revenue. I want to know what is his rank, and what are his duties?

Mr. BOWELL. As regards the Customs Department, a large number of preventive officers are appointed along the coast, receiving, some of them, $60, and some $150 or $200 a year. They are appointed to prevent smuggling in the different localities. In the Inland Revenue Department a preventive officer is appointed to look after illicit stills, or anything of that kind. It is not deemed necessary to make them pass an examination, but to give the Minister power to appoint them wherever their services are needed. We ought to make a little change in this clause—change the word "assistant" to that of "deputy," when speaking of collectors of Inland Revenue, as that is the name by which they are designated in schedule B.

On section 39,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I would like to amend that, by making it read: "The report required for the appointment of a clerk to fill such vacancy shall be made by the officer to the Minister of Finance;" because the report is always made by the deputy head.

On section 40,

Mr. CASEY. I think there is here a mis-description of what is intended to be enacted. The Bill says that promotion shall be by examination, under regulations made by the Governor in Council; then it goes to provide that promotion shall not be by examination. In the ordinary meaning of language, when you say that promotion shall be by examination, you mean that promotion shall be made in accordance with the results of the examination; but what is really meant to be intended here is, that promotion shall only be made from amongst those who have passed examination; that the examination shall be a qualifying one for promotion, and then the promotion shall be made by those at the head of the Department. I think that should be changed, so as to be in accordance with what follows. If it was worded like this: "That promotion shall only be made after examination," or some words like that, it would be consistent with what follows.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not see the necessity. The wording may be a little singular, but it has been well explained.

Mr. CASEY. I know what is meant to be said by it, but there is no doubt in anyone's mind, acquainted with the meaning of language, as to what meaning these words would convey.

Mr. CURRAN. There ought to be an amendment made here, which is required in the interests of justice to a large number of persons who are now in the Civil Service. Where the section says that promotion shall be made under examination and regulation made by the Governor in Council, I think there should be an exception, which would read in this way: "Except in the case of persons having entered the Civil Service prior to the passing of the Civil Service Act of 1882." There are large numbers of persons who entered the Civil Service prior to the passing of that Act, and they ought not to be affected by this law. It is not fair to them that this law should have a retroactive effect upon the promotion of good officers, who have performed their duties well and who are thoroughly competent men, but who may not be able to pass the examination required. I know, for instance, that in the post office in the city of Montreal there are officers who have been employed there for twenty-eight years. They know everything in connection with the business of the Department, from top to bottom, and are perfectly competent to discharge the duties in connection with any Department of the service; yet, having been so many years engaged in the public service, they have forgotten some of their classical training, and are quite unable to cope with young men who are fresh from school. I think that all persons who were in the Civil Service prior to 1882 ought to be exempted from any promotion examination; but if they are competent men, they should be entitled to promotion upon their merits and upon the report of the proper officer in charge.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not understand that the examination for promotion is in classical subjects.

Mr. CURRAN. Partly.

Mr. BLAKE. The examination for promotion, under the clause, as amended, is to be of two descriptions, as I understand it. First of all, the Governor in Council is to choose certain obligatory subjects, and I presume these are those subjects of general information as to penmanship and the rudiments of knowledge, which any man ought to have before he is fit to be promoted at all. And then there are to be certain other subjects, determined by the head of the Department as those best calculated to test the actual efficiency of the person to be promoted. I do not know how long service, which does not fulfil those conditions, should be sufficient to secure promotion. We must have regard to the efficiency of the service.

Mr. McNEILL. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. It does not follow that because a man is unable to pass an examination, that because he, perhaps, never attempted anything of the kind, he is not fit to be promoted. There are many men who, from the very thought of being obliged to sit down and attempt to answer questions on paper, become so nervous that they can scarcely answer anything. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has himself passed so many examinations and come in contact with so many people who have been subject to examination, that he ought to know what the effect is on some persons. There can be no doubt that there are many thoroughly deserving men in the service, well qualified to perform the duties of higher offices if they had promotion. I go further and say that these men are better qualified to perform the duties of those offices than some of the young men who are able to pass examinations. Those young men who are well qualified to pass examinations probably do not know one hundredth part as much about the service, practically, as do those men of experience to whom I have referred. We ought to consider the matter from another point

of view. When men entered the service twenty-five years ago, they selected this walk of life. They rejected other walks of life. They considered they had certain opportunities afforded them of getting on in the Civil Service; that certain advantages were offered them, and they deliberately resolved to enter the Civil Service on the faith of the regulations then existing. We come down on those men with our new regulations, and we cut away from them, to a very large extent the advantages which induced them to enter the Civil Service. Retroactive action on the part of Parliament ought to be a safeguarded to the greatest possible extent. There are very many deserving men in the service who are unable to pass an examination and would have had promotion except for this examination, which is no test of inefficiency, so far as they are concerned.

Mr. BLAKE. There are two questions to be considered. First, the character of the examinations; second, the capacity of the men to pass any kind of examination. As far as the character of the examination, I am entirely with those who would object, after a man has been admitted to the service, to any description of examination which would test his efficiency, except as regards promotion. You arrange a preliminary examination as to general attainments, so far as is deemed necessary. Then you come to the question of promotion. It is intended that the Governor in Council shall prescribe certain optional subjects. I presume the test will be of a very reasonable character, tests which it is impossible to say that any man who is fit to be promoted from the ranks should not comply with. What are the other tests? They are such subjects as the Department has, with the concurrence of the board, decided to be best adapted to testing the fitness of the candidates for the office. It is not an examination in scholastic knowledge, but in directions which will best test the fitness of the candidates for promotion. If he has got practical experience, you will examine him in such a way as to bring that out. We have, therefore, got down to the remaining point, that some men, by reason of their constitution, are unable, when put down at a desk, with pens and paper, to tell what they know. No doubt there are a great many men who will fail to work up to their training at oral examinations; but with men in the service, most of whom are accustomed to using the pen, this may be said: The man whose daily life for many years has been to deal with the subjects presented to him, will be able to make fair answers, at all events, and that is all that is wanted.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I quite agree with the leader of the Opposition, that if the Government confines the examinations merely to practical knowledge of duties in the Department, it is all right; but if the sub-examinations cover the history of China and Australia and the different European countries together with the higher branches of arithmetic and geometry, a mistake has been committed. I saw a man nearly crazy, five or six weeks ago—a gentleman of culture and education, some fifty years of age, who was trying to remember something of his school days and endeavoring to learn some arithmetic and algebra as he wanted to pass an examination, and he got through by the skin of his teeth. How many members of this House could pass such an examination? Many men are appointed to the highest positions on the bench who would not be able to pass one of these examinations if their lives depended on it, and yet they are men of high culture. Some people keep up their studies, but the most of us do not; and a boy of fifteen or sixteen years will be able to teach us arithmetic and history. If this examination is confined to what the member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has stated, I am perfectly willing. If it goes further, I do not agree with the proposal.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. What the hon. gentleman complains of has been remedied. It is one of those instances in which we have interfered with the notions which the Civil Service examiners held. It was their opinion that when an officer of long service in the Department wanted to be promoted, for instance, to a first-class clerkship, he should be submitted to some severe test of examination in history, or the constitution of the country, or on special rules of arithmetic, of a very difficult character. Well, we have put that aside, and I think that, as was explained by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) the promotion examinations of these men should be on subjects pertaining to the duties which they are called upon to perform. In these examinations the candidate is allowed plenty of time; the questions are prepared by the deputy head, with a view of facilitating these examinations and with a special view to the vacancies that are to be filled and the duties of those vacancies. We have left certain obligatory subjects to be determined from time to time by the Governor in Council, with certain subjects of general knowledge, which every officer must be familiar with if he is to remain in his position. For instance, there was a great objection to arithmetic, except in the Finance and Customs Departments, and in the accountant's branch of some other Departments, where it is specially required, and with these exceptions we have confined the examinations to the first four rules of arithmetic. The subject of composition we have arranged in the same way, assigning it to candidates for such Departments as that of the Secretary of State, were a great deal of correspondence is required, and not for those Departments where excellence in that branch would not be specially necessary. The examination has been conducted in such a manner that these old officers, for whom I must say I have a great deal of sympathy, when they enquired what those subjects were have been perfectly satisfied.

Mr. McNEILL. After the explanation of the hon. the Secretary of State, I should like to withdraw the amendment, because I think these men are protected. I should like, also, to make a remark with reference to what fell from the hon. gentleman opposite, with respect to competitive examinations, and I would mention a case with regard to two friends of my own, which is an illustration of the nervousness from which some candidates suffer, whether the examinations are written or *viva voce*. These two men were going up for examination in logic at Trinity College, Dublin, and the night before the examination one came to the other and asked for an answer to a certain question. When they came out of the hall the next day after the examination, the one who had made the request and who had got a proof from the other, told his friend that he had got on all right, but the other was so nervous that he actually denied that that particular question was on the paper at all. That is a fact, because I knew both men, and was present when the conversation took place.

Mr. BLAKE. It is one o'clock in the morning, so I will not discuss any further the question of nervousness, but I called the attention of the hon. gentleman to the awkward phraseology of the introduction to this section. I think it would be improved if he were to say, "and shall be in such obligatory subjects as may be determined from time to time for each Department," etc.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I intended also to amend the first sentence. It would be improved by making it "no promotion in the Civil Service shall take place," etc.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I would like to introduce the word "naval" there. Last year I pointed out, in the position in which we may be placed in the near future, you may have the necessity of employing a large number of naval officers. Certainly, as things are looking at present, you will require a number of them to defend our Pacific Province, and if it should be the intention of the House to give me an opportunity to hoist my broad pennant on one of your line of-battle ships, then we would require a clause for the appointment of naval officers, and giving them a certain

amount of pay. Therefore, as there is provision made for military and civil engineers, I should like to insert naval engineers also.

Mr. CASEY. I suppose the reason for exempting the classes named in this clause from examination on appointment is that they are supposed, from their position, to have sufficient education; but I do not understand why officers of artillery should be specially exempted.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman can understand that in the Department of Militia, in the store branch, for instance, it is necessary to have a person acquainted with artillery, for the purpose of getting out the stores which are required for that branch. A man in that position is looked upon as a specialist, and the fact of his passing the ordinary Civil Service examination would not qualify him for it.

Mr. CASEY. I was not disputing the propriety of exempting these officers; but I ask why artillery officers, only?

Mr. CARON. We may have specialists in other branches, for whom the passing of the Civil Service examinations could not be considered to be a qualification.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Is it not rather a mistake to confine the exemption, if there is any merit in it, to officers of artillery? There may be special qualifications in engineer officers, or even officers of cavalry or infantry. I think the clause, generally, is indefinite.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman is too liberal altogether. We do not require cavalry officers in the inside service of the Department. In providing, for instance, for the schools of gunnery, it is necessary to have a person who has the proper knowledge to provide stores for them; and such a person is excluded from the Civil Service examination, because he is looked upon as a specialist, called upon to occupy a position in the Department that the passing of the examinations would be no qualification for.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I am quite prepared to say that my disposition is not to go any further than the hon. gentleman, and I wanted to see what reason existed for the exemption of artillery officers that did not exist for the exemption of any others. Of course, the stores branch may require some technical knowledge, and it is well that the committee should know that it is for that specific purpose that this exemption is asked.

Mr. PLATT. I have been looking through this list of exemptions, and I fail to find any term designating that neglected class called physicians. I do not know why they should not be exempted, as well as barristers, attorneys, engineers, etc.

Mr. BOWELL. Fortunately, they are not required in the line of their profession.

Mr. PLATT. I am glad the Government do not require the services of medical men. I only wish their executive conduct was such that they did not require the services of barristers. I think ministers of the gospel and physicians, at least, should be added to this list.

Mr. BOWELL. If the physicians were, the ministers certainly ought.

On section 44,

Mr. CASEY. It would be better to provide that the person promoted should not be definitely promoted, unless at the end of six months the head of the Department makes a satisfactory report, instead of laying on the head of the Department the responsibility of actually rejecting him. In England the appointment lapses, unless the head of the Department expresses satisfaction at the end of a certain time.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Good officers would not be noticed, and after the six months of quiet good work they would find themselves out of the service.

Mr. BLAKE. Not when under the supervision of the Secretary of State.

On section 47,

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved to strike out the words "or loss of," in the 45th line, and make it read "without increase of salary."

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

On section 50,

Mr. CASEY. I think that this "for any other reason" is rather a wide power. I think that the class of reasons should be specified. And I really think that cases of illness to the officer himself or his family would be sufficient to cover all proper cases for leave of absence.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There are some cases where the services of an employé might be required specially in the interest of the public service; and I think leave should be given in such cases.

Mr. CASEY. I know of a case of an officer in one of the Departments, who is also a militia officer, getting leave of absence, and putting in his time with the battery at Kingston last winter. I mean Major Pennington Macpherson.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Cases of abuse of that power to grant a leave can be brought to the attention of Parliament.

Mr. CASEY. He was given leave of absence on account of an accident which happened to him. He had some bones broken, I think. But if he could put in his period of drill with the battery, one would think he could do his duties in the Department. As to absence on account of illness, I understand that the Government have appointed a certain doctor in this city as the only person to give certificates for illness in granting leave of absence; that an employé desiring to get away, on the ground of ill-health, must go to this doctor and pay his fee and get his certificate; that the certificate of his family physician is not sufficient. I should like to hear the reason for that.

Mr. JENKINS. The reason is very palpable. It is that the Department must have an officer in whom they have confidence, and one appointed for the purpose, for we know that medical men are apt to be very lenient to their patients.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Experience has proved that this is a very good precaution.

Mr. PLATT. Is the medical officer a civil servant?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. He is not.

Mr. CASEY. I do not know why the Department should be more particular than the courts, where a doctor's certificate is sufficient.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. In practice, it was found not to be sufficient, and it was because of the great number of cases in which there was abuse that we made that provision last year, and so far as the carrying out of it has gone, it is very satisfactory.

Mr. CASEY. The courts will take certificates of ill-health, and this House, when attendance on committees was compulsory, accepted a certificate from any licensed practitioner as sufficient, I think it is very strange that in the Civil Service alone so much more care is required and so many abuses have occurred as the Minister says; but, if the result of experience is that there were abuses, that goes a long way to diminish any objection. It is of course an important thing for the doctor, as I suppose in the course of the year almost everyone in the service would have to consult him.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No; the result has been that the doctor has been far from making a revenue out of it, and the Civil Service is profiting in the same proportion.

Mr. BLAKE. I judge there has been a marked improvement in the health of the Civil Service,

Mr. BOWELL. There has, if doctors' certificates are any indication.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister said the other reasons were principally to allow the person to serve in some other capacity under the Government. I think it would do no harm to put those words in.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This has been the law for a long time.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I know a case where an officer from Victoria—the inspector of Inland Revenue—came over to a school of gunnery to go through a course there, and, unless that clause were in the Act, he could not have obtained leave for the purpose. He got six months' leave purposely. He gained nothing, but he went through the course of gunnery and came back an efficient officer. He is the major commanding the battery in Victoria.

Mr. CASEY. That is just one of the other reasons I objected to. I do not think that was a proper cause for granting leave of absence to an officer of a non-combatant branch of the service. It is no gain to the Inland Revenue Department that this person should be a competent officer, and he should attend to his duties unless he is incapacitated. That is one of the abuses I objected to.

Mr. BAKER. Where would the country be at this moment without a good many of them?

Mr. CASEY. Of course we want good officers, but we can get them outside the Civil Service.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The clause seems to be a little ambiguous, as the Governor in Council is referred to as "him."

Mr. BLAKE. Except in cases of illness, this power ought to be used with very great discretion, because it always involves an increase of charge to the public service. Some subordinate officer has to be employed and paid the difference of salary between him and the other, and I have no doubt that the whole service, if it was not over-staffed before, will suffer from the absence of the officer. So that, unless there are very special circumstances, long leaves—and this proposed twelve months—ought not to be granted, except in case of illness.

Mr. CASEY. Perhaps, before the third reading, the Minister will consider what words might be employed to designate these other reasons.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is a case in which latitude should be given to the Government, who is presumed to exercise it with discretion; and, if it is not properly exercised, the remedy is here every year in the Session of Parliament.

Mr. CASEY. That is no answer to the objection. Sometimes the power may be exercised with discretion, and sometimes not. The case mentioned by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Baker) shows that it is not always exercised with discretion.

Mr. BAKER. I differ with you in that.

On section 51,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The reason for the alteration was this: It has been thought that the suspension of an officer from the performance of his duty might be a sufficient punishment for a light case of misconduct, without cutting off his salary, which might often be more a punishment to his family than to himself. And as there was no discretion with the superior officer in suspending the salary, it was thought well to impose the punishment of suspending the offender from the performance of his duty.

Mr. BLAKE. But that is not accomplished by the clause as it stands. I had supposed that with some officers, if you suspend them from the performance of their duty for a short time, and allow them to receive their salary, the punishment might not be very serious, because the offence itself might consist in the neglect of that very duty. But the hon. gentleman will observe that it is intended to imply that whenever you suspend from the performance of duty the suspension of salary follows.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The words in italics will cover that.

Mr. BLAKE. I put another construction upon this alteration. I had supposed that it might be the intention of the Government to say to the officer: We will not suspend you from the performance of your duty, but we will not give you any salary for your duty. Go on and do your duty, but you shall have no pay for it. That, I think, would be a very good plan, in certain cases.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I know that was done in several cases. An officer had misbehaved, and when he came back to the office he was told by the deputy head, on behalf of the head of the Department, that he would be deprived of three or four days' salary, and he would be obliged to remain at the office and perform his duty.

Mr. BLAKE. I think that is very good.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Last year we introduced a clause to that effect, imposing a fine of not more than one day's pay for each offence, to be deducted from the salary of the officer, he still performing his duty.

Mr. CASEY. I believe, as a matter of discipline, that the power of suspension should rest primarily, not with the head of the Department, but with the deputy head, subject, of course, to appeal to the Minister. The deputy is the person responsible to the political head for the discipline of the Department, and he cannot secure discipline unless he is able to enforce it. I know it is a matter of common report that at all times in the Departments there have been complaints on the part of high officials that the political heads interfered with them in the discipline of the Department. The hon. Minister of Public Works shakes his head—I am not referring to him; but such things have been done, and they will be done again. It is undoubted that the person who is responsible for the discipline should have the primary authority to enforce it, though, of course, the power must be left with the political head to interfere afterwards, if he chooses. But I do not see any limit here, as to the time of suspension. I think there ought to be a limit fixed.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. You had better leave the clause as it is.

On section 52,

Mr. BLAKE. I think this is a very objectionable clause altogether, and particularly with reference to this provision as to demise. Here you arrange for a period of three months, during which the office may remain in that state of demoralisation which is involved by a vacancy in the superior office. Why should it not be filled earlier than in three months? It is actually facilitating those procrastinations in appointments to office which happen too often.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is the same law as before. But it has been wrongly put in italics, where the clause read as follows:—

"When the duties of any superior officer or clerk during his absence or by reason of his demise, but not through superannuation, are continuously performed by an officer or clerk of an inferior class or junior rank during a period of more than three months, the officer or clerk per-

forming such duties may, on the report of the deputy head, concurred in by the head of the Department, by Order in Council, and provided that funds are available under parliamentary vote for such payment, receive, in addition to his ordinary pay, the difference between such ordinary pay and the pay of the officer or clerk whose duties he has performed, for the time he has performed such duties."

It is the same clause, with the difference that we put in the word "demise," but not this "superannuation."

Mr. BLAKE. That is the point to which I have called attention before. Of course it is not included in the law now. What is included in the law, as it now stands, is that when this officer, who is in the service, but who may be away, and his duties are performed by somebody else, the person who performs those duties may receive pay for a period of three months. It is adding to the public charge in the meantime, because there is the difference between the pay of the officer who is performing the duty and that of the superior officer who is absent, which is to be given. In the case of the decease of the superior, why wait so long before filling his place?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It might not be possible to fill the place immediately. There might be some objection; there might be no vote for it. Take the case of the acting librarian, for instance. I do not see why, after he has performed, for more than three months, the duties of his superior, he ought not to be paid for performing those duties. I do not see why he should not be entitled to receive the difference between his salary and the salary of the deceased officer during the time he performs those duties. It is not his fault if he has to perform those duties, though it has been the fault of the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. I have said already that I do not think that it is right, in the case of absence, and that is the law as it is. Now, the hon. gentleman has taken the case of the Librarian. If it is not owing to the acting librarian not wanting to be appointed Librarian, whose fault is it?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It might be necessary.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not think so. It is the fault of the Government, and it is very wrong that the office should have been kept vacant so long; it is a dereliction of duty on their part, that they did not grapple with the difficulty.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman knows that it could not be done, except by Act of Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course the office could be filled without any Act. If you want the anomaly and monstrosity you propose, there must be an Act of Parliament.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I hope, when the Bill comes before the House, the Government will be able to adduce good reasons for it, reasons which will perfectly satisfy the House, and even the hon. gentleman himself, because I know this course has been pursued for reasons which are very good reasons.

Mr. BLAKE. Inasmuch as the late Librarian unfortunately departed this life very early in last Session, it was quite possible for the Government to have arrived at those very good reasons, and have announced them to us last Session, and have given us a Librarian.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is another question.

Mr. BLAKE. It is the same question.

On section 53,

Mr. CASEY. This is a very wrong principle to introduce. A man resigns from the service because he thinks he can do better or because his health is not fit. Promotions take place. Some years afterwards, when he has lost the traditions of the Department, when he has acquired other habits, he chooses to return, and is able, by this section, to take up his old position at the same salary. He has, therefore, lost nothing by his rash resignation, but he is placed over the heads of others who had a right to expect promotion.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is easy to understand that it can only be for officers who have left either from sickness, or by officers who have ventured into some other avocation and have not been successful, owing to no fault of theirs. In such cases men perfectly well qualified might desire to reenter the service, and I do not think they should be submitted to further examination.

Mr. CASEY. Suppose the case of a civil servant who comes out as a candidate in some constituency. After the campaign and his defeat, he comes back to Ottawa and wants to take his place in the Department.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This section was not intended to apply to such a case, and there was no such case in contemplation when it was framed.

Mr. CASEY. If a man leaves the service he should take his chances of employment elsewhere. His position should not be kept open for him at the same salary.

Mr. BLAKE. There is another consideration. Officers leaving the service frequently receive gratuities. I recollect a case where a civil servant left the service to better himself, as he thought, and received a gratuity exceeding $1,000. Is it to be allowed that a man in such a case should again be admitted in the same class and with the same salary, although his gratuity had vanished, and he was out of the service.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Such cases would not be tolerated. It is a moral impossibility that they would occur. If it was done, no Government could ask Parliament to replace a young gentleman who left the service three months before to be a candidate for election to Parliament. The Government would be censured for such a course. We are only making provision for the readmission of good, efficient officers.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman said it is a moral impossibility. I think it is an immoral possibility.

Mr. TEMPLE. I think the section is a good one. I know the case of a young man who some fifteen months ago became ill and had to retire from the service. He desires to re-enter it, and will do so as soon as an opportunity is a afforded.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I think the section is wrong. When an officer resolves to go into another business, and probably leaves the Government or Department in the lurch, he does so to improve his position, and his reentrance into the service should not be tolerated.

Mr. CASEY. Care should also be taken to protect the juniors, who are looking forward to reaping the benefits of promotion. It is unfair and improper to allow men who have left the service to re-enter it.

On section 54,

Mr. CASEY. What payments are covered by those that are not salaries and not specifically stated in the estimates.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Extra pay.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose it is not intended to give larger powers to the Governor in Council to grant extra pay than the Act generally prescribes.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No. For instance, in the case of the consolidation of the statutes, an officer might be required for certain work, and we cannot pay him without putting a sum in the estimates. Even for the payment of that sum the Governor in Council should have power to regulate it by Order in Council. We do not want the money to be paid, except on revision by the Governor in Council.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman mean that the clause is intended to sanction the Governor in Council paying employés for services not contemplated to be paid for under the Act. He mentioned the case of the consolidation of the statutes.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Supposing we decided now that a consolidation of the statutes shall be made. During the vacation, one of the officers of the Department might be employed, and a sum might be put in the estimates to pay such officer. We do not want that sum to be paid without additional sanction, supervision, or, I would say, the revision of the Governor in Council.

Mr. CASEY. I do not think the hon. gentleman makes the meaning clear. It is provided elsewhere that no payments, except salaries, shall be made to employés, without its being specifically stated, so it must be either salaries or payments specifically stated, other than salaries. The two provisions do not appear to be consistent.

Mr. BLAKE. It does not seen to me that they are consistent. Section 52 provided that no extra sum shall be paid unless the sum is placed for that purpose specifically. Now, there seems to be an implied intention to give an officer an extra sum, although it has not been specifically voted in the Estimates. If you strike out the words "whether specifically stated or not," and say "whether specifically stated in the Estimates or payable," etc., then you will say what you mean.

On section 55,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I propose to insert the word "class" before the word "salary," in this section, and I also think, in reading over this clause, that it does away now with the necessity of section 7 which we allowed to stand.

On section 58,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I wish to include in this section the rules and regulations which may be passed during the year, according to section 5.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the insertion of the word "fiscal" will have the result of making these reports so stale that we shall have lost all interest in them. The reports of the May examinations will not come in before July, and the practical result will be that they will be a year behind hand, and we will not care to read them.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have no objection to strike out the word "fiscal."

On section 59,

Mr. CASEY. I think the list of persons employed in the House of Parliament should be taken sometimes during the Session.

Mr. BLAKE. I beg to make an humble protest against a portion of this clause. I think it is very good to have a list, but I am sorry that we should engraft permanently on the Statute Book a provision that a statement of the religion and nationality of the employés in the Civil Service of the country should be made to us year by year. I hope that some time or other we shall recognise our common nationality and not enquire into our respective religions.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We will strike out the words "religion" and "nationality."

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved that the 12th clause be struck out.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman think his virtue will be able to exist without that clause?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Well, we will try for a year.

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

Committee rose and reported Bill as amended.

Mr. CASEY. I beg leave to congratulate the hon. Minister on the pleasant and profitable discussion on this Bill we have had to-day.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman has reason to congratulate himself on having had forty-seven shots at that Bill.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And he has a few more in his locker.

Mr. BLAKE. They are not like some other shots which, we hear, that only three out of fifty-four went off.

Amendments read the second time and concurred in.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 2:15, a.m., Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 16th April, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 128) to make further provision respecting summary proceedings before Justices of the Peace and other Magistrates—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. Small.)

DAMS AT LAKEFIELD AND YOUNG'S POINT.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the Government has considered the claim made by Mr. R. M. Eden, of Lakefield, for losses occasioned by the construction of the dams there and at Young's Point, and whether it is proposed to recognise the claim? Who is the contractor for that work?

Mr. POPE. The claim has been under the consideration of the Department but no decision has been arrived at.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—LOAN.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, How much of the loan of $30,000,000 agreed to be advanced to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has been paid to date of enquiry?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The loan in the shape of an advance to the Canadian Pacific Railway was $22,500,000. Of that $19,962,100 has been paid to 14th April, 1885.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—SUBSIDY.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, How much of the subsidy of $25,000,000 to be paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has been paid to date of enquiry?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. $21,176,229.87.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—EXPENDITURE TO COMPLETE GOVERNMENT CONSTRUCTION.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, How much (approximately) is likely to be required to complete those portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway agreed to be constructed by Government?

Mr. POPE. I have not the exact figures; I thought I would have had them before this. A little time ago $600,000 was estimated for the British Columbia ends and about $60,000, if I remember rightly, for the work this way.

NORTH-WEST VOLUNTEERS—INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

Mr. FOSTER asked, Whether intoxicating liquors are served to the volunteer troops in the North-West as any part of their rations, or are allowed to be taken with them as private supplies? Whether canteens are allowed under the supervision of the commanding officers for the sale to the troops of intoxicating liquors of any kind?

Mr. CARON. No intoxicating liquors are served to the volunteer troops in the North-West as any part of their rations, nor are intoxicating liquors allowed to be taken with them as private supplies. No canteens are allowed under the supervision of the commanding officer for the sale to the troops of intoxicating liquors of any kind.

GLAMMIS POST OFFICE.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether there has been an enquiry in connection with the Glammis Post Office, and what action has been taken?

Mr. CARLING. Certain complaints have been made against the postmaster. Enquiry has been made and claims and reports have been received from the post office inspector of the district, but no decision has yet been arrived at.

LEWIS AND EUGENE COSTE.

Mr. LISTER asked, Whether Lewis Coste and Eugene Coste, or either of them, holds any position in the public service? If so, what position, date of appointment and amount of salary payable to each?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Louis Coste is assistant engineer in the Department of Public Works. He was appointed the 26th September, 1883, salary $5.50 per day. Eugène Coste is in the Geological Survey branch of the Department of the Interior as a mining engineer. His appointment dates 1st July, 1883 and he receives $100 per month.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—INTEREST ON LOAN.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, Whether the interest on the Canadian Pacific Railway loan is payable on or about March 12? 2nd. If interest on the Canadian Pacific Railway loan is payable on or about March 12th, whether it has been paid? 3rd. If the interest has not been paid, why such payment has not been made?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I have in my hand an answer which was prepared to a question very similar to this the other day, which was dropped. It will cover this. All interest payable by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to date has been received. In February last, the company brought to the notice of the Government that, under the 8th clause of the agreement entered into between the Government and the company under the Act of last Session, the interest was payable on the first days of May and November in each year. The Government found, after consultation with the Department of Justice, that the company were correct, and, in consequence, the next half-yearly interest does not fall due until the first day of May next.

EMPLOYMENT OF THE STEAMER *QUEEN OF THE ISLES.*

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether the steamer *Queen of the Isles* was engaged during the year 1884 patrolling Lake Simco eand Lake Cansheshing or either of them? If so, how many days was she so engaged? How much was paid for her services per day? What wages were paid for the engineer per day? How many other hands were employed and the daily or monthly wages paid each?

Mr. McLELAN. No steamer was employed by the sanction of the Marine and Fisheries Department, and nothing has been paid.

ABSENCE OF THE MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. BLAKE. I would remind the First Minister that he promised to bring down an answer to a question which was only partially answered, with reference to the absence of the present Minister of the Interior. The answer was given as to the year 1884, but, as to 1883, he had omitted, under a misapprehension, to obtain the information which he promised to supply.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will get the answer for the hon. gentleman.

COPIES OF THE FRANCHISE BILL.

Mr. CASEY. I desire to call attention to the fact that there is great difficulty in obtaining a copy of the Franchise Bill, which, as I understood, is to be discussed immediately. I have not a copy in my box in the post office. I have sent to Mr. Botterell, and found that he had no English copies at all. I have got a French copy, but that, on the statement of my hon. friend the Secretary of State, will not do me much good. I think we should have had a pretty good supply of these Bills before the discussion came on.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I went to get one the other day and Mr. Botherell told me that a dozen of the hon. gentleman's friends had gone there and got three or four copies each.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. McMULLEN. I rise to a question of privilege. In the Montreal *Herald* of the 14th, I notice a paragraph as follows:—

"One of the Grand Trunk representatives, a member of Parliament, and a director of one of Mr. Hickson's absorbed lines, questioned the Government to-day as to whether Mr. Hickson had communicated to the Government the cause of the misunderstanding between the member for Northumberland and himself, and he was very curtly informed by the Premier that he had no right to ask any such questions. This question was put in Mr. Mitchell's absence from the House, and on his arrival this evening he said to our reporter that he hoped Mr. Hickson had done so. For himself, while he had been the victim of Mr. Hickson's injustice in a business matter, he had never imported it either into Parliament or public discussion. His criticism on the Grand Trunk management and Mr. Hickson's dictatorial conduct towards the Government had been strictly on public grounds, but, as one of his many tools had chosen to refer to him in public, and doubtless at his suggestion, he (Mr. Mitchell) now defied Mr. Hickson to make a statement of the facts, and he might depend upon it that he would be prepared to meet them. The public might rely that it would redound much to Mr. Hickson's credit."

I wish to say that I did not put a question on the notice paper with the instructions or knowledge of Mr. Hickson. He had nothing whatever to do with it. I have never communicated with Mr. Hickson or spoken to him on the question. I put the question on the notice paper simply for my own purposes, and because I noticed that the hon. gentleman was continually worrying and badgering the Grand Trunk. I was anxious to find out whether the matter in dispute between him and the Grand Trunk was known to the Government, and I can only express my regret that the rules of the House do not permit me to bring before Parliament the facts connected with the transaction. I think I should show Parliament and the country that the hon. gentleman has been attempting——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman has chosen to criticise some remarks which

have been made by myself, and he is quite right when he assumes that I made those remarks to the reporter, and I am prepared to sustain them. I stated, in that communication which he has chosen to read to this House, that I have never on any occasion, and I appeal to any gentleman present as to that, sought to import any private grievance between Mr. Hickson and myself into any public discussion in which the Grand Trunk interests have been concerned, or in which they have been referred to. I have dealt with the Grand Trunk on public grounds, as a public debtor to this country to the extent of $46,000,000.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must conclude with a motion. He rose to a point of order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am speaking to a point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. What is it?

Mr. MITCHELL. It is this. He has chosen in his remarks to make reference to me, and has expressed——

Mr. SPEAKER. I called the hon. gentleman to order for making that statement.

Mr. MITCHELL. I think it is only due to me to reply——

Mr. SPEAKER. I stopped the hon. gentleman from making it.

Mr. MITCHELL. If your honor decides that I cannot reply, I shall of course submit to the Chair, with this single remark that I challenge Mr. Hickson to make a statement upon the subject, him or his tools either.

ENQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would once again call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that, although the time which he last named has more than elapsed, the papers connected with the North-West matters which were promised to be brought down have not yet been laid upon the Table, and I do trust they will be laid upon the Table without further delay. I also wish to point out that it is stated in the public prints that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has summoned a meeting of the shareholders to consider certain anticipated legislation with reference to the alterations of their financial and other relations to the Government of the country. Under these circumstances, there seems reason to believe that the negotiations which have been so long pending have in so far as this matter is concerned, concluded, and I really think that Parliament and the country ought to know of them as soon as the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that these papers ought to be laid on the Table also. At the same time, I wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that, while yesterday there were laid upon the Table certain papers purporting to be Orders in Council as to aids to north-western railways, not merely were there certain deficiencies in these papers themselves, to which I called the attention of the Minister of Finance, and I presume he has communicated upon it, but I have moved very early in the Session for all the correspondence and documents upon the subject, and it has been with reference to that that I have repeatedly pressed the hon. gentleman to bring the papers down. The papers before us are inadequate, even upon the face of them, but still more so when, at an early stage of the Session, there has been an Order of the House for the full papers, and they ought to be before us before we are asked to deal with that question. There is one other point which I wish to mention, the numerous Orders which have been made with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway, involving important information, which, in view of the public announcement to which I alluded a moment ago, it is doubly essential that the House should receive; and, while I ask that, I will also ask the hon. the acting Minister of Railways with reference to a rumor which has reached me from the west yesterday to the effect that the located line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from a point near the summit of the Selkirks to the westward where it strikes the Ille-Celle-Waet Creek, has been found impracticable on account of avalanches and other difficulties, and the location has been altered, increasing the length of the line somewhat more than three miles; and if that be so, whether he proposes to lay the facts and the revised location on the Table?

Mr. POPE. The information that the hon. gentleman has, is correct.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. POPE. I informed him a long time ago, in answer to a question, that we were watching very closely the effect of the snow slides, and the avalanches along that section of the road, and I said that if we found it impracticable, the line would be changed. It was found that, for certain distances, the line was not practicable; and the line has been changed, and involves an increased distance of about three miles. I will bring down the information that we have upon the subject. With respect to the other matter that the hon. gentleman refers to, the returns that have been moved for, he knows quite well that we are dependent upon the railways themselves for most of those returns. We have called upon them for the returns; they are being prepared, and, as fast as I can get them, they will be produced.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to the papers connected with the North-West, I saw the Deputy Minister of the Interior yesterday, and he told me he hoped the papers would be ready to-day. They have not yet reached my hands, but I suppose, from that statement, that we will have them, perhaps to-day, perhaps to-morrow. With respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway, I can tell the hon. gentleman that no conclusion has been come to with respect to their application for relief, though the matter has been under discussion. While they applied strongly for relief, the Government have seen difficulties in the way of granting the relief to the extent which they claim. So soon as the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have come to any conclusion, the conclusion will be laid on the Table without delay. With respect to the land subsidies—perhaps it is my want of apprehension, but I did not quite understand that the hon. gentleman attached any importance to the previous correspondence which resulted in granting land subsidies. We have correspondence of all kinds from the different railway companies, each pressing their claims, and the importance to the public that they should get subsidies, and all that kind of thing. I presume that correspondence is in preparation. I thought that what the House really wanted to know was what the Government had agreed to grant, subject to vote of Parliament, in the way of assistance by land grants. I shall expedite the matter as much as possible. I was told by an officer of the Department of Interior that a great many persons are employed in preparing the returns that have been moved for. I have no doubt that the correspondence is being prepared—though I do not specifically know that it is; but I suppose that correspondence, like all the other returns, are in course of rapid preparation.

THE BOUNDARY OF ONTARIO.

Mr. MILLS. I desire to ask the hon. gentleman when we may expect the resolution or proposition of the Government with respect to the northern boundary of the Province of Ontario. The hon. gentleman intimated early in the Session, that the Government intended to make a proposal of some sort to the consideration of Parliament; and now that we have been in session nearly three months, I think the Government must, by this time, have determined upon

what course to take, and what they will recommend to Parliament.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will simply say, that it is the intention of the Government to deal with that subject during the present Session, and to call the attention of the House to it.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LOCATION.

Mr. POPE. I ought to have said to the hon. gentleman that the new location, the proposed location, has not yet been approved. I have a small drawing of it which the hon. gentleman can see if he likes.

Mr. BLAKE. I would like to see whatever the hon. gentleman has.

Mr. POPE. That is all I have. Before it becomes a line it must be submitted to, and approved by, the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. I would like to see the correspondence which has given rise to the change, so far as it is in the hon. gentleman's possession, and the other papers that the company have communicated to him, although they may be imperfect.

Mr. POPE. I will bring them down.

ENQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. MULOCK. I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the resolution of this House, passed some considerable time ago, calling for returns of certain papers connected with the negotiation that culminated in the Washington Treaty. A number of members of the House are extremely anxious to see these papers, as they are of great and pressing importance. They immediately concern the question of the fisheries. And some hon. members say that they also affect another question—that they throw a good deal of light upon the question of reciprocity. If so, I think they should be brought down at an early date, in order that they may be seen, read and appreciated before Parliament prorogues.

Mr. McLELAN. I told the hon. gentleman personally that if he would call at the Department and explain more particularly what he required we might be able to meet his wishes. The correspondence is very voluminous, and it is a question whether it will all be brought down or not. I mentioned this to the hon. gentleman privately, and I understood him that he would call at the Department and explain more particularly what he wanted, and then I would consider how far they could be brought down. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has done so or not; but if not, I will bring down all that can be brought down.

Mr. MULOCK. I did call at the Department, I think more than a month ago, and went through the documents in the possession of the Department, and made a selection of such as appeared to me, and to the gentleman with me, as being papers proper to be laid before the public, but setting aside papers that ought not, perhaps, to be produced, as being of a confidential, or *quasi* confidential, nature. The papers that were selected are in print, and there is no necessity for the slightest delay in their production, as I think duplicate copies of all of them except one, are in the possession of the Department.

Mr. McLELAN. I will take note of what the hon. gentleman has said, and see how many I can bring down.

THE BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY BILL.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Before the Orders of the Day are called I would state, in answer to a question of the hon. gentleman opposite with respect to Bankruptcy and Insolvency Bill which has been reported by the Committee and now stands on the Orders of the Day, that it is the intention of the Government to take action and get the opinion of the House as to the principle of that Bill.

THE ELECTORAL FRANCHISE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the second reading of Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise. He said: In rising to move this Bill, I may say that I shall not occupy the attention of the House very long, because, as I have been reminded by the hon. gentlemen opposite, especially by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) more than once—this Bill has been before the House for a couple of years more or less—at least a considerable time; and I have no doubt that hon. members on both sides have discussed the principle as well as most of the details of this measure. The present condition of affairs with reference to the electoral franchise is altogether anomalous; and I do not think that that anomaly, in a country like this, owning British institutions, and drawing its inspiration from those institutions, should any longer be continued. The British North America Act contemplated that the system of representation should be, as it ought to and must be, in the hands of the representatives of the people, provided that until otherwise legislated upon by the Parliament of Canada, the old system of representation in the different Provinces should be measured by the representation in the Dominion Parliament. That was a matter of necessity. We had no Parliament in the first place to settle the representation, and if we had a Parliament at all the first Parliament must be called upon the electorate which existed in the different Provinces before and at the time of union. Since that time we have been going on using the voters' lists, the system of representation which existed in the Provinces; but it is quite an anomaly, it is quite contrary to first principles. The representatives of the people in Parliament, representing the people in a Dominion sense, must have and ought to have control of all reforms and changes in that representation and all alterations in any way of the representation. Sooner or later that principle must be affirmed, and I think and the Government think no time more opportune to affirm that principle by practical legislation than the present moment. We have had an Act passed in the Legislature of Ontario; there is an Act now before the Legislature of Nova Scotia; there may be Acts passed in every Province in the Confederation, and these Acts may sweep away half the constituency which centre here or may enlarge the constituency much further than for Dominion purposes, on Dominion principles and with Dominion responsibilities, it ought to be extended. One can quite understand that in all the subjects handed over to the Provincial Legislatures there may be probably a difference between the representatives of the people in the Local Legislatures and in the Dominion Parliament, just as in the same way there may be a difference in the electorate of the different municipal councils of the country and the Provincial Legislatures. It is out of the question that we here, representing the people of the Dominion of Canada as a whole, should find ourselves for local reasons and for local purposes, perhaps for beneficial purposes, in any given Province, actually deprived of all the people who elect us, or at all events the majority of the people who elect us, and to whom as a general rule we are responsible, and before whom we expect to go to give an account of our stewardship. The principle of this Bill, therefore, is simply to introduce as far as possible a system of representation which will be applicable to the different Provinces and will really give an opportunity for the people of Canada as a whole to send representatives here for the purpose of representing Dominion interests as a whole. It

is quite obvious that it is of practical importance, and any man of common sense will say so, that there ought to be as little difference between the franchise existing in one part of the Dominion to that existing in other parts of the Dominion as possible. The same classes should be represented, the same interests should be represented, and if it were possible, the electorate should embrace similar individuals in the different parts of this vast Dominion. I do not mean to say there should be a pedantic assimilation, that from the different circumstances of one Province as compared with another, the same classes may not require a larger representation or a smaller representation. It is of great importance that the same classes should be represented here, otherwise, as the House can well understand, we are sowing the seeds of discontent. If, for instance, in the contiguous Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, on one side of the river here there is a class which has a right to vote, and the same class is excluded just across the river, discontent must prevail there; and so in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick or any other contiguous Provinces. The principle, however, of this Bill is this: That the representatives of the people of Canada in the Dominion Parliament should have the right to control the electorate of the Dominion, and if there is any change or reform needed, that reform should be carried by the representatives of the people as a whole, and not be affected by local legislation, which may perhaps be of the greatest advantage to that Province but which may not meet with the approbation of the representatives of the people of Canada as a whole. I will not trouble the House now, because it would be a waste of time, by going over the alterations in the Bill from the present franchises which we exercise now for Dominion purposes in the different Provinces. I will simply say as regards the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec that it is a decided enlargement of the franchise. I believe it is also an enlargement as regards Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. It is not so with respect to British Columbia and Prince Edward Island. However, the question of the enlargement of the franchise, the diminution of the franchise, the maintenance of the franchise on its present basis are matters which will be discussed in full, no doubt, if the principle of this Bill is adopted, when we go into Committee of the Whole. There is one question, however, in this Bill in which, personally, I may be considered to be interested, and that is women's franchise. I have always and am now strongly in favor of that franchise. I believe that is coming as certainly as came the gradual enfranchisement of women from being the slaves of men until she attained her present position, almost the equal of man. I believe that time is coming, though perhaps we are not any more than the United States or England quite educated up to it, I believe the time will come, and I shall be very proud and glad to see it, when the final step towards giving women full enfranchisement is carried in Canada. We know that Mr. Gladstone, the head of the present Administration in England, is strongly in favor of women franchise, although he would not hazard and peril his late Franchise Bill by introducing that question. He said it was a separate question and must be dealt with separately, and therefore he resisted on that ground, and on that ground only, the extension of the franchise to women. We also know that the leaders of the Opposition in England in both Houses, the Marquis of Salisbury and Sir Stafford Northcote, are strongly in favor of extending the franchise to women, to the extent set forth in my Bill; that is to say, that widows and unmarried ladies who have the property qualification should have a vote. Following those illustrious examples, I shall not peril the Bill on that point. I do not mean to say I would strike it out, but when we go into committee we shall have a vote in the House upon that subject, but I have already prepared the Bill in case that the House is not in favor of extending in this Bill the franchise to women—I have prepared the Bill in anticipation of perhaps a hostile vote, which I would be sorry to see on that question. When this Bill is sanctioned by the adoption of the second reading we shall go into committee—I hope early next week—and I invite the fullest discussion in the House on the various clauses—the enfranchising clauses, and the disfranchising clauses of this measure. I move the second reading of the Bill.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I regret very much that the First Minister should have decided on bringing down a measure of such great importance under the circumstances under which he is bringing it down, and at the present period of the Session. It would be hard to conceive any measure which could be submitted to this assemblage which is in every possible shape and way more important than the Bill which the First Minister has submitted for a second reading on the present occasion. And, Sir, I must say, that I think it will be heard with astonishment and surprise, not only in this country but elsewhere, that a gentleman of the First Minister's position, a gentleman of his great experience and long standing, should have brought down a measure of this enormous importance, and that he thought it worth just eight and a half minutes' discussion, by the clock. I think, Sir, that that simple fact alone, if it came to be properly appreciated and understood, would show not merely this House, but very many of the electors of this country, the sort of fashion in which it pleases the First Minister to deal with questions of great importance. Sir, surely on an occasion of this kind a sense of his own position, a sense of what is due to the House, ought to have led him to enter into a more lengthy explanation of the very great and far reaching consequences which he must know are involved in many of the propositions which he has made. It is only, as he knows well, on the second reading that these questions of principle can be properly discussed and properly presented to the country. This, is not merely a measure of very great importance in itself, but it is a measure which deals with new questions which have not been at all properly presented to the public of this country, which have not been properly discussed in this House or discussed in the press. Now, Sir, nobody knows better than the First Minister that once you take any steps in the direction he has indicated, it is practically impossible for us to retrace those steps. Nobody knows better than that hon. gentleman also, that it is impossible for us, with our very limited experience, to say what the results may be, or what consequences may arise from the innovations which he proposes to introduce. Now, I am not going on the present occasion to discuss the details of this Bill itself. That can be better done, I think, at a later stage. What I specially desire to call the attention of this House and the attention of the country to are the circumstances—the extraordinary circumstances—under which this measure of so great importance is presented for our consideration. Sir, it is not correct for the hon. gentleman to say that the public mind is prepared for, or that the public mind is expecting this measure. On the contrary, the fact alluded to by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that over and over again—I think no less than seven times, unless my memory deceives me, in the past eighteen years—this measure has been brought forward by the First Minister; that it has been announced in Queen's speeches, tends above all other things to keep the public from properly considering it. "Wolf" has been cried so many times that the public mind has been diverted. We did not expect a few days ago that this great and important measure was going to be presented for our consideration now. Here we have it, Sir, sprung upon as—I was going to say, at an hour's notice, but practically on eight minutes notice—

for the consideration of the House, and what time has the First Minister selected to introduce it? We met on the 29th of January, and this is the 16th of April—78 days of the Session have elapsed. Over and over again I have known Sessions of great importance—Sessions in which great public questions have been discussed, in which in those 77 or 78 days the whole business of the country had been thoroughly examined, discussed and disposed of. Now, Sir, this question is brought forward at a time when the First Minister knows, when every man I address knows perfectly well, that from various causes a very large number of the members of the House are becoming constantly less and less disposed to discuss these questions, and more and more anxious to return to their ordinary business. I don't think, Sir, it would be possible—I do not think it has ever been done before by anybody except the First Minister—I do not think he will find a single precedent for the introduction of a measure of this particular class, at this particular period of the Session. Now, Sir, let the House remember the events of the present Session. We were brought here in the first place 14 or 15 days after the period at which we ordinarily assemble—after the period at which there is a sort of tacit agreement that we should assemble. After we did assemble here, five whole weeks were allowed to elapse before the Budget Speech was made. There was no reason that appeared, at any rate on the surface of the Budget Speech, why that delay should take place. There were no great alterations to be made in the tariff—no reason, I say, that I can understand or see, that five whole weeks should elapse before the Budget Speech was made. When the Budget Speech was made, discussion was allowed to go on from day to day, from week to week, I might almost say from month to month, for four whole weeks, without the least apparent desire or effort on the part of the Government to bring it to a close. These are facts known to every hon. gentleman; and it was only when the news arrived of those troubles in the North-West, which have since attained such serious and alarming proportions, that the Budget debate—apparently more by accident than by intention on the part of the Government—was brought to a close. Now, Sir, there is another and a strong reason why it is inexpedient, as I conceive, that this measure should be discussed at the present time. Of all measures which could be brought before the House this is one to which it is most desirable that public attention all over this Dominion should be directed. Now everyone knows perfectly well that at the present time public attention is to a great degree concentrated elsewhere. Public attention is concentrated on the affairs occurring in the North-West, and only a mere fragment of the attention of the press and the people will be given to this measure, no matter what consequences it involves, no matter what result may arise, or how important it may be to the whole future condition and welfare of this community. Then, Sir, let us look at the question from another point of view. We are, as I have said, at a very late period of the Session. I cannot recollect—looking back to 1867—a single occasion on which the ordinary and usual business of the House was so excessively in arrear as it is at the present time. I cannot recollect a single occasion in all those 18 years in which so little progress was made in the estimates, and there have been few occasions, indeed, in which it was so important that the House should examine the estimates, that they should be carefully scanned, that they should be critically sifted. We know very well from the confession of the Finance Minister himself, that it is only by the extraordinary, and as I contend, improper expedient of taking half a million of dollars from capital account received for lands, and putting it to the credit of his ordinary account, that he hopes to escape a considerable deficit at the end of this year. According to my view of the case the hon. gentleman has already by his own statement a deficit of $350,000. and he brought down and laid on the Table the other day a Message demanding nearly three-quarters of a million more; so that it is clear that we are going to be confronted, on the Finance Minister's own showing, with a very considerable and serious deficit, and it will be well indeed if these estimates are not seriously exceeded. Now, we have not merely to put through all the items of supply as yet undisposed of, which practically compose nine-tenths of the estimates, but we have to concur in these, and we have supplementary estimates, more or less, to consider besides. Why, we have not even disposed of the debate of the Committee of Ways and Means. One or two more important items remain to be discussed by the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Customs, which will require, as they involve in no small degree the interest of the mercantile community, some considerable discussion. And if we look down the Order paper, what do we find? We find, in the first place, that the hon. gentleman has given notice of an important measure, for doubling the Mounted Police in the North-West, which will probably involve an addition of half a million dollars to the annual expenditure of this country. We have just heard that in all possibility before this House rises, it will be called upon to discuss questions of great gravity and importance affecting the relations of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Dominion of Canada. We have, in addition, a considerable number of items of extreme importance to large sections of the community. The hon. gentleman has just told us that he proposes to take the sense of the House on the Insolvency Bill, which alone, if debated properly, will consume two or three of the days remaining for public business. I understood the First Minister also to say that we have the grave and important task of passing upon the consolidation of the statutes, a measure which he can hardly expect to carry through the House without considerable debate. I see that the Secretary of State has given notice of a Chinese Bill; and there are a considerable number of other items, affecting important interests, affecting persons whom we are here to represent, which cannot and ought not to be dismissed without some consideration. Then, as the House knows, in addition to the duty of attending the ordinary sittings of this House, there are still thrown upon us a very large amount of committee work. Many hon. members find it impossible to obtain any opportunity for the consideration of legislation before this House without at the same time neglecting some of the duties which the House has delegated to them, and I suppose expects them to perform. Now, Sir, we are bound to ask what can be the excuse for the course the hon. gentleman chooses to pursue on the present occasion? If this was an exceptional instance, if this was the first time we had been called upon at such a period of the Session to consider matters of such importance, there might possibly be some excuse found; although I am bound to say, when I recollect the scenes of the early part of this Session, when I remember that day after day and week after week the Government Orders were called up, and you, Mr. Speaker, after disposing of them, were accustomed to leave the Chair after scarcely an hour's Session, when I recollect how easy it was for the First Minister, who must have been acquainted with the details of this Bill, to have presented it to us and invited our discussion upon it, I find it difficult to imagine what possible cause there can be for his conduct in the present instance. It really does look as if it was becoming part of the settled policy of this Government to purposely delay the discussion of the most important questions until a period of the Session arrives when discussion has become practically impossible. And in this respect we have been going from bad to worse. It was always a part of the hon. gentleman's practice—I won't say policy, but always part of his practice—to put off from day to day, from to-morrow to to-morrow the discussion of matters of this sort; but I do not

recollect that he ever went as far as he has gone on the present occasion, or that he did it with so little apparent reason. Why, it is little short of a deliberate conspiracy to prevent the public consideration of this matter. The practical result is the same as if it was a conspiracy to prevent the public from understanding clearly and distinctly what they are called upon to do. This course of proceedure is tending to make Parliament a farce. If all that Parliament has to do is to meet here for the purpose of registering the decrees of a powerful Premier and a powerful Government, in my opinion it would be better away. It is becoming clear that we have a one man power, that we have a practical despotism established here. There may be, and there probably is, discussion of these questions in secret caucus, but there is very little debate on them in open Parliament. Now, the hon. gentleman appealed, in the few remarks he made, to the practice in England. Well, let the House look to the practice in England. Always, when a great constitutional question like this comes up, the fullest notice is given, and opportunity is offered for the amplest discussion, not merely in the House of Parliament, but in the press, in public meetings; in every possible shape and way, the opinion of the people is obtained, and is sought to be obtained. With us, if this measure becomes law, we shall be called upon to legislate on this question without in any way obtaining the opinion of the people or our constituents. I should like to know what is the use, when you come to consider it, of all the costly appliances with which we are surrounded here? What is the use of this costly *Hansard?* What is the use of our debates being published in the press unless time is given; unless the opportunity is given, more particularly on questions of this kind, for the public at large, and especially under a constitution like ours, which is based on federal principles, to express their opinion to their representatives on the floor of Parliament? Sir, if it comes to pass that all the important questions which are brought before us are only to be brought down in this fashion at the very close of the Session, when every member is reluctant to debate them, and impatient to get away, the people will begin to ask, and to ask with some reason: What is the use of maintaining at such cost all this expensive machinery of Parliament? I say more: I say that the course of the First Minister, who not only as First Minister, but as leader of the House, is bound to carefully guard the reputation of Parliament, has the effect in a great degree of bringing parliamentary institutions into disrepute. What is our business here? Our business as I understand it is threefold. First of all, we have got to audit the expense of the country: we have got to see that the Government, which has been entrusted with the task of spending the money of the people, does not abuse its trust and is able to show good reason for all the taxes, neither few nor far between, which they have chosen to lay upon us. This is one part of our functions; but, besides this, we are here for the purpose of hearing all the complaints which will naturally arise in a country like ours, and more particularly, in our capacity of a Federal Parliament, of hearing everything that can and ought to be advanced by the members who come, many of them, distances of thousands of miles for the purpose of representing those distant communities here. And lastly, and a very important part of our functions it is and ought to be held, our business is to see that the people do thoroughly understand the nature of all the new laws and legislation which the Government proposes to place upon the Statute Book. I repeat it is practically impossible for us, at this period of the Session and under the circumstances I have depicted, to give anything like proper consideration to this measure; and perhaps it is one of the worst results which have flowed from the present numerical weakness of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition that they are obliged to submit to more of this kind of thing than would ever be attempted by the First Minister if the Opposition were stronger, or was ever attempted by him when the Opposition were numerically somewhat stronger than they are to-day. Moreover, I say that if those things are necessary in any Parliament, they are very especially necessary in a Federal Parliament, and they are especially necessary in discussing a measure of this kind which affects, as the hon. gentleman himself has admitted, the whole nature of the relations which the various Provinces bear towards this Parliament. Now I do not want, as I said, at the present moment to predjudice the discussion by plunging prematurely into a debate on the details of the Bill. My point is simply this, that even if the hon. gentleman's measure were all that he claims it to be and that he describes it to be, he has committed a very improper act, he has trifled with the dignity of Parliament and the interests of the people, in putting off, without any conceivable reason or ground, the discussion of this measure to this very late period. And I must say that the fault rests specially upon himself; he is the gentleman who is charged with this measure; he, in his double capacity of Premier and as leader of the House, is responsible for the legislation of the House; he ought to see that the measures of Government are brought down at the proper time; he ought to see that full and ample leisure is given us to consider them, and that those to whom we are responsible should likewise have an opportunity of discussing them and of communicating with their representatives and advising them as to what their real feelings and sentiments are with regard to matters of this importance. I spoke just now of the state of ordinary business. Why the mere examination of the estimates alone, not to speak of the other necessary questions which lie before us, might very well occupy a matter of three or four weeks. If we are to discuss, and to discuss properly, the important question which the First Minister has submitted to us, five, six, or seven weeks would barely suffice for the proper discharge of our duty, and I know and he knows and every man here knows what an extremely difficult task it will be to induce hon. members of the House to remain here for a period of seven weeks longer in order to give the discussion which these measures imperatively require. If, on the other hand, the hon. the First Minister has made up his mind to force this Bill through, to compel the discussion of these items, to compel us to pass this Bill under any circumstances, I know perfectly well the result will be that other and most important work will be utterly neglected, that no time will be given for the proper discussion of those very important matters to which I have alluded; that no time will be given for the proper discussion of the estimates which, in this particular instance, not merely involve large expenditures of public money but large and important questions of public policy to which the attention of the House and the country must be directed. So, in brief, I say that whether you regard the conduct of the hon. gentleman with respect to Parliament itself or whether you regard it with respect to the public at large, he is equally blameworthy for not having brought this measure before us earlier. As regards Parliament at large, if, as I said, he undertakes to force it through in the teeth of the Opposition, we know perfectly well that can be only done by unseemly wrangling instead of discussion, in which the dignity of this House must suffer, as I fear it has suffered when the same thing has been attempted, and sometimes done, before. As regards the public at large, I say this, and everybody knows that what I say in that respect is easily verified, as you can see by reference to the public prints from time to time. When the House first meets, public attention is more or less alive and active: it regards with a lively interest what we are doing here, and if at that time these important measures were brought down, we would have had good debates on them, valuable suggestions would be received, not merely from the members of the House

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

but from the people outside, but after the House has been in Session nearly three months, after other important questions have absorbed public attention, then it becomes utterly impossible for anybody, even the hon. the First Minister himself, with all the influence of his position and his great majority, to obtain reasonable and proper attention to the exceedingly important questions which are involved in this measure. What makes the matter worse is this, that not merely has this thing been done without, as I say, apparently any pretext or excuse or reasonable ground why this delay should have taken place—not only is that the case, but over and above all that there is a complete absence of any real urgency for proceeding with this measure. We have gone on for a period of nearly 20 years, and the hon. the First Minister does not pretend or does not allege, at any rate, that the present House does not reflect the will of the people; continually do we hear him and his friends declare that it does so in the highest degree. I do not myself think that it does; I think, and it is the one general remark I will venture on, I think that it is a serious defect in our representative system and in all representative systems now a days, that the number of the votes on either side in no degree represent fairly the number of the votes which are cast at the polls. This side of the House practically represents nearly one half of the voters of Canada. Hon. gentlemen opposite dissent. Yes, I say it does. The thing can be shown and verified by the facts, by the votes recorded. This side of the House represents within a near fraction the number of half of the people of Canada, but it only represents, as we know to our sorrow and our cost, about one-third of the voting power of the House. It is not fair or right or reasonable, I do not think it will commend itself even to the more generous and more independent gentlemen on the other side, that this great majority which the hon. gentleman possesses should be used for the purpose of forcing a measure of this kind through at this particular period of the Session; and for the purpose of making manifest my views on this point and of putting on record the fact that we have been compelled to discuss it under circumstances under which we ought never to be compelled to discuss it, unless a case of extreme urgency was made out, which is wholly wanting in the present instance, I beg to move: —

That all the words after "that" be struck out and the following inserted:—"That in the opinion of this House it is not possible at this late stage of the Session, and having regard to the present condition of public business, to discuss the said Bill satisfactorily."

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is a measure that was introduced twice, I think, already, and the measure was explained at the time. Last year and the year previous, it was explained to the House when it was introduced, and the hon. the First Minister, when he he introduced the measure in the month of March — about the 17th or 18th of March, because I see the second reading is marked on the paper on the 19th of March— explained what the measure was. He did not go into all the details, because he had gone into them when the Bill was introduced before; but, on the interruption I think of one of the hon. members on the other side, who said: Well, is that the old Bill again? The First Minister said: It is the Bill that was introduced, with a few alterations. This Bill was therefore before the country, was known to the country and to hon. gentlemen even before its introduction this Session; and this Bill has been now before the House for more than a month and hon. members knew what it was. It was introduced about the middle of March, and the House and the country were perfectly aware what it was. It was discussed in the press, it was discussed outside; and hon. members, especially the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, should not complain that the First Minister did not do as hon. gentlemen did last night, keeping us here for six or eight hours discussing a measure that had been discussed for years past, and was the law of the land with very few exceptions; but, of course, it suited hon. gentlemen to keep us here until half past two in the morning discussing that matter; and hon. gentlemen say we come late in the day with our measures. It is the hon. gentlemen who have spent the time in discussing those measures. They were in their right; I do not complain of that; they used the right the rules of Parliament gave them, but at the same time they must take their responsibility in using the time of the House in that manner. The hon. gentleman complains that we come late with our measures. We introduced the resolutions about the tariff, and how long did hon. gentlemen go on with the discussion of those changes? One would have thought that those changes were of such great importance that they were a revolution in our tariff; but no, they were changes required by the experience of the working of the tariff, and in order to follow the National Policy and give it its full development, as we thought it should have and as the House evidently has found with us that it should have. Hon. gentlemen, nevertheless, day after day and night after night, went on discussing those changes with the seriousness that they put into the debates on measures sometimes of very little importance. But hon. gentlemen were using the right they had. We cannot deprive them of that, and we would be very sorry to deprive them of their right. They can discuss these measures with full liberty, and perhaps with a little more than they granted to us when we were on that side of the House and they were on this side, because I remember that, even when I came back to Parliament in 1876, when thirteen or fourteen of us in a row here came back, one after the other, and made a change of 26 votes in the voting power of the Opposition, we had even then sometimes great difficulty in discussing measures. And why? Because we had not that respect paid to us which I think we have paid to hon. gentlemen on the other side, though they are not more numerous than we were at that period. I think that the fair thing, the proper thing on the part of a party, a large party, a strong party, as the Ministerial party is, is to give to their opponents fair play and all the time and all the latitude which they deserve and which they are entitled to. The hon. gentleman says that this measure is too great a measure to receive the attention of this House, that public attention is concentrated just now on the North-West affairs, and therefore we cannot give all the attention possible to this measure. The hon. gentleman is quite mistaken as to that. If he had been here— and I think he was for a portion of the time—during the last two days and two nights, he would have seen how the attention of his friends around him could be concentrated upon the measures which were before the House at that time. They gave all the attention possible, they went into the discussion of those Bills and those clauses, of every line and every word, and they thought that even the law of the land, as it stood before those amendments were proposed, had not been passed with that care which should have been given to it, and that therefore a little word should be put here, and another little word should be removed from that clause, and so on. We did not find fault with hon. gentlemen for that. We accepted their criticism, and I must say my hon. friend the Secretary of State showed the greatest disposition possible to receive all the suggestions of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. The hon. gentleman says, moreover, that this bill of fare which we have before us shows us a great many important measures. No doubt about it. There are some very important measures, and I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman intends, as we on this side of the House intend, giving those measures all the attention they deserve. That is our intention. We wish that these measures should be well discussed, dis-

cussed with a proper feeling, discussed with a proper animus, and I have no doubt they will be so discussed on both sides. But it is no fault of ours if the hon. gentlemen will be so frightened at this measure that they cannot discuss it now. They think that, because this measure comes at this time of the Session, we cannot give it all the attention possible. As I said before, we have had that measure for a month before us. We knew what the measure was; the hon. the First Minister took care not to bring up the measure for discussion before a later period. If he had come on the 25th March, six days after the introduction of the Bill in the House, and said: Now I move the second reading of that Bill; what would hon. gentlemen have said? They would have said: No, we have not examined the measure sufficiently; we must consult some of our friends; we wish to weigh well that measure; it is such an important one, the hon. the First Minister will do better to give us a little more time and let us take another fortnight. Well, the hon. the First Minister has given hon. gentlemen over three weeks to consider the measure, to study it well, and nevertheless the hon. the late Finance Minister is there and says: "We are not ready; we cannot take that; our mind is not here; it is all in the North-West." It was not in the North-West last night, it was not in the North-West the previous night, it was not in the North-West during the six or eight or ten sittings of the House that hon. gentlemen gave to the tariff, and therefore I think the hon. gentlemen, if they could apply their minds to those measures during that long period, can give us a little of their attention for this one. At all events, I am sure that our friends on this side of the House intend giving that attention to this measure; they intend looking into that measure; they know that this measure is for what purpose?—is to decide whether we should have a franchise for this House, a franchise different from that of the Provinces or independent of them; whether we should be sure that our franchise is not to be changed at every Session by Local Legislatures that may be disposed to deprive the party in power of the votes they are entitled to receive in the Provinces. We remember what occurred in one of the smaller Provinces of this Dominion at a period when, for the purpose of depriving a certain number of people of the right to vote, men who were known to be disposed to vote for the Conservative party, it passed an Act to erase their names from the assessment book, and therefore from the list of voters. We now desire to pass a law to protect the voters against any similar action on the part of the Local Legislatures. We know what would occur to-morrow if this Bill was not passed. We see that the franchise has been changed in the Province of Ontario; and why should we allow ourselves to be dictated to by Local Legislatures in a matter that concerns this House alone? I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. the First Minister and the Government were perfectly right in asking Parliament to decide whether we should have a franchise or not. That is the principle of the Bill; that is what we intend to affirm by voting for the second reading. The details are matters to be discussed afterwards. We are here for the purpose of representing the people in this matter. We lay their complaints before Parliament, and we say: We take the responsibility of saying that this is a measure we believe to be in the best interests of the country, and therefore we ask you, the representatives of the people, to support us in this matter by affirming that we must have this franchise. Well, if certain details are objected to by hon. gentlemen, these gentlemen know perfectly well the freedom they have in this House, and they can fully discuss those details. We have shown more than once that we are open to conviction, that we are not here for the purpose of imposing our will upon the House. We say that this is a Bill for the purpose of having a franchise of our own; that is the principle of the Bill, and we ask you to affirm it by voting for the second reading. Another reason why the hon. gentleman complains is, that, as he says, we have brought down this measure too late, that they did not know it was coming, and that we should have had it much sooner. But the hon. gentleman has only to look at the first page of the votes and deliberations of this Session to find it announced in the Speech from the Throne that this measure was to be brought forward, and we afterwards introduced it. We have given hon. gentlemen three or four weeks to digest it, and prepare themselves for the second reading. I do not say that we expected absolutely that every member of the House would vote for the second reading; to be frank I must say that we did not expect that every hon. gentleman opposite would vote for the second reading. But we knew that our measure was acceptable to this country, because the electors desire that this Parliament should have their own franchise and should not be ruled by any of the Local Legislatures. The hon. gentleman says that we cannot fulfil our duties as representatives of the people if we bring up this measure and other measures which the Government may have in store for us. Why? Because, he says, we have three special duties to perform while we are here in Parliament. The first, he says, is to audit the expenditure of the country. I do not think that hon. gentlemen can complain much on that score; surely they have done their duty on that score, and have had all possible facilities for that purpose. Then, he adds, that we are here for the purpose of hearing the complaints and grievances of the people. Well, the hon. gentlemen opposite have been, during seventy-eight days, bringing the grievances of the people before this House. They have already given us two votes of want of confidence in presenting their grievances, as they call them; and if rumor is correct, it appears there are a few more in store for us. Well, the hon. gentleman may be sure that on our side of the House we are ready to meet them, and discuss with them their grievances. The third point the hon. gentleman makes is, that the people ought to understand the measures that are brought forward. Well, that cannot apply to this measure, because it has been before the people for the last three years, and therefore they know what that measure is. The hon. gentleman knew what it was before we introduced it; and when the First Minister introduced it he stated that it was the measure of last year, with a few amendments, which he explained at the time. Mr. Speaker, I need not go into the details of the measure. As I said just now, I will follow the example of my leader, by not discussing the details at present. The details of the measure will be discussed when we go into Committee of the Whole; then we will take up section after section and be ready to discuss them with the hon. gentleman. But the question now is on the second reading of this Bill. The hon. gentleman who has preceded me has thought proper, with his responsibility, to move that this Bill be not now read a second time, but that the Government should be censured for having brought this measure forward at this period of the Session. Well, I suppose he will not complain if we declare his amendment, as he has declared it himself, to be a motion of want of confidence in the Administration; and I think the motion will be so received by those hon. gentlemen who usually support the Government.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has found it necessary to apply the ministerial whip, and tells his followers that whether this motion is intended as one of want of confidence or not, he is going to treat it as such, and of course insists upon all his followers voting it down. It is of no consequence whether the motion of my hon. friend before me is a proper motion or not it must be voted down, and voted down it will be accordingly, no doubt, if the hon. gentleman's followers will follow his advice. Now, Sir, we have a right to discuss this question

in Parliament. It is our privilege; it is our duty. We are not dependent entirely upon the grace of hon. gentlemen opposite for that privilege. The rules of Parliament, and the practice of Parliament, entitle the Opposition, though they may be few in numbers, weak, numerically—they entitle them, justify them, compel them, to discuss every measure that comes before Parliament in as intelligent a way as they possibly can. The hon. gentleman complains that we have taken up unnecessarily a large portion of the time of this House. I deny it, Mr. Speaker. We had a long discussion last night, a long discussion the night before. Why had we that long discussion last night and the night before? Sir, to perfect the Bills, the imperfect Bills, that the hon. gentleman saw fit to introduce to Parliament. That it was necessary so to discuss them, the simple fact that the night before last the Minister of Agriculture found it necessary, under the solemn protests of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, to have some material amendments made in the principle of this Bill, indicates very conclusively that the Opposition were not taking up the time of the House unnecessarily, but were seeking, in a legitimate, fair and proper way, to perfect the imperfect legislation that was submitted to this House. The hon. gentleman says that there is, and always has been, plenty of time to discuss this and kindred measures; that the Opposition is responsible for the delays, if delay there be. The Minister of Public Works knows, as well as I know, that for five weeks of this Session there was not a sitting after six o'clock in the evening; that for nearly six weeks we did not meet for over one hour or, at the very outside, for more than an hour and a-half; for nearly two months of this Session not a Government Bill of the least consequence was submitted to Parliament. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that upon days when the business of private members was dealt with, notices of motion and public Bills and orders, the House, at the request of the Government, adjourned at six o'clock on several occasions, and you, Mr. Speaker, did not take the Chair after dinner. The Minister of Public Works is not right in charging the Opposition with protracting the business of the Session. We have been always, and we always are, ready and willing to enter upon the discussion of measures submitted to us, so long as we have a reasonable and a fair opportunity to understand the provisions of the different Bills. The hon. gentleman tells us we have abundance of time to discuss this measure. It has been before the country—how long? For years: It was introduced at an early period of the Session. I say it was not introduced at an early period of the Session. The First Minister moved the first reading on 19th March. The House opened on 29th January, and yet from that date to 19th of March I venture to say no hon. member on this side of the House or the other side had the slightest idea that the hon. gentleman seriously proposed to proceed with this Bill during this Session. We have had the hon. gentleman crying wolf for the last eighteen or twenty years on this question. He tells us that we should be prepared because this Bill has been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. The hon. gentleman knows that has been the chronic condition of the Speech from the Throne for seven or eight years. This Bill has been announced as one of the measures of the Government, as one of the Bills which they were pledged to introduce and carry through Parliament; and that was the last of it. I think on two or three occasions the First Minister did introduce the Bill, and that was the end of it. The First Minister has not ventured until to day to move the second reading. It was introduced, I say, on 19th March: When was it printed and distributed to the members, so that they might have an opportunity of perusing and understanding its provisions. I am very much mistaken if the Bill was distributed until after the Easter recess; and we are now told that this important Bill, a Bill far-reaching in its consequences and affecting the electoral body from ocean to ocean, is to be dealt with in this summary manner. And we are told that because there is not further time to consider the effects, consequences and principles of the Bill, we are obstructing the business of Parliament. I charge hon. gentlemen opposite with having neglected persistently and consistently, during the whole Session, the business of this country. They have not been ready with a single measure; they never introduce measures until the Session is almost dying and all hon. members are anxious to reach their homes. Then Bills of the first possible consequence are introduced by the Government and are forced through Parliament, without receiving that discussion which Bills ought to receive. Yet, forsooth, we are charged with obstructing the business of Parliament. We are here to criticise the actions, the legislation and the proceedings of hon. gentlemen opposite, and we are denied the right of so doing by the course which those hon. genlemen persistently pursue, when in their legislation it is utterly impossible to consider those questions with that earnest care and consideration that important questions of this kind demand at the hands of Parliament. The hon. Minister of Public Works said the First Minister explained the Bill, and we knew what the Bill was. What did the First Minister say? When he introduced the Bill, on 19th of March, did he explain the principles on which the Bill was founded? He condescended to make the following observations, and will the Minister say that they are clear. Did he, I repeat, explain the principles or provisions of the Bill? No; we were left in the dark, and knew nothing about its provisions until we received from the hands of the Queen's Printer this extraordinary Bill, the second reading of which we are now asked to sanction. In moving the first reading of the Bill the First Minister said:

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise. He said: It is not necessary to go into a discussion of the Bill; the Bill is substantially on the lines of the Bill of last year, of which the general principles were stated to the House. I move the first reading of the Bill."

That is the whole explanation the hon. gentleman condescended to give us. The Bill, he said, is on the lines of last year's Bill, and I move its first reading. We are told that was quite sufficient; that the principles of the Bill and the provisions of the Bill were explained to us. They are not explained to us now. Has the Minister of Public Works, who answered the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) explained the principles of the Bill? Not in the slightest degree; not a single principle has he grappled with; not a single change in the law has he explained. He knows, as well as I do, that the time for explaining the principles of a Bill is when the Bill is introduced or when the second reading is moved; yet the hon. gentleman does not condescend to give us the slightest explanation. What does the hon. gentleman say? He says I will follow the example of my leader—I will say nothing; I will not give the slightest explanation; I will appeal to my followers and treat any opposition to the Bill as a vote of want of confidence, and call on them to vote it down. That is the explanation of the principles of the Bill we received from the hon. gentleman. What did the first Minister say? He told us, and it was the only thing he did tell us, that it was an anomalous position for the Dominion to occupy, not to have a franchise of its own, to be dependent on the Local Legislatures either to restrict or to extend the franchise. There was not a word as to the principles on which the Bill is founded. There are in this Bill principles of the most serious character, principles that deserve the most earnest consideration of Parliament. The First Minister and his first lieutenant have addressed the House, and they have not explained even to their followers the principles of the Bill. The hon. gentleman should have explained the

principles to his followers; but no, he would call upon them to support it; they had not failed him in the past and they would not fail him now. It is an insult to Parliament and to this country that a Bill of this character should be foisted on Parliament, without any explanation of its character. I say we have good reason to complain; that by the action of the Government most of the legislation submitted to Parliament has been passed over, owing entirely to the delays and neglect which have become characteristic of hon. gentlemen opposite. Measures are thrown over to the following Session, simply owing to the delay and neglect of hon. gentlemen opposite. Measures of the first possible consequence, introduced by the hon. gentlemen themselves, which must necessarily involve discussion at considerable length, with respect to their principles and detail, have not yet reached the second reading; and we are asked to go on with this Bill, one of the most important, if not the most important, ever submitted to a free Parliament in a free country. What does the hon. gentleman propose to do? Do hon. gentlemen propose to keep Parliament in session till August next? I suppose they do. All I can tell hon. gentlemen is, that if they are prepared to work on that line, I am prepared for it also. Hon. gentlemen are not to imagine that by bringing in Bills of this character, at this stage of the proceedings, they are going to coerce hon. gentlemen on this side of the House; they are not going to silence us, because they bring in these Bills at this stage.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am sorry the Minister of Agriculture is not here, for I would ask him to amend his Bill. That Bill should be amended, and other animals should be provided for as well as four-footed animals. Hon. gentlemen need not try to put me down. I am too old a parliamentarian to pay much attention to what hon. gentlemen opposite may say—I know them too well. Now, Sir, I say it is an outrage, that at this period of the Session, when all these great public questions are before Parliament, we should be asked to deal with this question, and deal with it without a word of explanation as to the principles of the Bill, as to the grounds upon which it is founded. Without giving any explanation of these things, the hon. gentleman introduces it, and tries to force it through at this late stage of the Session. The hon. the Secretary of State has a Bill on the Notice Paper which will involve a large amount of discussion, a Bill involving a most important principle, affecting Chinese immigration into this country, and a question which has been discussed over and over again, and which this Government now propose to deal with. Does the hon. gentleman expect to get that Bill through Parliament by a side wind, without a discussion of the principle of the Bill, without the details of the measure being thoroughly discussed? All I can tell the hon. gentleman is, that if he expects anything of the kind, he is entirely mistaken. Then there is the Insolvency Bill. The hon. gentleman knows what an excitement it has created in the country. He knows that in the vacation he has been remonstrated with and memorialised, and that delegations have been here repeatedly, asking him to deal with that question. So far he has shirked his responsibility in that matter. But now he says he is going to introduce that measure, and I venture to say that it will require at least one week's discussion, sitting until two o'clock in the morning, before the principles and details of that Bill shall be thoroughly understood. Yet we are asked to take up this Bill—a Bill for which there is no possible necessity, before a Bill of the magnitude and importance of an insolvency law. Then, Sir, there is the consolidation of the statutes. The hon. gentleman, in order to shirk his responsibility in that matter, appointed a committee to investigate and report on a consolidation of the laws. Before that, he had commissioners for years undertaking to consolidate those laws, and I tell the hon. gentleman now, from even a cursory glance, that the work of those commissioners was a discredit to those who were engaged on it. I tell the hon. gentleman further, that if, without the most careful and painstaking investigation and analysis of the consolidation of the statutes, the hon. gentleman should ask the sanction of Parliament to it, he will make one of the greatest mistakes he has made for many long years, and that is saying a good deal. And yet, Sir, what is to become of this legislation? Is it to be disposed of? I say if it is, and the Estimates and the Supplementary Estimates, and many other questions are to be disposed of, we shall be here until the month of August or September next. The hon. gentleman has introduced this Bill into Parliament on more than one occasion. I do not propose to discuss the details of the Bill now, but I say, Sir, in order to understand the importance and the necessity of the Bill, one requires to look for a moment or two at the principles involved in it, and some of the changes which the hon. gentleman has seen fit to make. I say, that in order to understand thoroughly the effect and importance and necessity of a motion such as that moved by my hon. friend from South Huron, it is absolutely necessary that we should consider, for a moment or two, the principle on which the Bill is founded—if there are any principles in it—and the important details which are contained in this Bill. Sir, the hon. gentleman introduced a Franchise Bill into Parliament a good many years ago. He has introduced it several times since. The Bill was protested against; he was warned not to proceed with it; he was told that he was interfering with that which he should not interfere with; he was told that the Provinces were perfectly satisfied with the franchises they had; and he was told all this by his own friends. He has had it before his caucus more than once, and I am much mistaken if some of his friends there did not protest against his proceeding with it. The hon. gentleman knows there have been numerous protests against proceeding with the measure. He knows that the organs which supported the Government, and especially those in the Province of Quebec, for the last two or three years, have protested against it, as being a flagrant violation of the rights of the Provinces; that the Provinces themselves should have the right to declare who should be the electors to choose their representatives to this Parliament. He knows that an organ of the Government said this, in protesting against this legislation:

"The radical and revolutionary Bill of the First Minister on the electoral franchise, should be chucked into the waste paper basket."

This is an extract from a paper which supported the hon. gentleman a few years ago, and which I am told still supports him. The advice of that paper was, that this Bill dealing with the electoral franchise should be "chucked" into the waste paper basket. The hon. gentleman yielded to the warnings of the press supporting him; he yielded to the warnings of his friends, and he concluded to drop the Bill. But the hon. gentleman is becoming more defiant; he has now plucked up the courage to introduce the Bill, to bring it to a second reading, notwithstanding the warnings uttered by the press supporting him, notwithstanding the protests—perhaps, sometimes mild protests—but the protests of his supporters, all the same, over and over again given to him, that he should not proceed with this legislation, that the demands and the necessities of the public did not require it. The hon. gentleman proposes to proceed, and on what ground? The hon. gentleman gives us the ground; he told us the ground on which this Bill should receive the assent of Parliament was, that it was important that there should be uniformity in the franchise of the Provinces;

that the same franchise should prevail from ocean to ocean. I disagree with the hon. gentleman. I say the Provinces are the best judges of the class of electors who ought to be on the voters' lists for the purpose of sending representatives to this Parliament. They know more about this than the hon. gentleman does. I say that the people of Prince Edward Island, who have a more liberal franchise than is provided for in the Bill, are better able to judge of the class of electors they desire and require to send members to this Parliament than the hon. gentleman is able to judge. I say that, with respect to the great Province of British Columbia, which, I understand, has universal suffrage—that the franchise of that Province should be left in its own hands, where it has been for so many years. Let me ask the First Minister, who complained to him of the want of uniformity; what man complained to him; what Province complained to him; what leading politician complained to him; what public newspaper; what organ of the Government has for the last eighteen years, during thirteen of which the hon. gentleman has been in power, asked the hon. gentleman to introduce this Bill into Parliament; to force it through Parliament, contrary to the expressed desire and will of the Provinces, and many leading statesmen in all the Provinces? I have challenged the hon. gentleman on that subject, and he is silent. He knows that nobody has complained. He says he wants uniformity, and for the sake of uniformity; and what will flow from it. He is willing to sacrifice the simplicity and the inexpensiveness of the present franchise, the law as it now prevails, which allows them to fix for themselves the qualifications of the electors for the election of members to the Dominion Parliament. I say no one has asked the hon. gentleman for it. But the hon. gentleman is not satisfied. He wants to introduce a new franchise, and he does it without reason and without cause. He mentioned that in the Province of Ontario the Local Legislature, during the last Session, passed a Franchise Bill. They did; they passed a Franchise Bill, which is much more liberal than and far superior to the Bill the hon. gentleman has introduced. They passed a Bill which is practically on the verge of manhood suffrage; which practically gives a vote to every British subject of the age of 21 years who is living in the Province of Ontario. The hon. gentleman says that is not the franchise we want; we want a more restricted franchise. We do not want to give the great mass of the people of this country the power and influence in this House that the Province of Ontario has given, that the island of Prince Edward gave long ago, and that I believe they have in British Columbia. The hon. gentleman introduces a restricted franchise, and he asks us, at this late period of the Session, when we are all tired of discussion and anxious to get home, to consider and discuss and understand the provisions of this Bill. Understand them! I would defy a Philadelphia lawyer to understand some of the provisions he has incorporated in it. But at this late stage we are asked to consider it. As I said, I do not propose to enter into a discussion of the details of this Bill; but I propose to draw the attention of the House, for a few moments, to one or two of the extraordinary provisions in the Bill—to the complicated franchises set forth in the Bill, and to the difficulty of understanding what the hon. gentleman means. An enormous expense must be entailed on candidates for parliamentary honors, on whom devolve, after all, the expense and the duty of looking after the voters' lists; and we are asked to consider this important measure at this late stage, when we have been almost three months in session, and all because the hon. gentleman has been derelict in his duty in not submitting the Bill when he ought to have done. Now, the hon. gentleman has undertaken to give us a complicated and expensive franchise—complicated and expensive in the mode in which it is to be worked out, and in the proceedings before the revising barristers he has referred to Take that provision relating to tenants. The hon. gentleman provides that a tenant at a monthly, a quarterly, a half-yearly or a yearly rent, will have the franchise. He will be entitled to vote, provided he has been a resident for a year, and has paid his rent for the last month, quarter, year, or half year. In order to get the name of a man with this franchise on the voters' list, what has the candidate to do? And I tell hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, that this Bill affects them as much as it does the members of this side. They are the men, and they know it, who have to look after the voters' lists, who have to get a proper revision of the voters' lists; and by this Bill, in order to get the name of a tenant on the list, you have to prove that he is a tenant, that he has paid his rent; you have to fix the time of the payment of his rent; because, otherwise, you cannot show that he is entitled to be placed on the voters' list. You have to prove that he has remained in possession of the premises for one year; and in order to do all this, you have to go before the revising barrister and establish these facts at your own expense. And, Sir, we are asked to consider these complicated provisions when we have been three months in session and are anxious to get home. Take the case of an occupant, who is entitled to vote under this Bill. In order to get his name on the list, you have to prove that he is in occupancy; when he became the occupant of the property on which he votes; from whom he has acquired it; whether from a private individual or a corporation, and that he has been in occupancy a year; you have to go to the expense of proving these facts before the revising barrister, of getting subpœnas and summoning witnesses, and of employing a lawyer to see that there is a proper investigation. Now, several sections of the Bill involve principles that are not contained in the law as it now stands. Under sections 17 and 24 the revising barrister may hear the evidence on an appeal. He is not bound to take down that evidence or to have it put in writing; he hears the evidence, and gives his judgment, and that is the end of the matter. There is no appeal. He is there as an irresponsible officer; he is responsible to nobody, and what he says is law, so far as the voters are concerned, whether it is law or not. There is no means provided for reversing an improper judgment. The hon. gentleman, by this Bill, has invested this irresponsible officer with all these powers. Now, another new provision is introduced in the Bill; the hon. gentleman has given us woman suffrage. The hon. gentleman is proud of that; he is a ladies' man, he tells us; he thinks all the ladies will vote for him. I doubt it; I doubt it very much; I do not think they will, and I hope they won't. I think the hon. gentleman will find that he is mistaken. The hon. gentleman says he has given the ladies a vote. He has not; he only gives the widows and the spinsters votes. He does not give his own wife or my wife a vote. I ask him, on what principle does he propose to give votes to widows and spinsters, and deprive wives of the right to vote? The widows and spinsters who have the requisite property qualification can vote. Does the hon. gentleman think that they have all the wisdom and all the practical experience of the female sex? He gives widows and spinsters the right to vote if they happen to have property worth $150, while a wife, with property worth $10,000, is not entitled to vote? Why restrict it to the widows and spinsters? If it is a good, sound principle, the hon. gentleman ought not to limit to widows and spinsters. He ought to extend it to every female—to the whole fair sex who have arrived at years of discretion. The hon. gentleman's clause is founded on no principle; it is based on no necessity. Will he tell me of one woman who asks for the franchise? Has any member in Parliament suggested, on his responsibility as a member of Parliament, that the ladies

of this country want the franchise? I say no; I say the ladies of this country do not want the franchise. They are not anxious to engage in active scenes of political contests. They are not anxious to go to the hustings, to be cuffed and knocked about, which must often have occurred in the hon. gentleman's experience. The ladies of this country do not want the franchise; they have not asked for it; and the hon. gentleman will confer no favor upon them by giving it to them; and yet he wants us to discuss this new principle when the Session is about to end and we are anxious to go home. I ask again, why has the hon. gentleman put this clause in his Bill, and why does he confine it to widows and spinsters? It may be said that if wives are given the franchise, it will be calculated to create family jars and troubles in the household. I ask the hon. gentleman if there is not every likelihood that it will lead to jars and disputes between the daughter and father. The father goes to the poll and votes for the hon. gentleman, and the daughter goes to the poll and votes for me, as I have no doubt she would; and the mother stays at home and does not vote at all. Is there no chance of family jars and disputes there? The hon. gentleman can see that this clause is based on no principle and founded on no necessity. I ask the hon. gentleman again, why is he willing to allow an old maid, with property worth $150, to vote to send a member to Parliament, while he does not let the mother of that spinster vote. The hon. gentleman is reversing the order of nature; he puts the daughter above the mother, the mother beneath the daughter. To be consistent, what the hon. gentleman ought to do is, to strike out this clause altogether, or allow all females to vote who are of age, and who have the necessary property qualification. Now, Sir, I say that we are asked to deal with a very important question; we are asked to deal with all these delicate and new proposals, with all these new principles involved in this measure; and we are asked to do this at a time when, as everybody knows, Parliament ought to be within, at most, two or three weeks of prorogation, and when everybody knows perfectly well that Parliament will not prorogue for six months, if Bills like this are brought down and proceed with.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I desire to correct the hon. gentleman in the statement he has just made. He says the women of the country do not want to vote; I say they do.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Quite likely, in some of the families in British Columbia, the women want to vote, for I have no doubt it will be of some consequence to some people in that Province, for instance the Chinese, that their women should be allowed to vote. I am, however, quite satisfied that the great mass of respectable women—although I do not say that we may not have in our midst, as they have in the United States, some ladies like Miss Bella Lockwood, who desire to don the coat and pantaloons—but I am positive that the great mass of the women of this country are not desirous to exercise the franchise. The hon. gentleman is doing what he is not justified in doing, either by necessity or request, in giving the franchise to the women of Canada. I have shown two or three principles of this Bill that deserve careful consideration, and to which we cannot now give proper consideration. Let me go a step further. The hon. gentleman desires to create officials to be called "revising officers," and was cool enough to speak of them as the officers who are to make members of Parliament. Three years ago he tried his hand in this direction, by forcing a Gerrymandering Bill through the House, that measure was the means of making a good many members of Parliament; but the hon. gentleman is not satisfied with that to-day. He wants now to control the whole electorate.

Mr. HESSON. No.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I say yes; but we can expect nothing else from the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson). I would like to know what proposition this Government could introduce to which the hon. gentleman would say no. What has the hon. the First Minister undertaken to do by this Bill? What has he undertaken to do by the 10th section, by which he intends to create what he calls "revising officers." The 10th section reads as follows:—

"The Governor General in Council may, within three months after the coming into force of this Act and from time to time thereafter, when the office is vacant, appoint a proper person, to be called "the revising officer," for each or any of the electoral districts of Canada, who shall hold office during good behavior, but who shall be removable on an address by the House of Commons, and whose duties shall be to prepare, revise and complete, in the manner hereinafter provided, the lists of persons entitled to vote under the provisions of this Act in such electoral district, and every such officer shall, before entering upon his duties, take an oath of office before any judge of a Superior Court or Court of Record of the Province in which he is to act, in the form contained in the schedule to this Act for such purpose, which he shall forthwith thereafter cause to be filed with the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery at Ottawa; and in the event of the death, resignation, removal, inability or refusal to act of any such revising officer, another may, in the same way, be appointed in his stead, who shall hold office under the same tenure, and with the same duties and powers."

By the 11th section he provides that:

"A revising officer, to be appointed under this Act may, in any Province except Quebec, be either a judge or a junior judge of any county court in the Province in which he is to act, or a barrister of at least five years' standing at the bar of such Province, and in the Province of Quebec he may be either a judge of the Superior Court for Lower Canada, or an advocate of that Province of at least five years' standing: Provided always, that the same revising officer may be appointed for and be required to discharge the said duties in respect of more than one electoral district."

These two are very important clauses, yet we are asked to consider the effect of these two clauses, to analyse them, to deal with them, within two or three weeks of the close of this Session. We are asked to discuss them intelligently; we are assumed to discuss them intelligently; the hon. the First Minister, I suppose, intends that they shall be discussed intelligently. We are asked to deal with these two sections, perhaps the most important sections of the whole Bill, and the sections connected with them, sections which place in the hands of the Government the creation of a quantity of public officers and the dispensing of an enormous amount of additional patronage—we are asked to deal intelligently with this important question at the close of the Session, and that when there is no necessity for proceeding with this measure at this time. The 11th section provides that the revising officer may be a barrister of at least five years' standing. It does not make it compulsory that he shall be barrister of five years standing, but leaves it to the discretion of the Government. I would like to know if the hon. gentleman intends to appoint anybody except a barrister of five years' standing; he does not say that he shall not appoint anybody else; he merely says that he may appoint such a person. The clause is, indeed, an extraordinary one, especially when read in connection with some of the subsequent clauses. By this Bill the hon. gentleman gives himself the power to appoint 200 revising barristers to positions of trust in the service of the Crown and receiving emoluments from the Crown—a revising barrister for every electoral district within the Dominion. The revising barrister may appoint a clerk, making 200 clerks, and a bailiff, making 200 bailiffs; so that, in every electoral district in this wide Dominion, there is in this Bill a provision for the appointment of 600 permanent salaried officers, to be paid out of the Dominion Treasury. I say that to give the Government power of this kind is what no free Parliament ought to do; it it is what no Parliament would do. The Government have, under this Bill, the power of appointing revising barristers, and we may depend upon it they will be very careful that they shall not be very independent revising

officers. The Government have taken to themselves the power of appointing 200 revising barristers throughout the Dominion, and we know, from the appointments the hon. the First Minister has been lately making in the judiciary, that these appointments will be of the most partisan character. These revising barristers will see with one eye only; or they may see with two eyes, but it will be only through one glass, and that the glass of the hon. the First Minister. They will have at heart the desire to gratify the Government, to please the men who appointed them; and, unless I am greatly mistaken, they will not fail to succeed. Not only does the hon. gentleman do that, but he takes care to make each of these revising barristers independent of all power and of all control. They are to be permanent; they cannot be removed, except for cause, and then only by an address of this House. I would like to know something of the kind of offence committed by one of these officers that this Parliament would feel called on to dismiss him. Not only that, but this irresponsible officer has the power of giving a decision from which there is no appeal; and yet we are asked to dispose of all these important and delicate questions; we are asked to decide on the propriety of appointments without time being given for reflection, without the country being possessed of the subject, without the country grasping and realising what the hon. gentleman is attempting to do. I am satisfied that if this country, from one end to the other, thoroughly realised the true position in which the hon. gentleman is placing the electorate of the country—I am positive that if the great electoral body thoroughly realised that the hon. gentleman is, by this Bill, by the appointments which he will undoubtedly make under its provisions, taking into his own hands, without check or restraint, without giving the power of redress, the control of the elections, the great electorate would rise in their indignation against the hon. gentleman and repudiate with one voice the idea of giving to any Government such absolute power. The hon. gentleman makes this revising barrister a permanent officer; he allows no appeal from his decision; he leaves open no way of rectifying the wrong and the injustice which he may commit, and yet we are asked to sanction this at the close of Parliement, without being given a full opportunity of discussing the Bill. I say this officer is wholly irresponsible, he cannot be called to account by anybody except the House of Commons. His decisions cannot be appealed from, they are final — conclusive. The hon. gentleman has graciously condescended to allow a complainant, not satisfied with the adjudication of the revising officer, to appeal from his decision on a question of law which may happen to come up in the preliminary or on the final investigation. Did the hon. gentleman ever take part in the the revision of a voters' list, on an appeal before a county judge? I do not suppose he ever did, or he would have known there is not one case out of a thousand in which the adjudication depends upon a question of law. It depends altogether on questions of fact—the question whether a man had an interest in a property; whether he was a *bonâ fide* tenant; whether he came under the farmers sons' class, or other such questions, which are purely questions of fact; and yet the hon. gentleman makes an irresponsible officer the sole judge of the whole question of fact, without an appeal being allowed from his decision to any court of this realm. He is the sole judge, the irresponsible judge — responsible to the First Minister, and to the First Minster only. I said there was an appeal on the question of law. No; there is not. The only appeal on a question of law is where the revising barrister sees fit to allow an appeal. He can allow an appeal if, in the wisdom and judgment of this partisan of this Government sees fit, to allow an appeal. Does anyone believe that this partisan officer of the Government will ever allow an appeal? No. I say that in not one case in a thousand will an appeal be allowed. There is no appeal, and there is no way of getting rid of the adjudication that this irresponsible officer may give. After looking over this Bill, after considering it cafully, after rewading through its numerous provisions, after carefully considering the principles involved in the Bill, after reading it line by line, and paragraph by paragraph, and section by section, I arose from its perusal with a firm conviction in my mind that no honest Government would ever ask a free Parliament in this country to sanction such a Bill. I am satisfied that if the hon. gentleman had invoked the powers below, if he had invoked his Satanic Majesty to prepare a Bill that would enable the hon. gentlemen to remain in place and power for years to come, he could not have succeeded more effectually than he has by this Bill. There never was a more barefaced attempt, there never was a more outrageous and scandalous attempt submitted to Parliament by any Government in any country on the face of God's earth; there never was a more barefaced attempt to take from the people of this country their right to elect their own representatives freely and of their own choice; there never was a more barefaced attempt to deprive the electors of this country of the rights they ought to have as freemen of this country, than the Bill the hon. gentleman has submitted to Parliament, and we are asked to sanction it on the spur of the moment and on the eve of the close of the Session. It looks to me as if hon. gentlemen on the other side were lost to all sense of propriety and to all sense of shame. Not satisfied with the scandalous, outrageous and infamous Gerrymander Bill, they bring this Bill down and ask their followers to put it through Parliament, on the assumption that the motion of my hon. friend is a vote of want of confidence. I wonder if this Parliament will sanction this Bill. I wonder if the hon. gentleman's followers in this Parliament will sanction this Bill. We shall know what we shall know when we have the vote on this Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. CAMERON. I am fain to come to the conclusion that the hon. gentleman who says "yes" will vote for anything submitted by the Government of this country. For ourselves, we stand in this Parliament few in numbers, numerically weak; we have very little power here; but, with all the power we have in this Parliament we shall, to the very end, protest against the provisions and against the principles of this Bill; and we can only hope that, when the time comes, as come it must, when the hon. gentleman must render up to this Parliament and to this country an account of his stewardship, he will not find the people of this country servile enough to support him in the conduct he is pursuing in this House to-day by now forcing this Bill through Parliament.

Mr. WRIGHT. The hon. member (Mr. Cameron, Huron) says that this Bill is destitute of principles. On the contrary, I think that it is bristling with principles. It appears to me that this Franchise Bill, introduced by the right hon. leader of the Government, should meet with the approval of all sorts and conditions of men, for it appeals to the principles, peculiarities, and I might almost say the passions and prejudices of all classes in the community. It proves conclusively the profound study the right hon. leader has given to all questions of representation of franchise and suffrage, and that he is still distinguished by the same singular statecraft and political prescience which characterised him in the days of yore. It is also quite clear that age has not changed nor custom staled his infinite variety. I have said that this Bill appeals to the principles and peculiarities of every class in the community, and I shall endeavor to prove the truth of my statement. It appeals to those who, in the popular parlance of the day, are termed the plutocrats, that is to the men who have property and money,

because it gives them a franchise based upon property; it appeals to the proletarians, that is to the men who have no property or money, because it gives them a franchise which points in the direction of manhood or universal suffrage; it appeals to the humanitarians, because it gives the franchise to women, a class to which it has previously been denied. We have been told on high authority that the object of all government is the protection of property and person. Hence arise all duties and all rights. But it must be admitted that those duties and rights are of somewhat a diverse character. My friend on my right (Mr. Charlton), who is versed in Hebrew literature, will remember that Laban, who possessed innumerable flocks and herds, occupied a different position from Jacob, who possessed neither. Laban would have much more interest in the foreign policy of the East, in the movement of the Midianites, in the incursions of the nomadic tribes along his borders, and in the preservation of the watch towers which overlooked the vast plains on which his flocks and herds found pasturage. Jacob, who had only his own skin to defend, would have no interest in the matter; but so far as their personal rights and interests were concerned, both men would occupy the same position and stand on the same platform. History tells us that for long centuries the descendants of Laban have been masters of the situation, and virtually controlled the destinies of the world. But on a portion of this continent, at least, the whirligig of time has brought its revenges, and owing to the system of universal suffrage which has prevailed in the United States, the power has been transferred from the hands of the few to the hands of the many, from the descendants of Laban to the descendants of Jacob. We may be told that in some of the large cities of the United States this system has not worked as well as could be desired, and that at times the proletarians have been somewhat disposed to rough it on the plutocrats. However this may be, one thing is certain, that taking the Union as a whole, the system has worked as well as any perhaps that could be devised. At any rate, we have paid it the compliment of copying it to some extent, following therein the example of the great Province of Ontario, which has conferred the franchise on the sons of farmers, a class which have neither property nor money. Now, I think that is a step in the right direction, and I am quite willing to grant the sons of farmers every right and privilege they could reasonably ask. But why make them a privileged class? Why deny the same privileges to the sons of professional men, laborer and artisan as well. In one of the Provinces of the Dominion, more distinguished for the eloquence and ability of its representatives and for the intelligence and industry of its people than for the extent of its territory, in the Province of Prince Edward Island the system of manhood suffrage has been tried and has been found to work reasonably well. At any rate, I should say that, judging from the class of gentlemen it sends to this House, it works as well as that which prevails in other portions of the Dominion. Then, with regard to woman suffrage, I think this, too, is a step in the right direction; but why give the franchise to the few and deny it to the many? Why maintain the old mediæval myth of coverture. I have a profound respect for those ladies, who, from motives of delicacy, nervousness, or any other cause, decide on isolating themselves from their kind and leading a life of single blessedness. I think that from their point of view many arguments may be urged in favor of the course which they adopt; certainly they save themselves a great deal of trouble by so doing. I have also a great sympathy for those ladies who have been deprived of their husbands by death, divorce, or other causes. I would give to both these classes every right and privilege which they could reasonably claim. But I have a still greater respect for the woman who, in addition to performing her fair share of the work in the community, gives soldiers and sailors to the Queen and farmers and settlers to the country. While I would not discourage the sedentary, I would encourage the active force of the ladies of the community. The hon. Minister of Agriculture, with that practical ability, that knowledge of climatic influences which so eminently distingnishes him, sends his emissaries specially to the northern portions of the continent of Europe, for the purpose of inducing the surplus population of that portion of the old world to fill up the waste places of the new. I think his policy in so doing is a wise one. He sends to Iceland for Icelanders, he sends to Russia for Mennonites, he lays the Scandinavian kingdoms under contribution, he sends to Norway for Norwegians, to Denmark for Danes, and to Sweden for Swedes; but why not encourage native industry? Surely this is a question of vital statistics worthy of the practical ability which pervades the Department so worthily presided over by the hon. gentleman—a branch of the National Policy worthy the consideration of this House and country. In making these statements I do not wish to be understood as alluding to the inhabitants of any portion of the British Isles, who are bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh, but to inhabitants of foreign countries. While I would welcome foreigners with open arms, who come to help us build up our new nationality, I would give a still warmer welcome to native Canadians, I think

> "In native swords and native ranks
> The only hope of freedom dwells."

This question of woman suffrage is now exciting much attention in the world. A few years ago it was looked upon as being without the range of practical politics; now it is engaging the attention of some of the most eminent statesmen who control the direction of affairs. The recent debate and division in the English House of Commons proves the strides it has taken in advance. And, indeed, one cannot see how, in any country where the democratic idea prevails; where the principle is recognised that the object of all government is the greatest good for the greatest number; where it is understood that every human being has a right to the enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness - one cannot understand how, in any country like this, rights, privileges and franchise should be conferred on one-half of the human race and be denied to the other half. The existing condition of things appears to be a survival of the old barbaric *régime* of the rule of the strongest. Mr. Herbert Spencer tells us that in the youth of the world the Sabine marriages were the rule and not the exception. The warrior wooed his dusky bride by force, and the man who adopted milder methods was looked on as weak and effeminate. It was, literally, the rule of the strongest—

> "The good old rule, the simple plan—
> That they might take who have the power—
> And they may keep who can."

Notwithstanding the existence of this state of things, there has always been a protest against its injustice. Nearly every great writer, from Plato down to John Stuart Mill, has advocated the absolute equality of the sexes. In the abstract, the principle has been accepted, in the concrete it has been denied. The theory has been just, but the practice unjust. Mr. Mill says "the world is yet young." We have lived to see many changes and amelioriations take place. We have lived to see slavery abolished, and Catholic emancipation granted in our own highly favored land; liberty of the press conceded, and liberty of conscience accorded. Let us trust that at no distant period we shall live to see this great injustice removed, this "great wrong righted." A few years ago an interview took place at Hughenden between two of the foremost Conservative statesmen of the world. One wonders if this clause in the Franchise Bill, referring to woman suffrage, might not be traced back to that famous meeting. They must have had much to say to each other.

The one might have said that his career had been an extraordinary one. Commencing at the lowest rung of the political ladder, step by step he had mounted to its topmost height. Belonging to a despised race, which had been denied graves among the Christians of Europe, he had succeeded, by a combination of Oriental suppleness and Occidental audacity in placing himself at the head of the mightiest nation and the proudest aristocracy that ever the sun shone on. He found a people singularly brave, marvellously intelligent in all material matters, prone to perfect in all industrial pursuits; but, so far as the political matters were concerned, singularly stupid and stolid. His mission had been to train and educate these people and get them out of the ruts and grooves of centuries. After the fashion of his race, he had spoken to them in parables. He had put forth a series of works, purporting to be those of light literature, but in reality pregnant with the most profound political truths. In this way he had succeeded in educating his party and the people, in restoring the fallen prestige of the empire, and, what was of almost equal importance, placing himself at the head of direction of affairs. But popular favor was notoriously inconstant. He had soon been relegated to his original position of numerical inferiority, but still proudly preserving his intellectual superiority. But he feared that great evils were about to overtake the human race. He saw in the political heavens a little cloud, no bigger than a man's hand, which might soon assume colossal proportions and sweep away all existing institutions. Europe was honeycombed with conspiracies. It was like a pleasant vineyard on the slope of Vesuvius, rich with a wealth of greenery, but underneath ran the hot lava of revolutionary excitement, ready at any moment to burst forth and destroy everything in its course. The conspiracies of the Carbonari, of the Internationalists, the Invincibles, of the Socialists, the Communists, and the thousand and one ramifications of European discontent were to be dreaded; but not so much as the conspiracy of the Mary Ann's—the revolt of the women against the men. From the beginning women had been—treated with the greatest injustice. Her mission had been to perpetuate the races—to lick the cubs into shape—train and educate the masses of the world. Her reward has been to be relegated to a position of political and social inferiority and to be treated with contumely and contempt. The man who rights this wrong remedies this defect and restores this equilibrium, would solve the problem of the century. He knew, by signs not to be mistaken, that soon the silver cord would be loosed and the golden bowl would be broken, and he would transfer to his right hon. friend that immortality which was denied to himself. I trust that, with modification in committee and in the House, the Bill will be more acceptable to the great body of the Canadian people.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not intend to occupy the time of the House more than a few minutes, to express my opinions on this Franchise Bill. I occasionally give the right hon. the Premier of this country a little advice from my place in Parliament, and it is very seldom, I am sorry to say, it is taken; but he will remember that some seventeen years ago, when I had the honor of being one of his colleagues, when the question of the franchise came up, I expressed my opinions very freely of what I thought it was right for the Dominion Government to do, in the way of submitting to Parliament a scheme with respect to the franchise and the election of members of Parliament. I then stated, and I never have seen reason to change my opinion, that the duty of the Parliament of Canada was to adopt a franchise for itself. It is not reasonable that this Parliament, the paramount power in this country, should be subject to the ideas and views, the prejudices and political exigencies, of the different Provinces; that the Provinces should have power to dictate to this Parliament, and say what should be the qualifications of the men who send members to Parliament, and also the qualification of those who are elected members of this important assemblage. I then thought, as I think to-day, that Parliament should itself define what the franchise should be. I will not elaborate that point, for I do not propose to make a speech on the subject. I will support the general principles of this Franchise Bill. With respect to its details, I differ somewhat with the mover of the Bill. I think some of them are unworkable, and cannot be carried out. All that portion of the Bill referring to rentals, and everything of that kind, requiring receipts and enquiries as to whether people have paid rent, is practically unworkable, and it will have to be changed. With respect to the woman franchise, that is a more difficult matter. I have found it pretty hard work to manage a woman anyway, and one of the difficulties of our lives is to know how to manage our wives. Some fellows who have not wives find it more difficult still to know how to manage those who are not their wives. I have listened with great satisfaction to the very classical and eloquent speech, perhaps one of the most interesting speeches I ever heard in this House, from an earnest follower of my own, the member for the county of Ottawa—at least he has often personally declared that he was a follower, but publicly, I notice he always votes with the Government. In that respect, however, his position is very much like my own, for while I may criticise the Government pretty freely, they generally get my vote, not that they always deserve it, but, as the lesser of two evils, I generally give them my vote in preference to hon. gentlemen opposite. But I will say this, that whatever doubt I may have had as to the desirability of extending the franchise to women, I am rather inclined, while taking the subject under consideration, to coincide with the remarks of my hon. friend the member for Ottawa county (Mr. Wright). I have nothing more to say on that point, for I am one of the silent members this Session, whatever I may be in future; I am trying to keep as quiet as I can, if let alone—if I am not let alone, the hon. gentleman who stirs me up must take the consequences. There is one remark, however, I must make. I must give the right hon. gentleman, who is looking at me so severely, a little bit of advice. It is seldom I have heard more truth stated in the same time than I heard from the hon. gentleman who opened the debate in reply to the right hon. gentleman. That there is too much delay is perfectly true; that the business of "to-morrow" and "ere long," to which we have been treated in respect to the Grand Trunk motion, is about played out. We have had just about as much of it as we can stand. I must say, in all earnestness—and I desire the right hon. gentleman to maintain his position at the head of the affairs of the country for a long time—that it would be much more satisfactory to the country, to his followers, and last, though not least, to hon. gentlemen opposite. I am not quite sure about that; I am not quite sure they would like him to go on with more despatch—if he would bring down important measures at an earlier stage of the Session, and give us opportunity and time to consider and discuss and deal with them in the manner they deserve to be dealt with. It is not right that important measures should be brought down and passed through the House in a perfunctory manner, and that we should have to accept whatever the right hon. gentleman chooses to propose. The hon. gentleman to whom I have referred, who is absent from his seat at this moment, said truly, that the legislation of this country is simply the legislation of one man. I am looking at him, and he is a mighty clever man, too; but we would like to have something to say about the measures

ourselves. I advise him to change his hand and bring down important measures a little earlier, and give his supporters and hon. gentlemen opposite an opportunity to discuss them, and not leave his followers open to the opprobrium cast upon them by hon. gentlemen opposite, that they are bound to accept whatever Bills are placed before them, whether they are right or wrong.

Mr. FLEMING. No one on this side of the House could have said better than the hon. gentleman who has just sat down that measures for the consideration of the House, submitted by the Government, are invariably brought down at such a period of the Session as renders it impossible that fair and full discussion of those measures can take place. Here we are, on the seventy-eighth day of the Session, having proposed to us this important measure, which might have been introduced at a very early period. Last Session, in the Speech from the Throne, it was indicated that the Government would introduce such a measure as had been indicated in the Speech from the Throne for many previous Sessions; and last year we had the Bill introduced on 23rd January. At that early period of the Session last year the Bill was read the first time; and I observe there has scarcely been any change made in the Bill from that of last year. The Bill, as now submitted to the House, is, with one or two very small changes, the same as that introduced last year. Then it did not require that astuteness on the part of the First Minister, that ability for which he has just been complimented by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), to have introduced this Bill at such an early period of the Session as would have enabled us to discuss it in its details and upon its merits, without retarding in any way other important business. If hon. members will cast their eyes upon the Order paper, they will find that the important measures to be brought before Parliament this Session are still unconsidered. A Bill for the relief of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which we hear from the press is about to be sought from the Dominion Parliament, has not yet made its appearance on the Paper. The Estimates have scarcely been touched. All the important legislation of the Session is yet undone; and yet the Minister of Public Works charges upon the Opposition the obstruction of public business, although the Government withholds from the consideration of Parliament, until the very last days of the Session, all its important measures; and then, if we attempt to discuss them at any great length, or as they ought to be discussed, it is considered that we are lengthening the Session and retarding the business of the House,—that we are retarding the business of the House and that the responsibility of having a long Session of Parliament rests upon the Opposition and not upon the Government. Sir, this measure particularly might have been introduced the first week of the Session. It might, in the course of legislation, in the course of fair consideration, have been disposed of by this time, if the Government had been determined to press it on. But on this side of the House, at all events, we did not expect that it would be presented this Session at all. We believed that the hon. gentleman was following the precedent he had laid down in numerous cases before,—that he was about to follow the same course that he followed last year and the year before—to introduce the Bill, read it the first time and then let it drop. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman seems to have determined otherwise, and we are, at this late period of the Session, called upon to discuss a measure, the importance of which cannot be overestimated, a measure which takes within its grasp every elector in the whole Dominion of Canada, a measure which deals with the representation of the people in every Province of the Dominion. And this Bill is introduced because, the hon. gentleman says, it is anomalous that this Parliament should not deal with the franchise upon which representatives are sent to this House. I fail to see that it is an anomaly. The hon. gentleman says it is not consistent with the principles of the British constitution He says that the inspiration we derive from Great Britain would lead us to make such a measure as would give to this House the control over the electorate which sends representatives to this House. But in Canada we are not situated as they are in Great Britain; in Canada we have a federal constitution; in Canada we have a Dominion, composed of various Provinces, whose circumstances and interests are, in many instances, diverse and different; in Canada we have recognised in our own constitution the representation in this House by Provinces. We have, in the Province of Quebec, a limit fixed to the number of representatives which that Province shall send to this House, and the representation of the other Provinces shall be regulated according to their population by that standard, Quebec being the pivot Province. If that is the case, then the representation in this House is provincial and should be in the hands of the Provinces; the representation should be from the Provinces and not dictated from this House. Sir, we have had that principle acted upon for seventeen years; for seventeen years we have had the franchise adopted by the different Provinces, adopted also by this Parliament as the qualification necessary for voters for members of this Parliament, and we have never heard that those various franchises have worked badly. We have no representation from any of the Provinces, or from any body of the people—we have no petitions to Parliament—no voice from any part of the people of the Dominion, asking that the provincial franchise should be done away with, and a new franchise struck for representation in this House. The people have been satisfied, the interests of the country have been promoted, and hon. gentlemen cannot complain that under the provincial franchises they have met with any unfairness. They are here in a very large majority in this House, elected on the franchises adopted by the various Provinces, and just as, in 1882, it is proposed by the First Minister to go back to the electorate on a new franchise. In 1882, when the First Minister professed to appeal to the people that elected him in 1878, did he go back to the same people who elected him then? Did not he so change the constituencies of the great Province of Ontario—so change the boundaries of those constituencies—that the people to whom he appealed in 1882 were totally different from those who had supported him in 1878? To-day we find the hon. gentleman preparing for another election, and does he propose to appeal to those who supported him in 1882? Does he propose to go to Prince Edward Island and allow the electors of Prince Edward Island, that pronounced on his policy in 1882, to have the same voice in pronouncing on his policy now? Does he not intend, by the Franchise Bill he has introduced, to take away from a large number of the people of Prince Edward Island, from a large number of the people of British Columbia, and the people of Manitoba, the voice which they had in electing this Parliament in 1882? Does not he propose to restrict the franchise and take from the people the right they had under the franchise which elected this Parliament?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. FLEMING. Does the hon. gentleman propose that the same electorate of Prince Edward Island shall pronounce on his policy after the Bill is passed? By no means. A large number of those that were enfranchised under that provincial franchise will be disfranchised under the Bill before the House, and the same people will not have the opportunity of pronouncing on his policy that elected this Parliament.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Take the Province of Ontario; see how the franchise has been increased there.

Mr. FLEMING. I will deal with the Province of Ontario presently. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman proposes by this Bill to secure uniformity of franchise all over the Dominion. That is one of the reasons why the Bill has been introduced. But will the adoption of this Bill secure uniformity all over the Dominion? Is not the condition of the people in the different Provinces in many respects so entirely different that uniformity cannot be secured by any legislation such as this is? Has not the hon. gentleman shown that this is the case? Has not the hon. gentleman introduced into this Bill a section which declares that the fishermen owning fishing vessel or tackle may make that property the necessary property qualification? Because a large number of the people in some of the Provinces are engaged in the fishing trade, and would be disfranchised unless some exceptional franchise is given to them, and this is the way in which the hon. gentleman seeks to obtain uniformity of franchise. The industrial classes engaged in the fisheries are to have the amount of their fishing tackle and boats credited to them as a property qualification, while the industrial classes engaged in mining or other pursuits are to be excluded from the franchise altogether. The same class of people engaged in other occupations are not to enjoy the same privileges which the fishermen are given under this franchise, and therefore the hon. gentleman is not getting uniformity of franchise. He is not getting such a uniformity as will give all classes of the community in all the Provinces fair representation in this House. But there are other reasons why this Bill should not be passed. By it the hon. gentleman takes to himself the power of appointing over 200 revising officers who, at $500 apiece, represent an expenditure of $100,000. Then the revising officer has the power of appointing a bailiff and a clerk in addition, the expense attending which appointments will figure up to another $100,000. So that the total expense of carrying out the machinery indicated in the Bill cannot be less than a quarter of a million dollars.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FLEMING. The hon. gentleman laughs, but he knows that the class of officers he is going to appoint under this Bill will not be satisfied with any paltry remuneration. He knows that those who are looking for appointments under this Bill are looking for them because they are going to have respectable emoluments attached to them. Now, the expense and annoyance to the people from having separate machinery for making the electoral lists for this House will be so great that they will feel irksome under the machinery of Government. The local authorities have the machinery already provided for making up the voters' lists. In the electoral districts throughout the whole Dominion the machinery is at hand, without additional expense, or if the expense is in any way additional, it is only a small sum in addition, to enable them to perfect the lists themselves, as they do now—by officers who are directly amenable to the people, who are directly affected by their acts. The municipal officers in the various Provinces are directly amenable to the people by whom they are appointed. The assessors are appointed by those elected by the people of the municipalities. The whole machinery of making the electoral lists is in the hands of the people; and by this Bill the hon. gentleman proposes to take that power out of the hands of the people and to transfer it to nominees of the Government. Sir, a more direct attack upon the rights and liberties of the people has never been attempted, even by the hon. gentleman, in any of his legislation hitherto. Then, there will be confusion arising from two lists. The electorate will have to learn the two lists of voters; mistakes will be made; the difficulty of distinguishing between the one franchise and the other will be so great as to lead to confusion and mistakes, and many of those who ought to be entitled to vote will, in consequence, lose their votes. Then, this Bill is bad, because the franchise it provides is not as liberal as the franchises in most of the Provinces of this Dominion. The Province of Prince Edward Island, the Province of British Columbia, the Province of Manitoba, and now the Province of Ontario, have franchises which are more liberal than that provided by this Bill. Whereas, by this Bill, the qualification of a voter is $300 in cities and towns, in the Province of Ontario it is $200. The qualification in rural parts, by this Bill, is $150; by the Ontario Act it is $100. The income franchise in this Bill is $400; in the Ontario Act it is $300, and that income may be in cash or in kind. Where a laborer is engaged by the year, and receives, in addition to his yearly wage, his board, making up the amount of $300, that amount, by the Ontario Act, entitles him to a vote. There is no such liberal provision in this Bill. Then, by the Ontario Act, the sons of all the owners of the necessary property to qualify them are entitled to vote; the sons of tenants are entitled to vote; the sons of occupants are entitled to vote; sons-in-law living with the father-in-law, and grandsons living with the grandfather, who is a tenant or occupant, are entitled to vote. In all these respects the Ontario Act is much more liberal than this Bill. In Manitoba the present franchise is based on a property qualification in real estate of $100, and this Bill provides for a $300 qualification in cities and $150 in counties. So that by this Bill the franchise is restricted within limits which do not obtain in most of the Provinces of the Dominion. Now, the hon. gentleman professes to be exceedingly liberal in his franchise. He professes to desire that there should be another addition made to the voters for members of this House, and in his Bill he has provided that widows and unmarried ladies having the necessary qualifications prescribed for other voters shall also be entitled to vote. The hon. gentleman, if I understood him, this afternoon when he moved the second reading of the Bill, stated that he did not propose to press that portion of the Bill. I understood him to say that he would leave it an open question for the House to adopt that provision or not. I differ from my hon. friend, the member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron), as to the electoral franchise for women. I am satisfied that the day is coming when the women of this country will not only be entitled to the franchise, but will exercise it, and when that day comes, I can tell the hon. gentleman that they will exercise the franchise well. There s no doubt that if the hon. gentleman passes the Bill with that provision in it, he will introduce into the electorate of this country an element purer and less susceptible to those influences that are resorted to in election contests than any other class of the community; and if the hon. gentleman will give me an opportunity of voting upon that portion of the Bill, I will support that provision. I would support it much more readily if it extended the franchise to all the women possessed of the property qualification, no matter whether married or not. Now, we are asked, at this period of the Session, to examine and discuss a Bill, the nature of which I venture to say has never been introduced into any free Parliament before. The hon. gentleman says that we take our inspiration from Great Britain. The hon. gentleman is fond of saying that he takes his inspiration from Great Britain at the very time he is going to do something diametrically opposed to the principles of legislation in Great Britain, and in this Bill, which he professes to take from Great Britain, he has introduced a fatal principle that cannot be found in the legislation of Great Britain, or that of any other free country. The revising officers whom, by this Bill, he takes the power to appoint, are officers the like of which do not exist in England at all. The revising officers in England are not appointed by the Government of the day. They are appointed by the judges of the land,

and are not open to the charge of partisanship in any way. The hon. gentleman, I venture to say, will not entrust the judges of this land with the appointment of these revising officers. If he does so, one of the chief objections to the Bill will be removed. But the hon. gentleman has introduced his Bill for the purpose of securing to the Government the appointment of these revising officers, and we know who will be appointed. In every county we could name the appointee before the Bill is passed. I could name, in nearly every county of the Province from which I come, those who will be appointed revising officers.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish you would tell me who will be the man in my county; I would like to know.

Mr. SPROULE. Who will be appointed for Grey?

Mr. FLEMING. The hon. gentleman from Grey (Mr. Sproule) knows who will be appointed for his county, because he will have the nomination in his own hands. Now, we are to have the revising officers appointed by the Government on the recommendation of hon. members supporting the Government in this House. I will venture to say that they will recommend, and that the Government will appoint on their recommendation, the revising officers for the purpose of making the voters' list in the interest of those who nominated them. What powers are given under this Bill to the gentlemen who are thus to be appointed? They have absolute power to make up the electoral lists. They are directed by the Bill to obtain the assessment rolls, to obtain the voters' list in the various counties, to obtain such other information as they can obtain and from such sources as they may choose, and from the information thus obtained make up, of their own motion, the preliminary lists. These preliminary lists are, after certain notices, to be revised, but the machinery for their revision is of the most cumbersome and expensive kind. There is no possibility of any one who knows anything at all about the purifying of the electoral lists going into the revision of those rolls without incurring very great expense indeed. Every witness has to be subpœnaed; in the challenging of every vote there is to be a separate subpœna issued by the barrister; the expense of bringing the witness is on the scale of the Superior Court—the tariff of the Superior Court; the cost, annoyance and trouble, to hon. gentlemen whose sympathies are different from those of the revising officers, will be so burdensome that gentlemen without large fortunes will not be in a position to offer themselves as candidates for Parliament at all, or exercise that supervision over the rolls that will enable them to have any show in an election contest. Not only that; this Bill provides that after the lists are all made out there is to be no appeal. Questions of facts are to be under the absolute control of the revising officer; no matter what may be the question of qualification—a man may come up with any qualification that may be deemed good—it is in the absolute control of any revising officer to declare if that qualification shall entitle him to appear on the roll or not; and no matter what injustice may be committed by the revising officer against any elector, there is no court to which he can appeal. It is true there is a little appeal on questions of law, but even where that appeal is allowed, the question itself is to be settled by this revising officer, who will declare such question as he thinks proper to be subject to revision by the court of appeal. Not only that, but after the roll has been finally revised and made up, what do we find by this Bill, in section 55?

"And to change the names of others, where the same are incorrectly entered on any list, and generally to correct such lists so far as any information in his possession will enable him to do, in order to carry out the intention of this Act."

What does that mysterious provision mean? It means that this revising officer, nominated and appointed for the purpose I have indicated, by the authority I have spoken of, shall have the power, of his own motion, without complaint or appeal being allowed, to alter and change this list according to the information which he possesses. The whole electorate is in the hands of the revising officer; the making out of the roll is in his hands; the completion of the roll is in his hands; and after the roll is completed he may change it as he chooses, without the possibility of its being corrected by any power whatever. After the list is finally revised, the revising officer has the power, under this Bill, to eliminate from it the name of anyone he may think proper to eliminate, and add the names of those he may think proper to add, without giving notice to any body, and without anybody having the power to appeal from his decision—and this is for the purpose of getting over the anomaly of this Parliament being without a separate franchise of its own! These are only some of the principal objections that exist against this Bill. There is in every clause of it good ground for objection; its machinery is most cumbrous; its definitions are most involved; its whole provisions are so uncertain that if it ever gets into committee it will require very many nights and very many days' consideration of the Committee of the Whole, before it will be reduced to such a reasonable form as will do credit to this Parliament. If we are to have a uniform franchise at all, let it be a uniform franchise. If we are to have a separate franchise for this Parliament, let it be a separate franchise; let it be a uniform franchise all over the Dominion; let it be that every British subject of twenty-one years of age resident in the country, registered according to any law that may be adopted for that purpose, shall have a right to vote for members of this Parliament. There is no greater anomaly presented than the hon. gentleman's Bill presents. If taxation is to be the measure of representation, if representation is to follow taxation, then every British subject attaining the age of twenty-one years is subject to the taxation of this Parliament, and the hon. the Finance Minister takes care that he shall be subject to it pretty heavily too. If there is to be a franchise, that is one that could be adopted without difficulty. It would be uniform all over the Dominion; it would be such as would commend itself to those Provinces that have already adopted manhood suffrage, such as British Columbia and Prince Edward Island. It would, I am satisfied, commend itself to the friends of the hon. gentleman in Ontario, who, at the last Session of the Legislature of Ontario, proposed that that should be the franchise for the Province; and it would remove one of the great objections which exist to this Bill—this system of revision, and the powers given to the revising officer under its provisions. The hon. gentleman's Bill strikes at a very large class of the community indeed. There are serving to-day under arms, in defence of the peace and security of the people of this country, a large number of the young men of this country, from colleges, from offices, from stores, from workshops in one Province and in another. These men are not entitled, very many of them, by the hon. gentleman's measure, to a voice in the affairs of this country. They are liable to bear arms—and they bear arms with an alacrity and an enthusiasm which does credit to the loyalty of the people of this country—but these men are not to be enfranchised by the hon. gentleman's Bill. Many of them will be disfranchised; those who would be entitled, under the lower provincial qualifications, to votes, are to have those votes taken away. Those men who are able to bear arms in the defence of the country, those men who are able to undergo the hardships incident to a campaign in the North-West, at this season of the year, those men who are anxious to serve their country in their country's need, are, some of them, because they have not the qualification necessary under this Bill, to be deprived of the franchise which they have under the lower qualification in the separate Provinces. And this is the way in which the hon. gentleman is about to reward those who are so ready to defend the country's honor at the time of the

country's need. If there were no other reason than that—in these last days, has arisen this trouble in the North-West, that has called so many of our citizen soldiers to the front, so many of the young men from the country from their avocations, and their offices, and their colleges, and their schools, to go to the front in defence of the country—if there were no other reason why this Bill should be postponed, that is a sufficient reason for postponing it until it is remodelled, so that those who have served their country should have afforded to them an opportunity of pronouncing on the laws which are to govern the country. The hon. the Minister of Militia should be subject, to some extent, to those who are fighting the battle of the country, he should be subject to the voice of those who are so ready to take up arms when the time of peace comes about and the battle at the polls is taking place; these gentlemen that are now bearing arms in defence of the country should have an opportunity of voting either confidence or non-confidence in the Administration that has called them forth and, I fear, has been guilty of all the causes that have made it necessary to call them forth.

Mr. WELDON. I do not intend to enter into the question of the objectionable features of this Bill, but I must enter my protest, in common with the members of this side, against being hurried into the consideration of this Bill at this period of the Session. This is a very important Bill, especially with regard to the Province to which I belong. It is so important, because it makes a very essential difference both with regard to the qualification of the voters and the mode in which the revision should take place. It has been put forward that the Opposition are trying to obstruct the business of the country. We repudiate that charge. The hon. the Minister of Public Works charges that, because the Contagious Diseases Bill and the Civil List Bill have been the subjects of much discussion in this House, we were open to that charge; and the reason put forward with regard to the Civil List Bill was, that it was an old Act, the principles of which had been discussed before. If that was so, why was it not introduced at an earlier period of the Session? So, with regard to the Bill respecting contagious diseases of animals, we find not only that the discussion was an important discussion, but that certain changes are made by the Minister of Agriculture during that discussion. It is the duty of every representative in this House to give every Bill the consideration which he is able to give it. Where he has objections, it is his duty to his constituents and to the country to put forward those objections; and, if the Administration choose to leave it to the last moment, it is for the purpose of putting down that discussion and to prevent its being fairly discussed before the people. The Minister of Public Works said the principles of this Bill had been before this House before. I was in the House in 1883, when the Bill was introduced, and if my memory serves me aright, all the Minister stated then was as to the introduction of the principle of woman suffrage. Beyond that, no exposition was given of the principles upon which that Bill was put forward; and, in 1884, the hon. Minister simply brought it forward in the same manner as he did on the 18th March last, stating merely that it was on the same lines as the Bill of last year. So far as regards the people of the Lower Provinces, surely we have a right to have some opportunity for the people and the press to discuss this Bill before it is rushed through this Parliament. On the 18th March the hon. the Prime Minister brought forward the Bill, merely stating that it was on somewhat similar lines to previous Bills. No explanation was given in regard to it. That Bill was not distributed until after the Easter recess, and we have had no opportunity of communicating with them in regard to it, in regard to a Bill which so materially alters not only the franchise in Prince Edward Island, but also in the other Provinces. Speaking for New Brunswick, where it alters entirely the principles upon which we have based our suffrage and carried on the revision hitherto, I think, Mr. Speaker, that at this time it is more inopportune, because this is a subject upon which public opinion should be represented through the press of the country. At the present day not only are the people excited over the troubles in the North-West, but we know not the day or the hour when the news may be flashed across the Atlantic that war has been proclaimed between Russia and England, which would only increase the excitement tenfold. With these great questions now before the country, to call upon us to consider and pass a measure of this kind at this time of the Session is unfair to the people and unfair to the House. There have been no public expressions of opinion upon it; not a single petition in favor of it has been laid before the House. We find upon the Orders of the Day many important Bills. A Bill has come down from the Senate, in regard to the transfer of property in the North-West, and which introduces a mode of registration which is very important, and will be for years to come the law with regard to the transmission of property in that country, a law containing many sections which will require the earnest consideration of the House. Then there is the Insolvency Bill, which I contend is one of the most important measures before this House. The question is not as to whether the Bill should be passed or not, but it is to ascertain the feeling of the House upon that subject. The country is anxious that some provision should be made as to the distribution of the assets of insolvent debtors. It is not only a law which our boards of trade are asking for, not only are our merchants coming in deputations to the Government about it, but even the merchants of England are asking for some such measure as has been stated by the right hon. Premier, who met them during his late visit to England. That Bill, as reported by the committee, will require a great deal of consideration. It is a Bill with a great many sections, involving a great many points, upon which there may be a great difference of opinion; and if the House should adopt the principle of the Bill, it will take considerable time to discuss the details. There is another important matter, the consolidation of the statutes; and I must say that upon the gentlemen composing that committee a very important and responsible duty devolves, and if they are to complete their duties and to lay the consolidated statutes before this House for discussion, they must necessarily—and I can speak upon that subject, being a member of that committee—occupy a large portion of the time of the House in committee. We have thus these two important matters, the insolvency question and the consolidation of the statutes, which have been urged upon the Government as important measures. I consider they are both of paramount importance to this one, particularly as regards their immediate necessity. There has been no petition laid upon the Table of the House asking for this Franchise Bill. There has been no public agitation in favor of it. It has not been discussed in the press—not even the Government press have called upon them to make this change. For seventeen years we have found it working well, and I believe that the power of regulating the franchise is rightly vested in the Provinces represented by the Local Legislatures. This subject should be under their control, where it would be more consistent with the spirit of our institutions than if it were put in the hands of this Parliament. I think that my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), when he spoke of this Parliament being paramount——

Mr. MITCHELL. I never said that this Parliament was paramount, in so far as local matters are concerned; but I said that with regard to our own franchise, and our own representation, this Parliament is paramount.

Mr. WELDON. I understood my hon. friend to say that this Parliament was paramount, and had authority to deal with the whole subject of the franchise.

Mr. MITCHELL. I said that with regard to local matters, of course the Local Legislature has a right to deal as they like; but with regard to members who sit in this Parliament, and their qualifications, this Parliament alone had the right to deal with them.

Mr. WELDON. That is a subject which I will discuss with my hon. friend when we come to consider the Bill in committee. I believe that the people, in their Local Legislatures, are the parties who have a right to regulate the franchise, and that this is one of their civil rights, which may fairly be said to be under the control of the Local Legislature. But that is a question which touches the merits of the Bill; at present I do not desire to call the attention of the House to what I consider the objectionable features of this Bill; but I contend that, at this late period of the Session, considering the time that has already been wasted in bringing down their measures, it is unfair and unjust to attempt to hurry this important Bill through Parliament at this time, which can only have the effect of preventing a fair and just discussion of the subject. The question is admitted by the right hon. gentleman himself, and every member who has spoken on it, to be one of the greatest importance, as it is one which affects the right of the people of the Provinces, and of the individuals within the Provinces, to exercise the franchise.

Mr. LISTER. I do not intend this evening to enter into the details of the Bill now before the House. I feel that the measure we are now considering is one of surpassing importance, and of the deepest interest to the people of this country; and, as I have said, no language is adequate properly to condemn the First Minister for introducing this Bill at this late stage of the Session. We have been here nearly three months to-day, and for six or seven weeks of that time there has been absolutely nothing done in this House; because, at the opening of the Session, the Ministers had no measures prepared. Day after day we sat here ten, fifteen or twenty minutes and perhaps one hour, and now, at this late stage, almost at the last hours of the Session, the First Minister brings in the most important measure presented to the House during this Session, and he tells hon. members that it must be pushed through. The Minister of Public Works has told us that this measure has been before the country. It is true. But the country did not believe the statement of the First Minister, when he said he intended to make it law. Session after Session it was announced in the Speech from the Throne that the Government intended to introduce a Franchise Bill; but the promise was made so often that members and the country did not believe it. This is the first time the First Minister has attempted to make a move in the direction of having a Franchise Bill become law. This Bill before the House is a fit companion to that most infamous piece of legislation, the Gerrymander Act. They ought to go together—they will always go together, and they will be associated with the name of the First Minister. In 1882 the First Minister was afraid to go to the country, and in order to secure the election of himself and his friends he found it to be necessary to disfranchise and take away the seats of a large number of members on this side of the House. His mismanagement, if not corruption in the North-West and throughout the country, makes him feel that his hold on power is somewhat insecure, and in order to make it safe, as he thinks, the hon. gentleman introduces a Bill giving to his own tools the power to say whether men shall have votes or not. I say infamous as the Gerrymander Act was, this is infinitely more so. He proposes to take away from the people the preparation of their own lists, the right to appeal to the county judge, and he proposes to place the preparation of the lists in the hands of some creatures appointed by himself. This Bill will take away absolutely the right of the people to prepare their own voters' lists, and it will place in the hands, perhaps, of some irresponsible man the right to say who shall have votes and who shall not. Are we, members of this House, prepared to sanction such a measure, even if by chance it may be the means of keeping hon. gentlemen in power for a short time. In every Province of the Dominion the people have had the right to say who shall be voters. The people of the Provinces have had the right to prepare the voters' lists. This Government, centralising, as its policy is in everything, proposes to take away from the people the right to prepare their own lists, and proposes to give that power to men appointed by the Dominion Government. The country is eaten up by office holders. From the Atlantic to the Pacific the country has become a nest of office-holders, and it is proposed by this infamous measure to add 600 to the number, and thus increase enormously the expenses of this overburdened people. We have the fact that this country is not able to stand the burden. Thoughtful men must look to the future, and every person who gives the matter, as it now stands, a moment's consideration, must feel very grave doubts as to the future of this Dominion. Bad management, if not corruption, has created a rebellion in the North-West, and the people in the rest of the Dominion will not permit you (the Government) to go beyond a certain length. You are arousing feelings of resentment from one end of the country to the other, and it is impossible to say, when you once start this feeling, where it is going to end. Will the people tamely submit to have rights which they have exercised for years taken away from them and controlled by some creature appointed by the Government? I mistake greatly their independence and their power if they do not seek revenge at the earliest opportunity. This is the position: You are taking away from the people rights which they have hitherto enjoyed, and are placing the power in the hands of one man, and the decision of that man is to be absolute and without appeal. I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to point to any country having responsible institutions which has upon its Statute Book an Act equal in enormity to the one which the First Minister is now trying to rush through this House. The hon. gentleman asks Parliament to pass this measure. In its dying moments he comes down to the House with an important measure, and asks Parliament to pass it. He seeks to push it through this House, before the press of the country have had an opportunity of discussing it, before the people have had an opportunity of considering its provisions. It is to become law before the people know that their rights are to be swept away. I can tell hon. gentlemen opposite that, so far as members of this side are concerned, they will resent this attempt; they will not hesitate to discharge the duty they owe to the country, and that duty is to keep the preparation of these lists where it is now. Why should the hon. gentleman seek to take it away? Why should he seek to appoint men to prepare voters' lists, when to-day they are prepared throughout the length and breadth of the country without any cost to the Dominion Treasury? And why should he seek to pass a law respecting the franchise, which is less favorable than that which exists in Ontario and several of the other Provinces to-day? As the hon. gentleman who preceded me a few moments ago said, almost every section of this Bill is objectionable. The very man who prepares the voters' lists may be a candidate himself at the next election; and yet hon. gentlemen opposite will say that is a proper provision. Such a right was never taken by the Government of great Britain. The hon. gentleman always claims to be inspired by what takes place in England, and whatever legislation takes place there he seems to think it should be adopted here. I do not go that length, while I admit

that many measures are passed in England which are beneficial to the people; but there is no Minister or politician in England who would dream for a moment of taking the powers which the First Minister seeks to take here. It was never proposed that the Government of the day should have the right of appointing revising barristers. That would be repugnant to the feelings of the right-thinking of the older country, and such a proposition was never thought of; but it remains for the Dominion of Canada to say that the men who shall prepare those lists shall be men appointed by the Government themselves. Can that be justified? Can it be said, respecting the persons appointed to revise those lists, partisans appointed by the Government — because the appointments will be made on the recommendations of members supporting the Government—that it is a safe thing to place that power in the hands of partisans? Would it not be better and more honorable, and more in the direction of conserving the rights, if the appointments were made, as in England, by the judges of the Superior Courts? Should we not, in that case, feel that the persons would be appointed by men we could trust, no matter what their political predilections might be. We have the judges of the land, appointed for their ability to serve in the position to which they are appointed. The people of this country are glad to know, at all events, that the moment a judge is appointed to the bench he ceases to be a politician. I am happy to say that the people of the country, from one end of the Dominion to the other, have confidence in the judgment and honesty of those judges, that they believe they shake off their political feelings when they take places on the bench, and that they discharge their duties without political partiality or unfairness. I ask the First Minister and hon. gentlemen opposite, would it not be fairer and better, in every sense of the word, would it not conduce to the satisfaction of the people, to know that these persons are appointed by the judiciary and not by the Government of the day. We know that only gentlemen supporting the Government of the day will be appointed to those positions, and whether those gentlemen are fair-minded or not, I say there will be a feeling, there will be a possibility of their not being fair, and at all events those who are opposed to them may feel that entire and exact justice has not been done them. I ask the hon. gentleman if it would not better, under these circumstances, and more satisfactory to the people—if he is going to take the right from the people of preparing their own lists—would it not be more satisfactory, would not the people be more content, would it not look more honest on the part of the Government to say: We will give to the judges of the land the appointment of these officers. This plan has worked in England for upwards of fifteen years I believe, and I have failed to hear that there is any dissatisfaction there. The appointments are only made for a year by the judges of Assize as they go around on circuit. The persons appointed to these offices by this Bill are only to be removed by a vote of this House, but in England they are appointed from time to time by the judges, and I think the sense of security which the people have in the justice and honesty of the persons appointed is such as to prevent any dissatisfaction. But in this country the hon. gentleman may, perchance, appoint judges. But, perchance, he may appoint those who are not judges, and in whom the whole community have not entire confidence, and there will be a feeling throughout the country that the people have not been properly dealt with in the preparation of these lists. I say it is the duty of the Government of the day to remove all cause of dissatisfaction, and to place on the Statute Book —if they are bound to pass a law on the subject—such an Act as will give satisfaction to the people of the country, from one end to the other—place on the Statute Book a law which will convince the people that in this measure the Government has only the interest and well-being of the country at heart, and not to place on the Statute Book an Act which gives to one man the absolute right to say who shall vote and who shall not? And from that man's decision there is absolutely no appeal—no appeal as to law, except with his consent, and no appeal at all as to the facts. His judgment or determination, or whatever it may be called, is final and conclusive, and for persons who wish to get their names on the list or who wish to prevent their names being put off, there is no appeal. I feel that so far as the Act is concerned, in this respect, it might be made better and more satisfactory. But I say the Act should not be pressed at this time of the Session at all. I say that an Act of this importance should not be pressed by the Government. It is all very well to discuss the Act now, and to hear what may be said in favor or against it, but it should stand at least for a year, in order that the press of the country and the people of the country may become familiar with its provisions. Would it not be better for hon. gentlemen opposite to have an opportunity of consulting their constituents as to this Act; would it not be better for their constituents themselves, better for all classes of the community, that before this Bill becomes law they should thoroughly understand every provision it contains. Why force it through at this Session? If the hon. First Minister was determined to force it through, why did he not do it earlier in the Session? Why leave it to the last days of the Session before he announced his decision that this Act should become law. Has he any sinister object? Does he wish to stifle discussion on this Bill? What can be his motive for trying to force it through? I have noticed that hon. gentlemen opposite appear to take no part in this discussion. Is the Bill such that they cannot defend it? Is the action of the Government such that it cannot be defended?

Mr. HESSON. We want to give you time to attack and find fault.

Mr. LISTER. That is what you want, is it? You will get enough of it. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) has answered for the Government, and he wants to know how we are going to attack it.

Mr. HESSON. I answer for myself.

Mr. LISTER. Oh, I thought you spoke for the Government—for the Minister of Agriculture. I thought that, occupying some *quasi* position, you were speaking for the Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; address the Chair.

Mr. LISTER. I have observed that no gentleman on the Government benches has got up to defend this Bill. Why is it that the First Minister himself only took eight minutes to explain the provisions of the Bill? Did the First Minister ever read the Bill himself, I wonder? He may have read it, but I have some doubt about it, because he was reading from notes in front of him, which were probably prepared in his office. Now, I say it is a very cowardly position for hon. gentlemen opposite to take, to wait and see what the attack would be. If this is a good measure, it is the duty of hon. gentlemen opposite to get up and point out its good qualities and show wherein it is an improvement on the other Acts which have been in force in this country for the past number of years; to show that it enlarges the franchise, or that it simplifies any existing cumbrousness. These things we might expect from them, but they maintain a solemn silence, except the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson). Now, Sir, I do not propose, as I said a few moments ago, to enter into all the details of this Bill, particularly as it is objectionable in every feature and in every section. We will probably, before the Bill becomes law, have an opportunity of criticising its several provisions. I will, however, for a moment, advert to one section of the

Bill, which gives to women the right to vote. Now, I do not object to the ladies having the right to vote, but as was stated by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron), if you are going to give unmarried ladies, to spinsters and widows, that right, you should certainly extend it to married women. If you are not going to give them all a vote, then none of them should have a vote. This franchise has been in force in England, so far as school elections are concerned, for the past fifteen years, and it has, so far as I am aware, worked satisfactorily in educational matters there. In the Province of Ontario, also, the same class of ladies are entitled to vote at municipal elections; and we can understand why they should have that right, because their property is taxed for municipal purposes; and I do not know that that principle has worked badly there. I think a great many ladies have availed themselves of the opportunity of voting. But, while referring to this question, I cannot do better than call the attention of hon. members to an article which appeared in the *Week*, of 12th February, 1885. That article, I think, puts this question of woman suffrage upon its proper footing. It is exceedingly ably written, and I will give the House the benefit of it, for fear that they have not had the privilege of seeing the *Week* of that date:

"The Female Suffrage movement in the Ontario Legislature has now arrived at the second of its four inevitable stages. The first stage is municipal suffrage for unmarried women, which has been already carried; the second is parliamentary suffrage for unmarried women, of a Bill for which notice has been given; the third is the suffrage, both municipal and parliamentary, for married women as well as unmarried, and the introduction of political division into the family which has hitherto been a political unit; the fourth and final stage is the eligibility of women to Parliament and to political offices of all kinds."

Of course, if it is decided to give the ladies the right to vote for members of Parliament, it logically follows that they must have a right to sit in Parliament and to enjoy all the offices and emoluments in the gift of the people. You have no right to say that they shall vote, and that they shall not have all the rights which the suffrage confers.

"The logical connection of the last two stages with the third is not doubtful, nor are the leaders at any pains to conceal from us that spinster suffrage is the thin end of the wedge. The thick end it might be called, since a privilege conceded to spinsters may surely be claimed with greater reason by those who are doing the duties of wives and mothers. Mr. Fraser, then, was right in saying that if a stand was to be made at all against a revolution in the relations between the sexes, it had better be made at the threshold. It is to the credit of the Church to which that gentleman belongs that though female suffrage could hardly fail to add to the political power of her priesthood, she has so far steadfastly upheld the organic principles of Christain society and opposed herself to sexual revolution. The influence of the Church of Rome would probably be increased by the change; but it is doubtful whether Conservatism of the ordinary type would realize the party gain which in England, at least, it scents. Women of Conservative tendencies are likely to stay at home, while the revolutionary female mounts the Socialistic platform at Chicago, and bids the poor put their trust in dynamite and not in God.

"Petitions of course are got up in favor of the Bill. A petition was got up in fulfilment of a wager, and was respectably signed, praying for the immediate execution of the leading clergyman at Albany. No one who is in daily contact with society in Ontario and has opportunities of feeling its pulse can imagine that by the women of this Province generally the change has been demanded or is desired. The mass of women are domestic and feel that their kingdom is the home. The number is small of those who long for public life, who think with Mrs. Cady Stanton that maternity is a low object of ambition, or whose characters and aspirations have shared the general change which the utterance of such a sentiment denotes. They know that a perfect co-equality of the sexes is consistent with an assignment to each by nature of distinct functions in the organism of humanity. They know that as a sex they have privileges which they would not like to lose, that these are dependent on the existing relations between the sexes, and that if they insisted on becoming the rivals and competitors of man they would renounce their claim to his chivalrous protection. They know that they are not a class but a sex, and that they have not suffered, nor are they likely to suffer, any wrong at the hands of male legislatures the members of which are their husbands and brothers. It is at least doubtful whether, if invested with political power themselves, they would be able to extort by its use as much as they now freely obtain from the tutelary sentiment of the other sex. With regard to the mutual rights of married people, male legislatures have already gone as far as they could go without such destruction of all community of interest between man and wife as would loosen the conjugal tie; if they went too far, and made marriage a burden to the man without compensation, the consequence would be that men would begin to decline wedlock, as they did under the Roman Empire; and it would then be seen whether philosophic babble had power to control the strongest passions of the human breast. The property held by unmarried women differs in no respect from that held by men, nor is it likely to suffer any special detriment from legislation not controlled by its owners.

"Nothing is settled by repeating the phrase that taxation and representation must go together. Everybody pays taxes direct or indirect. Our seamen pay them though they can hardly ever vote. Married women, as the partners of their husbands' fortunes, pay them just as much as spinsters. No property is represented in any case saving the minimum required as a qualification for the suffrage. The practical question to be answered in the common interest of both sexes is whether government would be improved by putting political power into the hands of women. The men have made the laws because law rests at bottom upon the force of the community and the force of the community is male. If women made laws to which men were opposed, the men would refuse to execute them and the authority of government would fall. This would be the fate of those arbitrary enactments on moral and social subjects which the advocates of sentimental legislation always dream of carrying by the help of the women's vote. The women of France would at this time make laws respecting religion which the men would practically annul. Men alone can perform the full duties of citizens, since they alone can take part in the defence of the country, an obligation most properly attached to the suffrage by the present law of the Dominion. Men alone can be made thoroughly responsible for their public conduct; a woman arraigned for parliamentary or official misbehaviour would plead her sex. Political character must be formed in action and practical life, which as a rule is the sphere of man, while other qualities not less valuable in their way are formed in the home which is the sphere of woman. Certainly the contrary has not yet been proved by the examples of the women who have gone into public life in the United States; nor have those ladies given us reason to believe that tenderness will enter politics with woman; they have rather given us reason to believe that the tenderness of woman and the general beauty of her character depend on her exemption from political strife.

"In the United States the community possesses a safeguard against rash measures of fundamental change with which we unfortunately have failed to provide ourselves. There every such change must be submitted in the form of a constitutional amendment to the people, who vote on public grounds and in the mass are not amenable to personal cajoling or bullying. Here a majority in the Legislature is decisive, and that majority may be obtained by arts of persuasion brought to bear by an active clique upon members personally behind the scenes. But let members of the Ontario Legislature when they are subjected to this process, if their gallantry shrinks from refusing anything which is asked questionably, however, by a woman, remember that for one woman who asks there are hundreds who ask not."

Now, Sir, so far as that portion of the Bill is concerned, this article puts both sides of the question very fully. Personally, I have no objection at all to the ladies of the country having votes; but what I do object to and strenuously protest against is, that the right to prepare voters' lists throughout the country should be confided to persons appointed by the Government, who may not be, but in all probability will be, partisans. Such a provision will have the effect of creating in the minds of the people—at all events, in the minds of those opposed to the Government—the feeling that they have not been fairly and justly dealt with; and it is of the last consequence that such a feeling as that should not be allowed to arise. If that feeling existed, so far as the judiciary of the country is concerned, there could be no security or contentment amongst the people of this country. I repeat that it is of the last importance that in a matter so important as this, the right to vote, a right which the people hold dear and precious, when confided to the hands of any body, should be administered by a person against whom there is and cannot be the slightest suspicions of partiality. I say that if the appointments are to be made by the Government in the manner pointed out by this Bill, a strong feeling will inevitably be aroused throughout the length and breadth of the country. I warn hon. gentlemen opposite not to take a step of this kind merely for a party advantage; they are in power to-day, but we may be in power to-morrow, and this complaint we now make against them they may have cause to make against us. I would ask them to remember that Governments sometimes tumble very fast when they appear most secure. Hon. gentlemen opposite are strong to-day, but they may be weak to-morrow, and I ask them not to put an enactment on our Statute Book which they would not wish to see there if hon. gentle-

men on this side were in office. I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite, as honorable men, to put themselves in the position of the Opposition here to-day, and I say to them if you were here would you not oppose bitterly to the end the passage of a measure of this kind. This is the light in which hon. gentlemen on both sides should look on the question. If these appointments were made by the judges of the land in all the different Provinces, and if the Government are determined to take upon themselves to extend the franchise for this Dominion, there can be no objection to that, except so far as its expense is concerned; and I can only repeat what I said before, that the Bill involves an enormous expenditure on the part of the candidat and on the part of the Government; and not only will it involve an enormous expenditure, but it will necessarily cause a great deal of trouble in having these lists prepared. All this can be saved by leaving the franchise as it is. All the pernicious character of this Bill can be avoided, if the Government is determined that this Parliament shall have a franchise of its own, by leaving the appointments to the judges of the land. I trust, that before this discussion is ended, before this Bill becomes law, the Government will see that it is important to eliminate from the Bill the provision taking to itself the power of appointing these people. I believe that if the people had an opportunity of pronouncing upon this measure honestly and fairly, they would pronounce against the Government taking this power. Then, why hurry this Bill through now? This is only the third Session of this Parliament, and if the Government is desirous to have this become law before another election, they will have abundant time between this and 1887 to make it law, because it is not likely they will go the country again 16 or 18 months before their time has expired; so that if the Bill does not now become law we will, by this time next year, have ample opportunities to discuss its provisions. We will have had the opportunity of putting it before the people and consulting our constituents upon it, and will be enabled then to give it that consideration it should receive. I sincerely hope this Bill will not become law, at all events, this Session.

Mr. DAVIES. I think it is to be extremely regretted that the right hon. gentleman and his supporters have determined, as they seem to have, not to take part in this debate. The resolution before you, Mr. Speaker, is of the nature of a protest against the injustice of pressing this Bill through at this late period of the Session. That injustice has been done is made very apparent by the reasons which the mover of the resolution gave, and by the reasons supplemented by those who followed him. If this Bill be of the great importance that the hon. the First Minister attaches to it he owes, both to his own side of the House and to this, that he should not at this late period of the Session press it on a worn out House; and if he insists upon doing so, the least we can expect of him is that he shall rise in his place and give the House some reasons why this Bill should now be rushed through. He thought fit to introduce the Bill in very few words; to explain its provisions in a speech of seven minutes in length. I am not going to find fault with the course he has taken in that, because he knows best what course he should take, but we are not discussing the principles of the Bill now; we are simply discussing whether the hon. gentleman is treating this House with fairness, whether the Opposition have any rights in the House. The hon. gentleman knows well that this Parliament is composed of men who have not that leisure which professional politicans in England have, who are able to leave their business for twelve months of the year and devote their time to politics. He knows well that the vast majority of the members here are gentlemen engaged in business at home of that kind that it requires their presence, and if this Bill is of one-half the importance which the hon. gentleman seeks to attach to it, it was his duty to have had it prepared and brought down at an earlier stage of the Session, so that it could be intelligently discussed. I dare say there are numbers of hon. gentlemen sitting behind the First Minister who feel in their hearts that a gross injustice is attempted to be perpetrated in this House to-day, who feel in their hearts that this Bill should not be pressed to-night; and that if it is to be pressed, some reasons, higher and greater than any suggested by the Minister of Public Works, should be given for pressing it through. One or two hon. gentlemen opposite attempted, not by making speeches and taking the responsibility of their language, but by interruptions, to say that the time of the House this Session has been wasted, owing to the deliberate obstruction on the part of the Opposition. That is not true; hon. gentlemen opposite know it to be untrue; they know that hon. gentlemen on this side have devoted themselves with assiduity to the discharge of their duties in this House, and that instead of obstructing the business of this House they have done all they could to advance that business. It is our interest to get back to our ordinary avocations, out of which we make our living, and not to remain here for three months, and then at the end of three months take up a Bill of greater importance than any that has been yet brought to our attention. Why does not the hon. gentleman tell his own followers why this Bill should be pressed? He knows that we, on this side, are not cravens and cowards, and that we will not let the Bill pass without discussion, although he is driving us to the position of taking the choice between sacrificing our private interests or our public duty. Does the hon. gentleman seriously contend that it is right for us to sacrifice our business relations at home and to give up all our time here, after we have been here three months? He knows we cannot do it, and he knows that by forcing this Bill through the House, he is going to make us do it. I say that it is unjust; I say that it is unfair; I say it is without parallel. I do not know why he should do it, because he has not explained. If he has any reasons he could have given them in answer to my hon. friend from South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) in a very few words, andperhaps they might have been acceptable; but we have here the extraordinary fact that a Bill proposing to change the franchise for this Parliament throughout this whole Dominion is to be altered; that a large class of people who have never had the franchise before are to have the franchise; that a new electoral body is to be created—I refer to the woman franchise—and that other cardinal changes are to be made in the election law; and yet the hon. gentleman thinks he is discharging his duty to the House and the country by throwing this measure on the table, and telling us to swallow it *holus bolus*. It is unfair; it is unjust; it is unmanly. What will be the result? Does the hon. gentleman wish that the members of the Opposition in this House should give up fair and legitimate criticism upon the other mass of legislation which lies before us? He knows very well that we have here a most important measure. He introduced it only the other day. The same policy of procrastination was practised with regard to it that has been practised with regard to the Franchise Bill. I refer to the consolidation of the entire statutes of this Dominion. When he moved for the appointment of a joint committee, I entered my protest against it, because I said that to ask thirteen or fourteen of the working men of this House to give up their time for hours every day to an examination of the consolidation of these statutes, would deprive them of the power of discharging their duties to their constituents with reference to Supply—and I suppose that is a fair subject for discussion—and with reference to the other legislation of the House. He carried that through, and we submitted, and we accepted, and we have been for hours every day engaged in the examination of the consolidation of these statutes;

and now, while we are engaged in that very important duty, down comes this Franchise Bill, to which, while it is before the House, we ought to devote all our time and all our energies, and we are asked to sacrifice one or the other. The right hon. gentleman must see that he is treating us most unfairly. Are his measures such that he is afraid to submit them to fair and intelligent criticism? Does he feel bound to keep back his measures for eighty days after every Session begins, and then, when the House is tired and wearied out, and many hon. members feel that they are almost compelled to abandon their legislative functions and go home and attend to their private business, try to force the legislation through the House. It bears injustice on the face of it, and it challenges some explanation and some defence at his hands; and if he fails to give that explanation and defence, the country will see, and hon. members behind him will see, that it is not owing to any policy of obstruction on the part of the Opposition, but to a predetermined attempt on the part of the Government to force their measures through, whether they be good or ill, without criticism or objection. Talk about obstruction! The only time the House has been engaged on any measure of the Government, except on Supply, was the other day, when a very important Bill, the Animals Contagious Diseases Bill, was brought before the House. Where was the obstruction? Two or three members suggested an important change in one clause, and we could get no answer; we could not get the Minister of Agriculture to open his mouth; but, after the discussion had gone on for an hour and a-half, light dawned upon his mind, and he found that the suggestion which was made in a quiet way at four o'clock ought to be accepted at half past five; and, after that and some other slight changes, that clause passed, and nearly every other suggestion which we made was adopted and became part of the Bill, and the whole Bill went through in one day. Do you think such a Bill could pass the English Parliament in one day or in one week, a Bill affecting the interests of the largest class of the community in Canada—the farmers? No, it could not. I say that, very far from its being an evidence of obstruction, it was an evidence of a sincere desire on the part of members on the Opposition side of this House to forward the business of the country and to get to our homes. So with reference to the Civil Service Bill, which took up all the time yesterday. Is it not a most important Bill, dealing with thousands upon thousands of the moneys of this country, which are to be appropriated in the payment of Civil Service officers, and dealing with the mode of their appointement, and dealing with their salaries and the length of time they should fill those offices before they are entitled to superannuation—dealing with the whole subject, in fact? And it took one day, a Bill of 59 clauses. I venture to say that there is hardly another English-speaking Parliament under the flag that would pass that Bill in the time. And why was it passed? Because we felt that we must shorten our criticism and must do what we could to further the public interest. But we never dreamt, when we were lending our energies to forwarding the interests of the country in that way, that we were falling into the trap which the hon. gentleman had laid for us and that we were to be called upon suddenly to pass this Bill, which requires consideration and discussion that must occupy at least three weeks. The hon. gentleman knows that we cannot afford to allow this Bill to go through in the same way that the Contagious Diseases Bill and the Civil Service Bill went through. He knows that it must be discussed, and he is treating the members on his own side with unfairness and injustice as he is treating the members on this side of the House. We have other important legislation. Is it all to be abandoned? We have had discussions for twelve months on the subject of the necessity of a bankruptcy law for this country. We have had the hon. gentleman himself last summer informing a deputation of Liverpool merchants that this matter was a most important one, but that he was afraid, from the composition of this House, that it would be difficult to pass a Bill in reference to it. He appointed a committee; the committee sat and went through an immense deal of labor, and prepared a Bill. That Bill is before us. Is that to be slaughtered? Is that to be abandoned? Is the legislation, which he admits is essential, which he says is almost absolutely essential to this country, which is most important to this country, which affects every class of the community, to be discussed intelligently, or is it to be swallowed *holus bolus*? If Parliament submits to swallow Bills of this character without proper discussion, it abdicates its functions and shows itself to be unworthy to represent the people. This Bankruptcy Bill then has to be discussed, and if that is so, and if the consolidation of the statutes has to be gone through, when in the name of goodness are hon. members to get to their homes? It is all very fine for the members of the Ministry, who receive sufficient salary to keep them—I do not say it is too much. They can stay here until the warm weather wearies members out; but how about the mass of members, who have their own affairs to attend to? He gives us the choice. He says: Choose between sacrificing your own interests and sacrificing the interests of the people you are sent here to represent. More than that; we have the Factory Bill; but I suppose I need not waste time in reference to that, for it seems to have been cast among the slaughtered innocents already. I understood, from the motion made the other day, that that Bill is again to come up for discussion; but, if it is not shelved, it involves most important constitutional points, which must be discussed, and must be discussed, not by members of the Opposition alone, not by the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) alone, but by the legal gentlemen on both sides of the House. We cannot afford to let Bills go through this House which we say imtringe upon the rights and privileges and constitutional powers of Provincial Legislatures without discussion; and they have a right to be discussed, not simply from one standpoint, but the arguments have a right to be answered; and, if they are discussed and if the arguments of the member for Bothwell are to be answered, that will take four or five days. That is to be given up, I suppose; and what more? We have heard rumors, which I believe we may accept as authentic, that before long we have to discuss a new phase of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is not denied that that great corporation is in need of financial aid. It is known that propositions are to be made to this House, propositions having for their object appropriating enormous sums of the public money to build up that corporation. Are these enormous votes to be given without discussion, in absolute silence, by the representatives of the people? Are we to sit here merely to register the decrees of the Executive, and not to discuss them or to express our opinion upon them? Are hon. gentlemen to become the slaves of the right hon. Minister, and are they not to express their views on the subjects which come before them? That may be the case with some, but I believe there are a large mass of those who sit behind the right hon. gentleman who do it with very great reluctance, who feel that they are sacrificing their political manhood when they follow him in silence, swallow these Bills one after the other, and choke off that legitimate and proper discussion which it is the province and the duty of Parliament to give to all these important measures. More than that; we have hardly entered upon the voting of supplies. We have only spent one or two nights, and how is it to be when all the Departments in the Public Service will require and will receive criticism from the Opposition? Hon. gentlemen know that it is our duty to do it; they know that we would be guilty of dereliction of duty of the gross-

est kind if we allowed $32,000,000 to be voted without examination and without criticism. Why, Sir, we had better have no Parliament at all, if Supply is to be passed through the House *holus bolus* without discussion and without comment. The hon. gentleman must see, and must know, that is his duty, and ought to be his privilege, to rise in his place and explain why this particular Bill is of such paramount importance over all the others I have mentioned, that he must sacrifice them. This one is not of that vast importance, and he knows it. It might have been taken the first week in the Session. The hon. Minister of Public Works told us that the Bill was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, and he told us that a Bill somewhat similar to it, if not the identical Bill, was laid before Parliament last Session. If that is the case, why did they not tackle it the first weeks of the Session, when there was nothing to do? Hon. gentlemen know that the Parliament of this country was a laughingstock—for the first four weeks we came here and met, and had prayers, and went through a few forms, and went to our lodgings again, and did nothing. And this Bill was deliberately kept back—for what object? Why does not the hon. gentleman explain to the House why it is that for seventy-eight days he kept this Bill pigeon-holed in his office, and never brought it down to the House, until we were led to believe that it was not coming down at all, because it was too late in the Session to consider it. And we have a new court to be established, the court of claims, that involves a very important principle, and an expenditure of a large amount of money, and which will require a good deal of discussion. Now, when are we going to get the time to discuss it? Supposing it takes three weeks to discuss this Bill—and I think if we were to devote every day to it, we would be proceeding pretty rapidly—when are we going to get time to discharge our other duties, and to pass these other measures? There are duties which we cannot shirk; Supply has got to be voted; the expenditure of money has got to be criticised; the conduct of the Government in the administration of the affairs of the country has got to be brought to the bar of this House, and to the bar of public opinion. The hon. gentleman knows this well. He knows the character of the Opposition, and the calibre of the Opposition, and he knows they have the courage to bring him and his friends to the bar, and to condemn their conduct where they deserve it. Now, Sir, I am not going to take up the time the House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not think the gentlemen need complain that I have taken up much time of the House. For some time I have purposely abstained, for fear I would be charged with wasting time. I am not going to enter upon an examination of the principle of the Bill, because I do not think it is necessary on the motion now before the House; but I am going to call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the fact that it contains important clauses, which it will take some time to discuss. I said there were three or four cardinal principles underlying the Bill, and one is that it makes a change in the existing franchise of the country, depriving a large number of electors of their votes. Has not that to discussed and justified in a free country like Canada, where education is spreading, and where we ought rather to enlarge the franchise instead of contracting it? Can a Bill, disfranchising a large mass of electors, be allowed to go through without discussion? The hon. gentleman knows that it cannot be done. He knows, in the Province from which I come, this Bill will throttle the voices and the votes of a large number of people; and I, for one, cannot remain silent; and I would like to know whether some other hon. gentlemen who come from that Island will be able to remain silent. We have a protest to register, if we can do nothing more. If we cannot carry the House with us we can, at any rate, raise an indignant protest against a class of men being disfranchised who have been accustomed to exercise the franchise with credit to themselves for twenty-five years. If they are to be disfranchised, we must know the reason for it. Then we have another important feature of the Bill, conferring the franchise upon a large number of women. Now I am not going to discuss that at length just now. Personally, I do not feel very strongly one way or the other, whether we give the women the franchise or withhold it; but I shall be satisfied if he gives it. But, judging from the very few remarks the right hon. gentleman deigned to give to this branch of the subject, I have come to the conclusion that he is not going to press it. He seems to endeavor to throw off from his own shoulders the responsibility which he should adopt, of introducing and carrying that principle as a Government principle, as a cardinal principle of the measure. He got all the credit for introducing a Bill to enfranchise women. We remember last year, after the Bill came in, paragraphs appeared in large numbers of papers in the country and the United States, complimenting the right hon. gentleman upon the advance he had made in his ideas of constitutional Government. He was becoming quite a Liberal in his old days, and the ladies of the country were called upon to give thanks to the gentleman who was going to take them out of slavery and enfranchise them, and give them rights they never had before. And the hon. gentleman very complacently assumed all the praise which was due to that Act. What is he doing to-day? I very much fear he is going to throw them over. He now announces that he is going to leave it to the House. The poor ladies, after having their hopes raised for twelve months, are to have them dashed to the ground. And worse than all, by that very gentleman himself. If anybody else had done it, it would have been bad enough. But the friend of the ladies himself, who introduced the clause into the Bill, who got all his friends throughout the country to give him all the credit that was due to the introduction of such a clause, is now to throw them over—yes, throw them over, and not in a very gallant way either. It puts me in mind of an old English couplet:

> "He kicked them down stairs with such a sweet grace.
> They thought he was leading them up."

The hon. gentleman now is going to kick them out of the Bill altogether. And he is doing it in such a mild way. He is not going to do it himself, but he is going to get the House to do it. He is to get the credit of putting it in the Bill, and the House is to take the odium of kicking the ladies out. I am sorry that he did not consider the principle of his Bill more carefully. I am sorry that when he adopted this principle he did not adhere to it—if he thinks it is right and proper. And I assume he must have thought it so, or he would not have put it there; and then he should have the courage to keep it there. We know his followers too well not to know that if he told them that the clause was to pass it would pass—yes, and it would pass without a protest. There would not be a voice raised from the benches behind him. I tell you the ladies must put the responsibility on the right hon. gentleman himself, because, with one shake of his finger, he can carry that clause if he wants to; and if the ladies, after having their hopes raised, are now to have them dashed to the ground, they have got to thank the right hon. gentleman himself, and no one else. I will now leave the ladies in his hands—an hon. member suggests, in his arms. I should like to call attention very shortly to another principle of the Bill which must receive discussion at the hands of this House. The hon. gentleman has introduced a clause which I am very sorry he thought fit to introduce. It seems like a last dying political kick, an attempt to legislate himself into power once more.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIES. Hon. gentlemen opposite may cheer. They know very well that the manner in which those persons improperly called revising officers, are to receive their appointment and the manner in which they are to hold it, are such as will make them simply political partisans of the party in power. There is no parallel to such a mode of appointing revising officers. But these are not revising officers; they are voter makers. They are the men, not who revise lists made by overseers, or by parishes, but who make the lists themselves. They are arbitrary and absolute. They can put on the lists whom they please and they can keep off whom they please; and so careful has the hon. gentleman been to prevent the possibility of any one complaining even of arbitrary conduct on their part, that he allows no appeal, no matter how arbitrary, unjust or villainous their decisions may be. There they stand: unchangeable arbiters, men appointed by the Government, who know they cannot be disturbed. The clause in the Bill authorising them to be removed by the Parliament they make—for I say they make Parliaments—is more an insult than anything else. They are irresponsible, I say, except to the Parliament they make, and I challenge the First Minister to produce from history, at least from British history, a parallel for such an outrage. God knows, we are small enough in numbers in this House now, and as has been well remarked, our numbers do not present by any manner of means the voters we represent. Hon. gentlemen opposite may laugh, but they will awaken some day to their sorrow to realise the danger of an Opposition being weak. If we were stronger we could compel an explanation of this Bill, and that it should not be forced through with danger to ourselves and the country, in indecent haste. In England the lists are prepared by overseers of parishes, and revising officers there are such, not merely in name, but in law and reality. They revise the lists which are prepared by the people. By whom are they appointed? Did Mr. Gladstone, or Mr. Disraeli, or any other British Premier, ever place such power in the hands of revising officers as the hon. gentleman wishes to place unchallenged here? No. Revising barristers in the county of Middlesex are appointed by the Lord Chief Justice of Queen's Bench, a legal authority, removed altogether from political influences; and in other counties they are appointed by the senior judge of Assize, so that the appointments are in no sense political, and all parties have fair play and justice. In England, therefore, the people prepare the lists and non-political officials revise them. Here we have in contrast with this the following state of things: The First Minister, at almost the last days of Parliament, seeks to rush through a Bill to enable him to appoint 200 men, who will be irremovable, who will be there for life, who will be able to do what they please, and who will be able to place on the lists whom they please and to reject whom they please. Without discussing these principles at greater length, I say it must be quite evident to the better class of minds who sit behind the First Minister, those who have not yet quite surrendered their political consciences—and there are a number of them—that there must be a very serious and very lengthy discussion on these principles, a discussion in which it will be the duty of very many of those who do not often take part in ordinary legislation to take part. Why? Because this is a blow struck, not merely at themselves, but at their constituents, and if they are men they will be prepared to resent it. I hope the First Minister will yet have the courtesy to reply to the speech made by the member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), and to the protest entered by him and repeated by others against the indecent haste with which this Bill is attempted to be forced through Parliament in the dying days of the Session.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not have spoken at this time if it had not been for the assertion thrown out by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, and he has not thrown this out for the first time, either in this House or out of it. The hon. gentleman seems to take full liberty—and I will grant him the use of this liberty—to rank himself very high in intellectual culture and manly independence, and he has a fashion which, if he lives to grow older, and grows wiser as the years pass over his head, he may get out of, of thinking that no person but himself, or those who sit on that side of the House, have a political conscience, a mind that exercises itself upon subjects that come before him, two eyes which see, and a disposition to do what he thinks is best for his country, in matters which come under discussion. I wish to state that the hon. gentleman, and those who think with him on that side of the House, will not find in the history of human experience sufficient ground-work to base a claim even by the highest gifts and best of men, such as is put forward by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. With respect to this matter, if I thought there was any disposition to choke off discussion, such discussion as is necessary, I would be sorry to see the Bill introduced and attempted to be forced through. So far as I am concerned, as a supporter of the Government on this Bill, I intend to discuss it where I think I should discuss it, and take the responsibility for my own acts. I, however, am here to say to-night that I do not feel that I am either lacking in independence or lacking in manly character when I say that I am in favor of the principles of the Bill, that I am in favor of a large portion of the details of the Bill, that I am glad it is introduced, and am prepared to stay here, as all good representatives of the people should stay, to discuss the matter in a fair, honest, manly and independent way. I wish to state this as well: It is amusing to see the tone taken by hon. gentlemen as they rise on the other side of the House. They commence, in most doleful tones to say that we are in the seventy-eighth day of the Session, and we want to get to our homes as soon as possible, in order to attend to the business by which we gain a living; and yet, in the face of those statements, they directly afterwards proceed to make a speech of thirty, forty or fifty minutes in length, on the details of the Bill, every syllable of which they know they will have to repeat when the Bill gets into committee of the Whole. They say we are strong and they are weak, numerically. Then is it not fairly to be supposed that if the leader of the Government has introduced this Bill and has pledged himself that it will be put through, and if we have a majority on this side, sooner or later we shall go into Committee of the Whole? Then, evidently, looking at things as they are, we shall go into committee, when we will take up the different sections and discuss them; and we should, therefore, leave out this all-night discussion of details, when only the principles of the Bill are before the House. In that way we will get at our work far quicker than by proceeding in the present way. The hon. gentleman opposite has stated that there has been no obstruction from that side of the House. Whether there has or has not, I shall not take it on myself to say. He takes credit to himself that two Bills were passed, of a very important nature, in two days, and he says that in Great Britain these Bills would not have been passed in weeks. But the hon. gentleman was not honest enough, he was not frank enough, to say at the same time that those were not new Bills, introducing new principles, but Bills which had been on the Statute Books of this Parliament, and have been worked out in the country, one since 1879, and the other since 1882, and that there were but a few details which were new, and these, in the Civil Service Bill, had been thoroughly discussed and the sense of the House pronounced on them days before. Sir, the hon. member from West Lambton (Mr. Lister) has undertaken the discussion of this Bill, and has taken up a considerable portion

of the time of this House, which of course he has a right to do. If strong language means strong argument, the hon. gentleman would be the man of the strongest argument in this House; but it is not always so. It does not make a thing infamous that the hon. gentleman should say it is infamous, and it does not make a thing an unparalled enormity for the hon. gentleman to get up and throw out this invective towards this side of the House. He has—as the hon. gentleman who has just sat down did—exaggerated, with reference to the part of the Bill which provides for the revising barristers. The hon. gentleman knows he has exaggerated; he has not read the sections of the Bill over, if he does not know that he put the thing in an exaggerated light. If he will read that section he will see that the County Court judges, the Superior Court judges, may be appointed. Hon. gentlemen, always prone to insinuate where they have not arguments at hand to use, have based all their argument as to the question of revising barristers upon imagination and insinuation; and there is this to be said, that if this Bill contemplates, as it does contemplate, the appointment of county judges as revising barristers, I say that goes still further than they themselves say they would be satisfied with, because they say that they would be satisfied if the judges had the power to appoint the revising barristers. Now, if the power which appoints is so far above suspicion that its appointees would be satisfactory to hon. gentlemen, how satisfactory should it not be when that power itself is the power to which the revision of these lists may be appealed? Hon. gentlemen say nothing about the checks and guards which were placed about this portion of the Bill. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) puts himself in an illogical position in a good many ways, and I will just point out two. He says: Has any petition come before the House, asking that this legislation should be passed. He laid down the principle, with all the volubility that he possesses, that we should not go to work on this Bill, because there were no petitions brought into the House. Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that we should delay legislating on anything which has not been asked for by petition? Will he go over the years of the former *régime*, when his leaders were in power, and point out their measures, none of which they undertook to pass through unless they were asked for by strong petitions or public meetings? Let me call his attention to this: that this very year Franchise Bills have been introduced and passed through the Provincial Legislatures of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and the Provincial Legislature of Ontario, all of which Legislatures are under the control of friends of the hon. gentleman himself; and I doubt, Sir, if, in a single instance, there was a petition or a public meeting which called for such legislation. The hon. gentleman says further that we ought not to undertake this legislation. And why? Because there is trouble in the North-West and because England and Russia may probably go to war. Did you ever hear the like of it! Because two countries in another continent may possibly go to war we must not undertake important legislation in this Parliament. But, Sir, in the next breath he went on to state that there were Bills of equally great importance which must be taken up and put through. Why must we not stand still, according to his logic, and wait until all the clouds have passed from the North-West, and all the negotiations are cleared up between Russia and England, before we take up any of this legislation? Is it not a fact that we are here to do legislation for Canada and put our minds to the measures which come before this Parliament, and are we not able to do that? The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Fleming) advanced a most remarkable doctrine, a most brilliantly original doctrine, and it was this: That, forsooth, we should not meddle with the franchise, because the representation in this Parliament is not a Dominion representation but a provincial representation. I have simply to mention that argument, to show its absurdity. Why, Sir, if the Provincial Legislature of Quebec or of the other Provinces elected and sent here from those Legislatures members to this Parliament, then it might be called a Provincial Legislature. But the fact that we made a certain population—the population of the Province of Quebec—the unit for the representation of this country, does not constitute it provincial representation in the sense that we had no right to go back of it. Sir, the main objection urged against bringing in the measure, has been that it has not been given sufficient publicity. The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), said it was sprung on the House in eight and a-half minutes, and yet a little afterwards, he said that the same Bill, with a few alterations, had been before this Parliament seven times, and before the country for years. Do not hon. gentlemen opposite know that this very Bill, with very few amendments, has been before this House, has been seen by thousands in the constituencies of this country, has been in leader after leader treated by the press in every Province of the Dominion. Let me tell hon. gentlemen that this is not, after all, so intricate a question as it is placed here before us. Why, has not every Legislature of every Province almost, in this Dominion, been for the last year or two discussing franchises; discussing questions of franchise rights; discussing suffrage bases; and did not the hon. member for Peel himself go to work and read a list of the bases of suffrage in the Province of Ontario, which was far more intricate than, and which, in part, took in the same points as the suffrage bases which we have in this Bill. It is not the intricacy of this measure; it is not that the country has not had sufficient notice of it; it is not those things which trouble hon. gentlemen opposite, but it is this: They fear that this Parliament will take what from Confederation it was destined that some time it should and ought to take—the power to say who are its own electorate; the power to say who shall elect the men, to whom they shall go back, who have been sent here by them, and to whom the account of their stewardship shall be rendered. I hold that the principles of this Bill are incontrovertible, and on this point I am willing to take my stand, that a Parliament or Legislature should have an electorate of its own; that it should not be at the beck or the will, the wish or the whim, of any other body, be it higher or lower in the order of legislation. You might as well contend that the municipalities should have the power to say what is the franchise on which members of a Provincial Legislature should be elected, as to say that the provincial legislators should be the arbiters of the franchise, which shall elect gentlemen to come to the Dominion Legislature; for there is as much difference—nay, there is more difference—between the scope and power of legislation between the Dominion and the Provincial Governments, than there is between the Provincial Governments and the municipalities. That is one principle which should be held in view. The other principle is, that if we have a common country, we should have a common citizenship. If this Parliament legislates for the whole country, all who are legislated for by this Parliament should have a common suffrage citizenship. A man down in Prince Edward Island, having one suffrage, when he goes to Quebec or to Ontario should feel that he is a citizen there, as in his own Province. And, Sir, I hold that it is of very great consequence, and that it is a good that is worth all the trouble and time that it will take to have this Bill passed through, if we can make it felt, from one end of this Dominion to the other, that we have one suffrage as citizens of this Dominion, so far as the Parliament which legislates for the great interests of the country is concerned. One word with reference to the odd position taken by the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright). He undertook to state what were the

duties of a Parliament. He limited those duties to three, and what will you suppose they were? One was, that Parliament is here to audit the accounts; another, to right the complaints of the people, and the third, to make the people understand what the laws were. These were the three great functions of Parliament, and the only functions of Parliament that he stated. I wish that the members of this House would take a little cognisance of that; it shows the fundamental defects of the legislation of hon. gentlemen opposite. Just to audit accounts, to make complaints and hear complaints, and to let the country see what they are talking about—that seems to be the drift and the base of operations of hon. gentlemen opposite. I say there is a higher basis for Parliament. It is to look over this great country, to see where its wealth can be developed, to lay down railways, to promote our marine and our various other branches of industry, to legislate for the development and growth of the country; and the men who come to a Parliament with no higer ideas of their duties than simply to audit accounts, hear complaints, and let the people hear them talk, are not men who do now or will in the future command the confidence of the people of this country.

Mr. CHARLTON. I had supposed, Sir, until the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) addressed the House, that the silence of the Government side was tantamount to a confession that the Bill now under the consideration of the House was indefensible. Either that, Sir, or that the majority at the back of the Czar of Canada felt somewhat sulky that the flimsy, easily-broken-down restraints of parliamentary usage should interpose any obstacles to the registering of the decrees of that puissant potentate. The hon. member for King's informs us that he would be sorry himself to see this Bill introduced if there was any disposition to rush it through with undue haste. Well, Sir, I can credit the hon. gentleman with truthfulness, and I can also credit him, in the same connection, with verdancy. Any gentleman who will make that assertion is verdant, with regard to Parliamentary usages in this House. Sir, the manifest object of introducing this Bill at this stage of the Session is to rush it through with undue haste, and to stifle the discussion that should be had upon it. There could have been no other motive actuating the right hon. leader of the Government than to stifle that discussion, which he naturally dislikes and dreads, with reference to this most objectionable measure. The hon. gentleman asks: Is it not fair to suppose that the Bill will be put through? Yes, I think it is; I think it is quite fair to suppose that the Bill will be put through. I think it is fair to suppose that every gentleman sitting on that side of the House, who usually votes for a Government measure, will aid in putting this Bill through, no matter what may be its iniquities, and no matter or how clearly those iniquities may be exposed to the House and the country. Yes, it is fair to suppose that the Bill will be put through—summarily put through. It is fair to suppose, moreover, that no measure can be proposed by this Government, no matter how much it may trample on the rights of the people of this country, that will not be put through by that majority. The hon. gentleman tells us that the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) has exaggerated the provision of the Bill regarding revising barristers; he tells us that the Bill provides that judges may be appointed revising barristers. Yes, judges may be; but does the hon. gentleman suppose that any judges, except those of the right political stripe, will be appointed to those positions? Will he tell me that he thinks that the object of the provision with regard to revising barristers is to secure anything like justice—that any man with a character high enough to do that which is right between the Government and the Opposition will ever be placed in that position? No, Sir; that is not the object of this provision. Its object is to put in the hands of the Government the power to place its own creatures in those positions. Some Sessions ago this Government passed a Bill, which provided where Reformers should vote, and hived them together in useless majorities; and now it goes a step further, and introduces a Bill which provides what Reformers shall vote. That is the object of this provision with regard to revising barristers. Why, Sir, I am told that in the Province of Nova Scotia there are judges who have two or three large counties to attend to. Can they, in addition to the duties now devolving upon them, undertake the duties of revising barristers as well? No, Sir, they cannot; and it is not the intention of the Government that they shall. Then the hon. gentleman scoffs at the idea that my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon) should have said that there have been no petitions—no evidences of a popular desire that the franchise should be changed; no evidences of dissatisfaction with the condition of things that now exists. He says that this has nothing to do with the matter—that the legislation is introduced without reference to popular sentiment. I know it is. I know it is a common thing for this Government to introduce measures without reference to popular sentiment; but I say that there was force and pertinence in the objection raised by the hon. member for St. John, that there was no evidence of any popular demand for a change with reference to the franchise that we now have. Sir, the present condition of things has lasted—how long? Each Province has been the judge of the qualifications of its own franchise since it has had an existence, and this condition of things has lasted since this Dominion was formed. For eighteen years this practice has gone on, has worked well, and there has been no friction, and no desire or demand for any change. Whether the power rests with the Government or not, with reference to this matter, it is entirely unnecessary that the Government should exercise this power. The hon. gentleman tells us that the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), in asserting that enough publicity had not been given to this Bill, had made a statement that would not be borne out by the facts, inasmuch as the Bill had been before the country, not only during this Session, but had been introduced before, and for that reason the country must necessarily be familiar with its provisions. I say that the country is not familiar with the provisions of the Bill; I say the country has no means of becoming familiar with them, or at least will not likely become familiar with them, except by means of the discussions in this House; and the objections taken by the hon. member for South Huron, that the Session was well advanced, that public interest in the affairs of the Session had well nigh spent itself, that an event of greater importance in the eyes of the public was engrossing public attention, and that public attention would not be turned towards the discussions in this House, were objections in which there was force and pertinency. At this stage of the Session the Bill will not receive that attention which it should receive from the country. If introduced at all, it ought to have been introduced before. We are told that the Bill has been drafted two years. If so, it should have been introduced at the very earliest stage of this Session, when we were doing nothing, when we were meeting to hear prayers pronounced from that stand, to go through a few formal proceedings, and then adjourn. That was the time to introduce and discuss this measure. It should not have been held back until the 79th day of the Session. And he tells us that the principles of this Bill are incontrovertible, and the hon. member for Northumberland tells us that Parliament has paramount power in this matter. Well, the British North America Act, in the 91st section, delegates specially the powers of Parliament that belong to it—delegates each power by name—and this power is not there delegated. It is true that the 41st section of the Act does

say: that "Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, all laws in force in the several Provinces at the Union, relative to the following matters, or any of them, namely, the qualifications and disqualifications of persons to be elected or to sit or vote as members of the House of Assembly or Legislative Assembly in the several Provinces, the voters at elections of such members," shall be within the power of Parliament to act upon; but there can be no doubt that if the Government has the power to fix the qualifications of the voters, it will transcend its constitutional power should it enact the provisions of this Bill. If it has power to fix the qualifications of voters, it has not the power to place a creature of the Government in every electoral division of the Dominion, to trample upon the rights of electors, and to say that one man who has the qualifications may vote, and that another who has may not vote. The Government has not the right to put autocrats in these positions, to give decisions from which there is no appeal. In doing that it transcends the rights of humanity, it transcends the rights of human liberty, it transcends the powers inherent in and conferred upon it by the British North America Act; but I believe that even the power of fixing the qualifications of voters is a power not consistent with the broad principle of federation. I believe it is a power that strikes at the very foundation of that principle of federation upon which a great number of States and of Commonwealth may exist together under one Government. I find, in a work, the title of which is "The Republic of Republics," a reference to this matter in the formation of the American constitution; at a future stage of this Bill I shall dwell more fully upon that feature of the case, and point out more fully the example of the United States, the example of a federation in which for 100 years every State has fixed the qualifications for voters to vote for the President of the United States and members of the House of Representatives. When that provision was made, the greatest divergence of provisions existed among the separate colonies, with regard to the qualifications of voters; but every State has, from the date of the formation of the constitution to the present, been its own judge as to the qualifications of voters who shall vote for Presidents and members of Congress. It is a principle of federation, which lies at the foundation of the federative principle, that if the federation attempts to take that right from the individual members who compose it and who delegate their authority to the Union, it transgresses the fundamental principle of federation. The writer of this work says, under the title, "Only a Federation was possible:"

"In the great work before them, the fathers had little or no opportunity for high creative or reorganising statesmanship. The entities or materials to build with, were all matters of fact, pre-existent and perfect; the main conditions were all forewritten; and natural logic carried the architects, with the inexorableness of Divine decress, to a federation. Neighboring kindered, republican and friendly societies, each free and sovereign, and all with cognate principles and mutual interests, were to associate to preserve themselves, and the precious rights of their members. They could but plan through agents, and themselves vitalise the plan. So that if Hamilton, Morris, Wilson, Washington, and others really did wish—as some assert, thought without proof—to consolidate or nationalise the States, they builded better than they knew, and they afterwards confessed that such purpose, if ever held, was not accomplished; and declared that a federation of sovereign Commonwealth was actually made!"

Now, if this Dominion is not a federation of sovereign Commonwealths, what is it? When the foundation of this Dominion was laid, who were the parties that negotiated and carried into effect that scheme? Who were they who laid the foundations of this Confederation? Who framed the British North America Act? Why, it was the delegates of the different Provinces. These Provinces acted as separate and independent Provinces; their autonomy was distinctly preserved; they entered into Confederation, not as a common people, but as Provinces; the British North America Act made provision for the further admission into this Confederation of sovereign Provinces, and two sovereign Provinces have since been admitted into it. But perhaps it is not advisable, at this stage of the procedings, to enter more fully into a discussion of this matter. Of course the question before us is no not the Bill upon its merits, but the propriety of postponing its consideration. Now, the Government, in their course with this Bill, have resorted to tactics which are quite characteristic. I venture to say that there is no legislative body of a christian state in this world that pursues the course, with regard to important legislation, which is habitually pursued in this Canadian House of Commons. There are legislative bodies where, in the last days of the Session, measures are pressed through, perhaps, with undue haste, for the reason that the accumulation of work may render it necessary; but I venture to say that there is no Legislative Assembly in christendom where the deliberate, malicious intention of the Government leads to the introduction of measures which cannot be fairly and fully considered. In other Legislative Assemblies, where measures are put through at the end of a Session, it is owing to circumstances over which the Government has no control, but here it is the habitual act of the Government to introduce important measures at a stage of the Session so late that they cannot receive due consideration. I looked at the *Hansard* to-day to find out when the measures promised in the Addresses at previous Sessions were brought before the House. I took the year 1879. The Address was voted on the 13th February and the House prorogued on the 15th May. The measures promised in the Speech from the Throne were, first, specific railway legislation. That specific railway legislation was introduced on the 10th May, five days before prorogation, and the House went into committee on it on the 12th May, three days before prorogation, although the House met on the 13th February and the measure was promised in the Address. Then a measure was promised with regard to contagious diseases in animals, and that measure received its second reading on the 12th April, just one month before prorogation. Then the consolidation of Dominion Lands Act was introduced on the 7th May and the House prorogued on the 15th. Now, these were all measures promised in the Speech from the Throne, and ought to have been introduced promptly, so as to recieve full consideration and discussion; yet every one of them was introduced at a stage of the Session so late that it was impossible to give it the full, fair and candid consideration of the House. And these measures were introduced in this way, because the Government designed it, because the Government wished to force them through without discussion. In 1882 the House met on the 9th February and prorogued on the 17th May. In the Speech from the Throne the measures promised were, first, an Act for the winding-up of insolvent banks and insurance companies, and this measure was introduced and received its second reading on the 2nd May. Another measure was one consolidating the Dominion Lands Act, and that was introduced on the 11th April; another was an amendment to the Supreme Court Act, and that was not introduced at all. Another measure, not promised, was the nefarious Gerrymandering Act, which was introduced on the 28th April, and, of course, could not and did not receive that degree of attention, that amount of discussion and consideration, which a measure as important as that was entitled to. Then, in 1883, the House met on the 9th of February, and was prorogued on the 25th of May. The principal measure proposed that year was a Civil Service Amendment Act, and that Act received its second reading only on the 1st day of May. And, in 1884, the House met on the 17th January, was prorogued on the 19th April, and the only measure of importance promised in the Speech from the Throne was an Indian Bill, which received its second reading on the 24th March, just a few days before the prorogation of the House. This indicates the mode in which this Government habitually deals with important legislation—with its most important

measures. They are brought in at the very latest days of the Session, they are rushed through with unseemly haste, when the House is not prepared to accord to them full and fair discussion. It is the deliberate purpose of the Government, a purpose which we see repeated with reference to this Bill, which is now before the House. I suppose that really it would be about as well if we did not introduce these Bills at all. I suppose that, under our present system and mode of operating, we do not look very much to Parliament here. I have been unable, for the last two or three years to see what practical purpose this Parliament serves. The Government is autocratic. The head of this Government is as autocratic as the Czar of Russia. All that these hon. gentlemen on the opposite side do is to record his decrees. They have no individuality, so far as the legislation of this country is concerned, and for all practical purposes their services and our services might as well be dispensed with. This Bill that we are discussing at this moment, an outrageous measure, a measure that could not be passed in any other commonwealth in christendom, I believe, will receive every vote, I have no doubt, that is usually cast in support of the measures of this Government. The supporters of the Government will not stop to consider the ultimate consequences of that measure, and even, I fear, if they were convinced that the ultimate consequences of that measure would be disastrous and ruinous to the country, it would not detach a vote from that solid phalanx that backs up the Minister. It is true, as has been remarked before to-night, that the important work of this Session all lies before us, here on the seventy-ninth day of the Session, the estimates almost untouched, Estimates of enormous magnitude, Estimates that will be swollen, perhaps, by one or two million dollars, by the events now transpiring in the North-West. The very consideration of these Estimates, if they were properly considered, would consume all the time that this House ought to spend at Ottawa before prorogation. I say nothing of other pressing measures. This is not a pressing measure. It is a measure that can be considered for another year without detriment even to the interests of the Government. It is a measure certainly that ought not to pass, and that should, at all events, receive full consideration before it does pass. This measure is one of far-reaching consequences. Never before, since a Parliament assembled within these walls, has a measure been submitted to this House of Commons of as great importance and promising as far-reaching consequences as the measure we have under consideration at the present time. This Bill has been held back—I have watched the course of the Government, with regard to the Bill, with interest—it has been held back now for two years, and it has seemed to me that the First Minister and his colleagues have hesitated before taking that fatal plunge that they have taken to-day; it has seemed to me that they have realised the enormity of the offence they were about to perpetrate if they introduced and passed this Bill, and that, with that little lingering, flickering amount of conscience that may be left in their breasts, they have felt that they ought not to introduce it. But a few days ago, like a thunderclap, events burst upon them in the North-West, that were undoubtedly, to some extent, brought about by their own mismanagement. Their creatures there were engaged in dividing timber limits, mining leases, pasture land leases, and driving the half-breed settlers from the lands granted to colonisation companies and preventing them from cutting timber which had been granted to the friends of the Government; their creatures, I say, were engaged in dividing the spoils, every man with his arm up to the shoulder in the Dominion grab-bag, and like a clap of thunder the rebellion burst upon the country, a rebellion provoked, incited, brought about by the rascalities and misdeeds of these men whom the Government had sent up there as a reward for political services. And now the necessity for this iniquitous Bill, which will enable the Government to determine who shall vote, which will enable them to disfranchise enough voters to give them the majority wherever they please, now in their estimation the necessity for this Bill is very great, and consequently they have bid adieu to their lingering scruples, they have stifled their conscientious scruples, they have taken the last fatal plunge, they have introduced this Bill, and, as my hon. friend from Queen's says, there is no doubt it will be passed. Well, I have no doubt of it, but I cannot help saying that I feel more than regret at the course the Government has taken. I feel that this high-handed act of despotism, this measure, which is to trample upon the liberties of the people of Canada, is fraught with danger. This Confederation is already subjected to a dangerous strain. It may be possible that this Confederation, without further strain put upon it, already totters to its fall, and if the people of this Dominion are worthy to be considered free men, if the people of this Dominion value the privileges and the liberties that have descended to them from their forefathers, they will never submit to these usurpations that are practised by these political tricksters who occupy the Government benches. We are in danger of having our institutions subverted by secession. Measures of this kind cannot be carried forward year after year, and to any extent, with impunity. The day will come when my right hon. friend, with all his astuteness, with all his tact, with all his personal magnetism, with all his command of men, will find that the people will inform him and his colleagues and his supporters that they have trampled upon their rights and disregarded their interests as long as they will permit. The time will come when these high-handed outrages, when these acts of the Government, calculated to subvert the liberties of the people, will no longer be submitted to. Sir, I will say, in conclusion—because I am not going further into the discussion of the principle of the Bill at the present time—that there is no doubt, whatever may be the merits of the Bill, whatever may be the advisability of placing it on the Statute Book, that in the public interest, and with any due regard to decency, the consideration of the Bill ought to be postponed. It is a Bill that alters the very foundations of our institutions; it is a Bill that invades the domain of provincial rights; it is a Bill, Sir, that is subversive of the very principles of Confederation; it is a Bill that imperils the stability of this Dominion; it is a Bill of such importance, far transcending in importance any Bill that we have ever before considered in this House, that it requires ample time, it requires caution and deliberation, it requires the best counsels of this House and of this nation. It is a Bill, Sir, contemplating a step that ought not to be taken in haste; a Bill contemplating a step that ought to be taken deliberately and with care. It is a question that should be approached, not in the spirit of political jugglery, but in the spirit of statesmanship; and if the spirit of statesmanship actuates my right hon. friend and his colleagues, they will not attempt to press this measure at this stage of the Session, without permitting that, which cannot be had under the circumstances, the discussion to which the importance of the measure entitles it.

Mr. DAWSON. If we were to believe all that has been said about this Bill, we should suppose that it would turn the world upside down. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat describes it in such a way as would lead us to suppose that grave misfortunes are to be apprehended from it. As regards the complaint that there is not sufficient time to consider this Bill, it has certainly been for two years before the House. It was brought down last Session, and the changes made in it now are very slight. Last Session I got a great many copies of it and distributed

them through the constituency I have the honor to represent: so that the complaint that it is sprung upon the House is quite unfounded, so far as I can judge. We have also had it before us for some time during the present Session. Now, I think this is a necessary Bill, in the interests of the Dominion. At present the franchises are regulated by the different Provinces. In Ontario, within the last two years, we have had no less than two election Bills; and they are changing their system so often that we scarcely know under what franchise an election is to be carried. This last Session a very material change has been made by the Ontario Legislature.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). They are blind to anything done there, or not honest enough to admit it.

Mr. DAWSON. Why should we be subjected to having our elections regulated by any Province of the Dominion? In Ontario the changes brought about are very serious indeed. Speaking of Gerrymandering Bills, of Bills that change the franchise, they have in Ontario disfranchised a certain class of people, and have enfranchised others. Everything that has been said in reference to this Bill now before the House applies with ten times greater force to the Bill which has just been passed by the Ontario Legislature. I think this is a very liberal Bill, and goes as far as any Bill ought to go in extending the franchise. Unless we are to adopt manhood suffrage, or universal suffrage, this Bill goes as far as any Bill should go, at least in the present position of the country. The time may come when manhood suffrage may be desirable, but I do not think it is so at present. But as to having the laws of the Provinces made the law of the Dominion, I believe that when that system was first adopted, if this Parliament had declared the provincial laws then in existence, to be the law of the Dominion, it would not have been very objectionable; because, if the law, as it existed at one time, afterwards required amendments, they could have been made by the Dominion, and not by the Provinces. At one time there was a certain law in the Provinces, and if you had adopted it and amended it afterwards, as occasion required, I think there could have been no objection. But to leave the Dominion Parliament at the mercy of the changing politics of the Provinces, would be very unwise. I think this measure is well conceived, that the Dominion Parliament should legislate for the franchise on which its members are to be elected. When the Bill goes into committee I shall point out some little things in which this last Ontario Act would affect the Dominion. As to giving the franchise to women, I cannot say a great deal on that subject. However, I do not know that it would be a very dangerous step; and certainly it would be very interesting to have ladies engaged in canvassing, and the canvassing would be made exceedingly pleasant. But why are hon. members, who are in favor of this franchise, afraid to follow it out to a legitimate conclusion? If ladies are to be entrusted with the franchise, they ought also to be eligible as members of this House. If you begin with this step you cannot stop there. I think it would be very pleasant, I think it would be delightful, to have a lady elected as Speaker. If you are to adopt the principle at all, I do not see why you should not carry it out to its legitimate conclusion. I have no doubt many ladies would make excellent members of Parliament. Now, the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) expressed himself strongly on the subject of revising barristers. That, and other matters, can be discussed in detail when we go into committee on the Bill. We know that the Opposition are always ready with suggestions and amendments This is not an iron Bill, but is open to amendment. The general complaint is, that it is now too late in the Session to discuss this Bill. Well, I think there will be time to discuss it. The Opposition, at all events, cannot complain; they do a great deal of discussion every day, and I think they will manage to be able to discuss the provisions of this Bill. The hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) says that they are weak and few in numbers; but certainly if they are few in numbers we must give them the credit for making all that up in eloquence. I am sure if you refer to the *Hansard* you will find that more than one-half of the volume is taken up by the Opposition. So I do not think they should complain of the paucity of their numbers when they make it up so admirably, as they do, in the eloquence and length of their speeches. We must give them credit, to a certain extent, for helping through the legislation, when they are in the humor to do so. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has described this Bill as a measure of disfranchisement, as a measure to trample on the liberties of the people, and one by which our institutions are to be subverted by secession; in fact, this Bill is something terrible, from his point of view. I hardly think it is such a terrible Bill as he considers it; at least, it does not appear so in my view. It seems to be a very excellent measure, and when we come to discuss it we shall be better able to judge its merits, after we have heard the different clauses discussed. In the meantime, I am prepared to vote for the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster) has said that the fact that there have been no petitions asking for the Bill is no objection to it. The hon. gentleman seemed to take a different view a few days ago, when another Bill was before the House. The hon. gentleman, I think, referred to many petitions being presented, and he seemed to think it was of some consequence that Parliament, in legislating, should seek to legislate in accordance with the well-understood wishes of the people. The First Minister, we are told, proposed this Bill two or three Sessions ago. Yes; I think the hon. gentleman introduced a Bill very much like this one. But he did not carry it two or three Sessions ago, nor last Session. And we had no reason to suppose that he would attempt to carry out his purpose any more this Session than during the Sessions that have preceded. The hon. gentleman promised this measure in 1867. It is true that the Bill was not then introduced; but in 1869, the second Session of the first Parliament of Canada, the hon. gentleman did introduce the Bill. It was read the first time, and the Order was discharged. In the Session of 1870 the hon. gentleman brought forward a very similar Bill. It was read the first time on the 24th February; it was read the second time on 10th March, and some progress was made in committee; but the Order was, after some weeks, discharged. So it is perfectly obvious that this Bill truly represents the views of the First Minister. I do not agree with the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister), who said he did not think the First Minister had read the Bill. In my opinion, he has read it carefully, considered all the clauses, and estimated with the greatest possible care what will be the probable effect of the measure when adopted. It was prepared for a purpose. In fact, the First Minister had in view, it seems to me, the consideration of the question as to whether we should have in future two parties or one party represented in Parliament. That is the question which the hon. gentleman has considered in the preparation of this Bill, and that is the question which this House and the country must consider in discussing it. It is plain that the hon. gentleman has set his heart on this measure. Seventeen years ago he introduced a similar Bill into Parliament. It has been introduced six or eight times. The hon. gentleman has found great and formidable objections among his own party to the carrying of the measure; it is not the view of hon. gentlemen on this side, of the House, but of hon. gentlemen on his own side, that has caused this delay. It is perfectly obvious, not only to every member of this House, but to the country, that the hon. gentleman has

with the greatest possible difficulty, obtained the consent of his friends to the passage of this measure; and if it is carried through this House, it will be carried through with the great majority of the members, if they were to act according to their individual convictions, willing to vote against the measure. It is true that the hon. gentleman himself favors it. It may be true that a few of his followers favor it; but I believe it is equally true that the great majority of his followers are opposed to it because they know it involves the question as to whether we shall have a legislative in place of a federal Union. That is the important question. That is the all-important question. The hon. gentleman says he is in favor of British institutions. I find by the British North America Act that we were to have a constitution, similar in principle to the British Constitution, but it is also stated that we were to be federally united. The three kingdoms and Wales are legislatively united—there is only one Legislature to legislate for them. The representations of different portions of the United Kingdom are dealt with by the United Parliament, because there is no other Parliament to deal with questions, whether local or general. But I should like to know what the First Minister knows of the people of British Columbia? I know very little about them; but I believe that the people of that Province, represented in their own Legislature, separated from the rest of the Dominion, are infinitely better qualified to decide as to what should be the qualifications of the electors who are to vote for members of the Local Legislature and Dominion Parliament, than any of the members of this House. What do the members of British Columbia know of the people of Prince Edward Island, or the representatives of Ontario and Quebec know of the people of the other Provinces? Yet that is the question which the hon. gentleman proposes to deal with in this House. I am not going to discuss the merits of the question, as to whether we should deal with the subject of the franchise by this House or accept the franchises prepared by the Local Legislatures for local and federal representative purposes. But I will state this fact, that under the constitution of the United States, a constitution intended to govern a people of the same origin as ourselves, a constitution that grew out of the circumstances of the people and not out of the theoretical views of a Government, it was provided that each State should decide what should be the qualifications of the electors that sent representatives to the House of Representatives in Congress; and though a hundred years have gone by since the constitution was first established, yet that is the rule by which the peopeople elect their representatives in Congress, down to this hour. The hon. gentleman said he was in favor of British institutions. Those institutions require that this Parliament should und rtake to carry on its legislation in accordance with the well understood wishes of the people. When we go to the country each party submits its policy. The elections take place with respect to the political opinions advanced. The views submitted by each party upon public questions are taken up, and it is supposed that Parliament will deal with those questions during its continuance. I should like to knoww hen the First Ministers ubmitted this question to the country and made it a political issue? I say that unless he has done so he has no right to legislate on the question. There is no rule better settled in the Government of England, and in the practice of both parties of England, than this, that no important change shall be made in the constitution of the country without its first having been made an issue at the elections and the opinion of the country taken upon it. Why, Sir, Mr. Gladstone proposed, in 1868, his resolution on the subject of the connection between the Irish Church and the State, and Mr. Disraeli, who was leading the Opposition—or rather, who was leading the Government, for it was a Government in a minority, said: The hon. gentleman has no right to propose such a measure as this without an appeal to the country. It is our business here to legislate under the constitution, and not to alter the fundamental law or the principles upon which Parliament itself is constituted, and the relations between Parliament and the church. He said: The church is a national institution; the connection between it and the State has existed for centuries; it has so continued to exist, and the nation itself must decide the question as to whether there shall be a change or not. Mr. Gladstone assented to that view; he proposed his resolution, and he carried it through the House of Commons. It became an issue, the Conservative party taking the one side and the Reform party taking the other. The Reform party were triumphant and the question was dealt with, but not until the country had sanctioned and authorised Parliament to deal with it. I say that in every important question affecting the interests of the country, affecting the constitution of the Government itself, it is the duty of Parliament to seek the views of the country, to make the measures which it believes in the public interest an issue in the elections, and to take the views of the electors on such questions. That is the only way in which the Government can be carried on in accordance with the well-understood views or wishes of the people. It is sometimes said that if you had a Government by learned and competent men it would be safer that to trust it to a great number of electors. But I hold that it is better that we should occasionally make mistakes in carrying on the Government in accordance with the wishes of the people than that we should undertake to carry on the Government on some idea of perfectibility, without consulting the electors at all. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, on the question of the tariff, took issue with us in 1878. It is true, Sir, that he has sometimes said that the people should not be consulted on questions of public policy, but on that question he did consult them, and in 1882 he prematurely dissolved Parliament, in an unconstitutional way, while he was enjoying the confidence of a great majority of the country. And for what purpose? To see if the views of the people of the country had undergone a change on that question. But while he thought it important that the country should be consulted on that question, he proposes to deal with this question without consulting the country at all. Why, Sir, in 1869 or 1870, in the first Parliament of Canada, the hon. gentleman proposed a Bill of this kind, but he failed to carry it through Parliament; the Opposition in his own ranks was such that he could not succeed. This is the fifth Parliament of Canada that we have carried on the Government of this country on another system; we have acted on the assumption that the qualification of the electors should be left to the Local Legislatures. We have accepted without question the voters' lists that they have provided for us. They have the necessary machinery, and those lists grow out of the taxation of the country. The qualification of the electors is not determined or controlled by political considerations. It is based on perfectly fair considerations, and we have acted on that principle through four Parliaments, this being the fifth, and we have done so without any one complaining, without any mischief growing out of that system, without any abuse. Now, the hon. gentleman says that he is not a doctrinaire—he has told us so over and over again; he says he is a practical politician, and that he proposes practical measures to remedy practical defects. Now, what is the defect or evil which has grown out of the present system, rendering a measure of this kind necessary? It has not been intimated or suggested that any evil has grown out of the present system. Then, why is it proposed to radically change the constitution in this particular, without consulting the electors, without any practical grievance having arisen under the existing system. That is what the hon. gentle-

man now proposes. He comes to Parliament and says: Here, I propose a change in the constitution; I wish to make a radical alteration with respect to the preparation of the voters' lists. And to what purpose? What necessity is there for it? Has any one complained? Have the people of Canada, in any Province, said that they are not fairly represented, that this House does not fairly represent the country, or that you cannot have a fair representation under the present Franchise Bill? And, Mr. Speaker, let me say that the franchise law is a law of the Parliament of Canada. We have declared by Act of this Parliament that the voters' lists prepared under the local law for local purposes shall be the voters' lists upon which the elections to the House of Commons shall take place. That is our Act; we have adopted that rule. The hon. gentleman has not proposed, in any contest we have had, in any general election, that that law should be changed. The hon. gentleman said that he would teach the little tyrant Mowat a lesson in Ontario, that he would take the appointment of the license commissioners out of his hands, and why? Because, he said, they had taken the appointment of license commissioners out of the hands of the people. What does he now propose to do? The preparation of the voters' lists is in the hands of the people themselves, in Ontario, and, I suppose, in the other Provinces as well. They elect the assessors and the municipal councillors, and they have the preparation of the voters' lists. If a man is dissatisfied he appeals to the county judge; everything is in the hands of the people themselves. He proposes by this Bill that this matter shall be taken out of the hands of the people and put into—whose hands? Put into the hands of the creatures of the Administration for the time being. It is true that the Bill says what are to be the qualifications of the electors, but it also says that the revising officer, as he is called—and he is miscalled, for he is not the revising officer, but is the party who originally prepares the lists—shall judge as to whether the party possesses the qualifications or not. A man may be worth $10,000, and the revising officer may decide he is not worth $100, and yet he can have no remedy. I put this extreme case to show the absurdity of the rule. In all matters of evidence he is himself the sole judge, and his acts and conclusions cannot be questioned. They may be contrary to the law, they may be grossly in violation of the terms of the law, yet his decision is to be the law. This Bill practically provides, not that the provisions of the Bill shall be the law, but that the party who is appointed to carry out those provisions shall be himself the law-maker and the judge in the case. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman talks about uniformity. He says he is not in favor of pedantic uniformity, that he is not an admirer of anything of that sort, that he is not a stickler for anything of the kind. We all know what that means. It means that the hon. gentleman could not have pedantic uniformity. It means that his own friends have made some stipulations with him that he is bound to carry out before his Bill is carried through the House; they will not consent to his doing precisely what he wishes. What concession has he made to them? What change in his original intention? What alteration has he promised in this Bill, which made it necessary for him to inform the House that he is not going to be a stickler for uniformity, which, he said, was absolutely necessary in order to remove the anomalies which exist in the law as it stands at the present time. Let me mention a fact or two. The hon. gentleman, at the time of Confederation, proposed to create the district of Algoma; what did he do in that case? Did he decided that the people of Algoma should possess the same qualifications as the people in other parts of Ontario? Not at all; he established a different qualification; why? Algoma was in the Province of Ontario, and yet the people were so differently circumstanced in that part of the Province from what they were in other parts, that in order to give them the franchise at all it was necessary to adopt a different rule. He could not carry out the principle of uniformity in a single Province; how then can he do it over the entire Dominion? I say the people of Prince Edward Island are the best judges of who are capable of exercising the franchise in that Province; and so are the people in every other Province. The constitution of the Dominion provides that each Province shall receive representation in proportion to its numbers. That constitution does not do away with all provincial boundaries; it does not declare that we are here a unit, without provincial boundaries; it declares that this Dominion is a multiple, of which the Provinces are the integers; it says that the Province of Quebec shall have sixty-five members, and the others shall have proportionate representation. The whole organisation of the country is based on the autonomy of the Provinces, which the hon. gentleman is seeking by this Bill to break down. The hon. gentleman says the Local Legislatures may sweep away half of our constituents, and that we may not be able to go back to the same people who sent us here. That is perfectly true, and the hon. gentleman proposes, by this very Bill, that we shall not go back to the same people. He proposes that nearly one-half of the voters in Prince Edward Island, and nearly one-half the voters in British Columbia, shall be disfranchised. The hon. gentleman cannot find a single instance, in the United Kingdom, in which people were disfranchised, upon whom the electoral franchise was conferred, unless for some corrupt act, or for some gross violation of the election law. What does the hon. gentleman propose to do? These people are voters under the law of Canada, because the law declares that they shall be. He proposes, by the Bill before us, to disfranchise them. I would like to know how many members on the other side of the House are willing to go before their constituents and declare that they voted for and helped to carry through Parliament a measure, the effect of which was to disfranchise many thousands of voters in Ontario, and thousands in the Provinces where representation is based on the principle of manhood suffrage. Now, the hon. gentleman has spoken about the representation of interests. The doctrine he laid down, seemed to me a very extraordinary doctrine in the face of the constitution, which declares that the principle on which our representation shall be based shall be population, and not interests. The theory of the representation of interests, and classes as such, has entirely disappeared in England, and has long since disappeared in this country. The hon. gentleman, in the last Parliament, talked of the sacred principle of representation by population; and yet we find in this very Bill he declares that the principle of representation is not the one he keeps in view, but it is that of different classes and separate interests. Years ago, Sir James Mackintosh, in discussing representation in England, spoke of the representation of interests, and he said it was necessary to so organise the representation of the House of Commons that no one class should have the majority, so that no one class would guard its own interests, to the detriment and injury of the other classes of the community. But the Reform Bill changed that altogether; and since 1867 there has been no such principle recognised. Every one who followed the discussion that took place in England last summer, with reference to representation, found almost every speaker on both sides declaring that it was not their intention longer to keep alive the theory of the representation of interests; it was the people as a people who were represented. The principle of representation by population is there approximately recognised in the Redistribution Bill as it is in this country. The principle the hon. gentleman appeals to as an excuse for undertaking to deal with this question at all, is one that was swept away by the very terms of our constitution, which provides for representation by population. Now, the Minister of Public Works told us that

we had taken up a great deal of time in discussion; that we spent a whole day yesterday in discussing one Bill, and the whole of the preceding day in discussing another. Well, I believe one of those Bills had fifty-nine clauses, and the other a still larger number; and I do not believe the hon. gentlemrn will find that, except in cases of extraordinary emergency, in the last thirty years, Bills of similar length have been carried through in the British House of Commons in a single sitting. But hon. gentlemen opposite have been used so long to have granted what they ask, without enquiry or objection, that when it is proposed that we should exercise the functions with which the people have entrusted us, they make it a matter of complaint. Now, we know that very serious difficulties have grown out of this practice of carrying Bills through at the heel of the session. We know, for instance, the difficulties the License Act has created in the working of the Temperance Act, because of the inconsiderate and hasty manner in which that Bill was rushed through this House at the end of the Session. Then, to-day, in looking at the North-West Bill of 1880, I found a provision declaring that Rupert's Land should be under the jurisdiction of the Government of the North-West, that is, the whole territory on the east as well as on the west side of Hudson Bay, although separated by the district of Keewatin. It is quite clear that Parliament intended nothing of the sort, and it is probable that the hon. gentleman did not intend it; but the Bill was so prepared by the draughtsman, brought down, and hurried through the House. In the same way a great many measure are carried through without consideration, which are not creditable to the House; and this is always likely to occur, so long as the House fails to discharge the duties with which the electors have entrusted it. The hon. gentleman, talked early in the Session, of adopting the English practice—that is, of giving a full exposition of the principles and details of a Bill upon its first reading. Now, I find that about ten lines are all that the *Hansard* contains of the hon. gentleman's explanations of this Bill on the first reading. In England, a Bill is invariably explained on its first reading; then it goes to the country, and everything that may be said in defence of its principles by the promoter of the Bill goes to the country at the same time. A few days, and sometimes weeks, are allowed to elapse for the consideration of the Bill and the arguments of its promoter, before it is again submitted to Parliament, so that the opinion of the country may be had, and so that the press may be enabled to discuss the measure intelligibly. Everything is done there with a care that is not exhibited in the proceedings taken here. Now, I think the difference between the English practice and our own, with regard to legislation is worthy of the serious consideration of the House. I have, over and over again, complained that the Government have refused or failed to bring down their measures at an earlier period of the Session, and I have, on several occasions, pointed out the fact that in England the uniform practice is for the Government, at a very early period of the Session, though the Sessions in England last six and seven months, to bring their measures to Parliament. The House and the country have thus an opportunity of fairly considering them before they are brought up for discussion, and there has been no important measure carried through the House of Commons without its receiving very full discussion and without several weeks elapsing between the introduction of the Bill and its final passage through the House. I have taken a note of a few of the Bills introduced by the hon. the First Minister, and the time when introduced. In 1880 the House met the 12th February and adjourned the 7th May. In the Speech from the Throne the hon. gentleman promised to bring down an Insolvency Bill, or, at all events, he said the question would engage the attention of Parliament. I remember my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) reminding the hon. gentleman that such a Bill had not been introduced, and the hon. gentleman assured him that his words in the Speech from the Throne were only a prediction, and referred to the Bill in the hands of some private member as an evidence of the accuracy of his prediction. The Civil Service Bill, which was promised, was not introduced at all; the Dominion Lands Act was introduced the 7th April and read the second time—that is, submitted for discussion the 1st May, just one week before the adjournment of the House. Then there was a Bill on banking, which was introduced the 26th April and read the second time on the 5th May, just two days before the adjournment, although the House met the 12th February. Another Bill promised was that relating to the North-West Territory, and that was introduced on the 5th March and submitted for discussion on its second reading on the 29th April. Then, in the Session of 1881, which met the 9th December and adjourned the 21st March, the principal measure introduced by the Government, besides the Pacific Railway contract, was the Bill for the enlargement of the Province of Manitoba; and that was introduced the 11th March and submitted for discussion the 18th March, just three days before prorogation. In the Session of 1882 the hon. gentleman promised, in the Speech from the Throne, to bring down Bills on the subjects of insolvent banks, insurance companies, trading corporations, Dominion lands, and there was one that he did not promise, on the representation of the people in Parliament. The first of these was introduced the 13th April and was read the second time on the 15th May, and the House adjourned on the 17th May. The Representation Bill was read the first time on the 6th May and the second time on the 8th May, although this was a most important measure, affecting the people of the country. In 1883, Parliament met on the 9th February. The two principal Bills introduced by the hon. gentleman were, one declaring that certain railways were for the general advantage of Canada and another relating to the License Act. The first was introduced the 9th May and read the second time on 18th May, just seven days before the prorogation of Parliament, which took place on the 25th May. The License Act was introduced the 16th May and discussed and read the second time the 19th May, just six days before the House prorogued. Now, Sir, I wish to call your attention to the English practice, as compared with the practice of the hon. gentleman. I have shown that while our Sessions last about three months, the most important measures during the five Sessions which I have noted out of the seven, were introduced or read the second time during the last fortnight of each Session. Let us compare that with the practice of the English Parliament. In 1831, when the great Reform Bill was submitted to Parliament, the House met on 21st June, the Reform Bill was submitted the 24th June, and read the second time on the 4th July. In 1846, when the repeal of the corn laws was proposed and the abandonment of the theory of protection, the House met the 22nd of January; Sir Robert Peel submitted his measure the 27th January, within five days after the meeting of the House, although the Sessions in England last generally seven months. Again, in 1867, the House of Commons met on the 5th February and the Reform Bill of Lord Derby was submitted the 11th of February, five days after the opening of the House, and was read the second time on the 18th March. In 1869 Mr. Gladstones's Bill for the disestablishment of the Irish Church was submitted to the House of Commons on the 1st March; the House met on the 16th February, and the Bill was read the second time on the 18th March. In 1870 Mr. Gladstone's Government submitted to the House the Irish Land Act; the House met on the 8th February, the Bill was submitted on the 15th February, and the second reading was moved on the 2nd March. In 1871 the House met on the 9th February; the Religious Test Act, relating to Oxford and Cambridge Universities,

was introduced the 10th February; a Bill relating to Trades Unions received its second reading the 14th March; the Army Regulations Bill was introduced the 21st February, and read the second time the 6th March; the Scotch Education Bill was introduced the 13th February and read the second time the 27th March—so that the four principal measures of the Government, or at least three out of four of them, were introduced during the first week of the Session, and the fourth was introduced eleven days after the meeting of the House. In 1873 Mr. Gladstone brought forward the Irish University Bill as the principal measure that Session. The House that year met the 6th February; the Bill was introduced the 13th February, and its second reading was moved the 13th March. The next important measure was the Supreme Court Bill, which was moved the 14th February and its second reading was moved the 11th March. In 1876 the two principal measures were the measures relating to Merchant Shipping and the Royal Titles Bill. The House met the 8th February; the Merchants Shipping Bill was introduced the 10th February, and read the second time the 17th February; the Royal Titles Bill was moved the 17th February and read the second time 9th March. In 1877 the House met the 8th February; the Prisons Bill was introduced the 9th February, the second day of the Session, and read the second time the 15th February; the Valuation of Property Bill was introduced the 12th February and read the second time on the 8th March; the University Education Bill, relating to Oxford and Cambridge, was introduced the 9th February and its second reading moved the 19th February; the Supreme Court of Judicature Act was introduced the 28th February and its second reading was moved the 15th March. So that the House will see that all the important measures, although the Sessions of the British House of Commons generally last seven months, were brought down the first fortnight of the Session—the second reading moved for the first month of the Session. That presents a remarkable contrast to the course the hon. the First Minister has pursued here. Why is such a course pursued in England? I have mentioned the reason before, and will repeat it again. It is because it is carrying out the ancient practice of redressing grievances before the supplies are granted. It is true the supplies are voted for from day to day, but the Supply Bill is the last Bill of the Session, and the supplies are not put forward without the legislative measures being pushed forward concurrently. In fact, all the measures which the Government think necessary for the redress of grievances to enable Parliament to administer the affairs of the country more satisfactorily are proposed to Parliament early in the Session, so that Parliament may know what the Government propose to do. Members have an opportunity of considering them, of consulting their constituents, because there the theory is adhered to of seeking to carry on the Government in accordance with the well-understood wishes of the people. There is an attempt to educate public opinion and to support and uphold the legislation of Parliament by an intelligent and well-informed public opinion. We ought not to undertake to deal with so important a measure as this at so late a period of the Session. I have pointed out to this House that this is a very important measure; that it is one upon which the country has not been consulted; that it is a measure of that kind upon which the opinion of the country ought to be taken, and that ought not to be dealt with until the opinion of the country is expressed. This has not been done. The measure is far less satisfactory than the present law; it is a violation of the federal principle in our constitution.

Mr. MITCHELL. Cut it short.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman exercised his own judgment about his own speech, and he must allow me the same privilege,

Mr. MITCHELL. But it is very late.

Mr. MILLS. He claims to be a Liberal, and, being a Liberal, of course he will not undertake to interfere with the judgment of any other member of the House. I wish to say a few words with regard to what are called revising officers. There is no such thing as a revising officer, properly so called. In England, the revising barrister is an officer who revises a list which has been prepared by somebody else. That is not proposed in this Bill, but what is proposed here is that this officer shall himself prepare the list. He is in no proper sense a revising officer. He is an officer for the purpose of preparing the voters' lists. He may consult the assessment roll; he is not bound to do so; he is not bound to accept the valuation put upon property by a sworn assessor; he exercises his own judgment, and he will, no doubt, exercise that judgment in accordance with the interests of the party by whom he is appointed. I ask the attention of the House to this fact. Here is an officer to be appointed, with a position as permanent as that of a judge. He is appointed by an interested party. There is no principle in our constitution better settled than the one which declares that no man ought to be a judge in his own cause. These gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches and their supporters have a very great interest, and so have we, as to who the revising officer shall be. I say they ought not to appoint him any more than we. Give us the power of appointing the revising officers and we can determine beforehand who will command a majority in this House; and when the hon. gentlemen have that power, we know what it means; we know it is a decision beforehand what the result of the election shall be. If you take up a voters' list in any constituency, you will see how small the majority is. A change of 2 or 3 per cent. would change the result of the election, and yet a 2 or 3 per cent. change may be made by a revising officer without his subjecting himself to very serious censure. He knows he is sufficiently protected. He goes very near the line; he gives the hon. gentlemen the benefit of every doubt, where a friend or supporter of theirs has property which is scarcely of the necessary value; he gives us the very reverse; he decides that we shall not have the advantage of the support of some one whose qualification is barely sufficient to enable him to exercise the elective franchise. I say that these provisions of the Bill are pernicious; they are a violation of the first principles of natural justice; they propose to make one of the parties interested in the contest the judge of the matter, or to give him the power of appointing a man who is to determine who is and who is not an elector in this country. In my opinion, that is a principle which is so unjust, so unfair in itself, that this House ought not for a moment to entertain it; it is so atrocious that hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches ought not to have proposed it; it is so atrocious that no Minister in England would dare to make such a proposition; no Parliament in England is so servile as to support such a proposition. Why, what would the hon. gentleman say if we, on this side of the House, were to claim the right to appoint the revising officers in all the constituencies that we represent? They would not for a moment accede to our proposition, and yet they propose to appoint them in all the constituencies. The proposition is a monstrous proposition, and one which the hon. gentleman must expect will be very fully discussed when this Bill goes into committee. One hon. gentleman said: Why, the First Minister may appoint judges, and will not the judges act fairly? Yes, he may appoint judges, and we know where he will appoint them. If there is a constituency with 400 or 500 reform majority he may appoint a judge there; he cannot do him any harm or any good; if there is a constituency where there is an overwhelming Tory majority, he may appoint a judge there, because he cannot do him any harm or any good; but, where there is a doubtful constituency, a constituency with

parties nearly equally balanced, unless the judge is a very strong partisan, and one who would be perfectly willing to do the bidding of the party chief, he will not be appointed. It would ruin the reputation of any judge to accept the appointment in such a constituency. It would be known beforehand what work would be assigned him to do. I know, and other members of this House know, why the law was changed with regard to returning officers, why the appointments made by Parliament were set aside, and the power of appointment taken into the hands of the hon. gentlemen. I say we had then perjured men, men who were sworn to discharge certain, duties which they failed to discharge, and what reason have we to suppose that they will act with any more care or scrupulousness or honesty in this matter than in the matter of the return of members to this House. Then there is the important question of female suffrage, introduced into this House, never submitted to the country, nor was the opinion of the country ever taken upon it. It is a very large question, a very serious question, one requiring very full discussion and careful consideration, and one which the House ought never to undertake to deal with finally without consulting the country upon it. The hon. gentleman proposes to give to certain women votes, and he declares that, if they marry, they shall be disfranchised. He makes marriage a punishment. In England it is usual to disfranchise a party for corrupt practices, for doing an improper act, for accepting a bribe, and the hon. gentleman proposed, first, to give certain women votes, and then to disfranchise them if they marry, after having received the vote. Now, this question of female suffrage is a very important one. We know that the question is one upon which there is very great difference of opinion. No one exactly knows or can predict beforehand what the effect will be. We know that women have to perform important functions in the work of civilisation, and they exercise an important influence over society, which is greatly to the advantage of the community. But, Sir, what would be the effect if they were brought upon the platform, induced to take part in public discussions and made candidates at the elections? For I say it is preposterous to suppose that you can give women votes and deny them the right of being elected. You must open every office in the country to them in the same way. Are you going to make them judges? Are you going to make them police? Are you going to make them magistrates? One hon. gentleman proposed that your place, Sir, should be occupied by a woman. Well, all these questions are involved in the consideration of this motion. I say it is utterly impossible that you can draw a line of qualification where the hon. gentleman proposes to draw it by this Bill. Now, that being the case, the Bill is one that will require weeks to discuss, and if the hon. gentleman supposes that because it is late in the Session, the former practice of hurrying through measures without consideration, will be adopted in this case, I am inclined to think he is very much mistaken. I believe a considerable number of members of this House have come to the conclusion that no matter at what period a measure shall be introduced, they will not consent to allow it to be carried through Parliament without that consideration which such a measure is entitled to receive at the hands of the representatives of the people. Now, looking at the number of measures that are still before the House, that it is necessary to deal with and upon which public opinion has been expressed; looking at the condition of the Estimates; looking at the circumstances of the country in the North-West, and at the necessity for parliamentary discussion, I say it is obvious that if this measure is pushed through this House, we must make up our minds to sit here until midsummer.

An hon. MEMBER. All right.

Mr. MILLS. Well, that may be all right, in his estimation; but if it is necessary to go on with these measures it is all right, there is no doubt about that. Therefore, I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will not exhibit so much impatience in the discussion of questions as they have done this evening. They can hardly suppose that a measure which the introducer spent but ten minutes in discussing can be so fully discussed in this House so as to satisfy the country, or make the member conversant with all the principles involved in the Bill, without several weeks being devoted to the matter. I think it is clear that this measure ought not to be read a second time this Session. The right hon. gentleman professes to have a high regard for English practice and precedent, but the English practice is, in all such cases, that a measure should be introduced the first fortnight of the Session, and that the principle has been approved of by the nation.

House divided on amendment of Sir Richard Cartwright (p. 1137).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	De St. Georges,	Livingstone,
Armstrong,	Edgar,	McIsaac,
Auger,	Fairbank,	McMullen,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fisher,	Mills,
Béchard,	Fleming,	Mulock,
Bernier,	Forbes,	Paterson (Brant),
Blake,	Geoffrion,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Gillmor,	Ray,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Gunn,	Riufret,
Cameron (Huron),	Harley,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Holton,	Scriver,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Innes,	Somerville (Brant),
Cartwright,	Irvine,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casey,	Jackson,	Springer,
Casgrain,	King,	Trow,
Catudal,	Kirk,	Vail,
Charlton,	Landerkin,	Weldon,
Cockburn,	Langelier,	Wilson,
Cook,	Laurier,	Yeo.—59.
Davies,	Lister,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Dodd,	McDougall (C. Breton),
Allison,	Dugas,	McGreevy,
Bain (Soulanges),	Dundas,	McLelan,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Dupont,	Massue,
Baker (Victoria),	Farrow,	Montplaisir,
Beaty,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	Paint,
Bell,	Fortin,	Pinsonneault,
Benoit,	Foster,	Pruyn,
Benson,	Gagné,	Reid,
Bergeron,	Gigault,	Riopel,
Bergin,	Girouard,	Royal,
Billy,	Gordon,	Shakespeare,
Blondeau,	Grandbois,	Small,
Bourbeau,	Guilbault,	Smyth,
Bowell,	Hackett,	Sproule,
Bryson,	Hall,	Stairs,
Burnham,	Hay,	Taschereau,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hesson,	Tassé,
Carling,	Hilliard,	Taylor,
Caron,	Homer,	Temple,
Chapleau,	Hurteau,	Tilley (Sir Leonard),
Cimon,	Jenkins,	Townshend,
Cochrane,	Kaulbach,	Tupper,
Colby,	Kilvert,	Vanasse,
Costigan,	Kranz,	Wallace (Albert),
Coughlin,	Labrosse,	Wallace (York),
Curran,	Langevin,	White (Cardwell),
Cuthbert,	Lesage,	White (Hastings),
Daly,	Macdonald (King's),	White (Renfrew),
Daoust,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wigle,
Dawson,	Mackintosh,	Wood (Brockville),
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Macmaster,	Wood (W'tm'land),
Desaulniers (St-M'rice),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Woodworth,
Desjardins,	McCallum,	Wright.—104.
Dickinson,	McDougald (Pictou),	

Mr. LAURIER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman's motion ought to carry. Although the motion that has just been lost declares that it is too late in the Session to discuss this question satisfactorily, I think, so far as the speeches have come from the other side, it has been dis-

cussed at length and satisfactorily, at all events, to themselves. However, as my hon. friend has not spoken, and as I am very anxious to hear him speak on the subject, I shall agree with him that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

EXPLOSIVE SUBSTANCES.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 95) respecting Explosive Substances.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This Bill was read a second time the other day, and now stands for Committee of the Whole. The hon. member for West Durham stated that he thought the Bill varied considerably from the Imperial Act. My impression was that he was correct. There are some merely verbal alterations. I have compared the two Acts, and they are now substantially the same.

On section 4,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This clause is the same as the English Act, except that the term is extended from fourteen to twenty years. Section 5 is also the same as the English Act, except that the term is extended from seven to fourteen years.

On section 7,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The clause is framed to meet the exceptional position of Canada.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state the reason of the variation.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is to provide that if the offence, the introduction of dynamite, should be committed in the North-West Territory, and the offender is apprehended in one of the older provinces, he shall be tried here and not sent to the North-West to be tried by a stipendiary magistrate.

On section 15,

Mr. DAVIES. I draw attention to the fact that the punishment may be from one hour's immprisonment to imprisonment for life.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In many of the criminal laws a maximum is fixed.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; but in many of them a minimum is also fixed. Of course these offences mentioned in this Act vary very considerably in degree, and it is not unreasonable that there should be a wide discretion; but it is certainly a very wide discretion that is given here. I do not remember at the moment that we have any provision in our laws which gives a discretion of imprisoning a man for life or for an hour.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not quite sure about that, but if the Bill will be allowed to be reported without amendment, I will look into that point before the third reading.

Bill reported.

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

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12:50 a.m. Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 17th April, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST—LIEUT.-COL. OUIMET.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to a report that creates some sensation; I mean what has been published in the newspapers as to the withdrawal or retirement, or what it may be called, as to Col. Ouimet's leaving his detachment and being in Winnipeg, and also as to the reason that is alleged to be given by him for not continuing his services. It is a very grave matter, indeed, and I think the rumor ought not to be left to go abroad to the public without some satisfactory explanation.

Mr. CARON. I heard of the rumor which the hon. gentleman refers to. All I know about the matter is that Colonel Ouimet followed his command from Winnipeg to Calgary, that he returned from Calgary to Winnipeg alone. I have no doubt, knowing Colonel Ouimet as I know him, and knowing his intimate knowledge of military matters, that his going from Calgary to Winnipeg was on special duty or on leave, which he had a perfect right to do. He was for a short time in Winnipeg—about a day, I believe—and he returned back to Calgary, and he is now at the head of his battalion. That is all I know about it.

ENQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders are called, I desire to call the attention of the First Minister to a question which I called his attention to yesterday, with reference to the absence of the Minister of the Interior; and also to the fact that he promised the North-West papers to-day, and also that he has not brought down the commission and instructions of the commissioners, as promised a fortnight or three weeks ago.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I sent up last night and caused Sir David Macpherson to be asked, and it was from the 17th of June to the 12th of October.

Mr. BLAKE. The other question was, who acted as Minister of Interior at that time? I suppose it was the real Minister.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I acted.

Mr. BLAKE. He has omitted any reference to the North-West papers and the commissioners' instructions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have just been writing a note to the deputy head, asking why the papers are not sent over. I suppose they will be over to-day. I was told they would be ready last night.

Mr. BLAKE. I do trust they will be laid on the Table before the adjournment. It is very important we should get them early.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House resumed adjourned debate on motion of Sir John A. Macdonald for second reading of Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

Mr. LAURIER. During the discussion yesterday, the fact was brought several times to the memory of the House that this is not the first time the hon. gentleman has

endeavored to force this measure upon the people of this country. In fact during the nearly eighteen years that this Confederation has lasted, the hon. gentleman has made seven attempts to establish a uniform franchise throughout the Dominion, but each time until now he has been forced to abandon the attempt. Six times before has he brought in a Bill of this nature, and has either withdrawn it, or been obliged to let it drop after carrying it to a certain stage. Now it may be asked, what is the reason that he has made these numerous and persistent attempts to force this measure upon the country. The reason is simply this, that the right hon. gentleman has set his heart upon this measure which being one of centralisation, and antagonistic to the federal principle of our constitution, is quite congenial to his well known principles. But while he has endeavored to push his followers onward, they have each time failed to pass it for the reason that their hearts were not in the cause. Public opinion never responded to the calls that were made upon it. Yesterday, when the right hon. gentleman spoke upon this measure, he stated that public opinion is ripe for it. Sir, if public opinion is ripe for it, where are the evidences of it? Public opinion generally manifests itself either by petitions at the bar of this House, or by resolutions of public meetings, or through the press. Now, where are the petitions that have been presented in favor of it? Not one has been presented this Session, nor at any previous Session, that I am aware of. Where have public meetings been held in favor of a uniform Dominion franchise? I defy the hon. gentleman to point out one instance where any public meeting has passed a resolution to that effect. As to the press, while I cannot speak as to the other Provinces, so far as my own Province is concerned, far from expressing itself in favor of a Dominion franchise, such a scheme has been denounced as inimical to our institutions—not by the Opposition press, but by the Ministerial press itself. The fact is that, ever since Confederation, we have had a provincial franchise upon which the members of this House have been elected, and I am not aware that any complaint has ever been made against that arrangement. The steady conviction of the people seems to have been, on the contrary, that this provincial franchise was the best suited to our institutions, and under all circumstances was best adapted to the characters of our people. I have said that this measure is now introduced for the seventh time into this House, but it has been discussed only once—in 1870. At that time it was discussed at some length. The Bill was carried to its second reading, and taken into Committee of the Whole. But the discussion was somewhat desultory; most of the members who spoke upon it did not seem to see their way very clearly. They did not seem to have made up their minds as to what necessity there was for it. At that time Confederation was quite recent and the relative functions of the Dominion Parliament and the Provincial Legislatures were not as clearly understood as they are to-day; and consequently the general discussion was somewhat desultory. But when the measure was in Committee of the Whole, Mr. Dorion moved an amendment in favor of a provincial franchise. His amendment was to this effect: That the electors for the House of Commons shall be those who are entitled to vote at any election for the representation in the Local Legislatures; and that opinion seems to have met with the general consent of the House,—at all events, no attempt was made to contradict that amendment or oppose it. The only member who spoke after Mr. Dorion, was my hon. friend the present leader of the Opposition, who supported the amendment. The right hon. gentleman moved the adjournment of the debate, and that debate never was resumed. The measure was shelved, not again to be resurrected until the dust of twelve long years had accumulated upon it. Now, Mr. Speaker, the right hon. gentleman again proposed to change the existing state of things, and to substitute a uniformity of franchise. Now, what are the reasons for this change? What evil is going to be remedied by a uniformity of franchise, or what good is to be done by it? We should have had some explanations on these points, but the Government have been perfectly dumb. Up to the present day each Province has had its own franchise. Quebec has had its own franchise, and a very liberal franchise it has been—not universal but with very large limits, indeed. Ontario has had her franchise, still more liberal, I think, than that of Quebec. Prince Edward Island has had a universal franchise. Each of the members now present in this House has been elected upon the particular franchise of the Province from which he comes. And has any complaint ever been made either in this House, or in any other part of the Dominion, than an injustice is being doing against the Provinces, or against the people of any Province by the present franchise? I am not aware that any complaint has ever been made. And if no complaint has been made, if this system has worked well and satisfactorily, I ask why is this measure introduced? We, Sir, on this side of the House, are reformers. We do not believe in the immutability of human institutions: we believe in the perfectibility; but at the same time we would not alter any existing institution, unless some good was to be effected by it, unless some ill was to be remedied, or some great reform was to be promoted. But it seems that gentlemen of of the Conservative persuasion—at least in this House—are of a different opinion. I gathered yesterday from a remark made by the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) that the Conservative party in this House were ready to vote this measure without the slightest hesitation. I should suppose that a good Conservative, a strong Tory, would not like to alter existing institutions unless some reasons were given for the change. But the hon. gentleman said that they were waiting for the members of the Opposition to state their objections to the measure. It seems to me that it would have been more proper, first of all, for the Government to have given some reason why the existing state of things should be changed. But it seems that hon. gentlemen opposite are ready to vote for this measure without asking any questions, even before the Liberal members have raised any objection to it; and I really believe they will be still more ready to vote for it, even after unanswerable objections have been made against it. The only reason which has been advanced by the right hon. gentleman in introducing this measure in favor of a Dominion franchise—if it be a reason at all—was that our present franchise was an anomaly, that we ought to have a uniformity of franchise all over the Dominion. Well, I do not admit that it is an anomaly for each Province to have its own franchise. But supposing it to be so, I should not suppose that the hon. gentleman would have been so tender-hearted upon that score, because I believe, and perhaps he will admit himself, that in the course of his long political career he has been guilty of many sins of anomaly. Let me refer him to one glaring instance. Under our constitution we have a separation of powers. The Local Legislatures are properly entrusted with the establishment of courts of justice, and they are also to determine the number of judges of which the courts are to be composed, and very properly should, but the judges are to be paid by the Dominion Parliament, and this Parliament has no control at all over the establishment of the courts which it has to pay for, or over the number of the judges for whose salaries it has to provide. Can there be a greater anomaly than this? Can there be a more glaring lack of uniformity? The Provincial Legislature establishes the courts. It is in their power to appoint one, or two, or three, or four, or ten judges, and this House has no control over them, though we are obliged to pay them immediately after they are

appointed by the Local Legislature. Can there be a greater anomaly? Yet the father of this anomaly is the right hon. gentleman himself. Why did he do it? I do not blame the right hon. gentleman for having done it. Perhaps it is right that he should have done it. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman remembered at the time the language of Burke, which is to this effect:

"Government has been deemed a practical thing, made for the happiness of mankind, and not to furnish a spectacle of uniformity to justify the scheme of visionary politicians."

Perhaps the hon. gentleman well remembered that sentence when he created the anomaly which stands to-day in our constitution. But if he remembered it then, why does he not remember it now? If the practical necessities of the Government demanded such an anomaly as that to which I have just referred, is it inconsistent that the anomaly complained of should still exist in the working of the constitution? That is the only reason which has been given for instituting the change which it is now sought to introduce. The constitution is not uniform, and we cannot have uniformity. Undoubtedly it would be far preferable if we could have a uniform franchise. But uniformity is not in the spirit of our constitution. We have diversity of franchise as we have diversity of government. There can be no doubt, I suppose, and everyone will agree to this view, that the best franchise that could be adopted, the most rational and the most logical, would be one based upon taxation, would be one to make every taxpayer a voter. But such a franchise has never been adopted, and will never be adopted. It would lead to consequences which would defeat the object of the franchise. If we were to follow it to its legitimate consequences we would have to give the right of voting to women, married and unmarried, to minors and all other persons who would otherwise be deprived of their civil rights. In fact no franchise was ever adopted on a mere abstract principle. The franchise has been adopted everywhere according to the circumstances of the community where it was applied, according to the wealth, or intelligence, or passions, or prejudices of the community. This Bill is an instance of it. You take the Bill before the House, and it is impossible to find any principle upon which the franchise has been distributed; there is none. I do not blame the Bill for it; I believe it would not be possible to be otherwise. The right hon. gentleman in framing the Bill has given the franchise to unmarried women, and not to married women. He has given the franchise to farmers' sons, and not to sons of artizans. He has given the franchise to men who are owners of real estate in rural parts to the value of one hundred and fifty dollars, and refused it to those who are owners of real estate to the value of only $100. In cities, he gives it to owners of real estate to the value of $400; he refuses it to those who are owners only to the extent of $300. What is the reason of all these differences; what is the principle which underlies this Bill? There is none. The hon. gentleman has framed a franchise which he thought best adapted to the circumstances of the community. This would be well and right, and there would be no fault to find with the Bill, if this was a single community. But this is the point, and it is the objection to this Bill; we have not a single community in this country. We have seven different communities, and what the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said yesterday, that we have seven independent commonwealths in this country, is a truth which cannot be denied. This is the mistake in this Bill; it treats this country as a single community, and in the plan we find the well known predilection of the right hon. gentleman in favor of a legislative union. He does not admit that it is right to have seven separate communities. His opinion is that it would be right to have but one community, and acting on that view he has devised the franchise which is best adapted to suit the conveniences of a single community. Well, I start on this principle, and it is one which I commend especially to my colleagues from the Province of Quebec, which is supposed to be more in favor of the federative principle than the other Provinces; that we have in this country seven different communities. This is a fact which exists in the face of the law. It may be wise or unwise, according to the preferences and predilections of everyone, but this is the basis of our constitution. Our constitution is based upon diversity—diversity is the basis of our constitution. If we had uniformity of territory, of population, of institutions, perhaps we would have had legislative union, and then we could have had a uniform franchise. But our constitution recognises the differences of population and of territory, and, as a consequence, I claim, we should also recognise those differences when we prepare a franchise for the whole Dominion. If it be true that this Dominion is composed of seven different communities, it must follow as a logical consequence that the right to determine the franchise is to be left to each separate community. That seems to follow as a logical consequence. What will suit one community will not suit another community. What will suit Prince Edward Island, for instance, will not suit Quebec. In Prince Edward Island they have had universal suffrage for a long time, and as was gracefully remarked by the member for Ottawa County (Mr. Wright), this franchise has worked well. I believe the members from the Province of Quebec will admit that universal suffrage would not be suitable to the majority of the people of our Province. Then why not leave the regulation of the franchise to the Province of Quebec, if they prefer a franchise of their own; and why not leave it to the Province of Prince Edward Island, if they prefer a franchise of their own? The people of Quebec would deem it tyranny if this House were to attempt to impose on them universal suffrage, and the people of Prince Edward Island would deem it tyranny, also, if you attempt, as is going to be attempted, to restrict their franchise. This is the reason why this matter had better be left in the hands of the Local Legislatures. The member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) said yesterday that the regulation of the franchise was a matter which properly came within the attributes of civil rights, and therefore had better be left in the hands of the Provinces. I do not contend that we have not the right, constitutionally, to establish a franchise of our own to apply to the whole Dominion; but I say that, according to the spirit of our constitution, the regulation of the franchise is a matter of civil rights which comes properly within the attributes of the Local Legislatures. What I say now is supported by a very high authority indeed. Story, in speaking of the regulation of the franchise, uses this significant language:

"The truth seems to be that the right of voting, like many other rights, is one which whether it has a fixed foundation in natural law or not, has always been treated in the practice of nations, as a strictly civil right, derived from and regulated by each society, according to its own circumstances and interest."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a high authority—that perhaps is the best commentator we have upon federative institutions; and can it be properly said that on the contrary the regulation of the franchise is to be in the Federal Government, that it is to be given to the whole Dominion and not to the Provinces, or local powers. I claim under this authority that the regulation of the franchise properly comes within the limits and functions of the local powers. Now what is the reason given in favor of a Dominion franchise? It is that our provincial franchise lacks uniformity. Well I admire the square symmetry of the rectangular lines, but it is not an argument unless it is supported by other reasons. The hon. gentleman attempted to support it—not by reasoning but by precept, by example and precedent. He says our constitution was derived from British constitutions, and he appealed to British institutions as a reason for our

having a uniform franchise. Well, the example is certainly poorly adapted to that purpose, for even in Great Britain, where they have legislative union, uniformity of franchise is not known—in fact the franchise is much more diversified than our own. Let me quote on this point, from a well known book—one which is in the hands of everybody, the Statesman's Year Book. Speaking of the franchise and its modifications the author speaks thus:

"The next great change in the constituency of the House of Commons, after the Act of 1832, was made by the Reform Bill of 1867-68. By this Act England and Wales were allotted 493 members and Scotland 60, while the number in Ireland remained unaltered. In a borough a man was entitled to vote who was of full age, legally competent, had been an occupier of a house as owner or tenant for 12 months previous to July 20th of any year, and had paid his rates; a lodger was entitled to vote who had occupied the same lodgings for a year, if these lodgings, unfurnished, were of the value of at least £10 a year, paid by him. Every freeholder whose freehold was of the annual value of 40 shillings, every copyholder and leaseholder of the annual value of £5, every householder whose rent was not less than £12, and every tenant whose rent was £50 a year, was entitled to vote for a county representative. In Scotland the ownership franchise for the county was £5 a year; householders who had paid their rates and lodgers who paid £10 a year for their lodgings had a borough vote. In Ireland freeholders of £10, copyholders or leaseholders having a 60 years' lease, the value of whose copyhold or leasehold exceeded by at least £10 the rent or charge upon it, had a vote for the county. Leaseholders having a 20 years' lease of a clear value of £20 had also a county vote. The borough franchise in Ireland was confined to householders rated at not less than £4 a year."

So you see, Mr. Speaker, that Great Britain not only has established a separate franchise for each of the three Kingdoms, but in each there are several classes or standards of franchise. But our constitution is not only derived from British institutions; it is mainly derived from the American constitution, and the American constitution has a principle exactly similar to that which I now advocate. They have not a uniform franchise; they have a State franchise, and the constitution enacts that the electors to the House of Representatives shall have the qualifications requisite for election to the most numerous branch of the State Legislatures. Now the American constitution is our model in that respect. That constitution has stood the test for one hundred years; it has stood successfully the test of a great civil war. It has been amended from time to time, but very sparingly, and there has not been, to my knowledge, any complaint made against this provision of the constitution. Yesterday the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster), speaking on this question, said it was the duty of this House to regulate its own franchise, and not to leave it to the whim or fancy of this one or that one, but that we should by law enact who should be the electors to this House. Well, for my part, I have no objection that this should be done; perhaps it is well after all that the question should be settled once and for all, and that to-day this House should determine who should be the electors to this House. But if that is to be done, let it be done as it has been done in the United States, as it has been in the Dominion since the Confederation, and let us determine that the electors to the House of Commons shall be the electors to the several Local Legislatures. Now, again, the hon. gentleman, addressing himself to this question, said we should be independent of the Local Legislatures. Well, we are independent of the Local Legislatures in our own sphere, just as much as the Local Legislatures are independent of us in their spheres. But, at the same time, this House has no rights at all of its own; the only rights which it enjoys are those which are delegated to it by the people of the Provinces, and it is not for this House to determine what people of the Provinces shall delegate those powers to the House, or in what manner they shall be constituted for that purpose; it is the people themselves who should determine who shall be the constituents of the members of this House, according to the mode regulated by the constitution, speaking through the Local Legislatures. Again, the hon. Minister of Public Works (Sir Hector Langevin), speaking to this question, said we should have a legislative franchise of our own, independent of the franchises of our Local Legislatures. He said in so many words: Let the Local Legislatures have their own franchises if they choose, but let us go on and establish our franchise. This would be well enough if we had two classes of electors, one class for the Dominion House and one class for the Local Legislatures. But the hon. gentleman forgets that it is the same people who are represented in the Local Legislatures and the Dominion House. Our system of government is a system of divided powers. It is the same people who are represented in either House, whether in the Local Legislatures or the House of Commons. This House has certain powers delegated to it by the people. The Local Legislatures have certain powers delegated to them by the people, but it is the same people who delegate those powers in each instance. It is to my mind a fact which cannot be denied that this Bill is an attempt at the federal principle. It is an attempt at centralisation. No one ever dreamed that the right hon. gentleman who proposed the Bill on this occasion and on former occasions would show his hand and declare in so many words that his object in proposing this measure was centralisation. In 1870, when the measure was discussed for the first time, the hon. gentleman's most trusted lieutenant, Sir Charles Tupper, used this significant language:

"He entirely agreed with the centralising principle of the Bill, and he also thought that the franchise should be as near as possible uniform."

I commend this language, Sir, to those who value the federative principle. They will find it to be the true keynote of this measure; in fact, as the first lieutenant of the First Minister said, this was no less than a measure of centralisation and that was the reason he supported it. Now, in order to show that the franchise is specially a local matter and not a matter of Dominion concern, let us look at the Bill itself. The Bill, it is said, aims at uniformity, but it does not provide for uniformity. There are two different standards of franchise in this Bill, one for cities and towns, and one for rural constituencies. A man, if he has property or real estate to the extent of $150, if that property is situated in a rural constituency, is a voter, but if the same real estate forms part of a city he is not a voter. Now, why is it? I am not going to enquire as to the reason for it; but this shows that if there can be in the same Province two different standards for the franchise, still more there ought to be different standards in different Provinces. As to the question of woman franchise there seems to be a great diversity of opinion in this House. For my part, I say if Ontario wants to have a woman franchise, let them have it. Let the Legislature of Ontario give it to women if the people of Ontario say that it is best for themselves. If Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island or any other Province wants to give the right of suffrage to women, let it do so; their Legislatures have the power to do it; but in the Province of Quebec, so far as I know, there is not one single class in the community that would extend the right of the franchise to women, not even to that fair portion of them to whom it is intended to give it by this Bill. I must say this further: I am really surprised to see that the Minister of Public Works, who has always been represented among us as the uncompromising champion of that old, pure, unpolluted Conservatism which would not yield to the abominations of modern doctrines, and promote in this House a Bill which is not only a concession to the wickedness of modern doctrines, but which is far in advance of all accepted modern doctrines, even in the most advanced countries. If this Bill becomes law, it will go forth to the world that we in Canada are more advanced than most of the States of the American union; more advanced than republican France; more advanced than Italy; and all this will be due to a Conser-

vative Government of which the Minister of Public Works is a member. Now, I commend the Minister of Public Works to the tender mercies of the good, pious, Conservative French of the Province of Quebec. I am sure of one thing; if such a measure had come from this side of the House, there would have been thunders of appeals against it, as to the wickedness of the Rouges; but it is a Conservative measure, and being a Conservative measure, I suppose it must be accepted by the Conservative party. The right hon. leader of the Government said that he was in favor of the emancipation of woman. I am of French origin, and I am a Liberal; and holding this double title, I claim that I am in favor of the emancipation of woman as much as he can be; but I do not believe that the emancipation of woman can be promoted so much by political as by social reform. I believe that the action of women must be most influential in politics as in everything else, but I believe that action is more effective if exercised in the circle of home, by persuasion and advice, than if woman is brought to the poll to vote. If the right hon. gentleman is really anxious to do something for the emancipation of woman, let him give her the opportunity for more extensive education, let him open for her more fields of employment, and he will do more for her emancipation than by giving her the right to vote. But there is a greater objection to the proposal of the right hon. gentleman in this regard, an objection which was pointed out yesterday by the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Wright). This measure proposes to give the right of suffrage to unmarried ladies only, and it is a premium on celibacy. The right hon. gentleman said it was a measure of emancipation, If it be a boon, therefore, he places married ladies in this dilemma: they have either to choose to remain single and have the right to vote, or to marry and lose the right to vote. It is not fair that it should be so. The writers of the past have spoken of the perplexities of a young woman placed between two suitors; but the writers of the future will have to show the perplexity of the young woman who has to choose between a husband and the right to vote. It is not fair that it should be so, and if this meassure is pressed it will be a novel method of promoting the emancipation of woman. But the measure is liable to graver and greater objections. I submit to the sense of the House that this measure is an invasion of popular rights. Hitherto the voters' lists have been prepared by the people themselves. The assessment rolls have been prepared by the people themselves through valuators appointed by the municipal councils. The lists have been prepared by the people themselves through secretary-treasurers appointed by the municipal councils; the lists have been revised by the people themselves through the municipal councils. This system, so far as I know, has worked satisfactorily and well. Now it is proposed that there shall be a change. What reason is given for that change? Why should this right be taken from the people? If I had to make a report upon my countrymen I would say this, that they are too apathetic in the discharge of their public duties—that they do not give to public business all the attention they ought to give. The present system forces them to give their attention to public business. Now, that system is to be changed. The voters' lists are henceforth to be prepared, not by the people, but by lawyers appointed by the Government, assisted by clerks and constables. What can be the reason of that change? Can it be for the sake of uniformity? Uniformity is not alleged in this instance. Is it because of the adoption of a Dominion franchise, and because since we have a Dominion franchise we cannot allow the lists to be prepared by the municipal councils, but must have them prepared by officials of our own? But as long as we give the execution of our laws to the courts of justice, I do not see why we should not give the administration of that part of the law to the municipal councils, since it has been held so far to be one of the attributes of the municipal councils. If the change is made as a consequence of the introduction of a Dominion franchise, this must be a bad measure indeed if to carry it out you are obliged to deprive the people of a portion of the rights they now exercise. The present system has so far worked satisfactorily; I am not aware that there have been any serious complaints that the lists of voters have not been properly prepared and revised by those who have hitherto had the duty of preparing and revising them. Under the law, in the Province of Quebec at all events, there is an appeal from the decisions of the municipal councils to the courts. I have been curious to know if this right of appeal has been exercised to any degree. Because if it had been exercised to a great degree, that would be an evidence that the law was not properly administered by the Provinces; but I find that the appeals have been very few indeed. A friend of mine has taken the trouble to enquire how many appeals have been taken in the several districts in the four years, 1881, 1882, 1883, and 1884; and as a result of that enquiry I find that in the district of Montreal there have been 16, in Quebec none, in Three Rivers 10, in St. Francis none, in Arthabaska 2, in Montmagny 4, in Beauharnois 1, in St. Hyacinthe none, in Kamouraska 4, in Terrebonne none, in Rimouski none, in Richelieu none, in Beauce none, in Ottawa none, in Iberville 1, in Saguenay none, in Chicoutimi none, in Gaspé none, in Joliette 1, and Bedford 1; in all only 40 appeals in the four years, or ten per year. Well, in the Province of Quebec there are something like 800 municipalities, so that the number is just a little more than one per cent. and less than two per cent. of the total number of lists prepared each year in all the municipalities. It is therefore evident that this system has worked satisfactorily, and you must remember this, that the appeal given under the present law is not an appeal of grace such as that provided for in this Bill, but an appeal which is in the right of every one, and yet there has been, under this system, only an average of a little more than one per cent. of complaints made to the superior tribunals of the regulations of the franchise as established by the municipal councils. The Bill is still liable to a graver objection; it is a direct invasion of the powers hitherto enjoyed by the people. So far the people themselves have had the preparation of these lists, but henceforward that power is to be taken out of their hands; and what is the reason given for taking away from the people that duty of which they have had the enjoyment ever since Confederation? I use the word enjoyment advisedly because the exercise of a duty so precious as this must be an enjoyment rather than an obligation. Yet this precious right is proposed to be taken away from the people; and I do not imagine that the sturdy yeomen of this country will submit to this for any length of time; I do not imagine that they will yield without a protest this right to henchmen of the Government, to the innumerable army of parasites which feed on the Government and whose sole object will be to do the bidding of the Government. In every conceivable point this measure is in my opinion a bad measure, one that will be denounced by all those who believe in popular rights, who believe in the sacredness of our constitution, as an invasion of popular rights, and as a step towards centralisation; and in this view I beg to move the following resolution:—

That all the words after "that" be struck out and the following inserted: In the opinion of this House it is preferable to continue the plan which has been adopted ever since Confederation of utilising for the election of this House the provincial franchises and voters lists.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I was pleased yesterday to see, by the discussion which took place, the condemnation of the demand made by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the

House to adjourn the measure, owing to the impossibility to discuss it at this period of the Session. Notwithstanding the protest which was put before the House, it was deemed quite possible for them to discuss the question of the franchise proposed in the measure now submitted to us. I was also pleased to see that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House were fully prepared to discuss that question, were fully prepared to give their opinion now on at least the general features of the Bill, the principle of the Bill. We have had, yesterday, a detailed appreciation of almost every clause of this Bill. The discussion was not a novelty to us; we have seen the same discussion in the press, we have heard of it before in other Houses of Parliament. It was a novelty for nobody and the discussion of this Bill here, its full and fair discussion, was an impossibility for nobody, except a pretended one for those who did not like to see the measure brought down before Parliament, and who made that an excuse for the vote they proposed yesterday. That excuse did not hold; hon. gentlemen opposite proved by their own arguments that they were fully alive to every detail of this measure. That infamous Bill, as it was branded by one hon. gentleman on the other side, which was forced down the throats of the members of this House at the last hour of the Session and nearly at the end of this Parliament, that infamous Bill, which was an imposition not to be tolerated, has been shown as a measure not only known already to every one, but the necessity of which was demonstrated by the very arguments of my hon. friends. Let us take the first objection, that it is too late in the Session to bring down this measure. Is it such a complicated measure? My hon. friend, in a few minutes, went over the whole of the Bill. Are its different provisions so numerous and difficult to understand? I did not see that before, nor do I see it now. It is an important measure I admit; a measure deserving a serious consideration; and surely the time has not been wanting to give it that consideration which it deserves. But, I repeat, it is not a complicated Bill. What is the Bill? A measure creating a uniform franchise for the electoral body called to select representatives to the House of Commons, providing for the nomination of a permanent and independent judge to determine that franchise, and make a record of it in the shape of electoral lists, and creating an easy mechanism for the revision of those lists. It first provides for the qualifications of voters in towns and villages. There is nothing new in it, there is nothing difficult in it. The qualification is put at a certain figure, at $300 real estate in cities and towns, at $2 monthly rental in cities or towns, $5 quarterly rental, $12 half-yearly rental, and $20 yearly rental. I might ask my hon. friend who said this Bill was full of anomalies to point out the great anomalies which he found in this measure. At present, in the cities, in the Province of Quebec, the qualification is $300, and in rural constituencies only $200. It has been so before, and, if the law as it stands now is so good in the estimation of my hon. friends, why is it bad when the measure is proposed by my right hon. friend the Premier? It stands to reason, and it was found to be good, that the value of real estate should be made different in cities and in the rural districts, for this very good reason, that real estate in cities and towns is generally valued at a higher price, and that it would deprive of their right a number of men who are entitled to the franchise in the country districts, if the same value of property was taken as in cities or towns. My hon. friend finds it strange and an anomaly that we are giving a vote to farmers' sons and not to mechanics' sons, and he gives this as one of the reasons demonstrating that a franchise is never based upon a fixed principle. My hon. friend is mistaken in this respect, and he should know that the Bill gives the right to vote both to the mechanic's son and to the farmer's son, if the mechanic is in the same position as the farmer, that is to say, if he is the owner of real estate sufficient, when divided, to give to each the proper qualification for voting. With regard to the tenant and the occupant, there is a discrepancy there also, between cities and rural constituencies, and for the same reason. The resident is given a right to vote if he earns $400 annually; the farmer's son is given a right to vote; the mechanic's son is given a right to vote; the fisherman is given a right to vote, either on his real property or on the personal property he owns belonging to his trade. It is admitted that the franchise is generally enlarged by the present Bill, and the disqualifications for voting are about the same as in the law now existing. In two Provinces, where universal suffrage exists, this law is restrictive; but when we come to look at it closely, we will see that practically the change is unimportant. There is one feature in the Bill to which my hon. friends mainly object, but that provision is not hard to understand and is not difficult to discuss. It is the appointment of revising officers, and I will show in a moment that the fears of my hon. friends on the other side are exaggerated, or at all events have been expressed in very exaggerated language. My hon. friend who just sat down said it was an iniquity that this power to revise the lists was given to creatures of the Government, salaried men of the Government, henchmen of the party, parasites who did nothing but earn a living by the money which was paid to them by the Government. This is very strong language, but let my hon. friend forgive me if I say that it is also rather light language It is strong in words, but light in the thought which dictates the language. If this was the case that the fact of a man receiving a salary from the Government would make him a slave of the Government, would make him a parasite, would make him a vile creature whom one would not trust, what confidence could there be in the most important offices in the country? What would be the judges of the land? They receive their salaries from the Government, they are appointed by the Government, and, like the revising officers in this Bill, they have that inamovibility which is a guarantee for their independence if honest men are chosen. Those who receive a well-earned salary from the Government can be as independent, can be as patriotic as my hon. friends on the other side are, or pretend to be. This provision is made because we are obliged to find some machinery to carry the provisions of the Bill into practical execution. My hon. friend says that it is a great danger, and his motion is based upon that, because we are giving, by this Bill, to the paid officer of the Government a right which has heretofore been exercised by the people of this country, and which will no more be exercised by them. I tell my hon. friend that he is mistaken. Does my hon. friend mean to say that the lists that are prepared by the municipal council; that the assessment rolls will be useless in the machinery required by the statute to make the list of electors? They will not be useless.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friends who are laughing will say it is true that the assessment roll will be used, but that it does not necessarily follow that the list of voters shall be ruled by that assessment roll. They will say the assessment roll will only be made use of by the revising barrister, but that he shall alone decide what shall be the list of voters to go to the polls for the election. But my hon. friends will remember that the right to vote is now given to the elector by the statute passed for that purpose; it is not the municipal council that gives him that right, it is the law of the land.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I will explain to the hon. gentlemen. They need not be in such a great hurry. The qualification is given to-day by Parliament or by the Legislatures, and the power given for making the list of voters and for put-

ting upon it all those, and those alone, who have the right to vote by the statute is nothing but a machinery. Every elector has a right to tell the municipal council: You have left me out, or you have put on this person who should not be upon that list, and you must rectify that error which the law reproves. And the sovereign people, acting through the council, would have to revise and alter the list, or the court will revise it for them. And, in spite of the statistics of my hon. friend showing that there were only some forty or fifty appeals in four years from the decision of the municipal council, I say that, if there were only so few appeals, it was not because there was not a greater number of cases were not only mistakes but injustice had been committed. It was only because the costs of the law as it is, are so heavy that the elector unfortunately does not attach enough importance to his vote to go to the extent of a lawsuit to have his name put upon the list. But it leaves my proposition unshaken and it must be admitted that the qualification is given by Parliament, and that the municipal council, that is so much boasted of as being the power by which the right of voting is given to the people, is nothing but an instrument to carry out the will of the Legislature who have determined the franchise. Practically, the work of the municipal council will be utilized as before; the only difference is that we cannot give orders to municipal officers who are not under the control of this Parliament. The reason given by my hon. friend may be an apparent or plausible reason; it is not a true and substantial reason. What better persons could be chosen to revise the lists than the judges, who are learned in the law? But the hon. gentlemen opposite speak as if the Government had purposely set aside every judge on the bench as being the proper officer to prepare these lists. Sir, that is untrue, and it is unjust. With the proposed law the judges shall be entrusted with that duty.

Mr. BLAKE. Not shall be—may be.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am coming to that. The judges are to be chosen to prepare these lists. We know that in some parts of the country, it would be impossible to get a judge to prepare these lists, and how could the Government have been so imprudent as to have ignored this fact? And so we prepare for the contingency of the judges not being able to act, by providing that other well qualified persons shall also exercise that great power. Hon. gentlemen are presuming that the Government has decided not to employ the judges of the land to be the officers to prepare those lists. When the Government indicates that amongst those who may be chosen to fulfil those really judicial duties, are the judges of the land, is there not an absolute presumption that the Government, whether it be Liberal or Conservative, would not defy public opinion to such an extent as systematically to ignore those who, by their position are the better entitled to revise those lists, and to choose others less qualified to perform those duties. My hon. friend said that it should be the people of each Province, represented in Local Legislatures, who should have the power to determine how far the franchise for this Parliament shall extend. Mr. Speaker, I am one of those who are not ashamed to call themselves strong autonomists. I am one of those who have fought in the past, and I shall be one of those who will, if necessary, fight in the future, for the autonomy of the Provinces.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friends need not laugh. The other day I had the pleasure, with their consent, of defeating a measure of one of their friends which invaded provincial rights. I knew that in doing so I had the approbation of many hon. gentlemen opposite, and I did it in the name of provincial rights. But I ask those gentlemen who, on the hustings, are trying to make political capital out of provincial rights, how they understand the working of our constitution? My hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) said, and no doubt sincerely and honestly, that in legislating upon the franchise we were invading provincial rights. But are we not, we, the members from the Province of Quebec—and my hon. friends from the other Provinces can say the same thing—are we not representatives of the people of the Province? Am I not one of the true and loyal representatives of the Province of Quebec? Surely I am not going to abandon the right, privilege and honor of representing the people of my Province in this Parliament. My hon. friend opposite certainly thinks too little of himself, if he believes that he is not, while here, the real representative of the electors who sent him into Parliament. And if we represent the electors of our respective Provinces here, why could we not legislate, on their behalf, upon the right of electors to send representatives to this Parliament? But, says my hon. friend, you invite the Province of Ontario to prescribe what shall be the franchise of the elector in Quebec. I know it, and my neighbor invites me to prescribe what shall be the franchise in Ontario. It is a general franchise that we are looking for, and as in any other general measure, we lay aside each a portion of our local preferences and we put our wisdom together to obtain the best general result. The Provincial Legislatures have done the same within their jurisdiction. They have not left it to each county or municipality to decide the question of the electoral franchise. Well, if it is the municipal council alone that must decide that question, how is it that the Hon. Mr. Mowat, Premier of the Ontario Government, has taken it upon himself to fix the electoral franchise for that Province and to change it materially from what it was before? He did not say that he wanted to have the qualification of the electors fixed for the Dominion Parliament. He might, perhaps, have had that in view, but he was wise enough not to mention it; he said that he wanted to fix the franchise at a certain standard for the election of members to the Legislature of Ontario. Well, have we not an equal right to say, as representing the people of our Provinces, that we will agree upon a standard for the electoral franchise for the election of members to this House? Undoubtedly we have, and we do so knowing that we represent the people of the different Provinces from which we come. When we speak of autonomy we must not speak as separatists; and in speaking of provincial rights a member of this Parliament is really disloyal to our federal constitution if he means by that the absolute and independent action of the Provinces. We shall never build up a great country, if such an exaggeration of provincial rights is to prevail. I do not fear the imposition of legislative union, it is repulsive to our people, and therefore I am the more willing to give to the central authority all the rights and powers that belong to it. There is no inconsistency between a federal system and a great and homogeneous nation, and we have an example of that fact in the great nation to the south of us. Their's is a federation.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Each State has its rights, and although they may not be defined in the same manner as they are with us, their federation resembles our own more than any other federation, and if there is a difference it is in the direction of a still greater autonomy in the states. But I mean that the consolidation of a great nation is not at all inconsistent with that State autonomy about which hon. gentleman opposite are always preaching so loudly. I repeat that we must not confuse autonomy with separation, nor must we confuse confederation with legislative union. The hon. gentleman says this is a step towards legislative union, and

that the leader of this Government has always been in favor of legislative union. I have heard the declarations of the right hon. leader of this Government on several occasions, and on some the most solemn occasions of his life, and he stated that he was true and devoted to the grand constitution he had himself framed as he had always been loyal and true to the people of the country who are contented to live under this constitution. The right hon. gentleman has always declared that he had always been, and would always remain, a loyal supporter of Confederation, as it was established at first. Hon. gentlemen have thought proper to say that the individual sympathies of the right hon. gentleman are not in that direction. I have no right to enquire as to his personal sympathies or his personal views; I speak of the views expressed by the right hon. gentleman not only in this House but on every public occasion when he spoke on this subject, and he has done so frankly, loyally and truly. We are put on our guard against evils which do not exist, which are not presumable, but which in the possibility of time may perhaps happen in the working out of the law which is before us. We have to choose in almost every political act in life between what is opportune or what is not, between what is good and what is better. And very often we have to choose between two evils. I shall point out to hon. gentlemen an evil which is not only possible but which has existed too long already. Is it worthy of our Parliament, is it according to the dignity which this Parliament owes to itself, to allow the smallest Legislature of the smallest Province, not only to dictate, but to change, at its will, at its own caprice, the electoral franchise by which the members of the House of Commons are elected? It may happen that, at the most critical moment, when the most vital interests are at stake, the exercise of that caprice would be sufficient to alter materially the direction of the general politics of the country. Is it reasonable? Is it dignified for us that in a Province the electoral franchise should be changed on the eve of a general election for the sole benefit of one party, and in less than two years afterwards be changed again to suit the convenience, views and demands of the same party coming to keep them in power? We have seen in this Dominion the electoral franchise changed twice during less than two years. And changed for what reason? Was it to meet the demands of the people as expressed by their representatives here? Certainly not. I say it is beneath the dignity of this Parliament that the people of each Province should say: you have now a standard for the electoral franchise under which your representatives are elected to the Commons, but that standard shall remain just so long as the Legislature wishes it to remain. Suppose we decide to day that the electoral franchise is satisfactory as it is at present for the election of representatives to the Dominion Parliament. If that were agreed to by the 211 members of this Parliament, it would be surely the expression of the will of the people. Yet a week afterwards that decision of Parliament might be altered by the Local Legislature of British Columbia or of Nova Scotia or of Prince Edward Island, or the little Legislature of the Province of Quebec, if you like. I say that this state of things should be modified. This is really an intolerable anomaly. We must take care not to separate the franchise itself and the manner in which that franchise should be exercised. These are the main objections which hon. gentlemen opposite have presented against the passing of the Bill. My hon. friend said the officers which the Government will appoint are not men in whom the people would trust to prepare the roll of voters for elections to the Dominion Parliament. Why not? It is easy to express a blame, it is more difficult to attach it. I really believe it will be a decided improvement. It will prevent a great deal of difficulty and dispute. It will give to everyone in the country the opportunity of coming, and seeing, and doing—

what? Every elector in my county, for instance, will know that the assessment in his municipality places him on the roll at a certain amount. He knows whether that entry is correct or incorrect. The officer appointed, the judge, will go to the municipality and give notice that he will revise the lists on a certain day. The assessment roll will be taken, the municipal lists prepared for the Local Legislature will be taken, and the people will see whether their names are entered or have been omitted, and whether other names have been improperly entered; the whole according to the rule fixed for the franchise by this Act. Hon. gentlemen opposite have called attention to the fact that under this Bill the returning officer shall be acting independently, and they ask, why do not the Government propose that the municipal lists be prepared by the municipal officer for the parliamentary election? For this very good reason: Because we have no control over the secretaries of the municipalities. The Local Legislatures can command them, but we cannot. We shall say to them: We shall take your advice, we shall consult your rolls and lists, we will take advantage of your work, but as we cannot command you, we shall order our officer, after he has carefully gone over your assessment rolls to prepare a list of voters accordingly, and whilst he is performing that work, each elector can attend and see whether his name is on the list or not. Is the tribunal established by this Bill, as has been said, one from which there is no appeal? Will an elector be deprived of his right to be placed on the list by the revising officer if that officer has neglected his duty, and after his decision has been given, will it be one to which everyone must submit? There will be the same right of appeal as there is now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. To argue with hon. gentlemen one must be prepared on every little point. I say there is an appeal. It is, perhaps, because I said there is the same appeal that hon. gentlemen find fault. I say there is an appeal from the decision of the revising barrister, to a higher court and tribunal.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Decidedly, and hon. gentlemen only convince me by interupting me in this way that they have not read the Bill. Section 48 says:

"The appeal shall be in the form of a petition to the court, accompanying the statement of case certified by the revising officer, and praying that the voters' list in question may be amended by the insertion or omission of the name or names alleged to be wrongfully omitted or inserted, or otherwise, as the case may be, and shall be presented, on behalf of the appellant, at the next sitting of the court appealed to by any barrister or advocate practising therein."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read section 47.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. In every case, of course, my hon. friends think they will find some little quibbles, but I say in this case there are the necessary means for people who want to be put on the lists of voters, just as much as there exists at the present moment under the existing law. So, Mr. Speaker, the Bill is reduced to these three features: The qualification of the voter, the appointment of the officer to prepare the lists, and the revising of those lists by that officer, or by a higher court. That is the Bill and all of the Bill. I shall not repeat what I have said as to the officer who is to be appointed by the Government; but if a better system for the making and revising of the lists could be suggested, it will be time enough when we come to it, to suggest any amendment—anything which will make the Bill better than it is; and I am perfectly sure that the Government is not unwilling—and as they have shown themselves not to be unwilling to adopt any good suggestion that may be made by hon. gentlemen. Unfortunately, I know and I am sure that the objections of my hon. friend are not to the system itself, but are merely

and only because they find that the Bill does not leave to the Provinces the right to legislate as to the federal franchise of this Dominion. There are reasons which lead me to think that my hon. friends opposite desire that the local power should rule this Dominion of ours. We have heard elsewhere, we have read in a certain press, that a certain Province was boasting that it would rule this Dominion very soon, and it is perhaps because this power to alter the franchise was exercised not long ago by the legislature of one of the Provinces, and they feel that by the present measure they may be frustrated in their prospects and their views and their desires, that they are opposing this Bill. Mr. Speaker, let us for a moment examine the qualification itself. Is it too high or too low a qualification? There may be differences of opinion on this subject those differences of opinion must not deter us from our work. Some would prefer universal suffrage; others would prefer a restriction of the franchise and to determine it in a less liberal manner than it is proposed to do by this Bill. We, having the Dominion to legislate for, having to say who are the electors to elect us to this Parliament, we are obliged to do, as in justice we should do, to try to find a medium measure, one which is not repugnant to the Provinces, but which at the same time will have in its character the uniformity necessary for the good working of the institutions that we are enjoying. Mr. Speaker, there is one principle at the foundation of this Bill. It recognises the progress of the age; it recognises that tendency to have the people participate as much as possible in the administration of public affairs. I think that principle is not an unhealthy one which tends to give to as many as possible of the people in the country—who have an interest at stake, an interest in being represented — a share in the administration of public affairs, and in that sense the Bill goes certainly far enough. I do not say that in every Province the Bill will be appreciated in the same manner; we cannot do that in a country like ours, in any measure affecting the whole Dominion. When we frame a tariff we know that it is impossible to frame one which will be equally acceptable to all parts of the Dominion. It is one of the faults of our country to be a very extensive country. It is a great quality for the future, for the mighty extension which it may take, but there is no doubt that give rise to some inconvenience in preparing a Bill providing for the electoral franchise. Well, I say that a liberal principle is the basis of this Bill, and this principle is to give a share in the administration of the affairs of the country to as many people as possible, who must be and are interested in the welfare and future of the country. But, at the same time, there is at the bottom of it this other grand conservative principle, that nobody should take part in the administration of public affairs unless he has something at stake in the land, in the development of the country, unless he is paying something towards the public improvements, unless he is worth something, unless he is dependent on something in this country, unless he has an interest at stake as a proprietor, a tenant, an occupant, as the head of a family. I am opposed to universal suffrage. My personal opinion might not be shared, perhaps, by even all my friends sitting on this side of the House, but I say sincerely that I am opposed to universal suffrage. I think there is at the bottom of that principle an element which is subversive of well organised society. Though I am disposed to see as many people brought into the administration of public affairs as possible, I say at the same time that, unless they have some interest at stake, it would be imprudent, it would be dangerous to entrust them with the electoral franchise. Well, we have consecrated in this Bill the principle that the elector must have some interest. Shall I be told by those who, in some of the Provinces, have been enjoying manhood suffrage up to the present moment that this measure will be in their Province an undesirable novelty, and that probably a sore feeling will exist on account of the proposed changes. Changes are very often sore things; habits when contracted for a long time are pretty difficult to destroy, and the habit of voting is the habit of enjoying such a privilege that, I can understand that even the idea of being deprived of it might sound badly to the ears of those who might consider themselves threatened by any legislation on this subject. But I say let every intelligent, let every orderly, industrious, sober elector in the whole Dominion, from one end of it to the other, be satisfied and tranquillised. The provisions of this Bill confer the right of voting on every man in the land who is a good, sober worker, not one of such is deprived, at least for any length of time. You cannot pass a law the execution of which will not cause a little inconvenience to some person. It is with the laws as it is with nature. The execution of the great laws of nature require that in some circumstances some portions or fractions may be injured, but in the grand march of humanity towards progress, if some have to be injured, if some have to be touched in a way that is unpleasant to them, it does not prevent that grand and glorious march. And in the application of this Bill we have the same principle. By its provisions every man who works, who does not sleep at night under the stars, having heaven for a shelter, but who has a place to go to as his domicile during the night, has the right to vote, and can exercise that right. The only exception is that of the man who comes accidentally into the country, who has no home, who works for a trifle a day, and who is one of those bands of laborers who are here only for a passing moment. I do not speak of the good mechanic, the good laborer, who lives with his family, he has the benefit of the franchise by this Bill; but I say that those wandering laborers may not have the right to vote by this Bill, and I say that it is well that they should not have that right. In this respect we do not change the laws that exist to-day. My hon. friend says that if the Bill gave a good franchise it would be based on some principle. We are basing it upon a principle which, though it might not be the principle which would be adopted by some, really constitutes a good, sound basis. I say that the system, as it exists at present, of leaving at the mercy of Local Legislatures, possibly antagonistic to Federal institutions, the right and measure of franchise for the election of members of this Parliament, is not a rational and logical system, a common principle; and it is desirable that this should be changed. My hon. friend, in discussing this Bill, referred to what he termed a great anomaly. You are, he said, going to put one power in antagonism with another, you are going against the wishes of the people in some parts of this Dominion. The present Premier is not a new hand at such work; he has been the father of an institution which is a great anomaly, I mean the Confederation Act. The hon. gentleman said it was a great anomaly that the Government of Canada should appoint judges, should pay judges, while the tribunals deciding upon the civil rights of the citizens in the different Provinces were created by the different provincial powers in the Dominion. That is what my hon. friend calls an anomaly. Then, Sir, we may call one of the grandest and finest rules of nature an anomaly—the rule of equilibrium—the disposition and beneficial action of the forces which are opposed to one another which, though apparently fighting one against the other, guarantee stability and strength. The rule of equilibrium is nothing but the counteraction of adverse powers resulting in a state of rest and producing, when applied to structures and mechanisms solidity and durability. Well, in the case mentioned by my hon. friend, civil rights in each Province are determined by the Provincial Legislatures, and the constitution of the courts to hear cases involving those rights, is left, and properly left, to the decision of the legislators in each Province; and the general Government of Canada, by a wise provision of the law, appoints an officer independent of the Government naming him, because he is appointed for life, and can be impeached only by a vote of the two Houses of Parliament;

and this officer, acting in a court constituted by the Local Government, brings about that kind of equilibrium which is healthy and rational. My hon. friend asked, what is the reason this Bill, which was introduced six times, is now introduced for the seventh time, and why was it not adopted before? I need not discuss the reasons which have prevented this measure passing until the present moment, as we might be brought into a discussion of points and questions which at present it is useless to discuss. For a time the double mandate may have been an obstacle in the way. But I say that the electoral franchise provided by the Confederation Act of 1867 was not intended to be an ultimate and final franchise that was to exist forever in this Dominion. If we read that Constitution, we shall find that it states that until it is otherwise provided by the Dominion of Canada, the different franchises exercised in the various Provinces shall be the measure by which to determine the right for voters for members of the Dominion Parliament. By the Constitution itself it was declared that what existed then was only to be temporary and that when Parliament should decide to provide otherwise the electoral franchise should be, and it is well that it should be, the one that Parliament should decide. This is the Constitution which has been adopted both by my hon. friends opposite and ourselves. The Government now present this measure. Is it too late? I say no. Is it too soon? I say no. It is not too late because we have still one Session after the next to complete the duration of this Parliament. We must provide for the future. We must not make a law which would have to be applied to-morrow, because then the Government would be exposed to the reproach of undue haste; we must not follow the example which has been given by some Provincial Legislatures of the Dominion. We prepare a law, and we give time for the law to be well understood by the people before the time comes when it will have to be put into execution. It is not too soon, because, as I have said, we have hardly two years yet before we come to the general elections, and we bring down the law this Session because other Legislatures are also approaching the end of their parliamentary term as Provincial Legislatures and they might be tempted to introduce changes in their electoral franchises which might not be desirable for the Dominion. We bring down this measure now, because there is time enough to consider it, moreover it is already known to the country. We were asked yesterday a dozen times, and have been again asked to-day, whether the people were prepared for this law. I say they are prepared for it. I say the public is well aware of all the provisions of this Bill. What was the answer given by the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) when he presented last Session a Bill which we passed this Session, and when he was asked: Are the people petitioning for your law? Are they prepared for it? He answered: The moment the law is well known, the moment its principles are well before the public, it is always time to introduce it; we are not to wait for petitions, because the petitions for the law are supposed to have come before Parliament, because the people are supposed to have spoken, when their representatives have discussed a measure; and it is not because a measure has not been passed that one would have the right to say, this measure has been rejected by the people; on the contrary, it is to be understood that when a law has been fully discussed, fully put before the people, it is always the right time to introduce it, and the Government cannot be accused of too much haste in presenting that law when the Government deem that it is in the general interest of the community. I think that I have gone over the different provisions of the law. I may say that when I was examining whether the franchise, as it is in the Bill, was objectionable, there was one particular, into the discussion of which I will not now enter. I refer to the question of the electoral franchise given to women. That is a matter to be discussed and it can be discussed here, but I shall not discuss it at present. I would, perhaps, be called too inquisitive were I to ask my hon. friends on the other side whether they have not the same opinion as the Government has in the matter, and perhaps in the true spirit of liberalism they would be in favor, not only of giving universal suffrage to men, but of giving it also to women. I shall not discuss that question. I know that in different Provinces it is not accepted in the same spirit. I know that in the Province of Quebec, a thoroughly Conservative Province, in spite of the number of my hon. friends on the other side who are elected in that Province, public opinion generally is, perhaps, not altogether in favor of giving the electoral franchise for the election of members of Parliament to women. In some cities, in perhaps the oldest Conservative city, the city of Quebec, I understand that women who are the owners of real property have the right to vote in municipal matters. Not only have they the right to vote, but with that gallantry which distinguishes Quebecers, the ladies are not obliged to go to the polls; they have the right to select their mayor, which my hon. friend from Megantic (Mr. Langelier) has the pleasure and honor to be, without leaving their residences. I do not know what reason my hon. friends opposite from the Province of Quebec may have against women suffrage. I understood one not far from me here to say that he would object to woman suffrage. He says there was great objection to it; he thought political canvasses would last too long, and that really the electors who, after all, are toiling and paying, would be neglected; that it would be a hardship to the candidates; that politics might be too often set aside, and instead of having men elected who are well versed in the different laws of the Provinces and in the science of administration, we might have men who might be exceedingly well gifted, agreeable and pleasant, but who would not represent that stern and unadorned portion of humanity that has, after all, to perform the hardest task of political duty. Who knows but many, otherwise well qualified candidates, would meet more inducements to remain at home than to be exiled at Ottawa. On that question members of the House will express their opinion. The Government, in bringing down this measure, do not say that they are averse to discussion; the leader of the Government, in presenting this measure, has not dictated to his friends not to say a word about it. This measure will come before the Committee of the Whole; it will be discussed, point after point, clause after clause, in that same spirit of love of details that my hon. friends have shown in the discussion, for instance, of the Civil Service Act, and of the Bill relating to contagious diseases of sheep and cattle. Certainly the ingenuity of gentlemen opposite will be exercised in that discussion in finding out good amendments, not general amendments, which might be good, politically, from their point of view, but really good, practical amendments; and I am quite sure the Government will be ready to accept any such amendments as have, in some other instances, been proposed and adopted. One hon. gentleman said yesterday, you can judge the measures of the Government by the number of amendments forced upon them. True, the Government are not so unconciliatory as some people pretend they are; it is true the Government are open to conviction, and I am quite sure that if we think those amendments are in the public interest, we will be ready to accept them. I have already probably taken up the attention of the House too long. My hon. friends will not say that we are obstructing the Session. We are trying to do our duty, the best we can, the quickest we can. We have not felt so very much embarrassed or so very much offended at the length of time my hon. friends have taken on some measures, and we are ready to do the same thing now. I repeat

that it is an injustice and an insult to this Parliament to try to make us believe and to make the people of the country believe that we have not the time and the desire to discuss the different clauses and consider the different amendments which might be suggested on this measure. It is not necessary that two hundred members should speak upon the question. Eight or ten hours of a serious debate would, I am sure, be sufficient to elucidate the points raised by the measure. I do not see why, in this case, after a fair discussion of this Bill, we might not give to our country a good Electoral Franchise Bill, satisfying the good people of this country, satisfying those who have that good sentiment, that though one might be a little hurt in his sensitiveness, it is better to yield a little of our pretensions, a little of our own personal interests to try to arrive at a good medium measure satisfactory to all, and I am sure that this measure will be found to be so, and to be for the general good of this country.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who has just addressed us informed us that the measure which is submitted for our consideration is by no means a complicated measure. He apologised quite unnecessarily for the length of his speech, he told us that discussion was invited, and he declared to us, after having to some extent enlarged upon the liberal view of the Government as to the propriety of discussion, that a whole day might even be exhausted, that eight or ten hours might be given to us to debate this measure, in the course of which time he said the views which were necessary might be interchanged and the measure properly adjusted. Now, I join issue with the hon. gentleman as to this not being a complicated measure. I say it is, and I do not complain altogether that it is, because, in part, of necessity it is a complicated measure. A measure for the establishment of the character of the franchise in a country like ours, and for the establishment of a mode of ascertaining who, under the law, are entitled to vote, is of necessity a complicated measure, is of necessity a difficult measure, unless some general principle is to be adopted, which no one on either side of the House has proposed, and which, neither in the United Kingdom nor here, has as yet been adopted, except in some of those Provinces which the hon. gentleman has somewhat contemptuously, more than once this afternoon, alluded to as the smaller Provinces. I say, therefore, that I do not altogether attribute the complexity of the measure to the fault of those who framed it. In part, I believe it to be of unnecessary complexity, but, in part also, I admit that any measure for the ascertainment of the franchise, based upon the general views which have regulated such measures in the United Kingdom and in the bulk of the Provinces of Canada, is, in its nature, complicated and difficult. I shall go further to establish the correctness of this view of mine, as to the necessary complication and the necessary difficulty of a measure of this description, than merely setting my opinion against that of the hon. the Secretary of State, for I know very well that, by about two to one, if our opinions are set one against the other, in the vote, if not in the heart, his opinion will prevail. I shall therefore adduce testimonies as to the complexity and difficulty of a measure of this description, and as to the time which such a measure ought to occupy before it is disposed of, testimonies of a character which will be of greater weight with hon. gentlemen opposite than anything that I might hope to say. As has been more than once remarked, we have not before us now, to-day, for the first time, a Government measure for the establishment of a uniform franchise for Canada. The proposition that such a measure should be enacted was laid before us on the first day on which, with a Speaker in the Chair, the House of Commons of Canada assembled in this chamber. On the first day after the election of a Speaker, when the Speech from the Throne was delivered, in the year 1867, it was announced, under a Government of which the Premier was the present First Minister, that such a measure would be brought forward; and I need go no further than to say that, in the year 1867, it was announced as the policy of the Government, that the Government has been in power ever since that time, with the interval of five years only, and that we are, to-day, engaged in the discussion of the question whether such a measure is fit or not, to prove that the view of the hon. the Secretary of State as to the simplicity and easiness of such a measure as this must be wrong, unless we are to imply that the Government which announced that, as part of its policy, in the first Speech from the Throne delivered to a Canadian Parliament, was not honest and sincere in the enunciation of that policy. If it was honest and sincere in the view that a uniform franchise ought to be established, and established by this Parliament, for the return of members of this House of Commons, and if the measure is one of easiness and simplicity, why has it not been done? I say, as I have said, that the Speech from the Throne of the first Session proves it; but I shall go a little further. That Speech declares thus:

"You will also be asked to consider measures"——

Among others—

"For the establishment of uniform laws relating to elections and the trial of controverted elections."

So that we were promised, in the year 1867, by the right hon. gentleman, the measure which we are now engaged in debating. But why did we not go on with it during that Session? Why did we not attend to that business during that Session? Was it because it was a short and easy and simple business? Let me give you the right hon. gentleman's own statement of the reason; let me give you his views of what, at that time, were the conditions for proper and effectual discussion of a measure of this description. In March he said in the House—I quote from the report:

"That it was not the intention of the Government during that Session to submit any measures respecting the qualification of electors or elected."

Why?

"The Reform Bill, when brought forward, would be found so complete and comprehensive as properly to occupy the attention of an entire Session."

Is this measure complete? Is this measure comprehensive? If it be incomplete, fragmentary, rudimentary, if it deals only in a perfunctory manner with the question, then of course the words I read may be said not to apply; but that excuse would carry in itself the condemnation of the present measure, the ripe fruit of eighteen years of contemplation by the hon. gentleman of this political duty which he is to discharge. I will not say that it is incomplete, I will not say that it is not comprehensive. The right hon. gentleman declares that it is complete, that it is comprehensive, and that it is the full and effectual fruit of all the wisdom, of all the meditation, of all the consideration that he has been able to give this question which he pledged himself to Parliament to settle eighteen years ago, and in the settling of which he is now engaged. Well, Sir, if it be complete and comprehensive, have the circumstances so changed as to render that a light duty to be discharged in the eight or ten hours which the Secretary of State was gracious and liberal enough to accord to us? I say, Sir, has it now become a light and easy duty to settle this question which, eighteen years ago, would have required a whole Session to settle in a satisfactory manner? What have the changes been? Why, these have been the changes: that we have had introduced, since Confederation, the Province of Prince Edward Island, the Province of British Columbia, the Province of Manitoba, and have pressing upon our hands, with an urgency which the hon.

gentlemen opposite do not realise, the necessity of representation for the North-West Territories of Canada. I say, Sir, that you have got four questions on your hands, one of which you neglect for the moment, and three of which you acknowledge are to be dealt with in addition to the questions which you had to consider in the year 1867, when your Reform Bill was going to engage the attention of the House for an entire Session. No man can deny that one of the questions involved in the statement of a franchise for Canada is the condition of the people, the state of public opinion, and the actual results of the existing franchises in each Province of Canada. At the time the hon. gentleman said that such a measure would properly occupy the attention of an entire Session, we had to deal with it uncomplicated by the fact that there was as there now is a variety of franchise between Ontario and Quebec. They had had a common franchise, and we had therefore to consider only one franchise for the two great Provinces of the Dominion, and separate franchises for the two important Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. You had to deal, therefore, with three different franchises, and these perhaps, not very remote from one another, although containing divergencies which we found, when the hon. gentleman did bring down his Bill, were important obstacles to its success. But even these are in a different position to-day, because the franchises of Ontario and Quebec have diverged; and to-day you have to deal, so far as the old Provinces are concerned, with four franchises instead of three, with four conditions of public opinion, with four conditions of public life, instead of three; and in addition to that, you have to deal with the condition of the other Provinces. It is quite true that they are only small Provinces, as the Secretary of State observed—hardly worth while talking about, probably, hardly worth while considering as to their feelings. They are little Provinces. and they should not obtrude themselves very much into this discussion. Of course not. But still, let us give them a little space. Because we are so strong, because we are so powerful, let us be a little generous, if justice, even, does not require it—and consider a little the smaller Provinces. We have to consider them; we must consider them; and the consideration of them, even of that other one which it was at that time hoped to introduce into the Union, the colony of Newfoundland, was shown, many years ago, to be a very important obstacle to the hon. gentleman's proposal. I say, then, that instead of the difficulties and complexities which necessarily attend the attempt to frame a franchise for the Dominion of Canada, based upon those considerations on which this franchise is based, having diminished by time, they have increased by time. The area is larger; the franchises are more numerous and divergent, and the people have been accustomed for eighteen years, and at five general and as many or more local elections, to recognise that they have a common franchise for both Dominion and local elections. It has become their use and wont, their common experience; and these certainly are considerations which do not diminish, but largely increase the complexity and the difficulty of creating and forging in this Parliament a complete and comprehensive measure for a common franchise. I repeat, then, that if, in the year 1867, the Bill was not even brought forward, because a complete and comprehensive Reform Bill would properly occupy the attention of an entire Session, these words apply with infinitely added force to the consideration of such a measure at this time and under these circumstances. How do these words, then, comport with the eight or ten hours which, we are told, we shall be allowed in discussing it? Now, Sir, in the year 1869 we were informed by the Speech from the Throne that:

"Bills will be presented to you for the establishment of uniform and amended laws respecting parliamentary elections."

And the promise of the previons Session, and the promise of that Session, were fulfilled by the presentation of a Bill during that Session. That Bill was presented on the 18th May, 1869, and the order for the second reading was discharged on the 19th June, 1869. At that time the hon. gentleman adopted a different mode for the preparation and revision of the lists from that which he has now adopted, and he made a statement of the principles of the franchise Bill which contrast somewhat with the principles which have been announced to-day. But I shall not at this moment trouble the House with those references. I wish to continue the historical narrative of the adventures of the Conservative Government of Canada in search of a franchise Bill. In the year 1870 the Speech from the Throne was more comprehensive:

"The laws in force on the subject of the elective franchise and the regulation of parliamentary elections in the several Provinces of the Dominion vary very much in their operations, and it is important that a uniform provision should be made, settling the franchise and regulating elections to the House of Commons, and measures upon these subjects will be submitted to your consideration."

Now, Sir, growing bold by time, and having decided to set their hands to the work, a statement of the importance and urgency of the measure was introduced into the Speech. We were told that uniformity was the difficulty; that this want of uniformity was a blemish. It offended hon. gentlemen opposite. They did not like it. It is not the assertion of our power, of our prestige, it is not the badge of our humiliation, while we are elected to this House by a suffrage which is prescribed by the Local Legislatures for the election of members to their own Assemblies that is noted, but the need of a uniform franchise. That is the ground taken. I mark, and I ask the House to mark, the ground that is taken. The ground that is taken is the variation, the differences, that exist in the laws in force in the various Provinces. The laws vary much in their operation. What follows?

"It is important that a uniform provision should be made, settling the franchise and regulating elections."

It is as apostles of the great doctrine of uniformity, it is as exponents of the necessity of a uniform provision, that the right hon. gentleman induced his colleagues to come forward when they, for the third time, in the Speech from the Throne, announced such a measure. The House met on 15th February, and the hon. gentleman then felt, contrary to the view of to-day, that he ought, if he was going to carry his Bill, to introduce it early. When did he present it? He presented it on the 24th February, nine days after the House had convened. Thus he did, so far as time was concerned, offer the House the Session. But, of course, there was other legislative work to be done. He moved the second reading on 10th March. The debate was then adjourned. It was resumed on 18th March, and it was then adjourned. It was resumed again on 24th March, upon which occasion the Bill was read the second time and ordered to be committed. It was committed on 29th March, and progress was reported. It was considered in committee twice subsequently, and as the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) has pointed out, upon the assertion in the committee of the counter proposition by Sir A. A. Dorion, that the provincial franchises should be used, discussion in committee closed on 3rd May, and the hon. gentleman moved the discharge of the Order. Did the hon. gentleman then, when he brought forward the Bill, obviously with the intention of passing it through the House, adopt the pleasant and graceful mode of deciding upon what is adequate discussion and limiting that discussion, as is proposed by the Secretary of State? No. What the hon. gentleman said on the 10th of March, when he moved the second reading of the Bill, was this:

"He would have this Bill placed on the paper every Government day, and considered *in extenso* whenever opportunity offered. This would probably last till near the end of the Session."

And he went on to explain that the discussion would continue till very near to the end of the Session; as, no doubt, the Senate would not interfere with the Bill, it being a Bill respecting elections for the House of Commons. When he made that proposition to the House, to read the Bill the second time on the 10th March, the hon. gentleman thought that the Committee of the Whole would continue until nearly the end of the Session before the Bill would be thoroughly, exhaustively and satisfactorily discussed. How far that accords with one whole day, how far that accords with eight or ten hours for a discussion of a Franchise Bill, I leave the House to judge. Well, as I have said, the hon. gentleman failed of his effort. I pass on to enquire how it happened that, if this measure be not, in its character and in its provisions, complicated, difficult and extensive, that for three successive Sessions it should be promoted—not brought in the first time, because it would take the whole Session to deal with it; brought in the second time and the order discharged; brought in the third, early; debated in the House and in the committee for seven full days, and then dropped from the Order paper and the order discharged. These are not the signs of an easy Bill; these are not the signs of a simple Bill; these are not the signs of a popular Bill; these are not the signs of a Bill which public opinion was demanding. These are the signs of one mind and one will animating the Government and pushing on, as far as he could and as fast as he could, as far as he dare, in the direction which he was determined to go, and postponing it at one time without action being taken on it at all, postponing it the second time after he had introduced the Bill, postponing it the third time after he had challenged debate upon it, because he found his measure did not receive that support from his own followers which was necessary in order to its being carried. These are the signs which mark the progress of the adventures of the hon. gentleman in search of a Franchise Bill for the first three years of his reign. In 1871 the Speech from the Throne announced to us among other measures, that a Bill would be presented relating to parliamentary elections. But the only Bill that was presented was a Bill to make temporary provision for the election of members, and this easy, simple, popular and pressing subject was not even mentioned on that occasion. Then, in 1872, there was an announcement in the Speech from the Throne that the decennial census had taken place and that the duty of readjusting the representation in Parliament for the four Provinces would devolve upon Parliament, and a measure for that purpose would be submitted. So that while the subject of the representation of the people in Parliament was to attract attention on that occasion, too, the hon. gentleman had abandoned for the time, it appeared, the idea of pressing upon Parliament and upon the country a uniform franchise. He succeeded in obtaining a majority in the elections of 1872; and having succeeded, he renewed his efforts in this direction in 1873. The Speech from the Throne in that year makes this declaration:

"It is important that provision should be made for the consolidation and amendment of the laws now in force in the several Provinces, relating to the representation of the people in Parliament. A measure for this purpose, and one for the trial of controverted elections, will be submitted for your consideration."

The House met upon the 6th March. The Bill respecting the election of members was introduced on the 21st March, very shortly after the commencement of the Session, though not quite so rapidly as upon the occasion in 1870. The order for the second reading was discharged on 20th May. A temporary election Bill was introduced on the 15th May, and read the second and third time on 20th May. Hon. members will see the progress made during that Session in the discharge of this easy, simple and popular duty. Then there came, as some of us still remember, a second Session in 1873. We had, in that year, two Sessions of Parliament. We met here in the fall of the year, and though some of us had supposed that we met for the simple purpose of passing judgment upon an arraigned Administration, and deciding whether they should retain the confidence of the House and the country, yet their view was that there were general legislative duties to be performed; and pressed as the hon. gentleman was by many and urgent considerations of another character, that sense of duty, that earnest persistence in the discharge of what is right, that constant attention to the interests of the public which he has displayed through his career, induced him, even under those pressing circumstances, when his thoughts might be—when it is no undue reflection to assume they were—largely engaged in another quarter to act; he felt even then that still this question, so dear to his heart, must not be forgotten, and the Speech from the Throne, even in the fall Session of 1873, contained the old announcement, that a Bill for the consolidation and amendment of the laws in force in the several Provinces, relating to the representation of the people in Parliament, was to be again submitted. The Speech from the Throne added:

"By the postponement of this measure from last Session, you will have the advantage of including in its provisions the Province of Prince Edward Island, now happily united to Canada."

Well, we did not happen to have that opportunity. Circumstances over which the hon. gentleman had no control prevented him from redeeming the pledge which he had advised His Excellency to put in the Speech from the Throne on that occasion, and instead of such answer as he had hoped would be given by the House to that Speech, an answer was proposed by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie), which, after several days of debate, the hon. gentleman found he could not resist, but which he did not want to see pass, and consequently he retired from office, and I do not blame him for not having brought down a Representation Bill in the second Session of 1873. The hon. gentleman, being relieved for a time by an ungrateful country and an ungrateful House of Commons from the cares of State, was no longer charged in heart, in conscience and in brain, with the great responsibility of making uniform election laws for Canada; and my hon. friend who succeeded him, and who took a different view of his duty to the country, in reference to the policy of Administrations on the occasion of a general election, propounded his policy on that subject. My hon. friend did what the hon. gentleman does not do—he issued an address to his electors, and he declared his opinion to be—in that address, I think, but certainly in his public speeches, as the leader of his party—in favor of the provincial franchises as the rule for elections to this House, and having so declared—not as to all the details of the measure, which of course could not and ought not to be, because they would be ineffectually submitted to the people—but generally as to the principles on which in that and other particulars in which he invited the discussion of the people he proposed to conduct public affairs, my hon. friend was returned to power in January, 1874; and true to his pledge he introduced his Bill and asked the Parliament of Canada to consecrate the principle for which he had been contending, namely, that the franchises which the Provincial Legislatures adopted for the Legislative Assemblies should be the franchises for the election of members to this House. But in the course of the preliminary discussion on the debate on the Address, my hon. friend was subjected to some very severe criticism by the right hon. gentleman for his improper conduct. He was told that he had been guilty of an act contrary to the principles of the British constitution, that he had been guilty of an act which assimilated this country more to the rule which sometimes prevailed in France, under its Republican institutions, of a plebiscite—to Cæsarism, and so on, because my hon. friend thought fit to

tell the people of Canada, when he was appealing to them for their suffrages, the general principles on which he proposed to conduct public affairs; because my hon. friend had thought fit to say these and such are the measure which I intend, if you give me power, to ask the Legislature to adopt—because my hon. friend had frankly stated what things he would do if he were given power, and asked the people to exercise an intelligent judgment upon them, the hon. gentleman rebuked him most severely and said that, although my hon. friend had a precedent, although he had the precedent of Mr. Gladstone, who, on a late occasion, had taken the people into his confidence, yet the weekly newspapers had condemned Mr. Gladstone, and had found out that he was guilty of an act in England, as my hon. friend was guilty of an act in Canada, subversive of the principles of the British constitution. The people should have been left in the dark, their return should have been a question of confidence, and my hon. friend should have been quite free to decide what measures to bring down, unfettered and untramelled by the judgment of the people beforehand, as to the principles on which he should rule if they allowed him to rule. The statement my hon. friend made had several advantages; it had the advantage that the people returned that House with the knowledge that a Bill, based on the lines of a recognition of the provincial franchises, would be the result, and it was after that plain statement of policy that my hon. friend received the endorsement which gave him power to put the existing law on the Statute Book. Then, Sir, that Bill was very fully discussed, and it passed a second reading without a division. But in the course of a discussion in committee the right hon. gentleman felt so strongly on the importance of keeping free from all influences those who would have the revision of the voters' lists that, when an hon. member of the House said he did not see any reason why the county judges should not have a vote, the present First Minister pointed out, as a reason against their having the right to vote that they revised the voters' lists. Oh! he said, the county court judges revise the voters' lists, and that is the reason why they should not have the right to vote. Such were the pure, not to say the purist principles—I do not object to them, I think they were right—such were the principles upon which the hon. gentleman was disposed to deal at that time.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 74) respecting the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Royal.)

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the Rush Lake and Saskatchewan Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Tupper.)

Bill (No. 91) to incorporate the Winnipeg and Prince Albert Railway Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

Mr. BLAKE. I had pointed out, Mr. Speaker, before you left the Chair, that a settlement of this question was made in 1874, under the Administration of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie), and that during the continuance of that Parliament, during all its five Sessions, no proposal was made by hon. gentlemen opposite, then in Opposition, in contravention of that settlement or for the application of the principles which, in opposition to that settlement, they deemed to be right; that they made no proposal to challenge the attention of the House and the country upon the question, whether it was fitting that their views should prevail at the election which was getting nearer every Session. They went to the country, and the hon gentleman whispered, so far as I have heard, no word of dissatisfaction with the arrangement of the franchise. Certainly, it cannot have been said to have been an issue before the electors in the year 1878. The hon. gentleman then triumphed at the polls; he resumed office; he held it for a period, not the full term, but the period for which he thought fit to allow that Parliament to exist, from 1878 to 1882; he appeared to have abandoned his proposals; he did not bring them to the consideration of the Legislature; he did not even adorn a Speech from the Throne, as far as I know, in any of these four Sessions, with any such proposal. He dissolved the Legislature; in appealing to the country he did not express any dissatisfaction with the condition under which the people were called on to exercise the franchise. He could not do so, because for four years he had controlled the administration of affairs with a very large majority in Parliament, and during those four years he had been oblivious of his former views on this subject; he had made no attempt even to press the question upon the consideration of the Legislature. He went to the country upon other issues, not averring that he was about to introduce this change, not averring that there was any cause for dissatisfaction, not indicating this as a question to be at all considered by the electors. He succeeded, and the first proof of his success was the re-introduction of this proposal in the Speech from the Throne in 1883; so that for two Parliaments the question had been settled; it had been settled in the first Session of the earlier Parliament by my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) and had never been challenged since that time, although for a whole Parliament the hon. gentleman opposite (Sir John A. Macdonald) had the means, if he chose, had the power, if he willed, to have redressed this anomaly which grieves his soul so much; to have put upon a sound footing the principles of the franchise for this House, which, he says, have been false all this time; to have made accordant with the spirit of our constitution a practice which, he says, has been discordant all this time. In 1883 he brought the question under our consideration. He announced then:

"It is important that the laws relating to the representation of the people in Parliament should be amended, and the electoral franchises in the existing Provinces assimilated. And measures for this purpose will be submitted for your consideration."

The House met on the 8th February; the Bill was read the first time the 13th April, and the order was discharged the 13th May, the Bill never having gone to a second reading; but upon the presentation of the Bill the hon. gentleman said:

"The principle is not the principle which we have heard stated to-day, which was that this Parliament should control the franchise, but that the franchise shall be uniform throughout the Dominion, so that the same classes shall have the franchise in the different Provinces. So far as Ontario and Quebec are concerned, the Bill will operate, on the whole, as an enlargement of the franchise. It will affect other Provinces variously, according to the principles on which their various present franchises are framed."

So that once again you find the principle of uniformity consecrated as the essential principle of the Dominion franchise. He also made an observation or two in reference to other clauses of the Bill at that time, to which I shall not now refer. In 1884 the Speech from the Throne again contained the statement:

"The Bill laid before you last Session, for the representation of the people in Parliament and the assimilation of the electoral franchises existing in the several Provinces, has now been before the country for a year. The measure has been introduced and I commend it to your attention."

The House met the 17th January, the hon. gentleman presented the Bill the 23rd January, a week after the House had met. But that diligence was not followed by equal diligence in pressing the Bill, for the order was discharged

the 16th April, there having been no attempt to press the Bill to a second reading at all. Now, having framed his Bill in the first Session of this present Parliament, having introduced it at a comparatively advanced period of that Session, having brought it forward in the second Session of Parliament, having introduced it within a week from the opening of that Session, I should like to know what excuse there is, when this third Session we are met in the Speech from the Throne with the announcement that this measure will be brought forward, for the late period in which it is brought forward. If he intended to press it for settlement, after the statement to which I referred as to the length of time it would take for proper consideration, if he was able, at the opening of last Session, to bring down this measure, how is it that so many weeks have elapsed before he brought it forward, this Session? And yet he declares he intended to bring it forward, with a view of bringing it to a final conclusion. After all that has occurred on this subject during the past eighteen years, particularly after the early presentation of the Bill last Session, we had a right to conclude, when the hon. gentleman brought it forward so late this Session, that his intention was simply so far to fulfil this promise made in the Speech from the Throne that he would bring down such a measure, but that he had no intention to press it to a conclusion. And the reason given for pressing it to a conclusion to-day, the reason given for its being an opportune time for establishing this change, is that there are alterations in the franchise lately made in more than one Local Legislature. Now, I have pointed out that there was no announcement by the hon. gentleman of his declinature to accede, to assent to the settlement of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) as to the terms of settlement of the principle on which our franchise should be framed. There was no request on his part for the confidence of the people, either at the election of 1878 or the election of 1882, on the score that he would effect a reform of this description. There was no challenge of the existing system and of the verdict of 1874 upon that system, or of the legislation based upon that verdict. I think there should have been such a challenge; I think there should have been such an opportunity for discussion before the electorate of this country, if the hon. gentleman intended to propose such a measure. From his own point of view, it is a most important measure, it is a vital measure; it involves a fundamental difference of principle compared with the law of the land; and I say that when a question, with reference to the representation of the people in Parliament, proposing vital and fundamental changes of principle, is brought forward, it ought to be brought forward after the people have had an opportunity of deciding, at a general election, by the representatives they are to return, what shall be the general policy which shall regulate the legislation upon that subject. What has happened in England, with reference to the Reform Bills? We know the Reform Bills there have been adopted after long discussion; that for Session after Session those who have been in the minority, and sometimes even Governments who, on other questions, have had a majority, have made proposals, but that the measure has ripened by that good and wholesome process of discussion out of doors and of election after election held upon it, until the results are obtained. That is the great advantage of that principle, the general principle which has distinguished English legislation, the principle of progressive advance, the principle of stability, the principle that, as a rule, a settlement of a great question of this kind is irrevocable. Why is it irrevocable as a rule? Not because the people cannot change it, but because it is not made the law unless and until, by discussion and popular elections upon it, it is certain that the people have settled down to the adoption of that rule, not in some hasty fashion, but after mature thought and reflection, and after careful argument and discussion; and I maintain that the view to which I have referred and which I know is very much opposed by the right hon. gentleman, which I have already pointed out he reprehended in the case of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie), when he said he acted not in accordance with the spirit of the British constitution, because he told the people the general principles upon which he asked their confidence, is the true Democratic view, the view on which, consistently with the principles of representative government, on which consistently with the principles of representative government, as opposed to the *plébiscite*, you yet may give an ever-increasing measure of interest in, and control over, the legislation of the country to the great body of the electors. You give it to them when you recognise the view that they are to be consulted upon the general principles of legislation—not by a mere yea and nay vote, but by their fairly understanding what the large and fundamental questions are to be, as far as they can be anticipated, with which the Parliament they are electing is to deal, and what the general principles held by the competitors for their confidence are upon those large and fundamental questions. I do not deny that there will arise, that there may arise, in the currency of any Parliament, very grave questions, unanticipated in the election. I do not seek to shackle the authority of Parliament to deal with those emergent questions which may arise. But this is not an emergent question of that kind. For this, no such excuse exists. This is a question which we supposed to be settled, which we supposed was laid to sleep after the legislation of my hon. friend in 1874, and on which, if the decision of Parliament and the people was to have been challenged, it ought to have been challenged by the hon. gentleman before he went to the polls, on which he ought to have asked for the return of a Parliament of opinions contrary to those held by that which was elected when the people previously pronounced upon it. Under these circumstances, I maintain that we are entitled to say that there has not been that popular discussion as to the reversal of the views held in 1874 and since, that there has not been that opportunity for consideration by the people which, at this age and under our Democratic system of government, there ought to have been. I do not intend to say a word more than that which I have said generally, by my reference to former utterances, as to the period of the Session at which the Bill is introduced, and as to the possibility of dealing with the Bill as it ought to be dealt with, consistently with the discharge of our other business. The House has decided, by a very large majority, that it can fully discuss and deal with this Bill, and also with all the other pressing legislation which is upon the Order paper and which, though not upon the Order paper, is expected to come upon the Order paper after a little while. The House has so decided, and we are therefore to proceed to that discussion; but I do maintain that the observations of the hon. gentleman which I have read, his course of conduct in the past, and his professions in the past, sufficiently indicate that this Bill ought to receive a very considerable amount of discussion. If that is to be to the detriment of the discussion which is to take place on other measures, the hon. gentleman will obtain that advantage from this procedure which he has often in the past obtained from a similar procedure, in regard to other important measures, and which was reprehended by his independent supporter from Northumberland, N.B. (Mr. Mitchell), the other evening—the procedure of procrastinating the submission of his measures to the House, in the hope that the late period of their introduction might induce us, a busy people, a people dependent upon our own exertions for our maintenance, to curtail the debates, in order that we may be able to enter upon the discharge of our private duties. I trust that such will not be the case now. I have said that, for eighteen years, we have gone on under the provincial franchises, and

why should we not continue to go on under the provincial franchises? We are a practical people, and our politics, in this particular as in others, must be practical. You know that your franchise is not an artistic franchise, that no franchise that is proposed will fully satisfy the demands of logic and of reason. You say it is the best that can be done; it may not please all the Provinces; we hope it will please most of the Provinces, or the larger Provinces, or the majority of the House. That is all that we can expect. But I ask where are the practical inconveniences which have resulted from the operation of the existing system? What difficulty have we found? Do hon. gentlemen opposite say that the elections under the provincial franchises have not truly exhibited the popular mind? We know there are defects in all our electoral systems, defects which have affected the composition of this House, which have prevented its being a reflection of the popular will to so great an extent as, according to my notion, representative Houses ought to be. But I say these defects are not traceable and cannot be traced to the franchise. They are traceable to other causes altogether; and therefore I say that the experience of eighteen years and of five general and a very large number of special elections is valuable to us and ought not to be lightly thrown aside; and, if, for these eighteen years, we have lived without our prestige being dulled or diminished, without practical inconvenience, without its being possible to allege that the operation of the law, as it has stood for that time, has prevented the popular will from being reflected here to any extent to which it would have been reflected by any change in the franchise, if I say we are able to appeal to these results, we have a very strong argument for not disturbing the existing state of things. You may say it is rather a Conservative argument; but, although I am and avow myself a Reformer, and a radical Reformer, I have never been disposed to favor change for the mere sake of change, and I am disposed to pay very great respect, in a constitution like ours and in a system like ours, to the practical teachings of experience; I am disposed to acknowledge the merits of a system which has proved itself adequate to the occasion and to whose working which we are accustomed. I say then, that those who, at this time of day, propose a change, are bound to get beyond theoretic difficulties, are bound to get beyond alleged errors of principle, and to show us wherein a practical wrong is being done, a practical evil is being incurred, of some considerable extent, and I go further, of an extent which is not more than counterbalanced by the practical advantages of continuing the present plan. But I go much further yet. Ours is a federal system, its basis is the federal principle, and this basis of our system, although not a perfect federation, yet as a federal constitution, is representation in the popular chamber, according to the population of each Province. There is the base. Your fundamental principle is that in the Commons House of Parliament each Province shall be represented by so many members as the population of that Province is, in proportion to those of the other Provinces. It is provincial representation, therefore. It is representation of the Province; it is the popular opinion of the Province, according to its strength, counted by the numbers of the people; that is the base of our federal system. In the other chamber there is a recognition, in a peculiar and a somewhat marred form, of the principle of State sovereignty, with regard to which the numbers of the Senators are based. But here the principle of provincial representation is recognised in its entirety, and if that be so, I say that it is more in accordance with the true theory, it is more in accordance with the real spirit, of the federal principle, that the people of the Province should decide what is the best mode in which the sense of the Province can be taken as to the public opinion to be represented on the floor of this House. It is the people of the Province, in proportion to their numbers, that are to be represented here; it is the people of the Province, I say, who should tell you in what shape your representation is to take place. Now, I do not argue that the constitution says this in imperative terms. If I could say so the question would be at an end. We would not have the power to do this thing. Of course, it is admitted that we have the power to do this thing; but we have many powers which we are bound to exercise, if the the federal constitution is to be preserved, with due regard to the spirit and the principle of federalism. You have got the power of disallowance; you can disallow every Act of a Provincial Legislature. Will you exercise it? No. Why will you not exercise it? Because you kno.w it would be destructive of the federal principle altogether You know that some line and some measure must be laid down, and some conditions framed as to the extent of it. It is a question between parties what the extent of it should be, but it is admitted by both parties that some line and some limit should be laid down, and that these are to be found in the recognition, more or less perfect and large, of the federal principle. Some may say we do not choose to recognise the federal principle so widely as you do, and therefore we will assume a more wide exercise of the power of disallowance. Others will say: We recognise the federal principle more widely than you do; therefore we insist on a narrower exercise of the power of disallowance. But in either case the test to be applied is: What is the true limit of the federal principle? So I might say of many other things. I maintain that this constitution, in those regards which this Parliament and the Local Legislatures have powers, is to be worked by both, if it is to last, with a due regard to its spirit, which is the federal spirit. And therefore I say that it is not incumbent upon us to exercise all our powers, that when we are entitled to act in any given phase of legislative action, we are not bound to act because we are entitled to act. But we have acted, and how have we acted? We acted in 1874 by saying that we adopted the provincial franchises. Now, we still have power, if we find that the Local Legislature abuses its trust, if we find that what has been suggested from the other side to-day has really taken place—I deny that it has taken place at all, to my knowledge and information—but if there has been some abuse of trust, we have a remedy, and we have it always in our hands. But I maintain that there has been no such abuse of trust, there has been no such abuse of power; and if there has been, let the remedy to be applied be limited to the evil to be cured, and do not assume an entire and absolute power and control because there has been a partial abuse of power, which you can remedy by the proper and specific application to that abuse. I have said that this principle of a Province establishing a franchise for itself by which the representation in this Parliament shall be governed is the true federal principle. And besides the argument drawn from reason, we may draw the argument from experience. The right hon. gentleman opposite has more than once paid a generous and not undeserved compliment to the constitution of the neighboring Republic. He has more than once pointed out the wisdom with which that constitution was framed, and eulogised the great men who set their hands to that great work. It is true that those laudations were, perhaps, indirectly laudations of the speaker, because he has always contended that, great as was their ability, large their powers of statesmanship, and far-seeing their intellects, he has done better yet. He has contended that the constitution under which we live is a better constitution than theirs, and will do better work. But I say that upon this question of what the true spirit of the federal principle demands, as to the mode in which the people of each Province shall be represented in the general Legislature, you have got, besides, the reason and the theory, the practice and the experience of the great Republic, the largest and on all hands the most

glorious application of the federal principle which has yet been known to the world. And you do not find there that uniformity is so much admired. You find there that the basis of representation for Congress is the basis of the franchise in each State for the most numerous body of its Local Legislature. And therefore we have, as I have said, besides our own experience, the experience and the practice of the United States in this regard; we have the theory and the reason of the thing all pointing one way. I deny that uniformity is so charming as the hon. gentleman declares. I deny that uniformity is essential. I aver, on the contrary, that nominal uniformity has been proved to be, in the condition of our country, substantial diversity. I aver that the conditions of our people differ, that the circumstances differ, and the only way in which the hon. gentleman has ever been able, in any sense, to grapple with this phase of the subject, has been by laying down a rule and measure to satisfy the aspirations of none, because he was obliged to give and take something in order to make it tolerable to all. Now this difficulty is shown in the proposals that have been made from time to time. The truth is that the opinions of the Provinces on this topic differ. The hon. Secretary of State, this evening, in one part of his argument, announced that the opinion of the Province of Quebec was hostile to one disposition of this Bill, and that seemed to him to be a very good reason for its not being pressed. I dare say it was a good reason for its not being pressed, but is not the admission fatal to the proposition that we ought to have a federal franchise at all? Why should we not have a franchise that will suit the Province of Quebec, expressing, according to the mind of that Province, the opinion of the people in this Parliament? You want, for the Province of Quebec, just such a franchise as shall best express the mind of that Province on this floor. Who are to be the judges of what sort of franchise will best accomplish that result in the Province of Quebec? Not the people of Ontario; not the people of British Columbia; not the people of Prince Edward Island. The people of the Province of Quebec will best judge it. It is the people of the Province of Quebec, knowing their position, knowing their circumstances, knowing their conditions, knowing if you will—for they have them like the rest of us—their sentiments, passions and prejudices, knowing the state of public opinion amongst themselves, that can best judge for themselves what franchise will produce the desired result of representing upon this floor, fully and completely, the mind of that Province. And these you see will be the results achieved by those who are most deeply interested in the achieving of the result, and who have the best knowledge and the best means of achieving the result. The hon. gentleman acknowledged that the opinions of the Provinces differ. He has referred to one provision of the Bill that is to be dealt with specially in consequence of that difference. We know it also. We know that the people of Prince Edward Island have practically manhood suffrage; that British Columbia has manhood suffrage; that Manitoba has practically manhood suffrage; and, thus as we know, public opinion differs in a very marked degree in those Provinces from that which obtains in the other Provinces. The Province of Ontario has an enlarged franchise. The right hon. gentleman stated that the general effect of his Bill would be to enlarge the franchise in Ontario. The right hon. gentleman was repeating his speech of a year or two ago. A year or two ago that speech was, to a certain extent, true; but it is entirely inaccurate to-day. It has to-day no foundation in fact whatever. The franchise in Ontario is to be very largely restricted by this measure. That is an important consideration for us. You find that done. How was it done? Both parties in that Province—and the parties in that Province are composed of the same men, thinking the same thoughts as those who compose the people who send us here—were agreed that its condition and circumstances were, that an extension of the franchise was desirable. The right hon. gentleman, in his capacity of a provincial politician, himself adopted that view; and, at a party political convention, which was held under his auspices, in the Province of Ontario, resolutions were passed in favor of an extension of the suffrage in that Province. The Local Government pledged themselves to that extension, and they went to the people upon that extension; and, having been returned to power, they proceeded to put into execution their pledges, and they passed an Act of the Legislature. What is the state of public opinion in Ontario on this subject? Why, it is this, that the Liberals have passed a Bill, a very much more liberal measure than that which is now before us, and the hon. gentleman's deputy in that Legislature, Mr. Meredith, on behalf of the Ontario Conservatives, moved an amendment, practically in favor of manhood suffrage. So the opinion of the great Province of Ontario is represented—save in so far as it is divided by a suggestion on the part of the minority, the Conservative minority, that manhood suffrage should be the franchise—by unanimous agreement as to the liberal franchise to which I am about to refer. There is no dispute in Ontario that the franchise should not be at least as liberal as the provisions to which I am now referring. The question which the Conservatives raised, was that the Bill was not liberal enough, and that it should have gone down to manhood suffrage. If that statement of the political opinion of Ontario, is correct on the subject of the franchise, I want to see how the provisions of the respective Bills contrast. In Ontario, in cities and towns, the qualification of owners is $200, in incorporated villages and townships, it is $100 only. In this Bill it is $300 in cities and towns, and in townships $150. So you find that the qualifications are very different. You find that the franchise which both parties have united upon in Ontario is very much lower than the franchise proposed by this Bill. Then as to the income franchise. That franchise is $250 a year in Ontario; under this Bill it is $400 a year. Then there is the wage-earners' franchise. The hon. gentleman has adopted practically the language of his former Bill, as well as I remember it, with respect to the income franchise, and he explained in his former speech on the subject, his speech in 1870, what he intended the effect to be. He said, with respect to the provision, that parties having an annual income of $400 should have a vote, that it did not apply to day laborers, who might, as a matter of fact, earn $400 in a year. "It is not the intention of the Bill," he said, "to give votes to such parties, because they have no abiding interest in the country." That was the statement: the franchise was not to apply to men who earned their daily bread by day labor, because they had no abiding interest in the country. And even, although such a man might earn $400 in a year, he was not to have the franchise. He retains the same provision in the present Bill. But in the Province of Ontario, besides an income franchise of $250, there is a wage-earners' franchise. It is provided that every male person entered on the last assessment roll, and who is a resident at the time of election and has resided there continuously since the completion of the last roll and during the twelve months immediately preceding, being an earner of wages to the amount of not less than $250 in a year, shall be entitled to vote. It is further provided that in estimating or ascertaining the amount of wages or income, the fair value of board or lodging received in lieu of wages shall be considered and included. Those are the provisions of the franchise in Ontario. But hon. gentlemen opposite, the great friends of the workingmen, the great friends of the wage-earners of the country, who poured forth floods of tears for years while in Opposition, as to their unhappy fate, and who have poured forth more lately floods of congratulation and jubilation over

the improvement which, they say, they have effected in their condition — those hon. gentlemen told us, in 1870, that the day laborers should not have the franchise, and in 1885 they give an income franchise of $400, but provide no wage-earner's franchise at all. Then there is the householder's franchise, which is a very important franchise. Every householder is entitled to vote, without regard to the value of the house. Then there is the land-owner's franchise. The son of a landlord is entitled to vote, entirely independent of the value of the land-owner's property. If a land-owner has enough to qualify himself, his son or sons shall be qualified also, so that the restrictions in this Bill in that regard do not exist in the Ontario law. Such is the Act which has been adopted unanimously by the Legislature of Ontario as the best means of obtaining representation of the minds of the people of the Province, except that the Conservative party wish the franchise to be placed still lower, because the Conservative party say it should be still more liberal. They are all agreed it should be that far down, and how, with that state of things, the hon. gentleman could tell us that his proposal enlarges the Ontario franchise, I am really unable to understand. I shall not now engage in a discussion of its effect upon the other Provinces. I mention its effect in the Province of Ontario, as I happen to come from that Province, and as the hon. gentleman in so extraordinary a way misconceived the operation of the present law in that Province. But I observe that within a little time a measure has been introduced in the Legislature of Nova Scotia, which has the effect of liberalising the franchise in that Province also. Now, Sir, the First Minister declared that our present plan was, as he said, anomalous for us, drawing as we did our inspiration from British institutions, and it was contrary to the first principle of British institutions. Sir, we draw our inspiration from British institutions in so far as British institutions are consonant with ours. The British parliamentary institution is a legislative union, not a federal union, and ours must be modified by whatever elements exist in the spirit of federalism different from those which subsist in the spirit of legislative union. This question could not possibly arise under a legislative union. There you are dealing with one country, with no Local Legislatures, with no local authorities whom anybody proposes to entrust with the power of fixing the franchise at all! How else could you fix it, except by the Central Legislature? There is no other way of doing it; it is a literal, actual union; and yet even there, as has been pointed out by an hon. member, it is only now, under the recent Acts, that the principle of assimilation has become perfected. Up to the present, since the union of Scotland, since the union of Ireland, the franchises have been different in the United Kingdom, different even in different parts of each kingdon, so that in practice even there, in a legislative union, up to now, for these many years, there was not that assimilation which the hon. gentleman has contended for as belonging to the first principle of British institutions, and which, as I have said, if it was the first principle of those institutions, would not apply at all to a federal union which, is so wholly different. The hon. Secretary of State has said that provincial rights are not in question. Of course there is a sense in which provincial rights are not in question; that is the sense in which I have spoken a while ago, namely, that we have the power, if we choose to exercise it, of framing a franchise of our own. But the hon. gentleman said the members for Quebec were the representatives of Quebec on the floor of this House, and therefore they should establish the franchise for Quebec. True, the franchise for Quebec ought to be established by the members for Quebec; I admit the hon. gentleman's statement. The franchise ought to be established by the members for Quebec, but it ought to be established by the members of Quebec in the Provincial Legislature of Quebec, where they need not be troubled by other members in this House in the discharge of their duty; where they have control even more absolute than that which some of them claim in the deliberations of this Chamber; where they can decide for themselves just what franchise they want, and thus the hon. gentleman's view would be accomplished. But it might happen that the members for Quebec, who, as the hon. gentleman says, are the representatives for the Province of Quebec, might have a franchise forced upon them here by others that they do not like. Why, the hon. gentleman himself, and his colleagues, the Minister of Public Works, and the Acting Minister of Railways, and the Minister of Militia, are engaged at this moment in promoting a measure which is opposed to the feelings of the members for Quebec. They are engaged at this moment in promoting a measure to which the feeling of the members for Quebec is hostile—the provision of this Bill as to woman suffrage. The hon. gentleman says, forsooth, I will not express an opinion upon it. The hon. gentleman need not express an opinion upon it; we know his opinion; do not we see the Bill? Why, he has brought down the Bill; it is the Bill of the Government; it tells me what his opinion is. What do I care about his word of mouth. We have his bond, his Bill, his legislative act; three Speeches from the Throne, three Bills brought down to Parliament declared what his opinion is. We know his opinion. It cannot be that, on a great principle like this, the Bill which these hon. gentlemen have brought forward is not in accordance with their own opinions. It is impossible that they can be resisting this measure. Not even the Secretary of State, whatever his relations to his colleagues, will say that he is resisting a measure which he himself has joined in bringing down and, therefore, we know their opinions, in a parliamentary sense; we know their opinions, though the reasons for those opinions the hon. gentleman does not now propose to give us. Some other day perhaps, at some more convenient season, we may hear his reasons in support of the vote he is to give in favor of the clause for woman suffrage; but in the meantime I point out that a Government containing amongst its members four members from the Province of Quebec, might bring down to Parliament a Franchise Bill to which the Province of Quebec was hostile, and which Franchise Bill might be forced through this Parliament, notwithstanding that hostility; and thus it would happen that the representatives of the Province of Quebec, who, as the hon. gentleman truly says, represent that Province in this House, might represent it hopelessly—betrayed and misled by their leaders in the Government — they might find themselves in a position in which they could not resist. We do not know, of course, what steps they have taken. We are not acquainted with the precise process of preparation and elaboration by which the First Minister has made his specific declaration as to the attitude of the Government on this particular clause, to which I am just now about further to refer; but I use it for the moment as an illustration of the ineffective way in which those in that position, from even the powerful Province of Quebec, may be constrained to act, if you establish the principle that the representation of the Province is to be decided here. The question being asked here is, how best the members for the Federal Parliament can be chosen from the Province of Quebec. That question is to be fairly answered in this way: it can be best decided by the Province of Quebec. And what I have said as to the Province of Quebec applies to each of the other Provinces. I say the question is, how best can the members be chosen to this Parliament, to represent the mind of each Province, and I say it can best be done by the Province which is going to send the members—best be done by the people who are going to elect the members, and if by them, the Local Legislature is the exponent of their views and the representation of their minds. The First Minister said the Local Legislatures might increase or diminish our consti-

tuencies. Now, it is not at all proposed that we should call on the Local Legislatures to establish one law and one measure for us and another for themselves. That is not the rule in the United States; it is not the rule here to-day. The rule in the United States has been found a sufficient safeguard, and it is. Whatever you establish for yourselves locally shall be the measure for your representation here. It is not to be supposed that they will hurt themselves locally in order to hurt us here, and what interest can they have in hurting us here anyway? Their object must always be to have as full, as powerful and as fair a representation as is possible. And, mark you, although you speak so contemptuously apparently of Local Legislatures, yet the Local Legislatures are the creation of the same people who send us here; and they speak within their sphere of allotted or assigned power, whether it be assigned under the constitution or limited by our action in this matter, they speak with as good a warrant and with as great a popular sanction from the same electors, and as representing the mind of the same people, as we do who sit in this larger Chamber. Now, the First Minister a little bit withdrew from his position of uniformity in his speech. Did I perceive a sign of further party action? Did I find a small loophole of retreat from the main basis which has been for these 18 years alleged as the ground of this measure, namely, that we must not have variety, that we must have uniformity, that we must have assimilation, that we must have the same franchise for the different Provinces, when the hon. gentleman said he did not stickle for "pedantic uniformity?" Does that mean that we are going to have a franchise to suit the people of Prince Edward Island, for them? Or is the later language of the hon. the Secretary of State to prevail, who pointed out that under the present system the smallest Legislatures may be allowed, at will, to change the franchise —that little British Columbia and little Nova Scotia might change our law? Is little Prince Edward Island to change our law, as far as she is concerned, because our law, speaking of that as the law of the majority, requires uniformity? And if there is to be variety in the case of one of the Provinces, because one of the Provinces complains of the adoption of the principle of uniformity, the whole business is given up, the whole groundwork of action is gone. You say it is contrary to first principles that there should be variety; you say that you ought to pass a uniform franchise, and if a little Province is to say no, for itself, I want to know why a big one should not. Now, the hon. gentleman said that little Nova Scotia or little British Columbia might change our law, and the First Minister said they could increase or diminish our constituency. But I say again, it is the people of the Province who increase or diminish our constituency; it is the people of the Province that elect the Local Legislature; it is the people of the Province that will undo their work for them if it is undone; it is the mind of the people that is represented in the Local Legislature. But the hon. gentleman sneered at the Local Legislatures, as if they were not as sacred a representation of the popular will, in their sphere, as this Legislature can be in its sphere. The hon. gentleman, I say, sneered at these small Provinces.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did not.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, his language, I think, was that of sneering; but if the hon. gentleman did not intend it as a sneer, I am glad to know it, and glad to have elicited this expression from the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman, then, not sneering, pointed to the smallness of the Provinces and asked if they wanted to change our law. They do not ask to change it; they want to have a free mind, to say how they shall be represented, each in its own sphere, and each to the extent of its own membership. They do not want to control the deliberations of this Parliament; they do not want to decide how any other Province shall regulate its franchise; each wishes to regulate its own. As I said, the decision which is to be taken in small British Columbia, or in small Nova Scotia, is how the quota for British Columbia or Nova Scotia shall be chosen, and no more than that. The hon. gentleman has said that the constitution does not provide for a local franchise; but that observation I have already answered—I say its spirit does. Then the hon. gentleman referred to the forces of nature, and gave us an elaborate description of those forces; he told us how they operated, and how we ought to apply the great principles, which he seemed to evolve from that discussion, to the present debate. Well, Sir, I think we had not better enter into that large domain. The forces of nature and the laws that rule the world and the creatures therein, are vast and mysterious; they are beyond our ken. We do not apprehend how it happens that the lion and the tiger raven and rend; we do not apprehend the mysteries of the storm and tempest; we do not understand the mysteries of disease and death, of crime and misery; yet they are all parts of a great order, and, as I believe, are susceptible of explanation, though not to our finite minds, as clearly and as consistently with the great harmonies which, we believe, will be evolved, as those great rules which the hon. gentleman applied; and yet we would not propose to apply them to our legislation or to our action. No, Sir; we cannot dispose of this great question on this broad and mysterious basis which the hon. gentleman evolved; and, entirely agreeing with him in the belief that some day or other the mysteries of those things will be revealed, I decline to acknowledge in the hon. gentleman's argument any practical application which will aid us in the discharge of our duty of to-day. I believe that, notwithstanding lion and tiger, storm and tempest, disease and death, crime and misery, God is good—

> "That God which ever lives and loves,
> One God, one law, one element,
> And one far-off, Divine event,
> To which the whole creation moves."

But while I believe that, I do not profess to be able, as the hon. gentleman seems to think he is able, to solve those various mysteries, or to make a practical application of them to the business of a Franchise Bill. Then the hon. gentleman declared—I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I say that is great applause, after those beautiful words you have just spoken.

Mr. BLAKE. I may say to the hon. member for North Hastings that I did not expect him to applaud those words; they are not the kind of words he likes. If I were making a speech for his applause, it would be in quite a different tone. The hon. Secretary of State declared that this Bill recognised the progress of the age, that it recognised the fuller right of the people to act in the administration of affairs, and that it gave a larger interest to the people in that direction. Does it so for British Columbia? Does it so for Manitoba? Does it so for Prince Edward Island? Does it so for Ontario? Does it so, in some instances, even for Nova Scotia or New Brunswick? The hon. gentleman will find that these grand sentences, these rounded periods, eloquent though they may be, lack the essential element, I will not say of truth, but of accuracy. As a rule, and looking over this whole Dominion, whether you count the numbers of the Provinces or the numbers of the population, this Bill, if it recognises the progress of the age, recognises a progress towards a restriction of the franchise instead of its enlargement; it recognises a less right than those rights now belonging to the people to act in public affairs; it recognises and establishes a diminished power from that which now exists under existing legislation. Then the hon. gentleman declared that while the Bill went as far as it was possible to go without universal suffrage, to universal suffrage he was opposed. He denied the franchise

to those who had no stake in the country, and he admitted that some of the Provinces might be discontented, but that, he said, was inevitable. They must remember he said that the Bill gave the right to vote to every one who deserved it. That is just the question. The Provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia and Prince Edward Island have believed, and do believe, that many more people are entitled to the right of franchise than are included in this Bill. Why do you decide that point? Why should you take upon yourselves to determine that those who are now exercising the franchise in those Provinces do not deserve it? The Province of Ontario has, I have said, with unanimity decided that many thousands, aye, many tens of thousands of its citizens, are entitled to the franchise, who, the hon. gentleman says, do not deserve it. But for this Bill they would have it. By this Bill you are going to take it from them. Then the hon. gentleman, giving us some more of the philosophy with which he adorns his speeches, says we must choose in practical politics between what is opportune and what is better. Perhaps so; sometimes the hon. gentleman may have so to choose, and I dare say he is an opportunist. But I venture to say to him that you need not now so choose. Why? That which is opportune is, as in the broad sense and in the long run it always is, better, too. That which is better is that which is really opportune, and there is concurrence, and not divergence, between that which is opportune and that which is better. What is both opportune and better is not to disturb the existing system, is to leave this franchise to be regulated as, up to this Session, it has been regulated; and if it were not so, I would venture to say, in opposition to the hon. gentleman's doctrine of opportunism, that he had better assume a new *role* and declare himself "too fond of the right to pursue the expedient." But the hon. gentleman said there was a secret reason for the opposition to this measure, and the reason was that some Province wanted to rule this Dominion. I have no idea to what Province he referred, but if there were a way in which some one Province who wished it could get the power, and I do not believe anyone can get the power, if there were a way in which one Province could dream for itself it would have the power to control this Dominion, I suppose it would be by declaring that in this Parliament it would regulate the franchise for all the other Provinces; whereas, those who oppose this Bill say: We do not want, whether we belong to a strong or too weak Province, to interfere with the Provinces at all; we want each Province to decide for itself, how best its mind will be represented. Is that a desire to centralise? Is that a desire to get power here for some strong Province to rule the Dominion? Is it not rather a desire to leave to the smaller, the weaker Provinces, the fullest measure of self-control in this as in all other matters. It is the hon. gentleman and his followers who, by their policy, want to make the small Provinces bow to the will of the great; it is they who are proposing to do this, and who tell the smaller Provinces, such as Manitoba, British Columbia and Prince Edward Island—small in point of population, though in point of area Manitoba and British Columbia outshine a good many of us—it is they who are telling the smaller Provinces: Gentlemen, we insist upon administering to you such a dose of franchise as we think is good for you; it may taste bitter, but it will do you good afterwards; take it on trust; swallow your medicine! The hon. gentleman defends his course by saying that those who wish to leave each Province to regulate its own franchise are desirous that one Province shall rule. He says we will never build up the country or consolidate the Union on such lines of argument as these; and, by an unhappy illustration, he added, we shall never be like the great nation to the south of us. But the United States, the great nation to which the hon. gentleman referred for an illustration, is great, and consolidated in spite of its adopting the very rule the hon. gentleman denounces as fatal to greatness; nay, Sir, it is great and consolidated because of the adoption of that rule; it is great and consolidated just because of the great measure of local liberties which it enjoys. I am not now about to enter into a discussion of the arguments advanced sometimes by hon. gentlemen opposite as to the causes which provoked the great war which threatened at one time, in the opinion of some people, to rend the Union asunder. I think I know those causes, having studied them a little. I maintain, in spite of the arguments about State rights, and State sovereignty, and all those difficulties, that the principle of wide local liberties is the principle which has made the Union great, which has really consolidated it as a federal union, which has given such an adaptation of local powers and of federal administration as enable it, with its vast territory and enormous population, to regulate its local and general affairs efficiently and harmoniously, and to grow, as that great country is growing, and we are all glad to know that it is growing, in strength and unity as well. And those who hope the brightest hopes, who dream the most glorious dreams, who are inspired by the most exalted imaginations, with reference to the future of the land for which we are legislating, those who rejoice in its broad domain, in its immense area of territory, in its diversified interests, are they to forget that it is in this country, above all countries, by reason and by experience both, that we must preserve to the highest extent the principle of local liberties, if we would indeed accomplish that consummation which we all so devoutly wish—the consolidation of the country into a great nation? We, with our great difficulties, for they are serious, with our great distances, for they are obstacles to centralisation, with our differences of race, our differences of nationality, our sparse populations, surely ought to realise from our reason, and, if not, we ought to learn from the experience of ourselves and of others, how important it is that the principle of local liberties and local administration should prevail. Here I shall not touch upon topics which would be more appropriately touched later, but I am sure no man can reflect upon that which has largely engrossed the mind and thought of the people of Canada and the members of this House for three weeks past, without reflecting upon the importance of local administration, without reflecting upon the difficulties which administration, thousands of miles from the point at which you administer, involves the Government and the country. No person who reflects can doubt that the principle of local franchise and local liberties, applied at an early moment, even at a time when you might not be disposed otherwise to apply it, is after all the sound and just principle for us; and at this day, in this Parliament, with these events passing before us, we should pause before consummating the act of centralisation which the hon. gentleman has been attempting without success for these last eighteen years. There are great practical advantages in addition to all the considerations to which I have referred, in the retention of the existing law. It is the simplest law you can have. I do not care if the local franchise were, though it be not, so complicated as this one; for practical purposes, the local franchise of the Province is the simplest franchise you can have. Why? Because a double franchise is hard to understand; a double registration is hard to accomplish; the labor of revising lists, of organising and of electing are all increased. Great confusion is inevitable. Why, in those Provinces in which a different ballot law prevails, although you have skilled officers, whom you appoint presumably because they are skilled, and are men of intelligence and are men who have had some training in elections, the difficulties and complications which ensue from the mistakes that these men make, because they will apply to a federal election the

rules of the local ballot, or to a local election the rules of the federal ballot, are numerous, and they are within the experience of everybody. And, if a man whom you select, presumably because he is an able and efficient man, to whom you send your papers with instructions to study them, who is liable to the penalties of the law if he does not carry it out, if this chosen individual will make mistakes, as all of us know he repeatedly does, and will apply the federal provisions to the local or the local provisions to the federal, what will you say with regard to the ordinary voter, with respect to the provisions of the election law which affect him? I say the greatest confusion will ensue. Now, I want to know whether it is not of the last consequence, to ensure a true representation of the people, that we should have the lists as full as possible, and the people placed thereon with as little trouble and expense as possible, and as little doubt and uncertainty as possible, as to who have the right to be placed on the lists and who have the right to vote? I say that is a practical question of the greatest consequence to those who really value representative government. I say our first care ought to be to place as few obstacles and impediments as possible in the way of the honest man who is entitled to the franchise getting on the voters' list, and as few obstacles as possible in the way of his knowing what he is to do in order to get there; and I say that, if you establish, as you inevitably will establish by your law, one franchise for the local and another for the federal legislature, because you say you are going to establish one for all the Provinces, and because we know that the conditions and the views of the Provinces vary, you will then establish complications and troubles, a double trouble, a double registration, a double enquiry on the part of the voter, and you will thus create, instead of removing, obtacles towards a full and fair representation of the people. Great expense will be caused, too. Why, I suppose everybody knows, who has directed any attention to this subject, that it is an expensive matter to keep the voters' lists right, that it is an expensive matter to see that no improper votes are put on, on the one side, and that all proper votes are kept on, on the other side. It is often neglected now; it is often neglected by both parties, and, when an unexpected election takes place, you find sometimes that the real expression of the people's will is thwarted by the circumstance that the lists have not been revised and do not accurately represent their view. Are you going to double all that trouble? Are you going to have two sets of voters' lists to be looked after every year instead of one set? Do you think that is helping the elector on? Do you think that is making easy the path to a real and true representation of the people? It cannot be. It is impossible that those who argue for this Bill can contend for that result. Then there is the expense—the expense to the public in this double registration, the work that has to be done, the printing and revising of a separate set of lists. The local authorities—in my Province, at any rate, I know not whether in the others—provide you a list now; they provide you a printed list; they provide you a revision, a framing of it by the municipal officers elected by the people, a revision by the judicial officers you appoint yourselves, the judicial officers that you appoint here, the county court judges; they give you your list, complete, framed and revised, revised finally by judicial officers appointed by the authority of this Legislature. There is the system. And you are going to take upon yourselves the public expense of framing lists and printing them yourselves, and you are going to impose the private expense on individuals which is involved in the carrying out of this double franchise. I ask this House not to make the franchise more difficult than it now is, and I say you are making it more difficult, perhaps more than if you raised it, by the practical obstructions you are placing in the way by a double franchise. Make it easier if you can, and the easiest thing you can do is just to leave it alone. Now, if we are to have one franchise for this Dominion, to which I object, unless in so far as the mind of each Province shall from time to time approximate to the same point of view, if we are to have one franchise, I say it does seem to me that the only logical view for a Dominion franchise would be one based on other considerations than those which are stated in this Bill. I give my individual opinions, and I give opinions which I have never proposed to any Legislature to adopt, because I do not believe they are so generally accepted, as yet, that it would be fitting to make them the subject of parliamentary discussion, with a view to parliamentary action, and because I prefer not to force those opinions upon the consideration of any other Province, at any rate, than that in which I have the principal stake, my own. But, I say that this Parliament has naught to do with the real property of the country. We do not regulate the civil rights. The laws of descent of property, all the laws which affect the holding of property are not ours, and it seems to me that, if you are going to establish a Dominion franchise, which I do not ask you to do, which I oppose your doing, and which I should not propose myself, the basis for that franchise should be citizenship, residence and intelligence—that intelligence established by an easy test, which has been applied in several self-governing states and colonies, the easy test with reference to reading and writing. That, I believe, should be the basis. I have said you have no right to interfere with property and, as to the old British rule, that representation should depend upon taxation, your system of taxation strikes every man, whether he has real property or not. All of us who live, Sir, pay taxes here, and the wage-earner pays very heavy taxes indeed, and therefore, in so far as you resort to the old British rule, and if you say taxation entitles to representation, I would like to find the man, who is not a pauper living on public charity, who would not come within that rule in Canada. Now, then, you are proposing a franchise to give a fuller and freer representation, as you say, to the people. Let me call your attention to the operation of the existing franchises, so far as it is possible to understand them from the census. In the Province of Nova Scotia the males over twenty-one are 1 to 4·12 of the whole population; in New Brunswick 1 to 4·11; in Quebec 1 to 4·34; in Ontario, 1 to 4·04. So that there is a slight variation, the Province of Ontario having a larger number of males over twenty-one, in proportion to the population, than any of the other Provinces, but the results being nearly the same. Now, then, the voters on the list in each of the Provinces are, in Ontario, 1 in 4·73 of the population; in Quebec 1 in 5·97; in Nova Scotia, 1 in 6·78; in New Brunswick 1 in 5·94. Of course that is not an accurate statement, because we know that the voters on the list comprise a very large number of persons who are rated for more than one property; therefore there is an uncertain element which, in the Province of Ontario exists, perhaps, to a larger extent than in the other Provinces, and would diminish the number of separate voters in proportion to the population. But you observe that there is a fair approximation in all the other Provinces. The franchise for the Province of Ontario is more liberal than the franchise for the other Provinces, and that also in part, and to a large extent accounts for the circumstance that the voters upon the list number more, in proportion to the population, than those in the other Provinces. That being the state of things, I say that you will not establish uniformity, and you will not produce any better result by your change. Let me now look at one of the most important propositions, that to which I alluded a little while ago; look to the question of suffrage for women. Now, you found a marked difference in the language of the First Minister and that of the Secretary of State, with reference to that subject. The hon. Minister of Public Works was wisely silent; he said nothing about it. I do not know what he thought.

Perhaps it was because he thought so much that he said so little, But at at any rate he has kept a profound silence upon the subject of woman suffrage. The hon. gentleman, however, upon some former occasions, was disposed, I remember, when a little badinage was passing across the House, rather to take credit for the woman suffrage clause. I recollect he alluded to the ladies in the courteous and pleasant manner in which he speaks of the whole population, whether ladies or gentlemen, and spoke about the action of the right hon. gentleman with reference to it — so I presume that he favors it, too. But the First Minister declared himself strongly in favor of woman suffrage; he declared the time was coming, and that soon, when it would be granted, and that he would be glad to see Canada take the first final step ; and he referred to Mr. Gladstone, who, he said, was in favor of woman suffrage, and to Lord Salisbury and Sir Stafford Northcote, who had declared themselves in favor of it. Now, I think I have read all that Mr. Gladstone has ever said on that subject—though I have not been able to refer to all his speeches since the hon. gentleman spoke—and my recollection is, that Mr. Gladstone has not delivered an opinion in favor of woman suffrage. I am quite certain that, in the late debate, when he had to meet Mr. Woodall's motion, he did not express an opinion in favor of it. He declared he would not express an opinion on the subject. He took the line of the Secretary of State. But, if I do not greatly err, in a former debate upon the question he expressed the view that if the franchise was to be given to the other sex he saw no ground upon which it could be limited to unmarried women ; he expressed the view, if I remember rightly, that it must be conferred upon married women, if conferred at all. Now, the hon. gentleman says that he will adopt Mr. Gladstone's attitude, and that he will not imperil this Bill on the question of woman suffrage. But Mr. Gladstone's attitude was wholly different. Mr. Gladstone had not brought in a Bill with woman suffrage in it. Mr. Gladstone had brought in a Bill that did not give the franchise to women. It was a Government Bill, and he was handling that Government Bill with a Government in which the question was an open question, avowedly. Some members of the Government were in favor of it and others opposed to it. But what Mr. Gladstone, who had not committed himself upon the question, said, was: I will not imperil this Bill by allowing you to add the question of woman suffrage to it at all. I will express no opinion. It is an open question, so far as we are concerned, but we have a duty to discharge, and that is to carry this Bill through; and those of us who are in favor of, as well as those who are opposed to woman suffrage, take the ground that we are opposed to tacking it on to this Bill. But the hon. gentleman's view is different. He says: I have introduced a Bill. I introduced it in 1883; I introduced it in 1884, and now in 1885; and I commend it to your attention as a Government proposition. It is the Government's proposition, but, forscoth, I will adopt Mr. Gladstone's views, and I will not imperil the Bill. The hon. gentleman had better have left it out, if he did not intend to carry it. But the hon. gentleman seems to be disposed to think that he will manage the matter. Having brought it in in the former Sessions, and having, presumably, taken the opinion of his friends upon it, he still proceeded, this Session, with that clause in ; and presumably he took some opinions again, and in the end he is to be forced to leave it out. It cannot be called an open question. Whoever heard of any Ministerial measure being an open question. It is not an open question, but he has been forced to relax the tight bonds of party discipline and graciously to give his followers liberty to vote as they please on this question. Well, the Secretary of State declared that he would not discuss the subject. He said that in different Provinces that question was not accepted in the same spirit, and that in Quebec public opinion was hostile. Now the question is no doubt a very important one. It is one of the most important questions which can be raised. I cannot conceive a more important political question than that which is raised by this clause of this Bill, and I am free to say that I do not think the First Minister discharged his duty as leader of the Government by proposing such a clause in the Bill if he did not mean to pass it, nor did he discharge his duty in the way of exposition of the views of the Government in his speech. He said but a word upon the former occasion — he made the bare statement that the Bill conferred the franchise upon unmarried women, upon spinsters and widows. This time he made a speech, in all of eight minutes and a-half, of which two minutes were devoted to the woman question, and it was devoted to the account of Mr. Gladstone's and Sir Stafford Northcote's and Lord Salisbury's opinions. That was the nature of his speech upon that question. But of reason, or of argument, or of attempt to solve the great problems involved, or to state a theory upon which they should be dealt with, we had none from the hon. gentleman. This proposal is a halting proposal. It admits, it is true, certain spinsters and widows, but not all spinsters and widows of the same class as those males who are admitted. For example, a farmer's son is entitled to be enfranchised by virtue of his father having sufficent property in his own right ; but a farmer's daughter, although not married, although not subject to that disability, is not entitled to be enfranchised though her father owns sufficient property. Now, there is a distinction without a difference, except the difference of sex. Put for a moment the marriage relation out of the question. Do as the hon. gentleman does ; treat the question on the basis on which he treats it; treat marriage as a disability ; deal with the unmarried only, and tell me, if you please, if it be fitting that some spinsters and some widows should be enfranchised, why you should say that those spinsters should remain unenfranchised who are the daughters of farmers, having property sufficient to qualify ? I see no reason, I can understand no ground for that. But the hon. gentleman, in effect, says that marriage is a disability. Now, I ask, who seriously supposes that you can stop with this proposition, if it is once accepted ? Can it be seriously supposed that you are to stop there ? The appointed lot of the great bulk of men and women is the marriage state. The figures of the census of the Provinces indicate that, in round figures, there are of women, of the age of twenty-one and over, 1,000,000. Of those of that age of twenty-one there are 655,000 married, 105,000 widows and 245,000 unmarried. But if you run to the next point of the census, thirty-one years, you find that there are but 85,000 unmarried women of that age. So the great bulk of those who are unmarried at twenty-one are married, as we know, between that age and thirty-one, and most of them between that age and twenty-five. So we may not unnaturally say that if we take twenty-five years for the moment as a datum point, you may take 1,000,000 as the women of that age, and say that 800,000, or thereabouts are married, 100,000 are widows, and 100,000 are spinsters. Eight-tenths thus are married, and nine-tenths either are married or have been married, leaving about one-tenth of spinsters at that age. In that condition of things, I want to know why you suppose you can pause at the point at which the Government Bill proposes you should pause. Why do you suppose you can give the franchise to those out of this small minority of adult women who may be qualified under either class, and refuse it to that great majority of about eight-tenths, who may be qualified also as owners of property or income, and so forth. You cannot suppose it. If you once grant that it is for the good of the race that women should become political electors, you are driven to treat marriage not as a disability. You talk of elevating the race—the race of women and of men. You say it is for the good of the race that

women should become political electors. I grant your concession for argument's sake. But there is a law higher than your laws, that is the law under which we live, the natural order under which we live and in which the appointed state of the great bulk of us is the marriage state; and that is not for the good of the race which tells us: You are to elevate those who do not happen to be in the married state, and you are to disable them from the exercise of the elevating principle, as soon as they assume that which is the ordinary condition of the race, both as regards men and women. Will you be allowed, do you think, to say that the daughters may vote and the mothers shall not vote. Our laws are every day, and justly so, more fully recognising the right of women to own property—the right of a woman to have her own property, independent of her husband. These conditions of amelioration are being generally accepted, and they are becoming exceedingly wide; I do not know exactly how wide in the different Provinces. They exist in Ontario; under the old codes, to a very large extent, they exist in Quebec, which, for very many years, has had more reasonable laws on this subject than formerly prevailed in others of the Provinces. We do not recognise the old doctrine that the husband may say to the wife that all she has is his. That is no longer the doctrine. A woman's property may be her own. If a woman's property may be her own, why should we say it is for the elevation of the woman that she should have a vote, and yet deny it to eight-tenths of the women, the mothers and the wives, though they are property owners, and give it to those who are spinsters or widows, and to those only. How can the question stop even with the right to vote? On what principle will you grant the right to elect, and deny the right to be elected? On what logical and political principle will you do that? I can apprehend inconveniences, of course, but as to them, surely the people are to be the judges. If the people choose to elect a woman, and a woman is eligible to vote, why should she not be eligible to take her seat in Parliament? On what ground can we say that people shall not have the right to choose a woman as their representative, if women have the franchise? I do not see but that all these things are to be opened by this Bill, and that we may, some day or other, under the Government's proposition when fully developed, have a Speaker in a gown, it is true, but of a different kind and framed on different plans from that which you, Mr. Speaker, wear. These questions are all opened by this Bill; it is certain they are not closed. They are opened by this Bill; and even the proposition brought forward is brought forward without popular approbation? Have we been told by the hon. gentleman at any election that this was his policy? The hon. gentleman says that he has always favored it. But he kept it, like many others of his favorites, in his bosom. He did not tell anybody of his secret affection for the female franchise; he did not disclose his hidden love:

"Concealment, like a worm in the bud, preyed on his damask cheek."

He alone knew how devoted he was to the sex. Why did he not let us know; why did he not let them know? Why did he woo them so much in secret that they did not know he was wooing them at all? How did it happen that this unrequited attachment of the First Minister did not become known. I maintain that if the hon. gentleman nourished those views, and nourished them not merely as theoretical views and ideas which he would like to see put in force, but did not intend to take the responsibility of bringing forward, but as practical ideas, on which he was going to legislate, he was bound to have told the people at large, and to have said: I am in favor of woman suffrage, and I am not merely in favor of it, but I propose, if you elect me and my supporters, to use my influence and position to accomplish that which I conceive to be a great reform. We did not know anything about this until the hon. gentleman was in office. Has there been any agitation on this question; has there been any discussion on it amongst the people? Yes; I think I hear the hon. gentleman say: A petition or two was presented. But the greatest marks of surprise upon the subject were exhibited by the few agitators for the women's suffrage themselves, who met and passed a resolution of thanks to the hon. gentlemen for having spontaneously and without request done so much more for them than they expected. Now, I maintain that that is not the way in which a great idea of this kind should germinate and ripen until it becomes an Act of Parliament. I maintain that there ought to be suggestions by responsible statesmen, agitation and discussion, and a fair opportunity for the people at large to decide what they will have upon such a subject, before you propose to legislate at all. Then, I say, that so little did the hon. gentleman discharge what I conceive to be his duty, if he were about to propose such a measure, that he has not even really spoken upon it; we have not really got his reasons for it. Now, that is not the view which the great statesman to whom he has referred took in his last speech of the nature of this question. He did not think it as a thing so easily settled as to be disposed of in one and a-half or two minutes, as it was in the speech of the First Minister, not backed up by his colleagues. What is the character which he gives this question?

"My own opinions," says Mr. Gladstone, "upon this question, if I am to describe them in rude outline, are: that it is a question of immense difficulty, a question upon which nothing hasty is to be done, a question which requires absolutely to be sifted to the bottom, a question which should be completely disassociated from every movement of party, and every important political consideration, and upon which the House of Commons can only, by a strict adherence to these rules, arrive at a satisfactory conclusion."

Now, can you conceive a statesman like Mr. Gladstone, to whom the hon. gentleman has referred, arriving at a conclusion to treat this question as a Ministerial question, and bringing forward a Bill to give it effect; dealing without a single argument with a question, the character of which he has described in the words I have quoted. No, Sir; it would have been unworthy of him, and it was hardly worthy even of the right hon. gentleman to touch the subject so lightly if he was going to touch it at all. Now, I agree with the view Mr. Gladstone has stated, that this question is one of immense difficulty, and I dare say it is not at all necessary thoroughly to attempt to discuss it. In so far as the question of keenness of intellect is concerned, we know that some of the brightest brains in the world are those of women; in so far as interest in public affairs is concerned, we know that many of the keenest politicians have been, and from time to time are to be found, in the ranks of women; and in so far as political sagacity is concerned, we know that you have many striking examples in the ranks of women. All these things are not merely to be conceded, but freely to be stated and rejoiced in. But they by no means solve the question. I, myself, have not infrequently stated my earnest desire that my fellow-countrywomen should take a more active interest than they do in public affairs; that they should acquaint themselves more thoroughly than they do with with public questions, and I rejoice when I see them attending our political discussions and informing their minds on public questions. But while that is so, and while I believe there is a very satisfactory and progressive improvement in that department of this question, I ask the candid consideration of the House, and of the men and women of the country to the question, whether the women have as yet, as a class—if we are to call them so—as a sex, as a whole, taken up politics in the way we do. I do not think the men pay sufficient attention to public affairs. I do not think that the electors give that attention which they ought to give to the current of public events. I do not think they do their full duty, or that they are fully

alive to their responsibility as electors of this country. I think much has to be done in the way of informing them what that duty is, and in enlisting from them a more active discharge of it. But whatever the shortcomings of the men may be, it is clear, up to this time, that women have taken less steady and active interest in public affairs than those who are the electors. Now, do you wish to see them take that measure of interest that we do in politics? Unquestionably, yes, if you wish them to be voters. There is no more dangerous element in the voting community of the country than the mass which does not take a keen and active interest in public affairs, on one side or the other. I say the mass who do not inform themselves and keep their interest alive—and there are too many of them among the men of the country to-day—the mass do not keep alive their interest in public affairs, is a mass which is dangerous and which impairs and sometimes imperils the stability of our institutions. Therefore, unquestionably, you do wish them to take an interest. Then, do you wish them to become delegates to your conventions; to become committee women; to become canvassers? I say yes, if they are going to be voters. I say you cannot double the voting population of the country without danger, if you do not hope that the added population will take the same degree of interest and activity in the formation of public opinion, the organisation of public opinion, as the rest; and therefore you must wish these things. Therefore it is, Sir, that the question before you is a momentous question—the question whether you are to make electors of the women is a question not to be dealt with in a speech of one and a-half minutes, even by a gentleman of the authority of the First Minister, it should not be settled without full and ample thought and deliberation, without full consideration by the people at large, without full consideration by the women of the country themselves, without an appreciation of what their wishes are—which are important to the consideration of this question, because I think it would be a mistake to force the franchise on a reluctant portion of the population—if they be reluctant to accept the franchise, as to which, again, one has no opportunity of forming an opinion, except from the absence of application for the purpose. I say we have got to consider, then, the whole bearings of this proposition in the extent to which, in my opinion, it will inevitably lead. I do not believe the wives and mothers of Canada will be content to see the daughters and widows voting, and will support the proposition that they should vote the view that it elevates the sex that they should vote, and yet should find themselves relegated to the lower sphere of those who are debarred from voting because they are wives. I do not believe in that view at all. I do not think that we should in one breath say it is good for women; it is good for spinsters; it is good for widows; it is good for the race; it is for the elevation of women that they shall vote, but it is bad for the married woman. I do not think so at all; and therefore I think the question of their opinion and of their condition, must be taken into account on this subject. I do not intend, as I have said, to discuss what the present place of woman is, and what the future of woman is to be, but if you will allow me, I will read you what I think is some very good philosophy, couched in glorious poetry, on that subject, and which, although I do not agree with all it says, I think tells as much on the problem which the hon. gentleman has submitted to us, as has been told in any time past in so short a space:

"The woman's cause is man's: they rise or sink
Together, dwarf'd or Godlike, bond or free;
For she that out of Lethe scales with man
The shining steps of nature, shares with man
His nights, his days, moves with him to one goal,
Stays all the fair young planets in her hands—
If she be small, slight-natured, miserable,
How shall men grow? But work no more alone;
Our place is much; as far as in us lies,
We two will serve them both in aiding her—
Will clear away the parasitic forms
That seem to keep her up, but drag her down—
Will leave her space to burgeon out of all
Within her—let her make herself her own,
To give or keep, to live and learn and be
All that not harms distinctive womanhood.
For woman is not undevelopt man,
But diverse; could we make her as the man,
Sweet love were slain; his dearest bond is this.
Not like to like, but like in difference.
Yet in the long years liker must they grow:—
The man be more of woman, she of man;
He gain in sweetness and in moral height,
Nor lose the wrestling thews that throw the world;
She mental breadth, nor fail in childward care,
Nor lose the childlike in the larger mind;
Till at the last she set herself to man,
Like perfect music unto noble words;
And so these twain, upon the skirts of time,
Sit side by side, full-summ'd in all their powers,
Dispensing harvest, sowing the to-be,
Self-reverent each and reverencing each,
Distinct in individualities,
But like each other ev'n as those who love.
Then comes the statelier Eden back to men;
Then reign the world's great bridals, chaste and calm;
Then springs the growing race of humankind.
May these things be."

Yes; may these things be. But I believe that the philosophy which is indicated in those verses is a philosophy which requires deep study before you can decide that these things are to be by the hon. gentleman's proposal to confer the rights of voting upon spinters and widows, and to leave out those to whom these verses are addressed—the married women. Now, as I have said, the only safe process in this matter is discussion—gradual discussion, thorough discussion; and the result of that discussion may be, indeed probably will be—for we have to look far off—a diversity of opinion in the different Provinces. The hon. Secretary of State to-day frankly admitted that on this branch of the Bill there are two opinions. There is the hostile opinion in the Province of Quebec; there is perhaps a favorable opinion in some of the other Provinces; I argue for leaving each Province to settle its own franchise. If you do not want woman franchise in the Province of Quebec, you are free not to have it; but leave the people to decide whether they shall have it or not. Woman franchise may be popular in the Province of Ontario; let the Province of Ontario pass a law to give women the franchise; that does not hurt Quebec, but gives Ontario that which best suits her. And so with reference to the other Provinces. No stronger argument for the adaptability and convenience of an independent franchise for each Province can be found than that provision of this Bill, and the statement of the Secretary of State with reference to the woman franchise. Now, I want to touch on one remaining topic, that of the revising officers. Upon that topic I wish to remind you of the First Minister's statement, when, at an early period, he proposed this measure. He then declared, when proposing the Bill which should establish revising barristers the nominees of the Government, that this was analogous to the English system, where, he said, revising officers are appointed by the Lord Chancellor, who is a member of the Administration. That was the hon. gentleman's declaration; and, he said, here the Government is going to appoint them. The hon. gentleman was, in two respects, entirely wrong in that statement. In the first place, the revising officer in England is not the revising officer the hon. gentleman proposes to appoint; he does not make the lists; he revises them only. In the second place, the revising officer is not appointed by the Lord Chancellor. The revising officer for the county of Middlesex is appointed by the Lord Chief Justice, who is not a political officer; and in the other constituencies the revising officers are appointed by the senior judge going on the Assizes each year. And the hon. gentleman, for the purpose of assimilating this provision to the

English practice of appointing revising barristers by the judges of the land, made them out to be appointments by the Lord Chancellor, and declared that he was following the steps of British precedent! What the hon. gentleman does is, to take within the control of the Administration the appointment of these officers. Now, let us consider this a little. A little while ago the hon. gentleman wanted to excite a prejudice against the system of license inspectors being appointed by a Local Government, and what did he declare? He said the Local Government would appoint partisan license inspectors, who would exercise a baneful influence on the tavern keepers with reference to their votes. There was the danger, which was to be avoided by appointing independent persons, not under the control of the Government. Was it that he was so virtuous, and that other people were so vicious, that he could be entrusted with a power that others would abuse? Was it in reliance upon his well-known and thoroughly well-ascertained character of declining to avail himself of casual political advantages of one kind or another that the hon. gentleman was stating his argument? No; it was not on the argument of the nature of our First Minister, though good, or of a Provincial Minister, though bad. It was the nature of things, the weakness of humanity, that the hon. gentleman referred to; it was a bad thing that a Government should be allowed to appoint license inspectors, because of the influence they would exercise on the tavern-keepers, with respect to their franchise. But the hon. gentleman who said that, proposes to take to himself the appointment of the man who is to make the voters' lists, who is to empannel the jury that is to try himself. Now, the English system has for its basis the local making of the lists. I have spoken of local liberties in the sense of provincial liberties; but I say that municipal liberties are not less important. It has been recognised in England by the students of free institutions that the nurseries of larger liberties are minor local liberties; and that the powers of action of municipal bodies, within their narrow sphere of executive work of business done, and of functions and privileges enjoyed,, are of the greatest consequence, as educating the people in the general principles of representative government; and in those restraints, under constituted authorities, which are essential to the establishment of a democratic, and yet orderly and stable system of Government, I say, then, that the privileges which the municipalities enjoy in England, of making the lists through their overseers and officers, are ancient and important privileges, and if the hon. gentleman defers to British practice, he had better follow it here. But the hon. gentleman says: Oh, I am making the revising officers entirely independent; they are to be kept in office; they are not to be dependent on the will of my Government. Of course not. First of all, he appoints them; they do their duty to his satisfaction; they make the lists as he likes them to be made; they return members to support him; and then they are not to be turned out by the Parliament. Do you not think, Mr. Speaker, that the tenure of office will be just as secure without that provision? Is it at all likely that the Parliament they have made will turn them out? Surely they will not be so ungrateful; surely the Parliament will not allow the Government to turn them out, if they hold their office during these gentlemen's pleasure. This is a perversion, a total misapplication of the supposed benefits of an independent tenure of office. For the discharge of a duty, the most delicate in the world, that of establishing the lists by which it is to be decided whether the Government are to continue in power or not, the Government takes the power of selecting the men, and undoubtedly they will select safe men; and if any of these do not do the work effectively, and the Government continue in office, the House of Commons will turn them out, but not otherwise. The hon. gentleman's Bill is worse than his old Bill. His former Bill provided for the making of lists by three men, whom he was to nominate, but those lists were to be revised by the county and district judges; after the first making of the lists the Government nominees had no more to do with them for all time. All future dealings with the lists were to be in the hands of judicial officers. His present proposal, however, is to put these revising lists into the hands of his own nominees for all time. He is, in fact, proposing a scheme by which he can take control of the polls. The lists are to be made right for the Conservatives, and the Reformers will have to fight against them. The Secretary of State said that the lists could not be got from the local officers, because we cannot command their services. But we can command their services; we can command the services of every citizen of this country, whether he be a local officer or not, to do things which are within our jurisdiction as the Federal Parliament. We do so in the case of sheriffs and other officers. We have got rid of that doctrine, used by the right hon. gentleman many times in early days, that we could not force judges and other persons to discharge duties we order them to discharge; we can force any citizen of Canada, we can force any local or municipal officer, to discharge that duty which it is within our province to impose upon him, in order that the country may be well governed. The municipal councils do not make the franchise, says the Secretary of State. No; but the local officers decide, in the first instance, who, under the laws, are entitled to the franchise. That is the course here and in England; and, on the whole, it is the most satisfactory course. The judges, he says, are not more independent than the revising officers, because they are paid by the Government, and are equally obnoxious because they are appointed by the Government. But are they appointed for this purpose? No; they are appointed to dispense justice. Their whole character, their standing in the community, their instincts, their lives spent in the dispensation of justice—all these are against the supposition, and you cannot, you must not suppose, that they will, when they are called upon as judges to discharge this particular duty, depart from their ordinary rule of life, and degrade themselves in the eyes of those for whom they are acting by acting unjustly. There is, however, no such safeguard in the case of the revising officers, who will be selected as political men for a political and particular purpose. But, says the Secretary of State, there will be an appeal, the same as there is now. The Secretary of State declared that this was a very easy and simple Bill, one with which we are all thoroughly familiar; but he proved that there was, at any rate, one member of this House who did not know it, who had a good deal to study before he could say he was familiar with it, and that one member of this House, with reference to whom the Secretary of State falsified his statement, was the Secretary of State himself. He declared that there was an appeal, as before. First of all, the 46th section gives an appeal, if the revising officer thinks it reasonable and proper to allow the appeal. I remember a county court judge who was a little unfortunate with the appeals that were made from his judgment; and after there had been a great many reversals, he said one day to a friend of his at the bar: "I really cannot understand how it is that they always just happen to appeal from me in the cases in which I am wrong." His decisions were always reversed when appealed from, and so he thought those were the only cases in which he was wrong. Now, if that county court judge had been permitted, in every case, to decide whether an appeal should be allowed, he would have taken good care only to allow an appeal to be taken in cases in which he was certain that he was right, and that the appeal would be dismissed. How much an appeal from the revising officer, to be made only when that gentleman considers it quite safe to allow his decision to be appealed from, is worth, I leave you to say. What is more, the appeal is only to be allowed on questions of law;

no appeal is to be allowed from the decision of the revising officer in matters of fact. But the admission or rejecting of a vote is of itself mainly a matter of fact. We know perfectly well that if you allow a revising officer to decide on the evidence, and will not allow any appeal from his decision, as to the admissibility or the weight of evidence, and if you allow him to make up the cases in which an appeal is to be had, and if, finally, to make quite sure that there will be no inconvenient appeals, you allow him to decide when an appeal should be given, you may as well take away the right of appeal altogether. But the Secretary of State says there is to be an appeal, as at present. I would advise the hon. gentleman to study the Bill before discussing it further. Then he says it is impossible to get the judges, when you want them, always, and this is only to be used in cases of necessity. Why not say so in the Bill? Why not say the judges shall be appointed, and it is only in case of some such necessity that this other provision is to be used. If you remunerate the judges they will do this work, and you intend to remunerate the returning officers. There will be no difficulty. But the hon. gentleman asks us to give away the authority to cause every list to be revised by the revising barrister, and he says, we will only use this power where we must. But he may consider one of the cases of necessity to be the necessity of making a list right. That has always been the policy of the hon. First Minister. He took to himself the nomination of the returning officers; he took hold of the days of election; he declined to have one day of election, and insisted on having the days of election according to his will, so that he might fix them in the way he thought would best help himself and damage his adversaries; he insisted that the committees of Parliament should decide cases of contested elections. In the two latter instances he was ultimately forced to yield, after a violent and protracted agitation and a decided expression of public opinin. He was forced to give up the days of election and the election courts, but not until we had from him many speeches, saying that it was most monstrous to have the elections on the one day, and outrageous to have them decided by the judges of the land. When, however, it was impossible for him to resist public opinion longer, he yielded to it, and I believe he claims credit for the legislation in these two instances. With reference to the returning officers, he took possession of them, and when my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) came in, he restored the provision, the provision which, according to the hon. gentleman's view, might work fairly in some cases, where the Local Government was Liberal, but would work adversely in others. Take the Province of Quebec, which, at the time my hon. friend from East York restored the provision, was Conservative. Take the Province of New Brunswick, which was Conservative, and so on. You find it worked both ways, if it worked at all. My hon. friend restored it, and there was no complaint then. Why, I remember an hon. member then, who now occupies a place at the Table, complaining across the House, when I was Minister of Justice, because, the law being so, that there was a choice between registrar and sheriff, I had not chosen the sheriff, but the registrar. He said I ought to have chosen the sheriff, because he was first. The fact was, the sheriff was the brother of the candidate, and I gave that as a reason; but, when they were in opposition, they thought it dreadful to use the law to that extent that, when there was a choice between the two officers, we should choose the second of the two and should not choose the first one, though he was a brother of the candidate. They were so strict then, in regard to the matter, and, having taken all the benefit of my hon. friend's change, when they returned to office they took hold of the returning officers again and they now appoint them all. The hon. gentleman took the money of the public contractors in 1872, and subsequently, when he got back here in 1882, he took the electoral districts, and now he is taking the voters' lists. His efforts have been to secure and retain and increase a majority by the use of these powers, powers which ought not to be in the hands of Governments, in the great contest between the two political parties as to which has the majority of public opinion; powers which ought, as far as possible, to be kept out of the hands of Governments, which, being human, are liable to misuse them. Well, the hon. gentleman may succeed in procuring the passage of this clause, as to the appointment of revising officers, which he did not say anything about, which he did not intimate might be considered an open question, so that any of his supporters who felt they could not conscientiously accept a revising officer of their own nomination might be free to vote against it. He did not make this an open question, and he has not defended it as yet. He may succeed in carrying it; but, as he has from time to time found that many of these efforts to obtain control have failed, though many of them have succeeded, I hope and trust that this effort, even if successful here, will be less successful elsewhere; that a spirit of fair play and justice will be dominant through the land; that the people at large will say that the hon. gentleman ought to deal as he would be dealt by; that they will say there ought to be a pure and equitable and honest system of making the lists, and that he will not derive, at any rate, all the advantage from this disposition which, in his secret heart, he hopes to obtain.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received, from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, certificate of the election and return of George Guillet, Esq., to represent the electoral district of the west riding of the county of Northumberland.

Mr. GUILLET, having previously taken the oath, according to law, and subscribed the roll containing the same, was introduced by Mr. Curran and Mr. Wigle, and took his seat in the House.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) commenced his speech by referring to the delay in bringing down this Bill, and the difficulty of fairly discussing it at this period of the Session, and he devoted about one hour of that speech to a reference to the history of the Bill, showing that for eighteen years this measure had been before the people of this country and had been discussed at least once in Parliament and several times by the press of Canada. Now, it seems to me, that if the hon. gentleman really desired to discuss the measure, was anxious for time to discuss the measure, at least he might have saved this House that hour, in order that that might be devoted to the discussion of the measure itself; but, instead of that, we had, for three quarters of an hour before dinner, and for about twenty minutes afterwards, a painful iteration of extracts from Governor's speeches, extracts from speeches made in Parliament, a painful iteration of facts in regard to the history of this measure, not one of which touched in the slightest degree the question which we really have before us at this moment. One would imagine, hearing the hon. gentleman, that it has been an entirely unusual thing to have measures brought in of this importance so late in the Session; and yet, if he had looked to the action of his own friends in the Province of Ontario, in the Session which has just closed, he would have found that there was no such hesitation with them about bringing in most important measures at the very termination of the Session. He tells us that the extension of the franchise for the Province of Ontario was discussed at the last general election. Well, I took some interest in the last general election. I had the opportunity

of spending some days in my own constituency and some days in other constituencies, and I can only say that this is the first time that I have heard that the subject of the extension of the franchise was talked of at all at that time. The first practical statement that there was to be an extension of the franchise was made in the Speech from His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, in the opening of the Legislature, that having occurred two days before we met here; and yet it was not until the 24th of March, six days before the House was prorogued, that the measure was introduced for a second reading and the members called upon to discuss it at all. Then there was another important measure introduced into that Legislature, a measure of which no notice was given, even in the Speech of His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, delivered from the Throne, and that was the Redistribution Bill; and yet, although the House met two days before we met here, it was not until the 18th March that its attention was invited to a discussion of that Bill, on a motion for the second reading. The hon. gentleman has been good enough, in the closing sentences of his speech, to refer to what had been done by this Parliament in connection with the redistribution of the constituencies; but I think that, after the experience of the last Session of the Local Legislature, when, from no necessity imposed upon them by law to increase the representation, as was imposed upon this Parliament to increase it; when, from the mere motive of Gerrymandering the constituencies in that Province, under the pretence of adding one representative to the constituency of Algoma, the whole Province was cut up into new electoral districts, in such a manner that the members of that Legislature can scarcely recognise the constituencies which elected them to their seats. When a similar measure was introduced into Parliament here, a measure rendered necessary by the fact that under the constitution we had to add three new members to this House from the Province of Ontario, when that was introduced somewhat late in the Session, what were the attacks of hon. gentlemen opposite upon the Government, for the late period at which they had introduced it and for their unwillingness to allow the people of Canada fairly and fully to discuss it. So, Sir, the introduction of the Torrens' Bill, a system which changed entirely the manner of the transfer of land in the Province of Ontario. Although that was announced in the Speech of the Lieutenant-Governor, it was not until the 20th of March, ten days before the prorogation of the Legislature, that the attention of the Legislature was invited to the discussion of that question. This illustration, Mr. Speaker, serves to show how these hon. gentlemen and their friends have one rule for their own Legislature, in Ontario, where they control the administration of public affairs, and an entirely different rule for this Parliament. Hon. gentlemen pretend that they have not an opportunity of discussing this question, because it is proposed at so late a period in the Session. Have they shown, within this very week, any disposition to get through with the business before this House? Have they shown by the discussion which took place on Tuesday night, and by the discussion on Wednesday night, when one hon. gentleman spoke no less than forty-seven times—a tally of which was kept by an hon. gentleman on this side—in relation to the details of a measure which has practically been the law for several years? Yet those hon. gentlemen who waste hour after hour, who have been wasting hours of this Session during this week, tell us that they have not time for fair and reasonable discussion of the important question which is now before us. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is this measure of which so much is said? We are told, in regard to it, that it is an interference with provincial rights, that we have no right to pass this law, or that we ought not to pass it—for I believe that the hon. gentlemen do not go so far as to say we have not the right to pass it—but that we ought not to pass this law, because it is a matter which ought to be left to the Provinces. Under what clause of the constitution is it left to the Provinces? I find that it is so left under the 41st clause of the British North America Act, which is in these words:

"Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, all laws in force in the several Provinces at the Union, relative to the following matters, or any of them, namely, the qualification and disqualification of voters," etc., etc.

And, Mr. Speaker, there are no less than nine subjects which stand in precisely the same relation as this subject, affecting the privileges of this House, upon which we were permitted to enact laws, but upon which, until we did enact laws, we were to accept those that were in existence at the time Confederation took place. What were they?

"The qualification and disqualification of persons to be elected to sit as members of the legislature in the several Provinces."

Now, the qualification of a member ought certainly to be a matter of provincial rights, quite as much as the qualification of a voter; so that the principle laid down by these hon. gentlemen, that each Province knows best for itself whom they should send here and what kind of electors should be permitted to send them here, is precisely the same principle as that which permits them to say what shall be the qualification of the members who are to be sent to this House. Yet that was one of the things which we have changed. We have fixed our qualification, and there was no protest raised about provincial rights, no cry about interference with the autonomy of the Provinces, when we did pass a law to fix the qualification of voters. Then: "Voters at elections of such member." That we are proposing to deal with now. Then: "Oaths to be taken by voters." That, surely, is a matter which the Provinces might determine just as well as this Parliament. Then: "Returning officers, their powers and duties." These things we have already fixed. But if we leave the qualification of the voter to the Provinces, why not leave to them the question of who should be the returning officer. As a matter of fact, we did determine that matter in our first election. Then:

"The proceedings at elections, the period during which elections may be continued, the trial of controverted elections, the proceedings incident thereto, the vacating of seats for members, and the issue of new writs, in case of seats vacated otherwise than by dissolution—shall respectively apply to elections of members to serve in the House of Commons for the same several Provinces."

There were thus nine subjects upon which we were to accept the laws in existence in the several Provinces at the time of Confederation until the Parliament of Canada passed other laws. We have legislated upon eight of them; we have made our own laws in relation to eight of them; and when we come to make a law in relation to the ninth, which every one will admit is, if anything can be so, not only within our jurisdiction, but within the proper jurisdiction of this House, determining the qualification of the electors who are to send us here, we are told that we are interfering with provincial rights, because we are complying with that clause of the constitution which was enacted for our guidance at the time of Confederation. Then, Sir, we have been told, during this debate, that this is a policy of centralisation, and so we have heard it stated that the First Minister is simply indicating in this Bill his determination to carry out, as far as he dare, his well-known views in favor of legislative union. Sir, that statement in regard to the First Minister has been made so often and has been apparently accepted by so many people, that it is worth while referring, in a manner which cannot be controverted, to what were the actual opinions of the First Minister with regard to a legislative or a federal union. The hon. gentlemen from Ontario and Quebec particularly, will remember the agitation in favor of representation by population, the point to which that agitation was carried, the earnestness with which people discussed it, both

in and out of Parliament; and among those who did discuss it, in the year 1860, was the right hon. gentleman who is now, as he was then, the leader of the Conservative party. In his speech at that time he made use of these words:

"The only feasible scheme which presented itself to his mind, as a remedy for the evil complained of, was a confederation of all the Provinces. But in speaking of a confederation, he must not be understood as alluding to it in the sense of the one on the other side of the line."

Then, Sir, he went on to describe what the difficulties of that constitution were:

"The fatal error which they had committed—and it was, perhaps, unavoidable, from the state of the colonies at the time of the revolution, was in making each State a distinct sovereignty, and giving to each a distinct sovereign power, except in those instances where they were specially reserved by the constitution and conferred upon the General Government. The true principle of a true confederation lay in giving to the General Government all the principles and powers of sovereignty, and that the subordinate or individual States should have no powers but those expressly bestowed on them. We should thus have a powerful Central Government—a powerful Central Legislature, and a powerful decentralised system of minor Legislatures for local purposes."

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether it would be possible to describe, in a few words, more accurately the constitution under which we live than it is described in these words. We find in them no question of a legislative union. There is a statement that we should have a strong central power; and I think the events through which we are passing, and to which the hon. gentleman referred, as indicating the importance of our having strong local powers, to my mind, rather demonstrate the advantage of possessing a strong central power which can assert its authority in all parts of the country, and which can make Canada, and its influence, and responsibility, and power, felt from one end of the Dominion to the other. That was the principle laid down at the time by the right hon. gentleman; and neither by word nor by act, since that time, has he been guilty of anything which would justify any hon. gentleman, in this House or out of it, in saying that he desires to sap the foundations of the institutions under which we live, and that he proposes, by means of this measure or of any other measure, to centralise our system and to destroy in any way the legitimate and proper influence of the Local Legislatures. Then, Sir, we are told that in England reform Bills have been discussed for many Sessions, and at many elections, before they become law; that the popular sentiment is thoroughly aroused in relation to them; that they become in that way the subject of popular agitation, before they are crystalised into statutes by the Parliament of the country. Sir, is there any analogy between the English Reform Bill enfranchising millions of people, as has been done by the Franchise Bill just passed in England, and a measure of this kind, which simply proposes to take the power which the Confederation Act says we shall take, to determine who our electors shall be, and affixing machinery for voting, in order that we may carry out the constitutional system of the country. But if it were true, if there was an analogy, the answer to the hon gentleman is to be found in the fact that this measure has been before the country for many years, has been discussed for many years, everyone knowing that sooner or later this Parliament must take control of the electoral franchise, so far as its own privileges and its own members are concerned. Why, even the hon. gentleman himself, when the Bill was introduced in 1870, and that discussion took place to which he has referred, used these words at almost the opening of his speech:

"They were all agreed as to the necessity of an Election Act; and however he might oppose some of the details of that measure, he had no idea of opposing the second reading."

And as a matter of fact that measure passed its second reading without the votes being recorded; it passed on a division, it is true, but as I say, without the votes being taken, and with that declaration of the hon. gentleman, that everyone admitted we required an election law.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear. The hon. member for East York passed an election law.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). It is quite true that the hon. gentleman objected to some of the details, that he objected to the method of appointing revising barristers, and suggested, as he has suggested to-night, that the revising barristers should be appointed by the judges, as in England. It is quite true he objected to some of the forms of words used in declaring the qualification of voters, and discussing it from the point of view of his own great legal knowledge, pointed out what might be the effect of the words as to the qualification of voters. But the Bill introduced was a Bill to take control of the franchise, to arrange a franchise for the House of Commons of Canada, and it was a Bill providing machinery by which that might be carried out. When the hon. gentleman, as I say, came to deal with the question of the particular officers who were to carry it out, he made then, as he made to-night, in almost precisely the same words, objections to the officers appointed, and urged that the revising barristers should be appointed by the judges, as they are appointed in England. The hon. gentleman admits, in fact, that if Provincial Legislatures were to interfere in any way, or were to abuse in any way, the power thus conferred on them, this Parliament might then interfere. But why should it? If the doctrine laid down by the hon. gentleman be true, if the Provinces are to determine, and they alone, the qualification of the members who are to be sent to this House, what right have we to say whether they abuse their power or not? The hon. gentleman asked if any evil had resulted. All I know is this: We have had indications of a disposition to cause evil. I have here two statutes passed in the Province of Nova Scotia. I have here a statute passed in 1871, I presume when their own local elections were coming on, in which it is declared as follows:—

"It shall not be lawful for any person to vote at an election for a member or members to represent the people in a General Assembly of this Province, who, at any time within fifteen days before the day of election, was in receipt of wages or emolument of any kind as an employee, in the Post office, the Custom house, the Inland Revenue Department, the light house service, on the Government railways, in the Crown land office, or the local Public Works and Mines."

That was passed in 1871 by the Local Government. Why? Because they supposed that some of those electors, being officers in some sense, or employés of the Dominion Government, might be disposed to vote with the party represented in the Government, they passed that law to disfranchise them, practically to lessen the power of the Conservative party in that Province. Having accomplished their object by means of that Act, they went to work, when it was their interest, the Liberal party coming in after the election of 1872, and passed an Act to repeal that law, and give all those men votes again. What have we seen during the last Session in the Local Legislature of Ontario? The hon. gentleman has attempted a comparison between the franchise of the Ontario Act and the franchise of the Bill now proposed, and he has told the House that the franchise is much more liberal in Ontario, under the new Act, than it is proposed to be under the present Bill. But he did not tell the House that there are a very large number of voters who are cut off from the franchise altogether under the Act passed by the Local Legislature. They have made residence a qualification. They have struck a direct blow at the influence of property, at the influence which property should fairly have, and while attempting to go one better—having seen the Bill, which the right hon. gentlemen introduced last year—with a view, if possible, of carrying out the object which they appear to be resolved to attain just now, to catch the workingman's vote, they have deliberately cut off altogether the property vote, except in so far as

the proprietor is a resident in the county in which he desires to vote. We have here thirteen Ministers of the Crown, all of them compelled to reside in Ottawa, and become residents here by virtue of their office. Everyone of them residing in Ontario is disfranchised in his own constituency by the act of the Local Legislature. When the elections come on, although they may be large property-owners within their respective counties, yet because of the fact that their office compels them to reside in Ottawa, they will be, everyone of them, disfranchised. Who has not heard of what are called outside voters at elections? Who has not heard of the number of persons who sometimes vote three or four times at elections, in different counties, being able to reach there by railway or by fast horses. They cannot do it any longer; and I venture to say that more people are disfranchised by that Act — and those are the proprietors and property-owners of the country—than are enfranchised by the wider franchise that has been passed in Ontario, if you leave out mechanics' sons, which provision will undoubtedly bring in a large number. The hon. gentleman tells us there will be great confusion resulting from those several franchises. He tells us the effect will be, if we pass this Bill, that voters will not know where they are to vote and how they are to vote; that they will not know whether they are to vote or not; that, owing to the changes in the carrying out of the elections, they will not be able to perform their duties, because of the confusion arising from this multiplication of franchises. Yet, if the hon. gentleman will go to his own Province he will find that there are already four franchises there. There is one franchise for elections of school trustees, another for municipal elections, another for voting on bonuses or debentures for granting aid to railways, or similar objects, and then there is the provincial franchise, for the elections for the Provincial Legislature. So there is already in that Province that very confusion to which the hon. gentleman refers as likely to inure to the disadvantage of the people if this Bill is passed. They now have it there to the extent of four distinct franchises, and no one ever thought of suggesting that the Province of Ontario should have precisely the same franchise for the election of school trustees, of municipal councillors and of members of the Legislature. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman deals with the Bill itself. Now, Sir, what is the Bill? It is simply this; That we shall have for this Parliament electors whose qualifications are determined by Parliament itself. I have pointed out to you that, under the system which prevails at this time, as was done in the Province of Nova Scotia, they may change their franchise —having one franchise one year and changing it back again the next, the political object having been accomplished in the meantime. It is competent for any Province, at this moment, anxious to defeat the party which may happen to be in power here — whether that party be the party now in power, or hon. gentlemen, if in the remote future they should be in power, the argument is the same — it is competent for any Provincial Legislature, having the control of the franchise, by an amendment to that franchise on the eve of an election, to destroy very largely the influence and power of the Government, and in that way to alter the expression of public opinion, as represented by the party which happens to be in power. Sir, after all, this Bill is simply to determine our franchise. Are we, as a matter of fact, restricting the franchise? Are we giving greater or less power to the people of this country? Who are the persons to be enfranchised under the Bill? Who are the persons not to be enfranchised under it? In the first place, I think we can say that every householder in Canada will have a vote under this Bill. The hon. gentleman was good enough to say that, in the Province of Ontario, under the last Act of its Legislature, no measure of rental was put on the house which is to qualify the voter; that the householder, irrespective of what rent he has to pay, is to have a vote. Now, when I tell you that, under this Bill, the man who pays $2 a month rent has a vote, I think I may fairly say that this franchise includes every householder who is to be found in Canada; for I do not know the house, I do not know the cot, even, for which $2 a month will not be paid; and that being the case, I think I may say that every man who has a house over his head will have a vote. Then, every man who is a wage-earner, every man having an income, will have a vote. The hon. gentleman drew a distinction between wage-earners and persons having an income; but when he read the qualifications of wage-earners, and pointed out that a man must have been living 12 months in a place before he voted; that he must have been in the place and in receipt of wages, amounting to $300 a year, for 12 months before the voters' lists are made up, and must have continued there, in order to qualify himself for voting, I think the distinction between wage-earners and income franchise voters is very difficult to point out. Then we have, in addition to that, the sons of farmers and the sons of mechanics, who are entitled to vote under this Bill; so it is almost impossible to find any class of people in the country, who are residents of the country, who are earning a living in the country, that are not enfranchised in the Bill now before you. But we are told that the woman franchise is one which should have been discussed at very great length. Allow me to say that the hon. gentleman again forgets the experience of his own friends in his own Province. Why, Sir, in 1883, a Bill was passed, with regard to municipal institutions. It was a consolidation, and I find that the qualifications were there set forth, as follows:—

"Subject to the provisions of the next eight sections, the right of voting at municipal elections shall belong to the following persons, being males of the full age of twenty-one years, etc."

The law of 1883, therefore, restricted the franchise to male voters; and yet, in 1884, one year afterwards, without one single agitation from outside, without a petition, without a suggestion anywhere, that the subject of female suffrage was going to be taken up, we find another Act introduced to amend the Act of 1883, in which it was declared:

"In order that widows and unmarried women, who are in their own right rated for a property or income qualification sufficient to qualify male voters, may hereafter have the right to vote at municipal elections, it is enacted that section 79 of the said Act is hereby amended, by inserting after the word 'being,' in the third line thereof, the words 'widows, unmarried women or.'"

So it appears that the hon. gentleman's friends in Ontario, so far from considering that the introduction of female suffrage was a matter which should be carefully discussed, and discussed at great length, that it was a question involving the greatest consideration, a question of far-reaching importance, deliberately, after passing an Act one Session, in which they exclude female suffrage, in which they do not appear to have thought of female suffrage, next year passed an amending Act, in which they include female suffrage, probably simply because having seen the Bill of the right hon. gentleman, they determined that they would go one better. The truth is, that the Bill introduced in the Ontario Legislature bears on the face evidence of having been taken, in all its material details, from the Bill introduced into the House last Session, simply altering two or three particulars, so that it might appear to be more liberal and, not I believe, because of any strong conviction on the subject at all. The hon. gentleman says —and I speak upon this matter, because I am in favor of female suffrage—if we permit spinsters, as he calls them, —I prefer to call them unmarried women—and widows who have property, to vote, we cannot stop there, but we must give married women the same right. Now, I can see a very marked distinction between the two cases. I am a firm believer that the oneness of the family and the headship of the husband lie at the basis of the whole social fabric, and in those two facts you

have a sufficient distinction between the admission of married women to the suffrage, who are represented through their husbands at the polls, and whose property is thus represented, and the case of unmarried women and widows, who may be proprietors in their own rights, and whose property can only be represented by their own votes at the polls. The question, Sir, we have to deal with—and I do not intend to detain the House, because I think we can discuss the question in shorter speeches than five hours—so far as the principle is concerned, is simply whether we shall have the control of our own franchise or leave it to the Provincial Legislatures. Questions of detail—questions of whether $300 or $400 franchise is the best; whether female suffrage should be admitted or not; whether we should have $300, $250, $200, or $100 qualification for owners—these are all questions of detail, which may fairly be considered hereafter; but on the general principle of our controlling our own franchise, I think there can be no difference of opinion. Now, Sir, as to the question of passing this law at this time. We are in the third Session of this Parliament. If this Parliament lives out its full period the elections will occur in 1887. Under the Bill, as it is introduced, the voters' lists must be completed by the 1st of January, 1887; to that there is not more than time sufficient, between now and then, to have the voters' lists prepared, so that the elections may take place at that time. The question, therefore, is simply whether we are to have our own franchise for the next Parliament, or whether we are to postpone this measure for another Parliament, and possibly until the following one. If we are to have the voters' lists ready for the next Parliament, we must pass the Bill at this Session, and that is the reason why we ought to pass it now. There was no such necessity of pressing the Bill in the first two Sessions of this Parliament. If we had passed the Bill in 1883 or in 1884 it would not practically have come into operation as an active factor in the election of members of this House until 1887 under any circumstances; and therefore, the necessity of passing it in those years was very much less than it is to-day. But the hon. gentleman says that the proposal in this Bill is for the Government to take into their own hands the power of controlling the voters' lists, by means of the revising barristers. The hon. gentleman, I think, insults every judge in the land, when he undertakes to say that the clause in the Bill providing for the appointment of a revising barrister, of a gentleman of five years' standing at the bar, and qualified, by that fact, to be a judge, and that the fact of appointing him to office during good behavior is no security for his independence of the party who appoints him. How are our judges appointed? They all hold office by precisely the same tenure as is proposed in this Bill. The qualification for a county judge is, I believe, to be five years a barrister, and his appointment is during good behaviour. I think the county judges can be removed by a simpler process, but the Superior Court judges are only removable by impeachment in Parliament. Therefore, I say that no better safeguard can be provided for the independence of the gentlemen who are to make up the voters lists' and to revise them, than the fact that they are appointed during good behavior, and are not liable to dismissal from time to time. If that is not a guarantee, it is no guarantee in regard to our county judges. Now, the hon. gentleman tells us that the fact that we are going to appoint as revising barristers lawyers who are not judges, will render them dependent on this Government, and will be destructive of all security for their independence in the preparation of the lists; and yet he proposes that the county judges, who are appointed by the same power, and whose tenure of office is precisely the same, may be trusted with this duty without the same risk as to the independent performance of that duty. Sir, there is no difficulty, I should think, of securing in this country men of character and of professional standing, who have been barristers for five years, for the preparation of these lists. But the hon. gentleman says, in England they take the local machinery for the preparation of the lists, and the revising barristers are revising barristers and nothing more. Unfortunately, in our case, not having the control of municipal institutions, we cannot avail ourselves of local machinery to the same extent; but what has been done in this Bill is to provide that the revising barrister, or the county judge, if he is appointed, shall take the voters' list as they have been prepared by the local officers as the basis; and, having taken that list, he simply secures, in the best way he can, the addition of such persons as by the Act are entitled to be placed on the list. Suppose we did not adopt that plan. Suppose we took simply the municipal machinery; how would it be in the Province of Quebec, for instance? We have no machinery there that would enable us to ascertain those who are entitled to the franchise on the basis of income. Income is not assessed in the Province of Quebec; there, only a property assessment prevails, and there the revising barrister would be compelled to do precisely what he has to do under this Act, namely, ascertain, in the best way he can, those persons entitled to vote on income, and add them to the list. That must be the case, also, in other Provinces, where income franchises do not exist. So with regard to farmers' sons. I do not understand that they have been made voters in municipal elections. I do not understand that the qualifications for municipal voters have been made the same as those for parliamentary voters even in the Province of Ontario. So that if we take the municipal list, the revising barrister would be compelled to add such names as he could ascertain, by the persons coming forward themselves, or by political committees on both sides bringing forward their names. But the hon. gentleman says there is no appeal. Where is the appeal to-day? At present the assessor goes around and takes the assessment; the clerk makes up the voters' list from that; before the list is complete, the municipal council sitting as a court of revision meets, and anybody can go before that court and get the assessment increased or decreased, as the case may be; then the voters' list is made up from the assessment roll so revised; then the county judge, who will probably be the same person as the revising officer, sits as a revising barrister, in fact, in order to hear any complaints that may be made as to the voters' list; and after he has given his decision, there is absolutely no appeal of any kind whatever. So that, under this Bill, as now proposed, there is greater security, by way of appeal, than there is under the present system, under which the county judge simply revises the voters' list. Under this Bill we have, first, the authority to take the voters' list made up by the local officers; next, the power to add to the list the names of any entitled to vote under the law; next, the right of any person to complain that he is put on or left off, or that somebody else has been wrongfully put on or left; next, an appeal to the Superior Court on matters of law, as to the legal right of any person to be there or not; and in that way we have the best possible assurance that by this Bill we shall get an honest voters' list, and shall be enabled to know who our electors are, instead of being compelled to feel, from election to election, that we are subject wholly to lists passed by one party in the Local Legislature, who may be ready to doctor their election law just on the eve of an election, in order to change the entire complexion of parties in the country, as unfortunately was done in the case of Nova Scotia, and as to some extent has been done by the Act just passed by the Ontario Legislature. I think there is no doubt to anybody who looks at the matter fairly that we ought to have in this Parliament the right to determine our own franchise, and, admitting that right, that by no better means can it be carried out

than by the Bill now before us, for which I shall have great pleasure in voting.

Mr. EDGAR. I am afraid that the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) commenced his speech a little out of humor; he evidently came here after dinner, determined to make a speech, and had to make it an hour later than he hoped to do, and on that account he undertook to lecture the leader of the Opposition on making too long speeches. I think we will have to leave to the importance of the occasion and the feeling of the country, and to the brilliancy of the speech itself, to decide whether it was too long or not. I hope, however, that the speech of the hon. gentleman's leader (Sir John A. Macdonald) satisfied him on the point of length, for he made a speech of exactly eight and a half minutes in length, in introducing this important measure which, on a former occasion, he said, would be the work of a whole Session. The hon. gentleman pursued what seems to me, since I have been watching the debates in this House, a favorite method on the other side; when they find some act of their friends particularly indefensible, they think that they have condoned it completely, and answered all objections to it, if they can point to something which may have been done by the Ontario Legislature, and which they think is of the same description. In pursuance of that policy, the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) proceeded to attack the Ontario Legislature for delay in bringing in the Franchise Bill which they recently passed. Why, that Legislature opened its Session one day before this House did, and that Franchise Bill has been introduced, and passed, and become law, two weeks ago. Where was the delay there? Long before this Bill was brought before this House, the Ontario Government's Bill had become law, although their Sessions began about the same time as ours. We were told also that the Ontario Government had never given notice to the public of the intention of the Liberal party to extend the franchise. In that the hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. At the great convention of the great Reform party held in Toronto before the last election, a resolution passed at that meeting laid down the policy of the party on this question, and declared in favor of a largely extended suffrage, and in the Legislature a resolution was passed in a previous Session in the same direction. The Government went to the country on the platform declared at that Liberal convention, and in pursuance of the pledges made to the people, they brought in the Bill which has since become law. When did the Conservative convention declare in favor of this franchise? The hon. gentleman does not point to that, but he points to the Speech from the Throne as a notice to the public that this Bill was to be pushed forward this Session. Why, has it not been promised in Speeches from the Throne, off and on, for the past seventeen years? Putting it in a Speech from the Throne, so far as experience can show, is a notice that the measure will not be brought in during the Session. But a difficulty, it appears, arose in Nova Scotia, in 1871, in the imagination of the hon. gentleman, when the Legislature of that Province undertook to make some changes in their local franchise which would disfranchise certain Dominion officials. That may have been right or wrong; I am not going to discuss it now; and they changed the law afterwards, I believe, but that was in 1871, and the remedy for it has been in the hands of the hon. the First Minister since he returned to power in 1878. Why, therefore, did he not apply it before? The hon. the member for Cardwell (Mr. White) accused the leader of the Opposition of inconsistency of some kind, because he says he supported an election law in 1870 in which there were provisions as to the Dominion franchise. Fortunately, we can refer to the debate on that subject, and as the hon. gentleman has referred to the subject, I will have to trouble the House with a short extract showing what the leader of the Opposition said on that occasion. Mr. Blake said:—

"The Act was not of a nature to satisfy the people; it would satisfy them more were they to adopt the system used by each Province for the election for the popular Legislature. That was a plain rule. The people should be trusted so far, and until there should be found a necessity for acting. There was to warrant confidence in a scheme of this kind, and there was no doubt that the popular Legislature would adopt the wisest, best and most suitable rule for each Province, for this course was not without precedent. It was the course adopted in the neighboring Union. Congress had not given up the power of dealing with the question, but the law had been left to each state, and during all the trials and vicissitudes to which the Union had been exposed, the reserved power never required to be exerted. The rule of uniformity was not only unsuitable to the present, but was even more so in the not distant future of the country to which they must look. It could not be carried out without injustice to the feelings of those who were expected to join the Confederation."

That seems to me to be exactly the language which the hon. gentleman used to-night in respect to this Bill; and if the Government were consistent in proposing uniformity of franchise, the leader of the Opposition was consistent in opposing it. In the committee on the same Bill the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) said:

"If this Bill was passed as it now stood, it would be a very serious blow to the extension of Confederation. In view of these facts, he urged that the Bill be amended so as to adopt the franchise of each Province as the basis of franchise for the Commons."

And that is what the resolution of my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) says to-day. The hon. gentleman who last spoke (Mr. White) has also undertaken to attack the Ontario Government for its action in disfranchising non-residents. If it were necessary or proper, I would undertake to defend that, for I think a great deal of the corruption at elections is due to the existence of non-resident voters, but I do not propose to enter into the discussion of that to-night, for in the measure before us we have a great deal to discuss, without going into other questions. The Ontario Government is brought in again to condone the action of the Government of the Dominion in the matter of introducing female suffrage without notice. The hon. gentleman is in error there again. The action of the Ontario Government, in introducing the female franchise into the Ontario municipal law last year, was not sudden or unexpected; this principle has been in operation for years, in the election of school trustees in the Province of Ontario, and the people in municipal matters there are familiar with it. More than two or three years ago there was agitation in Toronto in favor of female suffrage; a convention was held, and a deputation of the ladies waited upon the Attorney-General, the Premier of the Province, to urge upon him the adoption of female suffrage, and he suggested it might be tried first in municipal matters; and it was so tried. Who has heard of any deputation of the public that waited on the hon. the First Minister for the purpose of getting female suffrage as part of this Bill? The Secretary of State this afternoon paid some left-handed compliments, as he meant them, to the Opposition, for the information they had shown by their speeches they possessed on this subject, and he did this in order to show that the Opposition had plenty of time to look into the question. I think that compliment was well deserved; although the speeches had to be made on short notice, there were not to be found in them the gross mistakes which were in the speech of the Secretary of State on the subject of the contents of a Bill of his own Government. He entirely misstated or misunderstood the provisions of that Act as to appeal from the decisions of the revising officers. He went on, and said this was a very simple little Bill; that there was nothing in it at all; it was not complicated, and any one could understand it. Why, Sir, if we look at that Bill, the interpretation clauses required to enable us to understand it at all are no less than twenty-three in number. Then, as to the qualifications in cities and towns, there are seven clauses or sub-sections, distinct and separate. Then, as to the qualification in coun-

ties, there are nine more distinct and separate clauses in this little Bill. Then, there is the great social revolution of female suffrage, and the mysterious revolution, which I do not exactly understand, of Indian suffrage. Certainly we have not had much notice of that in any Province. Then, as to the revising officers and their duties, in this simple little Bill, which is not complicated at all and which anybody who runs may read, there are no less than forty-six sections; and, besides, there is something else, which I did not see myself at the time, but the Secretary of State explained it to us, what he called "the equilibrium." That hon. gentleman told us there was no danger to be apprehended from this Bill, because the law itself, the statute law, would prescribe the qualification of electors. I think we knew that before. It is not the law that we are complaining about, although very likely we shall not like it and it may not be as good as it should be; but it is the interpretation of that law, and the interpretation of that law without appeal, that we complain of. Then, again, we were told that there was no danger in the provision as to the appointment of revising barristers, because the Government may appoint judges. Now, if they intend to appoint judges, could they not change the little word "may" into another monosyllable word, "shall," and then all the trouble and difficulty of that point will be over? Can we trust the gentlemen implicitly in this matter? Can we trust that they will never appoint partisan political officers to that position? Are not these the same hon. gentlemen who appointed partisan political returning officers, who sometimes elected men to this House whom the people did not elect, and who sometimes defeated men whom the people did elect? The other evening we had the pleasure of listening to the speech of the hon. member for Ottawa county (Mr. Wright). It was a very interesting speech, and I think both sides of the House would like to hear more of those speeches. He is almost the only member of the House who undertakes to make an oration to you, Mr. Speaker. Of course, an orator is entitled to a sort of poetic license, and there was nothing small about his speech; he completely involved everything with magnificent words and expressions. The whole measure, from beginning to end, in his mind, was perfect; but, if there were any points which he admired more than the others about it, they were female suffrage and the extension which the Act would give of the male franchise. Well, he cannot have known at the time that the female suffrage forms no serious part of this Bill; that, as the right hon. the First Minister has told us, it is just a sort of trial balloon, sent up to see which way the wind blows, and, as is often the case with the right hon. the First Minister, when he finds which way the wind blows, he will trim his sail to catch the breeze. Instead of there being the extension of the franchise which the hon. gentleman seemed to think there was in this Bill, I am prepared to show that in nearly all the Provinces there has been a disfranchisement by this Bill; therefore, there was nothing really left for the hon. gentleman to get enthusiastic about, except the revising officers, and I am sure that, if the hon. gentleman was here in the House to-night, he would not say he is in favor of that most extraordinary provision in the Act. He was enthusiastic, however, upon the subject of female franchise. Now, one can understand how the hon. member for Ottawa or the right hon. member for Carleton could come here with some excuse and advocate that provision, but what opportunity have any other members, who do not happen to have their constituencies around this seat of Government, for consulting with their female constituents as to this measure? We must inform ourselves upon this question. It has not been before the country at any election, and if there is any one subject more than another upon which it would be fair to allow hon. members of the House to consult their constituents, it is this one of female suffrage. It will be our duty, before we take such a revolutionary step as this, to have meetings of maidens and spinsters, and to call conventions of widows in our constituencies, in order to see what their views on that subject are, and it will be necessary for us to attend Dorcas meetings and places where the ladies congregate, because we can never form an opinion as to the views of those ladies merely from meeting the ordinary constituents that we are accustomed to talk to and address. Why, it would be a cruel and wicked thing to impose the obligations and duties and burdens of the franchise upon their fair shoulders without their consent. So I think it is hardly fair for the hon. member for Carleton, who lives in the county town of his constituency, and has no doubt had deputations waiting in his office, that we have not heard about, and for the hon. member for Ottawa county, who visits his riding every day and sees them all, to force this measure upon us who have not had that opportunity. One would think, if there were any agitation in the country upon this subject, we would have heard about it in this House. There would surely have been deputations here from different parts of the country, of the strong-minded women, who desire this extension of their privilges, demanding of us male monsters here to give them their rights. But what do we find? I took up the paper this morning and saw there was a gathering of ladies in this town; I saw that last night in the Drill Shed the ladies assembled together and organised themselves into an organised band—but what for? Was it to come up here and demand justice from us? No; it was for a very different thing. While we were discussing their interests and their rights here, they were not thinking of them at all. They were attending to matters which they thought much more in their own line, and were displaying the skill of the Broom Brigade to an admiring audience. The ladies were down there:

> "Attired in muslin caps, in beautiful garments, each with a dust pan fastened to her back, with the letters "B. B." inscribed thereon, and a broom completed the outfit. They had a captain and three sergeants, a drummer and standard bearers; and twenty privates formed the brigade; and, on forming into line and halting in front of the audience, they were greeted with loud applause. Keeping time with their feet and keeping up a proper motion with their brooms they sang the following song."

Now, Mr. Speaker, what song would they be likely sing on an occasion when they were demanding their rights? Would it not be some battle cry of freedom—a cry for their enfranchisement? I should almost expect them to sing, "Ontario, Ontario," on an occasion of that kind, as a gentleman beside me has suggested. But this was the song they sang:

> "No martial maidens, we,
> Though armed thus cap-a-pie,
> No weapons used for bloody field of war?
> Still must we fight our fight,
> Good friends we'll show to-night,
> We can, though only girls, do our devoir.
>
> "Then sweep, girls, sweep, sweep, cleanly sweep,
> And drive the dusty foe before each broom;
> For aching arms we care not,
> Ourselves and brooms we spare not,
> Till order reigns within the room.
>
> "And when we've done our sweeping,
> We shoulder brooms, and keeping
> A good look out, we march around the floor;
> Perchance we left some speck there,
> Some pin or crumb to vex there,
> But no, all's right, and now our labor's o'er."

That is all they sang. When we were discussing the question of their rights and privileges, I should have supposed they would have formed in marching order and come up to this House and demanded their rights at the point of the broomstick. I really think that when the female mind is no more agitated upon the subject of the franchise than that, the question might be postponed until another general election. Now, I stated a little while ago that this was a Bill, not to enfranchise, but to disfranchise, and I think I can show that. Take the Province of Ontario. Remember that the Bill recently passed by the Local Legislature establishes a franchise which is our own until we have made another. Now, the effect of this Bill will be this: In

Ontario this Bill will disfranchise all owners in towns, and owners and occupants in cities and towns, whose qualification is between $200 and $300. Every one now in Ontario, whose qualification in cities and towns is $200, has a vote; but this Bill proposes to prevent anybody voting who has not $300. In counties what does it do? At present, all having $100 property have a right to vote; this Bill says they shall not vote unless they have $150, so that all between $100 and $150—and they are a numerous class in the villages and towns—are disfranchised by this Bill. Then the same law will apply to farmers' sons, because, under this Bill, farmers' sons and owners' sons cannot vote unless the property, according the scale we introduce, is sufficient to give each one a franchise; whereas, all they require under the Ontario law is that they shall be the son of a qualified farmer or owner. Then, under the Ontario law, the sons of the farmer or owner of land are interpreted so as to include the stepsons, the grandsons, and the sons-in-law, of those people; you do not give them a franchise, therefore you disfranchise them, and they are a numerous class. Stepsons, and grandsons, and sons-in-law, are all disfranchised by your Bill. Then, with regard to incomes over $250. The leader of the Opposition mentioned $300, but in the last days of the Ontario Session it was reduced to $250, where it was left. Now, all those deriving income from trade, equalling, in Ontario, $250 a year, have a right to vote. You say they shall not have a right to vote unless the income amounts to $400, and that is a still larger class that you are disfranchising in my Province by this Bill. Then there are the householders. The Ontario Bill does not ask what the value of his property is; as long as he has a house over his head, and is a citizen of the Province, he has a vote; but you exclude all who do not qualify under your high property qualification. Then the wage-earners. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), is entirely wrong in saying that this Bill includes all wage-earners, because it does not include those who give a large portion of their wages in payment for board. Then, take some of the other Provinces. In British Columbia every male, twenty-one years of age, has a right to vote, but this Bill disfranchises every one of those who are entitled to vote there, unless they have this high property qualification which you are requiring to-day. But the Bill does more for British Columbia than that; it enfranchises all Indians who have a property qualification. They are many, and they are British subjects, and the Bill seems to enfranchise all the Indians for the benefit of the white people in British Columbia; whereas, on the Statute Book of the Province there is a law providing for qualification of local electors, which says that no Indian shall vote. So we increase, to that extent, the franchise in British Columbia. I do not know how the people will like it, for they have certain prejudices on the subject. Then you go a little further and you enfranchise Chinamen, who are qualified and take the oath of naturalisation. Now, the people there have strong prejudices on that subject. They have a local law of their own, which says that no Chinaman shall vote, and it imposes a severe penalty upon any officer who dares to put a Chinaman's name on the voters' list. Still, under your Act, you say that shall be done. Then, in Manitoba, you disenfranchise a still greater class. All owners of land worth $100 can vote under the local law; whereas, by your Bill, you provide that in cities and towns, in Winnipeg, for instance, where men can vote now on $100 qualifications, you say they shall not vote unless they have $300. You treble the qualifications in the cities and towns of Manitoba, and in the country you raise it from $100 to $150. Then, in Prince Edward Island, you take away what is, practically, manhood suffrage, and establish your high qualification there. In New Brunswick you raise the qualification of owners from $100, in cities and towns, to $300; and in the counties you disfranchise all between $100 and $150. Besides that, in New Brunswick you disfranchise all who qualify on personal property, and all who qualify on mixed real and personal property, except a few fishermen. In Nova Scotia, until the franchise was further reduced by a late Act, it was much the same. In cities and towns the qualification was $150, which you make $300. No, I would like to know how can members who are sent to this House by electors who probably gave them their majorities go back to their old constituents and say: I became afraid of you. It is true you sent me to Parliament, but I took advantage of my position there to take the franchise away from a large number of you who sent me here. How is it possible that any hon. gentleman can go to his constituents and say that? In Ontario we are not met with that difficulty, although the reduction in the franchise is very great; still none of us in Ontario were elected on that lower franchise that now prevails. But in a number of other Provinces the members were. They were elected by manhood suffrage in British Columbia and Prince Edward Island; by, practically, manhood suffrage in Manitoba; by lower suffrages in the other Provinces; and those come here, without authority, direction or instruction, from the electors who sent them, and exercise the arbitrary and high-handed proceeding of saying that a large number of those men who elected them shall not vote for members of the House of Commons hereafter. I do not believe any hon. gentlemen can go back and face their constituents successfully after doing that. I believe the indignation of the constituents who will be left out will be so great that the members will suffer the consequences of their acts. In this age we do not find that the franchise can be raised. You can bring a franchise down, extend it and widen it among the people; but it is a revolution to come here and raise the franchise in several of the Provinces, as is proposed by this Bill. Some of the reasons which strike me as influencing my decision to second and support the motion moved by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) are these. It is surely more in accordance with the federal principle to allow the Provinces to say how they shall be represented. It is their matter; it is their affair. If they are satisfied, everybody else should be satisfied, because, excepting the North-West, there is no part of this country that is not in one Province or another; and, therefore, if the Provinces are satisfied, the whole country ought to be satisfied. We have a check against any unreasonable provision, because they have to apply the same rule to themselves that they would apply to us. No two of the provincial franchises are alike now. That fact shows that local considerations have had full play, healthy play, and they have made their franchises to suit the habits, tastes and feelings of each Province. It is a great pity now to come here and try, instead of maintaining this interesting diversity, to create a dead uniformity of franchise. I do not believe it is healthy and good for the community. It is a long step, indeed, towards legislative union, and I do not think anything like a majority of the people are prepared for that, or ever will be prepared for it. Now, as to the mere question of convenience. Surely the machinery of the Government to-day is sufficiently complicated, without adding to it the preparation of those lists. The confusion will be very great; it will be created in every Provinces, for the proposed Dominion franchise differs from the franchise of every single Province. Surely the public are interested in having the political machinery simple and intelligible, and not complicated. The whole public, whether they have votes or not, are interested in that matter; every man, woman and child in the country is interested in having simple machinery for Government and for elections. But the electors themselves will annually be put to great additional trouble, in order to look after the correct registration of their votes, not to speak of the unspeakable trouble, annoyance and expense imposed on the candidates themselves. Of course, it is appealing in a very improper way,

I dare say, to address the interests of individual members of the House; but, after all, it is our successors we are talking about, not ourselves. Just think what trouble and expense it will be for all future candidates throughout this country to look after a separate electoral list. Hitherto, we have understood that the same electoral list was used for municipal, legislative and Dominion elections. In Ontario, for instance, the same printed list for municipal elections was used for provincial and Dominion elections, with this distinction, that the few electors who were qualified for municipal elections and not for the provincial elections were put on a small separate list. The municipalities themselves protect that general list. There is hardly a municipality in Ontario where there is not a contest for some office or other, for some councilorship, deputy-reeveship or reeveship. Men look after that list in their own interest. The municipal candidates take care of it, and try to see it is correct. They are watching one another all the time, as a cat watches a mouse, and it is quite certain no great fraud can be perpetrated in that list, because it is an extraordinary municipality where there is not, at least, one member of the council of five who does not agree with the majority and who goes to watch the lists, whether he be Conservative or Reformer. That is a very great safeguard to the public in Ontario. Altogether, apart from the interest the people have in protecting the lists and making them perfect for municipal purposes, an enormous expense is saved by the work being done in this way. The First Minister spoke of irritation being caused, when some voter in Quebec found out that under the provincial law of Ontario the franchise had been enlarged, and a man might be a voter for Dominion purposes in Ontario who would not be so in Quebec. I do not think that amounts to much, compared with the irritation that will surely be felt in every municipality and in every polling place in all the Provinces when they find that the provincial franchise is one thing and the Dominion franchise another; that a man who knows he has a vote for municipal and for provincial purposes, and thinks he should have a vote at Dominion elections, is thus addressed on his going up to the poll to vote: You have $200 or $250 or $275 worth of property, not $300, and although you can vote for municipal candidates and for the Provincial Legislature, and for school boards and other elections, you are not fit to vote at Dominion elections; we do not want such fellows as you are; you are not fit to vote, as regards Dominion politics, and you have not the franchise. There is where irritation will occur in every possible direction, if you make a separate and high Dominion franchise, as compared with that applicable to municipal and provincial elections. Now, what is the nature of the appeal from the revising barristers? It is simply no appeal at all. As to matters of fact, as to matters of evidence, as to whether a man has the property qualification at all, there can be no appeal. The decision as to whether the property is worth enough to give him a vote or not is absolutely and finally in the hands of the revising barrister, because these are questions of fact and not of law, in nine cases out of ten; and when the revising barrister settles that question, it is settled finally and without appeal. It is only in matters of law there can be any appeal, and only when, as has been explained already, the revising officer chooses to allow an appeal on questions of law. Well, how has it been before? In the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, where the lists have been prepared by municipal officers, they have been subject to revision as to fact and as to law, and as to everything else about them, to the county judges in Ontario, and to the Superior Court judges in Quebec. But we are deprived of that right now. Then, in Manitoba the lists are prepared by enumerators appointed by the Governor in Council, and they are subject to revision on all points by the county judge. That is taken away now. In British Columbia we find that the collector there, duly appointed by the municipalities, prepares the lists and that there is an absolute appeal as to that list, first to the county judge, and then, if necessary, to the Supreme Court, so that they were fully protected; and in all the Provinces, under the systems they have had so long, the people who had the preparation of the lists in the first place were persons entirely independent of the Dominion Government, and surely that is as it ought to be. I cannot believe that the Government will persist with that portion of the Bill, which is so repugnant to all sense of fairness and justice. I cannot believe it possible that they will persist in that portion of the Bill, which allows them to nominate anyone to create that list, outside the usual functionaries, and prevent an appeal from that person, to the fullest extent, to the judges of the land. If the revising barristers are to be limited by Act of Parliament to the county court judges, I shall not find fault; because, although we know perfectly well that the county court judges are appointed by the Government of the day, still, they occupy a very high, responsible and important position, and although appeals have always been to county court judges for the correction and revision of the voters' lists in Ontario, I never yet heard a case, no matter what the politics of that judge were, in which fault was found, for political reasons, with his action. So, Sir, when they are placed in that position, a sense of responsibility attaches to the office, and I hope the Government will be shamed out of attempting to place the correction of those voters' lists, the empanelling of this jury, in any other hands than those we have been accustomed to in the different Provinces, and will permit us to make the final appeal to those in whom we have confidence as a whole, in the different Provinces—the judges of the land.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am exceedingly sorry that it devolves on the Opposition to enter into a lengthy discussion of this question at this particular stage of the Session. I should have much preferred had we had an opportunity of giving it our serious consideration at an earlier period. However, Mr. Speaker, it appears the Government have decided to press upon the House the necessity of considering this measure before the House rises. I think it would have been better, if the Government had made up their mind to force us into a consideration of this question, that they had brought it on at an earlier period of the Session. It has been said that the measure has been before the House for some time, that it was brought down some years ago, and that it was repeated in the Speech from the Throne from time to time, and that consequently we might be expected to give it some consideration, after having had such an extended notice of the intentions of the Government to bring it in and carry it through. But the fact is, we began to think that its being introduced from year to year, and the Government taking no action, further than merely intimating their intention to legislate in this direction, we began to think that it was not their intention to touch the matter at all, but that in order to fill up the bill of fare for Parliament, it was put in as a mere ornament, amongst the other things which we were asked to consider. Now, I consider this is a very important question. It is not every year, or every five years or ten, that a Parliament is called upon to consider a Franchise Bill, a question of such vital importance as the ground upon which the people shall be represented in this House, and I think it requires a great deal of careful study. I have no doubt that the First Minister, in framing this Bill, has given it a good deal of study. I dare say he has bestowed a considerable amount of time upon it, and possibly some have assisted him in framing it and getting it into the position in which we find it. At the same time, while he has been doing that in the interests of the party that he so ably represents, it is quite necessary, on our part, that we should

be permitted the duty of viewing and investigating it from our standpoint, so that we may, in our own interests and in the interests of those who sent us here, give it that consideration which we think it is entitled to at our hands. We claim, then, that it is not right that the question should be forced on us at this late period of the Session. However, if it is the intention of the hon. gentlemen opposite to press this question on the House, to make us vote upon it, to make us give the several clauses of the Bill our consideration, we certainly shall discharge that duty. We are not going to shrink from the responsibility that rests upon us. Although, perhaps, we are few in numbers, not possessing the numerical strength of hon. gentlemen opposite, after all, if we are forced into a fight over this thing, we are bound to show that we are prepared to defend our right, or at least to present our view of the case to the House and to the country, and discharge the duty devolving upon us as an Opposition. If we did not discharge that duty, the country would find fault with us and the House would have a right to find fault. The fact is, that the functions of an Opposition are to investigate and examine very closely every measure that is brought before the House. When we come here we are supposed to come for that purpose, and when we return to the country the country will expect that we will be able to show that we have discharged the duty devolving on us; and if we fail in this case to discharge that duty, we would undoubtedly be liable to suffer censure at the hands of those who sent us here. Consequently, although it is getting well on in the Session, although we have been quite a time here now, and although a number of us, with a number of hon. gentlemen on the other side, would be very glad to go home, still, if it is necessary that we should sacrifice further time and pay that attention to this Bill that it necessarily requires, we will remain and will devote the time and attention and criticism necessary on our part. We will try to make it, by what advice we can give the Government, as perfect a Bill as possible. And, judging from the difficulty we have had in getting hon. gentlemen opposite to listen to our remonstrances on questions brought before the House this Session, I am afraid it is going to take us a very long time to drill into their heads the necessity of the changes we think should be made. We had some little experience, a few nights ago, of this difficulty, when the question connected with the shipment and importation of cattle and the powers vested in the Minister of Agriculture in that matter came up. We were here a whole night trying to drive into his head the necessity of changing the value that he would allow a person for a valuable animal from $40 to $150. Judging from the difficulty he had in accomplishing that change, in his case, I would not venture even to suggest what length of time it may possibly take to get through the different clauses of this Bill. However, if we have to undertake the task, we shall proceed with it. Now, we have had a great many changes in Canada in our election laws. I can remember the time when no one was allowed to vote in this country unless he held a freehold—unless he was an absolute owner in fee simple. I can also remember the time when people had to travel to one place in a county in order to discharge that privilege and duty. After that, we had our laws altered, so that we had an election in each minor municipality. Then the voters all went to one place in each of these smaller municipalities to record their votes. Sometimes elections lasted two days, and in some cases, in which there were a very large number of votes, I believe they lasted as long as three days. We have overcome that state of things; we have got our election law into a very perfect condition. I think the system by which we elect our municipal officials and our members of Parliament is about as complete as we can reasonably expect to have it, and I think it is unwise to be continually altering our franchise system. Our experience, since the introduction of the ballot, has been that it is quite difficult to train people into the use of the ballot. There is hardly a constituency in the entire Dominion in which very great mistakes have not been made by people recording their votes at elections; and although the ballot is now used, not only for Dominion and provincial, but also for municipal elections, yet after quite a number of years of education in this matter, we find still that very great mistakes are made and very many ballots are spoiled. Well, I hold that any changes in the mode of electing members of Parliament or municipal officials, no matter how trivial those changes may be, are a mistake, if they can be avoided; because, unless people get in the way of doing a thing properly, a little change very often leads to many mistakes and results in a great deal of confusion. Now, I do not think that there has been any evidence of a necessity of the Bill now before the House. I do not know that any Province or county or riding has presented to this House a memorial asking that any change should take place. I think that from Confederation down to the present time we have got along very nicely. In all the trials that have taken place before the judges of the Superior Courts, I do not know of a case in which a judge has found any serious fault with our system of election. On the whole, I think things have passed along very well. Hon. gentlemen opposite should at least be satisfied. Under the present system of election, and when the reins of power were in the hands of the Reform party, they again secured the Treasury benches, and they claim to be in pretty secure possession of them. I do not think, under these circumstances, that they should be at all alarmed. They appear to place a good deal of faith in the National Policy and other things which have contributed very largely to put them and to keep them where they are. Well, I do not see how they can feel very much dread when they are so secure, and why they find it necessary to make a change in the election law, such as they propose in this Bill. For my part, I cannot see that there is any just ground for it. A few years ago we had what was known as a Gerrymander Act. To-night I heard the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) speak of the changes which Mr. Mowat has made in the constituencies of Ontario as a Gerrymander Act. Well, I can honestly defy any man to put his finger on a single county in the Province of Ontario, the boundaries of which have been interfered with in any way by that Act. Not a single county in the entire Province has had its boundaries disturbed, and in no case has a municipality from one county been pitchforked into another county, for the purpose of strengthening the hands of the Government or its friends. When you confine the changes of a county strictly within the limits of that county, it is impossible to put a certain number of townships in a square together. When you want to adjust the number of inhabitants, you have to take the townships in the county that will most nearly bring together the necessary number, in order to give an equitable representation; and in order to do that, you sometimes have to make some very peculiarly-shaped constituencies. We admit all that, but it cannot be avoided; but in the entire Province of Ontario I defy hon. gentlemen opposite to put their finger upon one single instance in which the boundary of a county has been broken upon, or in which any change that has been made has not been made for the purpose of adjusting the representation and equalising the population of the different ridings. I was saying a few moments ago, that there was no evidence of discontent on the part of the people with regard to the franchise system that now exists. In the Province of Ontario some representations were made with regard to the changes which have taken place in the franchise there. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster) state the other night that in the Province of Ontario we had taken up this matter. He said the Government of that Province had taken up

the question and handled it, without any evidence whatever having been brought to bear on the Government to adjust the matter. He said there were no deputations. I was very much surprised to hear the hon. gentleman say so. I have some reason to believe that a deputation of ladies waited upon the hon. Mr. Mowat, and that it was very courteously and kindly introduced to the Attorney General (Mr. Mowat), by an hon. member on the other side. He will, if no other hon. gentleman opposite will, vouch for the fact that there were representations made to Mr. Mowat by the ladies, and that the ladies had taken the opportunity of approaching him on that question. The hon. member for King's was not, therefore, quite correct in saying that there was no complaint and no request on the part of any of the people of Ontario, with regard to changes in the franchise. I think the great question we should consider in arranging this whole matter is the question of cost. It is a deplorable fact, and I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite agree with us on that point, that the expenditure of this country is increasing yearly, and it is absolutely necessary, as well as highly desirable, that every item tending to increase our annual expenditure should be cut down. I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite, notwithstanding the fact that we have approved of the appointment of judges as revising officers, will deny that this will cost a considerable increase of money. Although you may get judges, in certain cases, to act as revising officers, you cannot enforce upon them increased work without giving them considerable allowances; they will have to employ clerks and constables; they will have to apply to the several clerks in the ridings for copies of the assessment rolls; those clerks will not furnish those copies for nothing; they will require to be fully paid for that service, under the present system, there is no necessity whatever that all this increased cost should be incurred. Under the present arrangements, the assessment rolls prepared for municipal purposes can be used for provincial and also Dominion purposes; the voters' lists prepared by the municipalities can be used for the purpose of electing members to the Local Legislatures and to the Dominion House of Parliament; consequently, the copying of the assessment rolls, the reprinting of the voters' lists and other additional expense, can be avoided by just allowing matters to be left as they are. I was saying that in my humble opinion all these costs can be avoided by letting matters remain as they are, and I am sure it is highly desirable and in the interests of the people that not one single dollar of increased expenditure should be permitted that can possible be dispensed with. We must all feel that our country is getting very rapidly into debt, that our national debt is increasing year by year. We have very heavy and important demands continually being made upon us for public improvements, and is it not desirable that in a matter of this kind the whole matter should be left as it is, especially as we are not suffering for the want of this Bill. No person has complained that our present system is not just and honest in itself; nobody has found fault with it, and I can see no grounds whatever why this increased cost should be incurred. The course adopted in the past, and which is now in force is, that when the assessor goes through a municipality he enquires, as he goes from house to house, the names of families who have the right to be put on the assessment rolls, also the names of their sons, and generally all the information required, and the assessor under oath has to make a faithful and efficient return of that roll to the township clerk. After the roll has been returned to the township clerk, a notice is posted up and a day for revision appointed. These councillors are directly dependent upon the people for the positions they occupy, and naturally seek to popularise themselves with those who confer that honor upon them. The revision court is held. There are Conservatives there to look after the interests of their friends and Reformers look after the interests of Reformers; the arguments are presented on the one side and on the other, as to who should and who should not be put on or off the lists; and the municipal councillors virtually become the revising officers. There is not one but five revising offices; there are four men and a reeve charged with the performance of this duty of revising the voters' lists, and they are supposed to do it in the interests of the people. After they have made their revision, after every one has had an opportunity of making representation with regard to those who should be put on and off the lists, an appeal is allowed to the county judge. Now, I hold that is an appeal that is wise and prudent; because, however well disposed the municipal council may be to do what they think is wise and fair, after all special cases may arise in which parties may consider themselves aggrieved, and in those cases they have a right to appeal to the county judges. The appeal is very simple, and there are no costs connected with it. There is not that amount of form and proceeding to be gone through which would have to be gone through in the case of an appeal under the Bill we are now discussing. The county judge appoints a day for the appeal; the parties appear and are permitted to give evidence; and after the judge has carefully considered the whole question, he decides who should have and who should not have the franchise; that is to say, the voters' list is revised and perfected, and that is the end of the proceedings. With regard to the duties devolving upon the county judges, I do not think that in any case very serious injustice has been done. In my own section the county judges have almost all been appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite. I cannot say myself that in the county in which I live the judges are both Conservatives, but I know that in every case they try to do what is right, and I am glad to be able to bear this testimony to their merits. As far as the county judges are concerned, matters put in their hands would not be handled in the way they are likely to be if put in the hands of revising officers. I think that taking away the right of appeal from the people is a very unjust move. In the first place, I do not think it is right that, in a free country such as ours, where a man is a citizen and is entitled to all the rights and privileges of a citizen, he should be compelled to submit to the dictation of a revising officer, as to whether he should be permitted to vote or not. I think it is a most unjust principle. Even supposing the revising officer discharges his duty with fairness and efficiency, still, with that particular clause in the Act, that provides that no appeal shall be allowed unless with his own consent, it is so tyrannical, it is so unjust, it has the evidence of tyranny about it to such a degree, that people will not be satisfied, there will always be a feeling that injustice will be done. I think it is unfair that the people should not be allowed the privilege of appealing, if they choose to make an appeal. I think, if a man is disposed to spend the money in order to have the decision of a Superior Court judge as to whether he is to be allowed to vote or not, he should be allowed the privilege of spending his money in that way. I do not think it should be left in the power of any partisan returning officer, through some personal spleen of his own, through some cause that perhaps nobody would know but himself, to decide to act in a very crooked or unjust way with some particular individual that justly deserved to be enfranchised. I think it is not right that any man should be placed in the position that he would have to run the risk of submitting to an injustice of that kind without redress. I hope and trust, if the Bill is forced upon the House, the hon. the First Minister will seriously consider that provision, and will at least allow a reasonable appeal and a reasonable proceeding with as little cost as possible, so that any person who feels aggrieved may be permitted to appeal and to have his case brought before a Superior Court judge; and it is only in that way that electors will feel that there is no desire on the part of

the Government to do them any injustice. The Secretary of State insisted that there was an appeal. I do not know whether the clause with regard to the appeal was read or not, but I shall take this opportunity of reading it. Clause 47 points out very plainly what kind of an appeal it is, and on what grounds a man can appeal. It says:

"No such appeal shall be allowed or entertained against any decision of the revising officer upon any matter of fact, or the admission or rejection of evidence adduced or offered on any matter of fact, but the appeal shall be allowed only on some point or points of law, as before mentioned, with the consent of the revising officer."

Now, it is only with his consent that you can have an appeal, and, in the case where there is a bitter spleen between himself and the person who is applying for the purpose of being enfranchised, or where some particular friend has an influence and wishes to exercise it against some other person, he does so, and the result is that, when this man applies to be put on the voters' list, the application is brought before the revising barrister in the form prescribed, and he says: No; I do not consider it is a case that I could allow to go to appeal, and I will not grant you any appeal. I think that is exceedingly unjust, and I am quite sure that, if the hon. the First Minister will seriously consider that question, he will feel that there is a tyranny and an injustice about it that should not be made the law of the country, and I hope it will not be. Now, with regard to this Bill, no doubt it has been, I dare say, a long time under consideration. However, there have been matters of an important character that have been brought before this Parliament, and which the hon. the First Minister has deemed it his duty to ask that a committee of this House should consider. When the question of insolvency was up, and that is a very important question, and one that has been pressed upon him, I believe, by a number of merchants, both in Toronto and in Montreal, he did not consider it would be wise for the Government to undertake the duty of preparing a Bill and bringing it before Parliament to settle that question, but he asked that a committee should be struck. That committee was struck, and has been laboring very carefully in order to perfect that Bill. If it was his intention and anxiety to perfect an election law, I cannot see why he might not have asked the co-operation of gentlemen on this side of the House to assist, as he did in connection with the Insolvent Bill. I would also remind him that, in England, and he is very fond of following English precedent, when the question of readjusting the constituencies and settling the representation was brought before the English House of Parliament, one party did not go into that question and settle it all in their own interest, the same as, unfortunately, it was settled in this House four years ago, but they consulted the Opposition and arranged a Bill to which they all agreed, a Bill that was fair in itself, that was just to the Government and just to the Opposition. The Government did not take it into their own hands, and it is creditable to them; I am glad to think that they acted with such generosity; it becomes men belonging to the political stripe to which they belong to extend justice and fair play towards their opponents. I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will take a pattern from the example set them in that particular, and, in this Bill, as well as in any other Gerrymander Bill, if we should ever be called upon to consider another, which I have no doubt we may be, because one thing leads on to another, I hope they will ask us to consent to whatever future changes are made, and that we shall not have the unsightly exhibitions and extreme bitterness and injustice that we have had in this country in the past. Some reference was made to the license commissioners. Some reference was made by the hon. member for Cardwell to the Mowat Government having taken the appointment of license commissioners, and the hon. the First Minister found very grave and very serious fault with them on that account. He said it was exercising a political power in the Province of Ontario that was unjust and unfair, and that it was being used for political purposes, and all that kind of thing. Now, if the appointment of license commissioners, in connection with the license law in the Province of Ontario, is acting unjustly towards the Conservatives of that Province, I wonder if this law will not act unjustly towards the Reformers of that Province. Men who feel that injustice is done them in one case should not perpetrate that injustice upon their opponents in another case; but, in order to get over that difficulty, the gentlemen opposite went to work and passed a Dominion election law and they have been appointing Dominion license commissioners, and the one have been playing against the other, and we have had a state of things in that Province that is positively a shame and disgrace to the Government and to the legislation of this country. It is an outrageous thing to see in some places the number of houses that have been licensed and the quantity of liquor that is being sold; to see the miserable hovels that have been permitted to sell liquor under the provisions of the Dominion License Act. It has completely demoralised the towns and villages in some places, owing to the collision between the Ontario Act and the Dominion Act. The Ontario people would go around and license the best and most respectable men, regardless of their political stripe, and as soon as they got through the Dominion license commissioners would go around and license the balance, and the result is that we have a condition of affairs in that section of the country that is disgraceful. Now, there was another remark made with regard to the franchise in Ontario not having been considered before the last election. If the hon. gentleman who made that statement had paid more attention to the platform of the Reform party he would not have made it. If he had looked back to the convention held at Toronto before the last general election he would have seen that one of the resolutions passed there asked for an extended franchise. It was plainly set forth in that resolution that the Government should extend the franchise considerably, and it was in accordance with the declaration of that convention that the Legislature of Ontario has recently made the change referred to. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) referred to that Act as having disfranchised the members of the Government here. I do not know whether that is correct or not, but I find by the Bill now before this House that if it comes into force it will disfranchise all police magistrates and recorders, and will seriously affect some of those individuals who are appointed by the Mowat Government. I was rather amused, also, to hear the hon. member for Cardwell say that the wives were represented by their husbands. Well, in the matter of recording their votes they will not be represented by their husbands; properly the husband cannot represent them. If a woman owns property when she marries, her husband does not get possession of her estate. She still owns it in her own right, and he cannot interfere with it; so I do not see how you can claim that the woman is represented in the person of the husband when he goes to record his vote. The hon. member also states that he wants this Bill passed now, in order that the list might be prepared for the next general election, and that unless it was passed this Session there would not be time to prepare the list in time for the next general election. Now I find by this Bill that once the list of electors has been certified to by the revising officer, even although he consents to an appeal, or a dozen appeals, in the case of votes that may be entered that should not be on the list, or in case they wanted to put them on the list, any decision that may take place afterwards, according to the Act, is not to affect the result of an election that is held in the meantime. Now, if this Bill passes

and the list is revised by the officer in the fall of 1886, if there is then an appeal from the decision of that officer with regard to certain electors, the election cannot be affected by the result of that appeal. Suppose there is an appeal in the case of fifty, and that the officer consents to that appeal. If, in the meantime, there is an election held, and the successful candidate gets twenty-five of a majority, and gets the whole fifty votes that are appealed against, according to the provisions of this Bill the result of the election cannot be affected. The man will continue to hold his seat, because the list is certified, and no alteration in the voters' list made by any judge afterwards can make any change in it. Now, in regard to the question of women suffrage I have not much to say. From my little experience in the matter of canvassing, I should very much dread to go through a constituency trying to secure the votes of perhaps forty or fifty old maids who have got beyond the age when they may expect to enter the marriage state. I must say that it will be a difficult duty for any man to perform. I was struck with the remark of the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), who did not appear to dread any engagement of that kind. Well, he is a bachelor, and he is reaching that age in a bachelor's life when it becomes doubtful whether if he will continue in that state of single blessedness very much longer he will ever get married. He will shortly find himself in as bad a position as the old maids. But if this Bill becomes law, and if, in the course of his canvass through Algoma during the next election, he is not able to get a wife, with all the coaxing he will no doubt have to do in order to get votes, I am afraid he will never succeed afterwards. I have no doubt that if this Bill becomes law we will have more actions in our courts for breach of promise than has ever yet been known in the history of this country. It is well known that a great many of these old maids will be only too willing to promise to vote if they are promised a husband; and a single man, in that case, will undoubtedly have the advantage of a married man. I do not know whether a promise of marriage, under such circumstances, would be an act of bribery or not, but if it is, I have no doubt it will be perpetrated. Now, the First Minister said, in introducing his Bill, that women now-a-days were about equal to men. Well, I have learned for many years to believe that they are the better half, and I was surprised to hear the Minister say they were very nearly equal. I think it is pretty well known, in his own case, that she is the better half, and I think in the case of most all married men they are prepared to admit that the woman is the better half. I believe myself that it is very becoming on the part of the hon. gentleman to give the franchise to women; I think it is a just tribute to the fair sex, in the declining years of their life, to bestow that privilege upon them. The poet has told us that:

"The wisest man the world e'er saw,
He dearly loved the ladies."

If we believe current report, and what we hear from day to day, I believe that some of the gentlemen opposite love the ladies, and I honestly believe that if this country is blessed with any of the Solomons of the age, we have them in this House. I believe that they can be credited with that as much as any others, and it is no disgrace to any man, and we have no right to believe that it is. I am very glad to be able to say that I have no doubt myself it is a fact, in the case of some of those hon. gentlemen. I was pleased to hear the Minister of Public Works say that he was willing we should have all the time necessary to discuss this Bill. I hope and trust, whatever may be the issue of this discussion as regards the interests of the general community, the result will be for good. I am sure the party on this side of the House, so far as I know their feelings and sentiments, are quite willing to go to the country on fair terms and on equal grounds. We are perfectly willing to start in the political race from the same point, and end at the same winning post; but we do not want to be fettered or put outside the course and placed at a disadvantage. We are perfectly willing to contest with hon. gentlemen opposite on a straight course and equal terms. We say that is right, just and fair, and I trust hon. gentlemen opposite will not attempt to take any advantage in this matter. I think they should place us in an equal position, so that they may be able to say, after the next general election: We have fought you a fair fight; we went to the country on equal terms; we have beaten you and compelled you to again take the Opposition benches. This we are willing to do, but we do not wish it to be by the operation of a statute and by hon. gentlemen opposite legislating themselves into power; for we do not wish for office although in Opposition we do not feel at all uncomfortable, but on the contrary satisfied. We have no particular desire for office; and I have been having a feeling of compassion for hon. gentlemen lately, owing to the amount of trouble which they have had to meet. It has been great and grave, and I shall be glad indeed if some of the trouble that unfortunately has arisen recently is quietly and satisfactorily settled. I cannot help but feel that a very large amount of expense will be incurred in connection with this unfortunate trouble. I hope, I say, it will be settled, and that matters may turn out to be better than they appear at present. I do not wish to prolong my remarks, and I shall reserve what I have to say for a future occasion.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Laurier, p. 1171.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Edgar,	Lister,
Armstrong,	Fairbank,	McIsaac,
Auger,	Fisher,	McMullen,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fleming,	Mills,
Bernier,	Forbes,	Paterson (Brant),
Blake,	Geoffrion,	Platt,
Burpee,	Gigault,	Ray,
Cameron (Huron),	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Gunn,	Somerville (Brant),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Harley,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cartwright,	Holton,	Springer,
Casey,	Innes,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casgrain,	Irvine,	Trow,
Catudal,	Jackson,	Vail,
Cockburn,	King,	Watson,
Davies,	Kirk,	Wells,
De St. Georges,	Landerkin,	Wilson,
Dupont,	Laurier,	Yeo.—54.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Dodd,	McNeill,
Baker (Victoria),	Dugas,	Massue,
Barnard,	Farrow,	Paint,
Beaty,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	Patterson (Essex),
Benoit,	Foster,	Pinsonneault,
Benson,	Gagné,	Pope,
Bergeron,	Girouard,	Pruyn,
Bergin,	Gordon,	Riopel,
Billy,	Grandbois,	Royal,
Blondeau,	Guillet,	Shakespeare,
Bowell,	Hackett,	Small,
Bryson,	Hall,	Sproule,
Burns,	Hay,	Stairs,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hesson,	Taschereau,
Campbell (Victoria),	Jenkins,	Tassé,
Carling,	Kaulbach,	Temple,
Caron,	Kinney,	Tilley,
Chapleau,	Kranz,	Townshend,
Cimon,	Langevin,	Tupper,
Cochrane,	Lesage,	Vanasse,
Colby,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (Albert),
Costigan,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace (York),
Coughlin,	Mackintosh,	White (Cardwell),
Coursol,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Hastings),
Curran,	McCallum,	Wigle,
Daly,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wood (Brockville),
Daoust,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dawson,	McGreevy,	Woodworth.—86.
Dickinson,	McLelan,	

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) has not voted.

Mr. WELDON. I am paired with the hon. member for North Renfrew.

Mr. FAIRBANK moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

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

Mr. BLAKE. I hope the hon. gentleman's motion will not be adopted for a moment, until he has had an opportunity of placing those North-West papers on the Table.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I received a note from the deputy head, informing me that those papers will be ready in the morning, and I will send them to the clerk.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1:25 a. m., Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 20th April, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. CARON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to read to the House some telegrams which were received during the course of yesterday and to-day. The first one is dated at Clark's Crossing, the 17th, and is from Major-General Middleton:

"Arrived here last afternoon with small party, and found scows safe. Remainder of troops came in this morning. Grassett will catch up to-night. Men have behaved and marched wonderfully. 198 miles from Fort Qu'Appelle in 11 days, in this country and weather, and with all the difficulties about supplies, is a feat not to be despised. The hardships have been real and great, and have been borne by all ranks, not only without a murmur, but cheerfully."

Another telegram is also dated Clark's Crossing, 19th April, 1885, and is signed by Major-General Middleton:

"Sent out scouting party under Melgund this morning. We captured three Sioux of White Cap's band, who have been lately forced to join Riel. Got a little information. I kept two and let one go, telling him to tell the chief and all Indians that we have no war with good Indians, and that they had better go back to their reserves where no harm could come to them."

I also wish to read a telegram from Captain Stewart, who, most of the hon. members of this House will remember, was in command of the Princess Louise Troop of Cavalry here.

"CALGARY, 19th April, 1885.

"To Hon. A. P. CARON.

"Organisation complete. Withdrawn police from Fort McLeod. Have put fifty men and mounts in garrison. At request Commandant, 100 additional on duty at important points.

"J. O. STEWART."

I have also received the following telegram:

"CALGARY, 19th April, 1885.

"To Hon. A. P. CARON.

"I assumed command 65th on Sunday. I am ready to assert we are ready for action. The physique and health and endurance and soldierness of the men, are excellent. The drill has improved wonderfully. Target practice is going on with good results. The men are well equipped, and I consider the battalion is in as good condition as any. We march on Edmonton on Monday.

"GEO. A. HUGHES,
"Lieutenant-Colonel."

Another telegram received from Mr. Bethune states:

"April 20, 1885.

"Hon. A. P. CARON.

"HUMBOLT, April 19.—Courier just arrived from Prince Albert. Reports all well there. No scarcity of provisions at present."

These are the telegrams I desire to read to the House, and I can only say that the report of the Major-General in so far as the volunteer force is concerned did not take me by surprise. I knew, being thoroughly acquainted with the force, that the men are equal to any emergency, and that the Canadian army would prove true to the country, and would endure the hardships through which they were called upon to pass in the manner reported.

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL OUIMET.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Militia to a report concerning Lieutenant-Colonel Ouimet. I was informed the other day, in reply to a question asked the Minister of Militia, that Lieutenant-Colonel Ouimet had returned to his post at Calgary. I am, however, credibly informed, and have reason to believe that the hon. Minister was mistaken, and that Lieutenant-Colonel Ouimet is now in Montreal. Perhaps it would be advantageous, under the circumstances, to know why he left his post. I desire at the same time to say this: I do not put this question in any way to obstruct the Government, nor do I desire to interfere in any way with the military discipline and internal economy of the force; but I think, under the circumstances, we might expect an explanation that would relieve the public mind respecting certain rumors that are afloat.

Mr. CARON. When I answered the question which was put to me the other day, I stated that I had reason to believe from the telegram which I had received that Lieutenant Colonel Ouimet had returned to his command. My reason for so stating was, that in the telegram which he addressed to me he asked me to give instructions to himself, to General Strange and to Colonel Osborne Smith, who at the moment were all either at Calgary or, as in the case of Lieutenant-Colonel Smith, leaving for Calgary. I took it for granted that, if he wished me to send instructions to him, that it must be for the reason that he was returning to his command. In so far as Lieutenant-Colonel Ouimet is concerned, I may state that this morning Lieutenant-Colonel Ouimet called at my house at 6.20 a.m. He stated to me that he had left Calgary and come down to Ottawa *en route* to Montreal on pressing and most important personal business, and, as he stated to me, under leave from Major-General Strange. Lieutenant-Colonel Ouimet also stated to me that he was going down to Montreal by the eight o'clock train, that he would leave Montreal to-morrow night at the very latest to rejoin his regiment at Calgary.

ENQUIRIES RESPECTING RETURNS.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I desire to again call the attention of the Government to return No. 63. I drew the attention of the Government to this return a few days ago, asking what explanation was to be given for the failure of the officers of the House to bring down the return as directed by the House. I have since examined the return. A portion of it has been printed; but all the return ordered by the House has not been brought down. I am aware of that fact, because the matter with which it deals came under my own notice, and so I know there are other papers which have not been brought down. The officers of the Department have disregarded the Order of the House and have brought down such portions of the return as they thought proper, altogether disregarding the Order. I am aware there are other papers, papers of the greatest importance in order to an intelligent discussion of the question. The papers brought down begin right in the middle of the history of the subject, and it is altogether out of the question to thoroughly

appreciate or intelligently discuss it unless you have all the papers asked for by the Order. There are the following papers which have not been brought down: March 24th, 1879—Report of Attorney-General Mowat discussing the whole subject, and recommending that His Excellency the Governor General be moved to bring the subject under the attention of the Imperial authorities. March 27—Order in Council adopting the same. April 2nd—Despatch, Assistant Secretary to Secretary of State, transmitting claim. April 4th—Under-Secretary of State to Provincial Secretary in acknowledgment. April 9th—Report of Committee of Privy Council. April 16th—Under-Secretary of State to Provincial Secretary with copy of same. May 5th—Under-Secretary of State to Provincial Secretary with following enclosures: Letter, E. H. Baldwin, March 2nd, to W. I. C. Miller, with extract from Toronto *Globe* of 28th February; letter, E. H. Baldwin, February 19th, to W. I. C. Miller; letter, U. Ackland, 28th March, to Secretary of State for the Colonies, enclosing resolution and correspondence relating to qualifications to practice medicine in Canada; despatch, Sir M. E. Hicks-Beach, 17th April, to Marquis of Lorne with above three letters. July 4th—Despatch, Assistant Secretary acknowledging receipt of above, enclosing extract from letter of President of College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario, and calling attention to Minute of Council of 27th of March last. July 29—Under-Secretary of State to Provincial Secretary in reply. May 13th, 1880—Confidential despatch, Secretary of State to Lieutenant-Governor, with secret despatch from the right hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and draft clauses therein referred to. September 28th—Report of Attorney-General upon same. September 30th—Order in Council adopting report. October 5th, there is a despatch from the Lieutenant-Governor to the Secretary of State transmitting report and Order in Council; on October 7th from the Under-Secretary of State to the Lieutenant-Governor acknowledging it; and October 22nd, from the Secretary of State to the Lieutenant-Governor answering the despatch of the 5th instant. Now it is important to notice with reference to information of this kind, asked for by an Order of this House, that it has not all been brought down, and that in the printed return no notice is taken of the fact that only a portion of the information is given. What was asked for by the Order of the House has been ignored by the officers of the Department, there being no minute or reference in the printed portion showing that a certain portion of the return is printed and that a certain portion is not printed. Nor is there anything stated showing that the most important portion of the return asked for by the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) has not been brought down, or showing why the House has been insulted by the officers of the Department in refusing to obey the Order of the House in bringing down the whole of this information. I think it is the duty of the Government to stand up for the dignity of the House, and to see that the officers of the Department observe orders which are sent to them, and that returns are not mutilated in this manner. I feel that it is decidedly wrong and decidedly a breach of trust—something which the House cannot permit to exist, something that the Government should not tolerate—that the officers of the House should disregard an Order of the House and bring down only the portion which suits them, when it is known to the medical men of the country that this correspondence exists.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. So far as the return from the Department to this House is concerned, I understood the other day from the explanation of the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) that all the information necessary had been brought down, the hon. member for Cornwall having called at the Department to see that the papers asked for had been brought down. I understood, however, that owing to some reasons which I do not exactly remember, the Committee on Printing had given an order only to print those which were thought to be necessary. I have nothing to say—in so far as the work of the officers of the House is concerned. So far as the bringing of the report to the House I understand that that hon. gentleman now, in spite of what was said before, states that some papers have been forgotten and not brought down, and as to these I may say I will see that they are brought down immediately. I may tell the hon. gentleman that I was informed by the hon. member for Cornwall that there was a large quantity of official correspondence which hardly had any bearing on the subject, and which would take a long time to be copied, but I understood that all the information which had a bearing on the subject was brought down. I will, however, make a note of it and if any has been forgotten it will be brought. The other part of the hon. gentleman's remarks I have nothing to do with.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not object to that portion of the report which the committee in their wisdom saw fit not to print. What I do object to is that the full Order was not carried out by the officers of the Department, and that the papers to which I have alluded as being in existence were not brought down and printed. It may have been all right for the committee not to print all the correspondence, but it was wrong for the officers of the Department to bring only a portion of what was ordered when the origin of the question actually arose in the correspondence which they omitted, so that it would be impossible for us to apply the correspondence we have, when it is selected from that which had reference to what occurred several years before. The matter is one of the greatest importance to the medical men of the country, and I am much obliged to the hon. gentleman for stating that he would have these papers brought down.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to call attention to some papers which were sent to the Clerk of the House in consequence—I cannot say quite in pursuance—of an arrangement made by the hon. gentleman—at eleven o'clock to-day. From a cursory perusal of these documents I find that they are inadequate to what I think was our just expectation. Of course it is impossible for me, with the meagre sources of information I have at hand, to point out to the Government what they can do, but I can produce something which will facilitate the hon. gentleman's labors in laying the information before the House. I will begin by adding to my many times repeated reference to the Order of the House, passed on the 7th of March, 1883, with reference to the land claims and other claims and grievances of the settlers at Prince Albert and neighborhood. I have been asking many times that that Order should be complied with, but it has not been complied with, and there is no attempt to comply with it in this document. This document is directed to another and a particular purpose to which I shall allude presently. Now I really think that not only should we have a full compliance with that, but I think it would be reasonable that hon. gentlemen should carry that Order up to the latest practicable day. We got in March, 1883, an Order for this information in a debate in which the hon. gentleman answered me and promised those papers, a debate in which the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) took part, in which there was a statement with reference to those grievances, including the question of the claims of these settlers by analogy to those of the Manitoba half-breeds, and although I have been pressing and pressing again for that information that Order has not been complied with. I ask therefore for a speedy compliance with that Order, and that we should be placed in the same position as if that Order had been up to the present date, so that we may get the papers between March, 1883, and now, as well as those prior to that date. Then the papers laid on the Table, though they purport to be with reference to the com-

mission lately issued, are themselves imperfect even in the narrowest sense in which that phrase can be used. In the first place the commission itself is not brought down. Well, really, I cannot see why the commission should not be brought down. We have the Order in Council on which it is based, we have papers respecting it, but we have not the document itself. There may have been a supplementary commission; I do not know whether there has been; but, judging from the papers, I think it possible, and if so that also ought to be brought down. Then the telegram of the Minister of the Interior, dated 6th April, to Mr. W. P. R. Street, refers to the action of the Government taken in January last, and that action, so far as it is brought down, consists of a memorandum of the 26th of January, of the Minister, promising the appointment of persons unnamed for the enumeration of the half-breeds, and an Order in Council of the 28th agreeing to that recommendation that they should be authorised to nominate three persons to enumerate. Subsequent papers recite that in pursuance of that Order in Council three persons have been appointed, and then they go on to enlarge their commission and give them fresh powers, but no papers connected with the appointment of any persons under the Order of the 26th of January are brought down. The same telegram of the Minister of the Interior to Mr. Street states that on the 4th of February the half-breeds were notified of the action of the Government. There is a telegram to Mr. Dewdney, I think of the 4th of February, but there is no telegram or other communication as to any notification to the half-breeds. There also is a defect palpable on the face of the papers. Then, there was doubtless some correspondence in January, upon which the action of the Government on the 28th of January was based; there is no correspondence, however, brought down. The first paper I remember is the memorandum of the Minister on the 26th of January. Then, a telegram of Mr. Street, of I think the 5th or 6th of April, proposing a change and enlargement of the principle of action adopted by the Government in dealing with the half-breeds, refers for explanation of that enlargement to a letter of the 3rd of September, from Mr. Johnson, I presume, of the Council of the North-West Territories, to Sir Hector Langevin, I presume the Minister of Public Works. That paper, although it is referred to as one of the documents on which the Government acted in modifying their views and enlarging their powers has not been brought down. Now, I have pointed out papers which on the face of this return, and immediately connected with the return, are important and ought to be brought down, but which are yet missing; and it must be remembered that the papers which we have here are papers which could have been copied by three or four clerks in a few days. My hon. friend says one clerk could have copied them in one day. At any rate, it is a mere matter of a few hours, and no question of time could be a justification of delay. I think the delay has been in large part the framing of the policy of the Administration down to the part which is indicated by these papers being reached, but the old papers which disclose the past have not been brought down. Now, I have no opportunity of telling the Government all that they have got, but I can tell them some of the things which I perceive, from information which is public to us, that they have, and others that they probably have, and I will invite them to consider the propriety of bringing these down in accordance with the exigencies of the case, and also in accordance with the promise of the First Minister made to the House that that course would be taken—made, I cannot remember the precise date, but I think as long ago as the 26th of March last, or thereabouts. Now, in the year 1878 Lieutenant-Governor Laird visited Prince Albert and that neighborhood, saw many of the people, and received addresses and deputations; and in September, 1878, he received amongst others a deputation from the half-breeds of Duck Lake. I presume there was a report made by Lieutenant-Governor Laird to the executive of his mission, and of what he had heard and seen; I cannot tell—I presume there is. In the course of his receiving that deputation to which I have specifically referred, the half-breeds of Duck Lake asked him whether any reply had been received to their petition which had been sent to Ottawa, and the report which I have states that Lieutenant-Governor Laird gave them explanations on the subject. There, therefore, appears to have been a petition sent to Ottawa as long ago as September, or earlier than September, 1878, and I think the House ought to see that petition. In the year 1879, the North-West Council passed memorials requesting the adjustment of the half-breed claims and a number of other things deeply affecting the future of the North-West Territories. That memorial came to Ottawa; it has been brought down to Parliament, and therefore I do not ask the bringing of it down to be repeated; but some response must have been made to that memorial, some report must have been made by the Minister to whom it was referred, some action must have been taken upon a memorial of that description, and I think the report of that action ought to be brought to the House. In the year 1879 the Government proposed to Parliament, and Parliament passed, a Land Act, a clause of which gave authority to the Government to dispose of this half-breed question. I am not, of course, dealing with anything but the right of the half-breeds to be treated upon similar terms to those who were dealt with at the time of the settlement consequent upon the extinguishment of the titles. For convenience sake I am limiting the series of papers to that for the moment. I say that in the year 1879, then, the Administration had a policy upon this subject in so far as they proposed to Parliament to withdraw it from parliamentary action and to bring it within the domain of executive and administrative action. Some report must have been made, some communications must have been had, some memoranda must exist, upon which the Administration were moved to adopt that policy. That step having been taken, no doubt the Minister who was charged with the settlement of this question must have proposed a policy to the Administration, and there must be some report or proposals with reference to the executive action which the Administration had proposed to Parliament they should be entrusted with during the Session of 1879. I should have said that I have mistaken the date of the memorial. I am rather inclined to think it is not the memorial of 1878 or 1879 of the North-West Council, but rather of 1883; and in that case, I would ask him to bring down the memorial of 1879. Then, in October, 1883, the North-West Council petitioned, and their memorial has been brought down; and the reply to that memorial ought also to appear. Then, in 1883, Father Leduc, who was the clerical guide of the half-breeds, I think, in the neighborhood of St. Norbert, came to Ottawa to discuss the claims of the half-breeds, and there no doubt exists some memorandum or some report of the action taken in consequence of that delegation. Then, in 1884, there were a number of meetings held in the section, in connection with the claims, not merely of the half-breeds, but also of the white settlers at various points. I have no doubt these meetings attracted the attention of the officers of the Government in the Territories, and of the Government itself, and there must be some report upon the resolutions adopted at those meetings, and upon the agitation which was going on at that time. Then, there came another phase of this question. There was a policy adopted for the organisation of militia corps for the North-West Territories; action was taken upon which these corps were organised, and we voted special sums with the view of their being organised. The correspondence, the *motif*, which induced

that organisation, and the action of the Government, would also be interesting. Then, in May, 1884, there were meetings of settlers, as well white as half-breeds, at which proposals were made to invite Louis Riel to visit them and give them assistance; and I have little doubt that there were some reports as to these meetings, which were general, having taken place, and some report from the local officers as to what it would be fitting to do, and some action of the Government on these reports. In June, 1884, Riel arrived, and there were numerous meetings held during that and the succeeding months, at many of which he attended. I have no doubt, also, that these meetings again attracted the attention of the Government at Ottawa and the officers of the Government in the Territories, and that there were reports in connection with them. Then, in July, the Deputy Minister of Interior visited the North-West and acquired information upon this subject, and expressed his views in public, and they were published in the newspapers of the country in the month of July. Doubtless upon his return he made a report to the Government, giving them what information he had acquired. Then, in July, Colonel Houghton visited this Territory, under instructions of which we have not received a copy yet, and of which we ought to receive a copy. Colonel Houghton visited the Territory for the purpose of securing the arms of five corps to which arms had been entrusted, and upon his return he also intimated, to persons who made public his views, his ideas of the situation. It was his plain and obvious duty, having regard to his mission, to what he had heard and the conclusion he had reached, to report his views, and I have no doubt he did so to the Department. He was there also at another interval with reference to the original organisation of these forces upon which there will have been no doubt reports. I have little doubt that Louis Schmitt, who was Dominion land agent in those quarters, and was secretary of the meetings, and had the advantage of being the link of communication between Riel and the Government, would have communicated to the administrator of the Department his views of the situation, and I am quite sure if he did not, the Government would have communicated with him who, through his obvious acquaintance with the precise condition of affairs, was well informed and could give the Government accurate information. Then the hon. the Minister of Public Works went to the Territory under a mission which was, as he publicly stated, to ascertain what the grievances of the people were. He passed through the Territory, and he ascertained their grievances, and he made a statement upon his homeward trip that he had, I think, found two discontented individuals in the Territory, whose discontent he had been able quite to soothe. In the course of that progress the Minister, whose time of course was valuable and the case of the Metis was probably not worth a journey over the prairie, did not visit the scene of the disturbance but he visited Qu'Appelle where we hear the commission are now. But although he did not go to the Metis they came to him. A deputation of the Metis met him, expressed their claims and their grievances, and he promised that upon his return to Ottawa he would report to his colleagues and lay the matter before them. We know the Minister of Public Works, and knowing him we are quite sure that upon his return to Ottawa he did, without delay, make that report to his colleagues. Then there was obviously on the 3rd of September a letter of Mr. Jackson, to which I have already made allusion; that letter is also of importance in this connection. Immediately after the published statement of the views of the Deputy Minister of the Interior, those views did not appear to be shared by the constituted authorities in the North-West Territories, for on the 21st July there was a meeting of the Council of the North-West Territories at which they passed a resolution declaring that they dissented from those views, that they thought that the claims of the half-breeds just and pressing, and they once more drew the attention of the Executive to their claim. That paper ought also to be brought down; it is of great consequence. That resolution seems to have been communicated by telegraph because the case seemed emergent; and the Government have, I find, a report of a reply by telegraph in the same month to that paper, showing that on the return of the Deputy Minister of the Interior, the matter would receive immediate attention. That paper ought to be also before us. Then three other Ministers visited the North-West with a view of seeing for themselves. The hon. the Minister of Marine visited the country in company with the hon. the Minister of Public Works. I have no doubt he found out all about it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Not in company.

Mr. BLAKE. Not in company? Well, they were together. They were together enjoying a great banquet at which many speeches were made, and among them speeches by the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; and the latter hon. gentleman inveighed in his usual happy and courteous language against the political gentlemen with whom I happen to be associated; and I read his remarks with the feelings with which he no doubt desired that I should read them Then the hon. the Acting Minister of Railways who, in that capacity and as Minister of Agriculture and as Minister of Immigration and as Minister of Statistics, had a fourfold claim to visit the North-West and a fourfold duty to discharge, also visited the North-West last summer and doubtless found out something about it. So did the hon. the Postmaster General whose fellow citizens and constituents are now making a visit under his auspices to the country in different guise from that under which the hon. gentleman visited it a few months ago. There were some demands made, formulated by the Metis under Louis Riel, which I suspect must, in some way or other, have reached the Government, or at any rate if they did not it was because the Government did not read the newspapers and their officers did not inform them. Resolutions were formulated and demands made embraced in a Bill of rights. There must have been some letters and correspondence on that. Then, Mr. Richardson, the stipendiary magistrate, was summoned to Ottawa; it is not long since. He was here, and I cannot doubt that he, long acquainted as he is with the Territory, gave some information, and in fact it is generally assumed that the stipendiary magistrates and the commissioners of police or the officers of police there, from time to time, have made some reports upon this question. The Comptroller of the Mounted Police was up there last summer, and he also expressed his opinion publicly more or less on this question. I have no doubt since he gave the public his views upon it, he also gave his immediate superiors and the Government his views. Then the Lieutenant Governor, Mr. Dewdney no doubt has from time to time made his own report, apart from those of the Council, upon the condition of the Territories and more particularly as he made a wonderful tour, visiting St. Albert and other points in October, 1884, when, besides those effusive displays of loyalty and contentment with which he was greeted, perhaps his private ear heard something which he communicated to hon. gentlemen. Then, there must have been some reports, some orders, some correspondence, as to the arrangements under which Fort Carlton was obtained from the Hudson Bay Company last fall, was repaired and rearranged, as I see by the papers it was repaired and rearranged, and was ordered to be occupied by a force of the mounted police. Then, in November, 1884, a very widely circulated petition of settlers and others to the Privy Council was signed, as I see by the papers, embracing amongst other things the claim of the half-breeds. That, no doubt, is also here. Then, Sheriff

Chapleau was here during this winter, and he also in the course of the summer and fall had expressed his opinion, with reference to the condition of this question, publicly. I have no doubt that, during the same summer and fall, and at any rate when he was here, he will have expressed that opinion to the Government. I will not weary you, Sir; I have not quite done, but I think I have, perhaps, given the hon. gentleman enough for one afternoon.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has given us enough for one afternoon, and for a great many other afternoons. Under the pretext of asking for a return, he has made a speech for the purpose of encouraging the half-breeds. There is nothing more clear and nothing more discreditable to the hon. gentleman's patriotism than the course he has taken to-day, a course that will meet with the indignation of the country. He may sneer at it, and the hon. gentlemen behind him may cheer him, but the country, or at all events the loyal portion of the country, and that is the great majority of the people, will look with disgust at the attempt of the hon. gentleman to keep up this feeling at a time like the present. The hon. gentleman may make the most of it and, five years hence, and for the rest of his life, he may perhaps regret the spirit and the tone and the motive that has actuated him in all this. The course taken by the Government in bringing down the returns is the same as is taken by all Governments when a return is granted, the papers are sent to the Department. The permanent head of the Department, who has charge of these papers, who has the custody of these papers, who is responsible for these papers, is told to prepare the returns and to send them down, and I can only say that, in anything that I have stated in this House, that has been fully carried out. The Departments were instructed to send down all the papers that could by any possibility be included in this return by the most liberal construction of the Order. The hon. gentleman has gone on supposing, and making sneering insinuations. It appears that three members of the Government have gone up there. Have they not a right to go up there? Are they to be sneered at because they went? Are they to be sneered at because the people treated them with civility and acknowledged them to be members of the Government at the time? Are the givers of the complimentary demonstrations to be sneered at, and are the recipients of those demonstrations to be sneered at? The hon. gentleman sneers at all that. He is good at a sneer, Mr. Speaker, if he is not good for anything else. I hear the hon. gentleman laugh. He is good at a sneer, and they are good at a laugh.

Mr. CASEY. We have plenty to laugh at.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman says they have plenty to laugh at. I think that is the hon. gentleman who spoke forty-seven times in one evening, or was it seventy-one times?

Mr. FARROW. Seventy-one.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Seventy-one times.

An hon. MEMBER. Seventy times seven.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can only say that the papers have been brought down, as far as I know, to cover these returns. It is impossible that we could guess, or that we could assume, or that we could presume what the hon. gentleman wanted. If he wanted them, he should move for them. He has not moved for any of these papers; he has not moved for a report from any one of these Ministers, or from Mr. Chapleau, or from Mr. Richardson, or from everybody that he has read of in any newspaper that exists and that he has happened to cast his eye upon, and that he has presumed and assumed has made a report. He ought to have asked for them——

Mr. BLAKE. So I did.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD——and they would have been brought down if they were not confidential. I must say that we do not get from the hon. gentlemen opposite any courteous acknowledgment of what we do. We bring down returns—the returns are enormous in number, and enormous in volume—as quickly as we can, and again and again it has been my duty to call upon the Departments in reference to questions put to me in the House, to make these returns. We will continue to bring down these returns, and the hon. gentleman may make the most of it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not think the First Minister should be permitted to make insinuations against the loyalty of men in this House. I think he was distinctly out of order in doing it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. State the point of order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I say the First Minister was distinctly out of order in insinuating that my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake) was actuated in any respect by any improper motive, and least of all by any disloyal motive, in making enquiries which it was his right and his duty and his privilege to make. The hon. gentleman's own conduct shows that he desires to keep the House in ignorance of what it ought to know.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I rise to order. That is a charge of motive. The hon. gentleman is out of order. I made no charge against the loyalty of the hon. gentleman. I spoke of the effect of his language in the country, and said the effect was to encourage the disloyal. I made no charge upon him or his motives, but I said his remarks would have an injurious effect in encouraging the disloyal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I withdraw my statement, and will say that the hon. gentleman's action has the effect of making the country believe he does not want to make explanations.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman says he did not make any charge of motives against my hon. friend from West Durham. His words were that that hon. gentleman had taken the pretext of criticising this return in order to make a speech for the purpose of encouraging the half-breeds in the action they were taking. Those are the words to which I object.

Mr. SPEAKER. If he said such a thing, of course it would be out of order, but the right hon. gentleman states that that was not what he said.

Mr. CASEY. It is what he meant.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not true.

Mr. HESSON. I find that, in a recent debate, I am reported in *Hansard* in a certain way, and as it reflects upon a member of this House as well as myself, I should take this opportunity of setting myself right. In the debate on the Civil Service Bill, the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) expressed his regret that he did not know this Bill was coming on, or he might have had something to say as to the principles of the Bill. I took occasion to make a remark as to a certain gentleman obstructing the House and prolonging the debate unnecessarily; and at the close of the debate, when the Chairman left the Chair to report the Bill, the hon. member for West Elgin expressed himself in this way:

"I beg to congratulate the hon. Minister on the pleasant and profitable discussion on this Bill we have had to-day.

"Mr. HESSON, The hon. gentleman has reason to congratulate himself on having had forty-seven shots at that Bill."

Now, I had no intention to do the hon. member an injustice, and I now wish to do him justice. I had taken the number of times he spoke from a certain period of the debate, but not from the commencement. I wish to give him the full benefit of his ability. We all know what his ability is. I was incorrect in saying he had forty-seven shots at the Bill, because it was exactly, by count, seventy-one times that he spoke. I wish to give him the benefit of that.

Mr. CASEY. It seems that this is what has been making the hon. gentleman so anxious to get up for the last half hour. I have to congratulate him on the important question he has at least cleared up. As to the number of times I spoke on that Bill, I would point out that the Bill was in committee, that there were fifty-nine clauses in it, and I think the number of times we on this side spoke was not inconsistent with the importance of the measure. The discussion on the Bill was a real discussion, and obtained a real result, as I think the hon. Minister who had charge of it will recollect.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders are called, I wish to say, with reference to what the hon. gentleman has said as to the personal charges against myself, that my character and my reputation for loyalty are well known in this country, and any effort to impugn them will have very little result. As to the statement that it was my duty to have asked for those papers if I wanted them, and that I had not moved for them, I desire to say, Sir, that I did move for them in amendment to the motion going into Committee of Supply on the very first occasion after we had news of this disturbance and before it had assumed its present proportions. The hon. gentleman resisted the motion. The following day he came down to the House and stated the gravity of the events, which have been communicated since, and I then asked him: Would he bring down all the papers referring to the matter, and he said he would bring down any papers as to the past that did not throw too great or two bad a light upon the future—something of that kind—papers that would not affect the military arrangements. He agreed to do that. A few days afterwards the question came up again, and I said once again:

"I trust that on Monday, without fail, we shall have on the Table of the House all the papers that can be laid on the Table with reference to past events, in connection with this matter, and any reports made in the course of last year by any of the officials of the Government bearing on the matter—Mr. Dewdney's report, the report of Colonel Houghton, who was charged, I believe, with the duty of picking up arms in the neighborhood of this disturbance, and the report of Mr. Stephenson, with reference to the settlers on the lands of the colonization companies. Now, I am not giving a list; I am only mentioning three or four reports which have been probably received; but I have no doubt that in the discharge of their duty in the North-West, the officers of the Government, and in the discharge of their duty at Ottawa, the Government, have had numerous communications of what was going on, and I think these papers should come before us without any delay."

That was a repetition of what I said before, and what the hon. gentleman acceded to. Now that is the state of things; these were the transactions that occurred between the 23rd and the 26th of March, and I have been repeatedly asking for these papers ever since, and have been given to understand, across the House, that they were coming down. As to moving for the papers, I could only do so in amendment to going into Committee of the Supply; there was no possibility of doing so except in one way. I desire therefore—and I think I am entitled to ask him—whether he intends to bring down those papers without a motion, or whether he insists upon a motion before they are brought down.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly not. I said at the time I would bring down every paper that had any connection with the matter, and under that promise the officers of the Department were instructed to take the most liberal view that their sense of duty would allow, in bringing down all returns in any way connected with those events. If any of those papers are not among them—I have not looked over them—they are either of a confidential nature, or such as cannot be produced at present, at all events, without prejudice to the public.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman laughs, but I am making a serious statement. Perhaps my hon. friend did not catch exactly what I said about the return. I do not suppose there is any report from Colonel Houghton on that subject. The hon. gentleman says that several officers of the Government have given their views to the public. Well, we all know what that means. It means that a zealous correspondent of a newspaper sees an officer from the North-West and begins to cross-question him. I take it that the officer says as little as possible, and unless he keeps silence altogether, he cannot but state something of what he has seen in the North-West, and a zealous correspondent certainly does not diminish in quantity or importance this statement. These interviews are something of which Government can take no notice, and it is not the proper thing that we should.

Mr. BLAKE. I ask whether it is intended to comply with the Order of this House made on the 7th day of March, 1883, as to the papers up to that date.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, I will take a note of that.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 55) to authorise the Dominion Grange Mutual Fire Insurance Association to insure against fire the property of the Patrons of Husbandry wheresoever situated in Canada.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

THE RICHELIEU NAVIGATION COMPANY.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Before moving that you leave the Chair that the House go into committee on the Bill amending the Act incorporating the Richelieu Navigation Company and the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, I beg to inform the House, that, in order to meet some objections that have been raised against the Bill, I intend to move, with the permission of the House, an amendment in Committee of the Whole. It is this: That to the first clause relating to the power of purchasing a certain amount of shares at a price not exceeding sixty per cent upon its par value, the following words shall be added:—

"Such purchase of balance of shares shall only be made after notice has been given to all the shareholders of the intention to purchase (which notice shall be in the manner in which advices for general and special meetings of the shareholders are given), and each shareholder shall be invited, if he or she desires to dispose of any part of their stock, to offer the same in writing to the company on a day and hour to be named in such notice, and in purchasing said stock preference shall be given to those offering it at the lowest price, and in case more stock than needed should offer at same price, the same shall be divided among the persons so offering in *pro rata* to the amount so offered."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before that is put, I think the Government ought to give some expression of their views on this Bill. In the committee this was discussed, and the Minister of Finance, who I do not see here, expressed a tolerably strong opinion on the principle of the Bill. I call the attention of the First Minister to the very peculiar position that is raised.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not personally cognisant with the matter at all. I am sorry to say that the Minister of Finance has been obliged to leave the House to-day in consequence of indisposition. Perhaps my hon. friend would allow it to stand over until he returns. Of

course, we will give an opportunity to the hon. gentleman —he will not lose anything by it.

Mr. BLAKE. I would recommend my hon. friend to give notice of that upon paper. It is a remarkable Bill, and contains an extraordinary proposition. The amendment seems to be an important one. He could not move it, of course, without two days' notice, and if he puts a notice on to-day he will be in order, and the House would be made aware of the amendment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And no one can object to it.

MR. ANTOINE LEBEL.

Mr. DE ST. GEORGES asked, Whether the Government are aware that Mr. Antoine LeBel, Indian agent for the Township of Viger, Temiscouata, is acting without sureties? 2nd. Is it true that the sureties asked the Department to compel Mr. LeBel to render an account of his administration with a view to ascertaining how matters stand? 3rd. Has Mr. LeBel been ordered to furnish an account; has he furnished it, or what reply has he given?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. LeBel, agent for the Township of Viger, is not acting without security. His sureties have, I believe, given notice that they desire to withdraw from their position as such, and Mr. LeBel has been notified to furnish new sureties.

INDIAN RESERVE AT VICTORIA ARM, B. C.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether any negotiations have been entered into for the sale of the Indian reserve of about one hundred and ten (110) acres across the Victoria Arm from the City of Victoria, British Columbia? Whether it is proposed to sell this reserve, and if so, whether it is to be sold by private sale or public auction?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No negotiations have been entered into. Offers and applications have been made for the acquisition of the land in question. It is desirable those lands should be sold, but the difficulty in the matter is that the Indians are not inclined to surrender their reserves. It is not proposed to sell the reserve at present, either by private sale or public auction, until the question of the Indian consent is settled.

SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS BEFORE JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the Government will take charge of the Senate Bill for the purpose of curing irregularities in summary proceedings before justice of the peace, etc., so as to secure its consideration this Session?

Mr. CARON. At the request of the Senator who introduced the Bill, the Government will take charge of the Bill.

MAILS BETWEEN SHILOH AND FERGUS.

Mr. INNES asked, What are the names of the parties who tendered for the carrying of the mails between Shiloh and Fergus *vid* Oustic and Speedside? To whom was the contract awarded, and was it awarded on the lowest tender, if not, whose tender was the lowest, and why was it not accepted?

Mr. CARLING. In the arrangement for the carrying of the mails in the locality referred to, tenders were not asked for. An arrangement was made by the Post Office Inspector at Toronto with Thomas Hamilton, of Shiloh, at $150 a year, from the 1st April, in accordance with the provisions of the Act.

MR. MILLARD.

Mr. FORBES asked, Have the fines imposed upon Mr. Millard for putting mill rubbish and shingle shavings into the Mersey River been collected, or have the same been remitted?

Mr. McLELAN. One of the fines has been collected and two of them stand in abeyance.

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883.

On Order for Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution (Mr. Cameron):

Resolved, That in the opinion of this House such portions of the Liquor License Act of 1883, and the Act to amend the Liquor License Act of 1883, as the Supreme Court of Canada has declared to be *ultra vires*, should be suspended unless and until the same shall be decided by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to be *intra vires* of the Parliament of Canada.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Before the hon. gentleman speaks on this motion I desire to say that the Government have delayed acting in the matter in expectation of hearing the result of the application in the appeal. In consequence of no answer having been received up to this period of the Session, the Government intend to bring in a measure on the subject.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). What do the Government propose to do?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is in the nature of a suspensory Act.

Mr. CAMERON. To suspend the operation of the statute?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; in the line of the hon. gentleman's motion.

Mr. CAMERON. Then the hon. gentleman will allow my motion to pass?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no objection to do so.

Motion agreed to; and resolution considered in committee and ordered to be reported.

Mr. CAMERON moved the second reading of the resolution.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To-morrow.

Mr. BLAKE. Now. This is not a money resolution.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. gentleman knows I cannot move it to-morrow.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will give the hon. gentleman an opportunity of moving it to-morrow.

OTTAWA RIVER CANAL SYSTEM.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew) moved:

That in the opinion of this House the improvement of the navigation of the Ottawa and French Rivers by a system of canals, so as to enable vessels to pass from Lake Huron (*via* said rivers) to tide water on the St. Lawrence, is a work deserving the early consideration of the Government.

He said: In moving this resolution I desire to offer a few observations in relation to the importance of the work referred to in the motion. In doing so I may say that I am not starting any new theory or project. This scheme has been spoken of, has been before the country for many years. But for several years nothing has been said about it, and nothing has been done in relation to it. As long ago as 1615 the great French navigator, Champlain, passed over the identical route which is intended to be adopted in the construction of this work from Montreal to

Lake Huron which was the first of our great fresh water seas gazed on by European eyes. The same route was used until a comparatively recent period for transporting the fur-laden canoes of the Indians and voyageurs from the great lakes to Montreal, and the question of improving the navigation of that route was taken up a considerable number of years ago. I believe, Sir, it was at the instance of John Egan, a former member of the old Legislature of the Province of Canada for the county of Pontiac, that the question of improving the navigation of the Ottawa was first brought to the attention of the Government, and as early as 1854 work was commenced on the impediment known as the Chats Rapids and for the purpose of connecting the Chats and Deschênes Lakes. Considerable money was spent on the prosecution of that work, and it was continued until 1857, when, for some cause, the work was abandoned. In 1856, however, a survey of the whole route was commenced by Mr. Walter Shanly, under instructions issued by the Commissioner of Public Works of that day, and was continued thereafter by Mr. Clark and completed in 1859. It will be necessary, Sir, for me in discussing this question and endeavoring to press its importance and advantages on the House, to refer to some of the statements that appear in the reports of Mr. Shanly and Mr. Clark, and more especially to the report of Mr. Shanly. I do not think any apology to the House is necessary for referring to Mr. Shanly's report, because, although it has been before the country for a considerable length of time, and although its contents are tolerably well known to members of this House, the circulation of that report was so limited that I think very many people in the country know very little about it. In referring to his report and to the advantages set out in that report in regard to the importance of this work, it will be necessary for me to refer to its great advantages over existing routes. In doing that I do not desire to decry in the slightest degree the importance of the existing system of canals on the St. Lawrence river connecting the great lakes. The importance of this improvement will, I think, be made manifest by the references which I propose to make to Mr. Shanly's report; and in the first place I propose to refer to the great advantage in distance which will be possessed by this route over any other route now existing, in carrying grain from the great west to tide water at Montreal. Mr. Shanly in his report gives the distances between Chicago and Montreal as follows: Welland Canal route, distance by lake, 1,145 miles; river, 132 miles, canals, 71 miles, making in all 1,348 miles. By the Ottawa and French river route he estimates the distance as follows: Lake, 575 miles; river, 347 miles; canal 58 miles; making altogether 980 miles, or a saving in distance between Chicago and Montreal by adopting this route as compared with the Welland canal route, of 368 miles. He also estimates that by the Welland Canal route the time consumed in a voyage between Chicago and Montreal would be 196 hours, while by the Ottawa and French river route it would be 152 hours, or an advantage in point of time of 44 hours in favor of the Ottawa river route, in a voyage between Chicago and Montreal. As regards the estimate of the cost of transporting grain or other commodities between those two points he makes the following comparison; and in making this comparison Mr. Shanly has estimated that the greater mileage cost of the work to be performed on the Ottawa as compared with the Welland route would necessitate an increased toll equal to double the tolls which would legitimately be chargeable on the Welland route, and includes those tolls in his estimate of the cost of transportation. His estimate as to cost is as follows: Cost of carrying on the lake, 1,145 miles at 2 mills, $2.29 per ton; river, 132 miles at three mills, 40 cents; canal, 71 miles at 8 mills, 57 cents, making altogether $3.26, as the cost per ton from Chicago to Montreal by the Welland route. The estimate for the Ottawa route gives, 575 miles lake at 2 mills, $1.15; 347 miles river, at 3 mills, $1.04; 58 miles canal, including tolls, at 8 mills, instead of 4 as on the Welland route, and estimating the cost of canal navigation at 12 mills altogether 70 cents, giving a total of $2.89 per ton by the Ottawa route, as compared with $3.26 by the St. Lawrence route, or a net saving of 37 cents per ton. In the report of the Canal Commission appointed in 1870 I find the following paragraph, and as I desire to make this comparison as fair as it is possible to make it as regards all other routes, I give to the House a comparison, under the state of affairs stated to exist by the Canal Commission in 1870.

"In instituting a comparison between the St. Lawrence and the Ottawa routes it is necessary to point out an error which has been repeated in various official reports on the subject, with regard to the comparative distance between Chicago and Montreal."

Then they give the comparative distance as follows: Welland canal system 1,261 miles, Ottawa river 991 miles, making a difference in favor of the Ottawa route of only 270 miles, instead of 368 miles as stated in Shanly's report in 1856. I have taken those figures as stated in the report of the Canal Commissioners, and made a comparison of the time which would be consumed in the transportation of a vessel from Chicago to Montreal, and of the cost, basing both on the estimates adopted by Mr. Shanly. By the amended figures I find that the lake and river navigation 1,190 miles, by the Welland canal route, and estimating eight miles per hour as the speed with which a vessel could pass over that portion of the route gives 149 hours; 71 miles of canal, 24 hours; 553 feet lockage 13 hours, making altogether 186 hours by the St. Lawrence and Welland route. By the Ottawa route there is lake and river navigation of 952 miles, consuming 120 hours, and canal navigation of 29 miles. Mr. Clark in his report estimated that by a series of dams he proposed to build at the obstructions on the Ottawa river, the canal mileage would be reduced from 58 miles, as estimated by Mr. Shanly, to 29 miles, and I take Mr. Clark's mileage. That would consume 10 hours; and 710 feet of lockage would consume 18 hours; making a total of 148 hours, or a difference in favor of the Ottawa route of 38 hours, instead of 44 hours, as computed by Mr. Shanly. I may say at this point, that although the navigation would be open during a greater period of time by the Welland route than by the Ottawa route, yet according to the estimate I have made, at least one freight trip would be saved by the Ottawa route, estimating the saving 38 hours on each voyage, over the Welland route. As to the question of cost, taking Mr. Shanly's figures, I find, according to the report of the Canal Commissioners, that by the Welland route there would be 1,005 miles of lake navigation, at 2 mills per mile, giving $2.01; 185 miles of river, at 3 mills, 55 cts.; and 71 miles of canal at 8 mills, 57 cts.; making $3.13 altogether as the cost of transporting a ton of merchandise by the Welland route. By the Ottawa route there would be 560 miles of lake navigation, at 2 mills, $1.13; 402 miles of river, at 3 mills, $1.20; and 29 miles of canal, at 12 mills, 35 cts.; making altogether $2.67, or a saving of 46 cts. per ton as against 37 cts. as estimated by Mr. Shanly. Now, Sir, as regards the period of navigation open upon these two routes, Mr. Shanly gives the average of 11 years, from 1847 to 1857. The average opening of navigation on the Welland canal was the 9th of April, on the Erie the 26th of April, and on the Ottawa the 27th of April. The average closing of navigation during this period was on the Welland December 12, on the Erie December 9, and on the Ottawa

November 27. The information, he says, respecting the dates of the opening and closing of the Ottawa navigation were obtained from Capt. Cumming, manager of the old Union Forwarding Company, a company that controlled the steamboat navigation upon the Ottawa for many years, and as manager of which Capt. Cumming had many opportunities of obtaining, during those years, correct information respecting the opening and closing of navigation. As I said, although the Welland Canal would be open 33 days longer during the season of navigation than the Ottawa route, yet the saving that would be effected on each voyage would more than counterbalance the greater period of time during which the navigation would be open on the Welland Canal. Now, I do not propose to occupy the time of the House at any considerable length on this question; but I desire to offer the opinion but of one gentleman—obtained by the Canal Commission in 1870, in answer to a series of questions proposed by that commission—Mr. James Little, of Toronto. I give his opinion, because I am convinced that he could have no local reason for advocating the Ottawa route in preference to the St. Lawrence, and because he was a gentleman of long business experience, who had much to do with the business of navigation on the upper lakes, and his evidence on this route will, I think, be taken as impartial. He says:

"The Welland Canal is known to be some 370 miles further between Chicago and New York than would be the route by the Ottawa. All other things being equal, the difference in cost between enlarging the one and constructing the other is not a matter of sufficient importance to be allowed to stand in the way, when the volume of commerce to be opened up is to be taken into consideration. The opening up of the Ottawa will ensure to the country a much larger amount of benefits arising from the moving of products than the Welland; and while the enlargement of the latter will open up no new section of the country, the Ottawa will at once bring into market the timber, and promote the settlement of the vast territory drained by the Ottawa, Mattawan and French Rivers—a distance of 330 miles from the city of Ottawa to the Georgian Bay—equal in length to the Erie Canal, and sufficient of itself, from its agricultural, timber and mineral wealth, and the enormous amount of water power it would make available, to overbalance any difference of cost that might accrue. Unlike the Welland, which had to wait on the agricultural development of the west, the Ottawa route would at once force business to itself on account of its immense advantages over every other route. It would leave the Erie Canal just as the completion of the St. Lawrence Canals has left the Rideau—simply dependent on the local traffic, and what it could gather from the shores of Lake Erie; and even there it would meet the competition of the Welland. It would be without a rival for the western commerce, as no canal can ever be constructed through the United States with a tithe of its advantages, even at the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars. Other advantages may be summed up as follows:—

"1. It would open a far safer and more capacious route than any other in use or construction.

"2. It would effect a saving of time equal to two full trips, according to Mr. Shanly—possibly to three.

"3. It would afford direct communication, without breaking bulk, between Lake Superior, Michigan and Huron, and the head of ocean navigation at Montreal, and by the Caughnawaga to the head of Lake Champlain, within about 60 miles of steam navigation on the Hudson.

"4. It would possess immense advantages for the timber trade of the Georgian Bay, the valley of the Saginaw, the whole northern peninsula of Michigan, and Green Bay.

"5. It would give but a short lake run to reach the shelter of Manitoulin at either end.

"6. It would leave the Welland undisturbed to the business of Lake Erie and other ports that would make Oswego their distributing point; and above all, it (the Welland) would supplement the overtaxed Ottawa route; for the latter, soon after its completion, would certainly have more than it could do to meet the requirements of the 17,500,000 of people of the great grain-producing country of the West, ever seeking a way to the points of distribution and consumption."

So important was this work considered to be that, if I am correctly informed, a number of gentlemen from Chicago visited this city in 1880 or 1881, and offered to construct it as a private enterprise, provided it was subsidised by a grant of land from the Government. So, it would seem that the advantage of this work made itself manifest to the people of Chicago and the western States. That it would be an advantage to our own North-West is undoubted. The advantages of the Ottawa route would be as great for moving the products of our own North-West as for moving the products of the western States, and if this work were undertaken and carried out by the Government as a national work I am convinced that its importance would become manifest to everybody in a very short time after its completion. But it may be said, and I have no doubt will be contended by some, that the era of railway traffic has at the present time, to some extent, superseded carrying by water. To some extent that statement may be true, but I think it will be conceded that for the moving of heavy products, such as the grain, lumber and minerals of the North-West and of the western States, and all heavy products of that kind, it is a matter of absolute necessity that we should have some other means of moving those heavy products than the railways either of the United States or Canada.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Why?

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). In the first place, waterways possess no franchises; any person who chooses can use them. They are not exclusively owned by one company or any set of companies; no combination can be made by which the freights upon the waterways of the country, whether natural or artificial, can be controlled as they can be upon railways; no combination of companies can be made that would create a monopoly in the carrying trade over our waterways; whereas, on the other hand, combinations may be entered into by railway companies by which a monopoly may be created even where more than one line of railroad exists. The importance of canals and of other artificial and natural waterways is well known in the older countries. France, I believe, possesses the largest extent of inland waterways of any country, at all events, of Europe. In 1873 there were in France 3,000 miles of canal, 2,000 miles of canalised river, and 2,000 miles of navigable rivers, giving a total of 7,000 miles of inland waterways; in 1875 there was carried by water transportation in that country 1,748,500,000 tons of freight, besides large quantities of wood, and the canals of England are estimated to carry annually some 23,000,000 tons of freight, and are in length some 2,500 miles. The United States canals, according to the 4th volume of the Census of 1880, are some 2,500 miles in length, and carried in that year 21,044,292 tons. I have a table here which, while it goes to show that the proportion of freight carried by railways was greater in the decade from 1874 to 1883, inclusive than during the previous decade, is susceptible, to some extent, of explanation. I shall not trouble the House with all the figures contained in this statement, but will simply give the results. The shipments of wheat and corn from Chicago, during the decade from 1864 to 1873, inclusive, showed the following averages: 87·04 per cent. by water, and 12·06 by rail. In the decade from 1874 to 1883 the proportion shipped by water was 70·8, and by rail 29·2; but it will be found on examination of these figures that the inroads of railways upon the carrying trade was not a continuously progressive one; it will be found that during the railway war, in 1876 and 1881, during which merchandise was carried by railway at a loss, the proportion carried in those two years by lake was only 59 per cent., and by rail it was 41 per cent. In 1876, however, the percentage by water was 61 and by rail 39; in 1877 the percentage by water was 82, an advance of 21 per cent. over the previous year, and by rail only 18 per cent. Then, if we take 1881, another year of railway war, we find that the percentage by water was 58 per cent. and by rail 42 per cent.; but in 1882 the percentage by water was 70½ and by rail only 29½ per cent., so that it will be seen there were circumstances, other than the advance of railway construction, which entered into the causes that produced the general results over the years I have just quoted. If we take the

shipments of wheat and corn received by lake at Buffalo and forwarded thence eastward, we find that in the six years, from 1872 to 1877, there were shipped by the Erie Canal 223,000,000 bushels, and by rail 62,000,000 bushels, whereas in the six years, from 1878 to 1883, the shipments by canal were 266,000,000 bushels, and by rail 111,000,000, the percentage by canal for the six years ending 1877 being 78·03, and by rail 21·07; and in the six years ending 1883, the shipments by canal were 70·20, and by rail 29·80. Then, as regards the rates of freight, we find the average rate of freight upon a bushel of wheat from Chicago to New York during the decade from 1864 to 1873 was, by lake and canal, 23·84 cents, by lake and rail 26·32 cents per bushel, and by all rail 38·29, showing the proportion of 38 per cent. as the cost by water and 62 per cent. as the cost by rail. From 1874 to 1883 the rates were considerably lowered in both instances. By lake and canal the average during that decade was 10·39 by lake, and rail 12·66, and by all rail, 17·80, but the proportion of the cost between the water transport and the rail transport was similar to that of the previous decade, the proportion being 37 per cent. per canal, and 63 per cent. by rail. So that, I think, the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) will admit that there are advantages in carrying heavy products by canal as compared with railways. A writer on this subject has, to some extent, accounted for the inroads that railways have made upon water carrying in the following way. He says:

"The waterways being closed some months in the year, place the producer and the consumer in the power of the railway companies, who, during that portion of the year, can raise the freight rates on all products that are unable to await the opening of navigation to the utmost these products will stand. In this way numerous articles that could be, with equal facility and less cost, transported by water, have gone to the railways, as those compelled to send freight by rail find it more advantageous to make contracts covering the year, on the condition that the railways have the carrying during the season of navigation."

That advantage we hope by legislation—at least those of us who are favorable to the railway commission—to remedy. He also says:

"The greater portion of the United States canals was built before the era of railways. They were purely artificial, of small sectional area, and for local traffic and local distances. As the country settled, the water supply of many became deficient; the sectional area was decreased by sediments and deposits, forming a very imperfect navigation, which the construction of railways superseded for transportation, leading to the abandonment of some and the maintenance of others, chiefly as regulators of freight charges by the railways.

"Of the 2,500 miles now in operation, with a very short mileage excepted, they are of limited capacity, with a depth of from 3 to 7 feet, and many with difficulty supplied with water. Reference is made to the American canals on account of comparative statistics of their traffic forming the stock argument, both when the increase in traffic upon our own canals is discussed and when opponents to their completion attempt to present any facts in support of their assertions."

It may be said that the expenditure which the country has made upon the Canadian Pacific Railway, running, as it does, parallel to and in competition with the navigation which is proposed to be adopted by this resolution which I am about to place in your hands, does not justify the assumption of an additional burden for the improvement of the Ottawa River, but I think it will be admitted that if the anticipation which we have in regard to the development of the North-West be at all realised, the time will soon arrive when the Canadian Pacific Railway will be wholly unable to move the products of the North-West alone, leaving out the products of the western States altogether. It has been stated on good authority that during the present season there is a surplus of six million bushels of wheat in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, and I have computed that, taking 6,000,000 bushels as the quantity to be exported from that country during this year, it would require two trains of twenty cars each, carrying 500 bushels per car, nearly every working day in the year, to move that. If that be the case, what are we to expect if the progress of the country goes on, as we have reason to believe it will go on during the next ten or twenty years, in the same progressive ratio as the north-western States? I need only refer to the production of grain in the north-western States to show what we may reasonably expect in our North-West Territory within a very limited period of time. I will take the six States of Dakota, Illinois, Iowa, Ohio, Kansas and Nebraska, which are the great grain-producing States of the north-west. Dakota, according to the United census, produced, in 1870, 422,426 bushels of grain, and in 1880, 7,352,589. In Illinois the production was 207,936,491 in 1870, and 444,622,350 in 1880. In Iowa the production was 121,951,917 in 1870, and 362,497,131 in 1880. In Ohio the production was 123,473,304 in 1870, and 188,933,077 in 1880. In Kansas it was 23,726,086 in 1870, and 131,971,726 in 1880. In Nebraska it was 8,572,842 in 1870, and 83,039,613 in 1880. This shows an increase from 486,083,066 bushels in 1870, in those six States, to 1,223,416,486 bushels in 1880, or an increase of about 250 per cent. That, to my mind, is some evidence of the vast increase that must take place in the production of grain in our North-West Territories, and inasmuch as a large portion of the grain, in fact the major portion of it, must be moved within a limited period of time, not extending over the whole year, it is, to my mind, evidence that we must obtain other outlets than one line of railway from the North-West to enable us to carry the products out of that country. And, in addition to what comes from our own North-West, which will be shipped at Port Arthur, a very large quantity of grain will be brought by the Northern Pacific to Duluth, and if we are to obtain the carrying of that grain through our own territory, if we are to compete with the Americans for it, if we are to prevent it from going by way of the Erie Canal to New York, we must, I think, have a shorter route and a cheaper route than that which at present exists by the St. Lawrence and the Welland Canal. This work is, to my mind, not so costly a work as to prevent the Government from entering upon it. It has been estimated by Mr. Shanly to cost $24,000,000. That is the highest estimate that has been placed upon it, and Mr. Shanly, in his estimate, does not pretend to base it upon actual quantities, as has been done in the case of Mr. Clark. Mr. Clark, who performed a subsequent survey to that of Mr. Shanly, taking out quantities and showing the estimated value of all the quantities upon which he based his calculation, estimates the whole cost of the work at $12,058,680. In view of the fact that there is so wide a discrepancy between the estimates of these two engineers, I think that, before any appropriation for the actual construction of this work be made by this Parliament, it would be the duty of the Government to undertake a new survey, for the purpose of determining, as accurately as possible, what the cost of the work would be. I do not think that survey would be a very expensive one, for I find that the survey performed by Mr. Clark, which was a very exhaustive one, cost the country only $32,479, so I think a moderate sum expended by the Government in obtaining the necessary information to enable them to determine whether his work could be performed within a reasonable compass might very reasonably be voted by this House, and I would suggest to the Government that such a course as that be adopted. Then, if the Government and the House should come to the conclusion that this is a work in the interests of the country, it would not be necessary to make any very large expenditure in any one year. Each of the links of this navigation would be of itself an advantage to the country. The construction of the first link here at the city of Ottawa would open up an additional navigation of some thirty miles. Then the construction of the link at the Chats would open up an additional navigation of from twenty-six to thirty

miles. The construction of the link from Portage du Fort to the head of the Calumet, would open up an additional navigation of about 100 miles, so that each of the links in this chain of navigation would be of itself advantageous to the country, and whilst no very large expenditure would be required upon each, great advantages would ultimately result from the construction of the whole work. I am not here to propose any particular scheme as to the depth of water that would be most advisable to be adopted in reference to this system of navigation, but I firmly believe that the construction of this work is one that would result in great advantage to the country, and that its benefits would more than counterbalance any possible expenditure that would be required for its construction.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a few remarks on the motion that has just been presented to this House by the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White). This is a subject that, at the present time, is agitating the public mind, more or less, on both sides of the House. We have had laid before us the advantages which the Ottawa River route possesses in comparison with the Welland Canal route, and several other routes. The advantages which the Ottawa River route chiefly possesses, I think, are three-fold, namely, in the saving of time, in the saving of expense in handling heavy goods, and in the safety of carrying those goods. I find that the distance, as compared with other routes, stands thus: Welland route—lake navigation, 1,145 miles; river navigation, 132 miles; canal navigation, 71 miles, making a total distance from Chicago to Montreal of 1,348 miles. By the Ottawa route there is, of lake navigation, 575 miles, or about one-half that of the Welland route; of river navigation, 347 miles; of canal navigation, 58 miles, or a total of 980 miles, showing a difference in favor of the Ottawa route of 368 miles. These distances are estimated by Mr. Shanly, but I find that Mr. Clark, in his report, reduces the canaling required by about 30 miles. In carrying the comparison a step further, we have from Chicago to New York, taking the Erie Canal route, the following distances: Lake navigation from Chicago to Buffalo, 1,000 miles; canal navigation from Buffalo to Troy, 350 miles; river navigation from Troy to New York, 150 miles—or a total distance from Chicago to New York of 1,500 miles. Distance from Chicago to Montreal, by the Ottawa, 980 miles, or a difference in favor of Montreal of 520 miles. The Atlantic distances, also, compare favorably with us. From New York to Liverpool, the distance is 2,980 miles; from Montreal to Liverpool, 2,740 miles; from Quebec to Liverpool, 2,580 miles; difference in favor of Montreal 240 miles, and in favor of Quebec 400 miles. The distance from Chicago to Liverpool, by Lake Erie and New York, is 4,480 miles, and from Chicago to Liverpool, by Ottawa and Gulf of St. Lawrence, 3,729 miles, showing a difference in favor of Ottawa and Gulf route of 760 miles. The advantages to be secured by such a line as proposed are the following:—1st. As to time saved: By this route grain could be taken from all ports on Lake Michigan and delivered to sea going vessels in Montreal, two days sooner than by the Welland route, or than by any other route that can be constructed; and in fully eight days less time than is required to lay down in the harbor of New York a cargo loaded in Chicago or Milwaukee. The better condition for the transfer to ocean vessels in which the grain will come to hand after the shorter as compared with the longer inland voyage, is a point that will be conceded by all shippers, and is one of such moment that it should be kept in view in contrasting the merits of the proposed new route with the existing and more circuitous ones between Lake Michigan and tidewater. Now, as regards the expenses saved: In the item of freight charges alone, the Montreal or Quebec merchant purchasing grain in Chicago or Milwaukee can effect an average saving of fully 4 cents, after allowing a liberal estimate for tolls, on each bushel, as compared with what it now costs him to bring it around by way of the Welland Canal; while that which now goes from the same points to New York by way of Lake Erie and the Hudson, at a cost of 27 cents per bushel, can be delivered at Montreal for 15 cents and at Quebec for 18 cents per bushel. Now, Sir, if we compare the cost of the insurance and commission, the advantage in the Ottawa route to the trade of the western States may be seen by a reference to the comparative cost of transporting a bushel of wheat from Chicago to Liverpool *via* Buffalo and New York, as contrasted with the cost of the same *via* Ottawa and Montreal. Cost of average cost of lake freight to Buffalo on a bushel of wheat, 10¾ cents; from Buffalo to New York 15¾ cents; insurance from Chicago to New York 2½ cents; weighing, brokerage, stamp duty, etc., 1 cent. It is unnecessary, however, to go further in enumerating each item of cost. The chief difference between the route *via* Buffalo and New York, and the route *via* Montreal and Ottawa would be in commission and insurance. The total cost to Liverpool from Chicago *via* Buffalo and New York would be 71 cents; while *via* Ottawa and Montreal it would be 53½ cents, making a difference in favor of Ottawa and Montreal route of 17½ cents. The importance of the Ottawa River should not be overlooked. It is 780 miles in length, draining an area of 88,000 square miles, or one-fourth of the whole Provinces of Quebec and Ontario. Its course for 305 miles above the city of Montreal to the confluence of the Mattawa River is nearly due west, and a straight line drawn from thence to the centre of the Straits of Mackinac would clearly define its course. The estimates that have been submitted by the hon. gentleman who proposed the motion differ considerably from that proposed by Mr. Shanly for the improvement of the Ottawa River route, which was $24,000,000; and the cost estimated by Mr. Clark, was $16,000,000. Mr. Shanly, however, states:

"My original estimate was for a propeller navigation lock, 250 x 50 feet; depth of water 10 feet, and as the report shows, was based on very liberal prices for all classes of work, with a view to covering every unforeseen contingency that might possibly arise in carrying out an undertaking of such vast magnitude. It amounted in gross to $24 000,000. Deducting the lowest above estimated difference, $8,000,000, and we have $16,000,000 as to the probable cost of a large barge navigation, such as contemplated in the question submitted to me by the sub-committee, but still having locks of the dimensions originally designed, so that when the larger project shall have become a commercial necessity, it can be attained without the sacrifice of any costly works."

It will now be argued that the cost of labor has very much increased, but when we take into consideration the advantages that we now have, in the shape of drilling by steam, and the appliances that may be used on the Ottawa River in removing shoals and rock sediment in the bed of the river, I think this estimate may fairly be considered a safe one, of the cost of improving the Ottawa. Mr. Shanly goes on to say:

"I have now completed my sketch of the various waters which form the several links of the Ottawa and French River navigation; but there still remain for discussion three important questions—supply, capacity and cost—ere a final opinion can be pronounced on the practicability of so great a project."

It seems to have been a question in Mr. Shanly's mind as to whether they could produce a sufficient quantity of water at the summit of the lock to enable them to have sufficient lockage, making calculations for a much increased trade, or calculating upon carrying all the western trade this way. He seems at one time to have been undecided as to whether the prospects of this route were not greatly endangered by these circumstances; but he goes on to say:

"Lake Nipissing is 23 feet lower than Trout Lake—the summit. I propose, by means of dams thrown across its outlets, to raise it to the latter level, and thus at once increase the storage capacity of the summit reservoir from 12 to upwards of 300 square miles. In speaking of the Chaudière outlet of Lake Nipissing into the French River, I have said

that the passage is through a narrow channel, between lofty walls of rock, resembling a combination of mighty locks, from which the pent-up waters have swept out the gates. The other two outlets are of similar formation, presenting great facilities for the construction of dams to any required height. In this way the water can be raised 25 feet above its natural level, and an inexhaustib e supply obtained to feed both ways from the summit; for even setting side the enormous storage capacity of its immense area, the accession of water which Lake Nipissing receives from its many tributaries is ample to guarantee a sufficiency from whatever draughts may be made upon it for any possible purposes of lockage in the most distant future. The raising of Lake Nipissing would reduce the actual canalling between it and Trout Lake to less than half what would be required were the latter body of water capable of furnishing the necessary supply, and as the cost of one mile of canal would be more than that of all the dams together, it follows that the cost of the whole work on the plan proposed will be considerably less than if the supply were drawn from the natural summit."

Having solved the question of intercommunication between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, Canada now finds herself face to face with the problem of internal navigation *via* the great lakes and rivers between the fertile Provinces and the seaboard. Seven years ago those territories raised sufficient cereals to feed their population, but the last season it is reported that a surplus of 6,000,000 bushels, equal to 150,000 tons, is added to the rapidly increasing freight and mercantile development of Canada. Such rapid expansions will soon place this question of freight transport to the seaboard beyond the power of railways or existing lines of internal navigation, and as the great national enterprise, the Canadian Pacific Railway, is approaching completion, an additional stimulus to increase production will be given, so that it would be no unwarrantable assumption to state that this traffic alone will furnish 1,000,000 tons of freight before the end of the present decade. It is obviously a present necessity to prepare sufficient means of transport in order that the resources of the North-West may be developed *parri passu* with the increase of population. The tendency of commerce to concentrate in one great centre the various products of the adjacent territory will make Winnipeg what Chicago is to the United States, the great grain centre, a market of the North-West; from thence it must pass by rail to Fort Churchill on the Hudson Bay, or to Prince Arthur's Landing, at the head of Lake Superior. A traffic of this description cannot be passed to the seaboard by an all-rail route—1,000,000 tons would require 5,000 trains, at 5 miles per hour, running time 12½ days between Winnipeg and Montreal, a distance of 1,500 miles, for each train—and assuming that 12 trains per day could be forwarded, the time necessary to transport the given amount to the seaboard would be 420 days. Moreover, it is assumed that every movement should be made into mathematical precision; one break-down, and the road was blocked indefinitely. This brings the problem down to the consideration of internal navigation as the only sure means of effecting the distribution of the surplus grain crop in one season of ninety days. At present there is only one route available for this purpose—rail from Winnipeg to Prince Arthur's Landing, 426 miles. Great lakes, St. Lawrence River and canals to Montreal, 1,290 miles; thence to Liverpool, 2,770 miles; total, 4,476 miles; time, railway, at five miles per hour, eighty-five hours; lakes, river and canals to Montreal, at eight miles per hour, 161 hours; total, ten days and six hours. There is the route from Prince Arthur's Landing *viâ* Lake Superior, Georgian Bay, French, Mattawa and Ottawa Rivers to Montreal, the distance on railway, 426 miles; lakes, 470; river and canals, 430; Liverpool, 2,770; total, 4,096 miles. It is thus 300 miles shorter than the lakes, Welland and St. Lawrence canals, and as their grain is in our inland waters it gives the command of time, which is the most essential consideration, to this route. As time is necessarily the test of value of all these routes, that on the St Lawrence in detail will be as follows:—Lakes and river, 1,240 miles, at the rate of eight miles per hour, 155 hours; canals, fifty miles, at two miles per hour, twenty-five hours; lockage, 560 feet, at 1 foot per minute, 9⅓ hours; total 189⅓ hours from Prince Arthur's Landing to Montreal. Ottawa route, lakes and rivers, 900 miles, at eight miles per hour, 112½; lockage, 660 feet, at 1 foot per minute, eleven hours; total, 123½ hours from Prince Arthur's Landing to Montreal; difference in favor of this route, 65,983, or one third of the time by the St. Lawrence. The capacity of each route being equal, that by the Ottawa could accommodate two-thirds of the freight and transport it in two-thirds of the time. The following extract will show what the traffic in cereals is now in the south-western States, and what it is likely to become in the north-western Provinces, emphatically the wheat-producing areas in this continent:—

"WASHINGTON, March 10.—The Department of Agriculture reports that 37½ per cent. of the last crop of corn remains in farmers' hands, against 33 per cent. on the 1st of March, 1884. The supply in farmers' hands is 675,000,000 bushels. The proportion of merchantable corn is very large, 87 per cent., against an average of 80 for a period of years, and 60 last year. Wheat in farmers' hands is about 33 per cent. of the crop, 169,000,000 bushels, an increase of 50,000,000 over last March. The quality is above the average, except in Illinois and Missouri."

Hon. members will doubtless remember that last year the Minister of Railways, now High Commissioner in England, made a statement in this House, showing the basis on which he made a prediction as to the amount of freight which might be expected to be carried from the North-West. He said:

"But I may say that I believe there are few members of this House, much as our attention has been turned to the development of the North-West, who have begun to contemplate in all its fulness what the capabilities of that great country are. I have spoken of its enormous extent, of the unexampled fertility of the soil, of the splendid description of wheat that can only be produced in these more northern and colder climes. But let me just ask the attention of the House for a single moment to a few figures which will indicate what the capabilities of that country are in regard to the production of wheat. One hundred thousand farmers, each farmer cultivating 320 acres of wheat land—has any hon. member made the calculation of what they would produce?

"Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

"Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I am glad the hon. gentleman has done so. I am glad his attention has been drawn to the fact that one hundred thousand farmers, cultivating 320 acres each, or two hundred thousand farmers, cultivating half that quantity each, and taking the product at only 20 bushels to the acre, instead of 27 or 30, which is the average in the North-West in favorable years, would give 640,000,000 bushels of wheat, or 50 per cent. more wheat than the whole United States produces to-day. You have only to look at those figures for a single moment to see what the future of Canada is, to see what a magnificent granery for the whole world is placed in our Canadian North-West; and when you remember we have six belts running through that fertile country, that would each give 320 acres each to one hundred thousand farmers, you can understand to some little degree what a magnificent future awaits us in the development of that great country."

I desire also to call the attention of the House for a few moments to the statistics of the lumbering trade. This trade is annually increasing. The cut of our mills in the Ottawa district has been increasing since 1881. The following is a statement of the quantity and value of planks and boards exported from the port of Ottawa to the United States during each year, from 1881 to 1884 respectively:

Year.	Quantity. M. feet.	Value. $
1881	173,772	1,956,314
1882	164,055	2,202,229
1883	159,539	2,312,331
1884	169,078	2,381,718

The amount of sawn lumber in the Ottawa River mills, during the season of 1884, is estimated at 450,000,000 feet, board measure, as compared with 300,000,000 feet in 1870. I hold in my hand a statement of the number of pieces of timber and saw logs that passed through the Government slides and booms on the river Ottawa and its tributaries from 1870 to 1883-84. I shall not trouble the House by reading all the figures, but will confine myself to stating that the number of saw logs

last year was 2,943,804, as compared with 3,550,698 in 1882-83. I have also a statement of the square timber; but as all this timber is shipped to the Quebec market, and as the trade for the last two years has been depressed, and the quantity has consequently been very much reduced, I think it is unnecessary to read the statistics. In conclusion, my humble opinion is that if the Government are not in a position to express an opinion as to when they will be able to take up this great question of the improvement of the Ottawa River, still it would be well to have surveys made of the whole river. The surveys as they stand at present will merely act as a guide, they having been made some years ago, and the channel of the river having very much changed during that period, and very many improvements having been made. If the Government are disposed to take up the question, a small sum should be placed in the Estimates, to enable the Government to have a proper survey of the whole river made. Then, if the Government should decide to take up this matter, I have no doubt, from the remarks made by the mover of this resolution and by others, that there are a sufficient number of gentlemen on the other side of the line who would be only too glad to take hold of the enterprise if a subsidy were granted, as has been suggested.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. COCKBURN. I desire to say a few words on this subject, as it is one in which I have taken some interest, so much so that in 1873 I put a notice on the Paper with respect to it. Some time ago a Mr. Plummer, who took a great interest in this scheme, wrote a letter to the *Citizen*, in which he proposed to the Minister of Railways and Canals to get up a company to carry on this work, on condition of receiving a grant of land. He was very enthusiastic in the matter, and he wrote a lengthy letter, from which I will read a few extracts, while those who take an interest in the matter and may wish to read the whole letter may have an opportunity of doing so in *Hansard*. It is true, as Mr. Plummer stated, that the Ottawa ship canal is on a direct line to the great west, the mouth of the French River being directly in line with the Strait of Mackinaw, so that the scheme would appear unobjectionable with regard to the directness of line. There is one part of Mr. Shanly's report that is nothing short of absurd—I mean that part in which he suggests the raising of the waters of Lake Nipissing about 23 feet; for if you would raise the waters of that lake 12 feet, the result would be to lay some 30 miles of the Canadian Pacific Railway under water altogether. There is no doubt, however, that the construction of this canal would be a great advantage to lumbermen and to carriers generally. Mr. Plummer says, in his letter, after referring to some figures:

> With these figures and facts in my possession, I propose to deal, and I am very much mistaken if the people of Canada do not decide that they have already waited long enough for the opening of one of the greatest thoroughfares the world ever saw.

I may mention, in this connection, that the average time of open navigation on Lake Nipissing is 210 days. As to the means for constructing this work, Mr. Plummer makes the following suggestion:—

> "The manner I would suggest for its construction would be this: The Government to set apart a certain amount of land in the North-West, for the express purpose of opening up and improving the route, in such a manner as the facts will warrant; and they appoint a committee, whose duty it shall be to make terms with some good and responsible parties, composed in part of Americans and Canadians."

He also describes his work as:

> "A work that, in my opinion, shall eclipse all others of a like nature on this continent, and rank as an undertaking worthy of the nineteenth century."

While saying this much with respect to the Ottawa Canal, I may say that I am a supporter of another canal scheme which has made important progress, and is in a more advanced state; I refer to the Trent Valley Canal, a scheme which has already been undertaken by the Government, so that, while it is advisable to keep the other scheme alive, I wish to say that my present constituents are much more interested in the Trent Valley Canal than in the other scheme. As, however, the Government are already committed to the construction of the Trent Valley Canal, and as a failure to prosecute that work would be a breach of faith to some twenty constituencies in the country, there can be no danger in referring to the newer scheme, especially as I feel interested in all these great waterways. The country expects that the Dominion Government will carry on the Trent Valley scheme, but at the same time there is no rivalry between the two schemes, and the Ottawa canal must commend itself for its directness, especially to the people of the United States. The country will have to find the money to build the Trent Valley, and as I do not suppose our finances are in such a position that we could undertake the other work, I think a scheme such as Mr. Plummer suggested, involving a grant of land might be considered. I know that the popularity of the canals has passed away, to a certain extent, but I think it is important to the country that these canals should not be lost sight of entirely, and particularly the Trent Valley Canal, which is to be carried through by votes of money, while the other, as I have said, might be carried out on the basis mentioned by our American friends, namely, by a grant of land:

> "THE OTTAWA SHIP CANAL.
>
> "*Editor of the Citizen:*
>
> "SIR,—I wish to call your attention to a very important subject, and one which I am sure will interest the people of the Ottawa valley. I refer, Sir, to the carrying trade of the great North-West and the proposed opening up of the Ottawa River ship canal. But first of all, let us secure a map of the route proposed to be traversed and the country to be benefited. For instance, starting at Montreal, passing up the Ottawa River to Ottawa city, a distance of 110 miles, by river, already improved to 9 feet, thence up the Ottawa to the Mattawa, a total distance of 305 miles above Montreal; thence up the Mattawa to the east end of Nipissing, a distance of 44½ miles; thence through Nipissing and down to French River to Georgian Bay, 80 miles, a total distance from Montreal of 429½ miles.
>
> "Now, let us again return to Montreal and follow the St. Lawrence through its various canals, through Lake Ontario, the Welland Canal, through Lake Erie to its head, a distance of 607 miles, including 70 miles of canals; thence due north 346 miles, a total of 953 miles, as against 430 by the Ottawa route.
>
> "With these figures and the facts in my possession I propose to deal, and I am very much mistaken if the people of Canada do not decide that they have already waited long enough for the opening of one of the greatest thoroughfares the world ever saw.
>
> "With a total rise to the summit of 642 feet in 350 miles, thence a fall of 83 feet to the Georgian Bay, or about 1⅞ feet to the mile, with 29 miles of canal, with 69 locks, with a depth of water in the rivers and lakes of from 15 to 20 feet, enabling us to pass through without breaking bulk the largest vessels now navigating the great lakes.
>
> "Allowing, as I believe, English bottoms to unload at the docks in Chicago, or from Chicago to Liverpool without breaking bulk—let me assure you that by this route, standing upon the docks in Chicago, you are but 27 miles further from Liverpool than from New York, saving over the American route, *via* Buffalo and the Erie Canal, 1,392 miles, or a saving in time equal to a return trip as against the arrival in Liverpool by the American route. Astounding as these assertions may seem, they are backed up by the best judgment and engineering skill this continent affords.
>
> "Such is the opinion of Walter Shanly, who, while he differs with me as to a ship canal, gave it as his opinion that it could be made the finest barge route of the world, capable of accommodating the entire traffic of the great lakes, causing but one transfer, and that at Montreal.
>
> "By this route we will be enabled to secure the cattle of the great North-West, as we avoid the dangers of the three great lakes, Huron, Erie and Ontario. Keeping land locked and having 1,500 miles more of smooth water than by the American route, and 550 miles more than the St. Lawrence and Welland, being but 1,714 miles of ocean as against 3,633 from New York.
>
> "Again, I expect to bid for the conveying of coal from the mines of Nova Scotia, to aid in opening up the vast mineral deposits of Lake Superior region, whose hidden wealth, in my opinion, is second to none on this continent—to say nothing of the almost inexhaustible supply of timber regions to be immediately benefited by this great work.

"And right here I wish to say that this is not a political scheme, sprung upon the people to catch votes, and in the interest of any particular party, as the present advocate is an American, with no wish or desire to aid or advance any particular interest, but simply to urge upon the Dominion Government the opening of this route, a work that, in my opinion, shall eclipse all others of a like nature on this continent, and rank as an undertaking worthy of the nineteenth century. The manner I would suggest for its construction would be this: The Dominion Government to set apart a certain amount of land in the North-West for the express purpose of opening up and improving the route in such a manner as the facts will warrant; that they appoint a committee, whose duty shall be to make terms with some good and responsible parties, composed in part of Canadians and part Americans, or either, for the completion of this great work, and when so completed to make over to them said lands, together with the improvements herein mentioned, subject, however, to such restrictions and regulations as the Dominion Government may impose as to the working and operation of the same. With these suggestions, I would urge upon the Dominion and upon every Canadian that they individually give the scheme their most earnest attention.

"Information as to the survey may be found in a report of the Commissioner of Public Works for the year ending 30th June, 1867, also Sessional Papers 17 to 24, Clark's "Survey of the Ottawa." With these remarks, Sir, I close this, to me, very important matter.

"Yours truly,

"C. H. PLUMMER,
"Saginaw, Michigan.

"Windsor Hotel,
"16th March, 1882."

Mr. DAWSON. In this era of railways, it is hardly to be supposed that a projected canal will attract much attention, but this canal, which has been brought to the attention of the House by my hon. friend from North Renfrew (Mr. White), is certainly one of the grandest and most important works ever thought of in this Dominion. It is a work which, if carried out, would change the face of the country, and would be the means, I have no doubt, of adding very greatly to its trade. It would bring the trade of the North-West to our doors, and the trade of Chicago. The hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Cockburn), who has just spoken, has referred to a gentleman who interested himself in this scheme a few years ago. I remember that he came here accredited to us by the Governor of Michigan and other people high in position there, about two years ago, and he had a project for the opening up of this great canal, in the interests of the people of Chicago and other people in that direction. He had statistics to show that the traffic which would pass through it would be something immense. Now, Sir, since Mr. Shanly, whose report has been quoted in this connection made a survey of that country, the circumstances have very much changed—the conditions of navigating the great lakes have changed. We now use much larger vessels than we did then, and it is nothing unusual to see vessels approaching 300 feet keel, with auxiliary steam—great four-masted schooners drawing 16 feet of water. The canal which he proposed would not admit of these vessels passing through it; still, I think, a scheme of navigation could be carried out which would meet the requirements of the country, without our embarking in such a stupendous work as would be necessary in order to accommodate such vessels as now navigate the great lakes. It would be quite possible to construct the canal as far as Lake Nipissing, which is only about 55 feet above the level of Lake Huron, and to make it of a size and depth sufficient to accommodate such vessels. These great vessels could go as far as Lake Nipissing, the eastern end of which is, I think, 250 miles from Ottawa. Then, you would have these huge lake vessels coming within 250 miles of Ottawa; and the question would arise, what would be the best system of navigation between that point and Montreal or Quebec? I should suppose that a canal of moderate dimensions would be the best. The navigation would be of that nature, that is called in the United States slack water navigation. There would be a series of lakes connected at short intervals by short canals. This system could be so arranged as to admit vessels of moderate draught. Mr. Shanly's estimate was for a canal 10 feet in depth, the construction of which he considered would cost $24,000,000. A depth of 2 feet, more or less, means a difference of $5,000,000, according to his estimate. Now, a canal of the depth of 8 feet on the sills would, in my opinion, meet the requirements of the case. You would have to employ different vessels. You would have to break bulk at Lake Nipissing; and from that point to Montreal the wheat could be carried in barges, such as are to be found in the river at Ottawa. In view of all the facts, I consider the scheme quite practicable, and one which, if carried out, would be of immense advantage to the country. As to the traffic which such a canal would have, it is impossible to estimate it, when you consider the vast extent of prairie country lying to the west of Duluth, and when you consider the extent of the trade of that country in wheat already. It is only ten or twelve years since the country, immediately to the west of Duluth began to settle up; and in the beautiful valley of the Red River itself, which is 300 miles long, including the portion on the Canadian side of the boundary and the portion on the United States side, there is not a single acre that is not susceptible of cultivation; and not only so, but it is the richest soil in the world. You can easily consider what an enormous quantity of wheat 30,000 square miles of fertile country like that would produce every year, without taking into consideration a much greater extent of country to the west and north of that, in our own prairie regions and in the prairie regions of the United States. But it may be said that the wheat of the United States would pass by way of Chicago, and would not come this way. Well, I have a statement of the quantity of wheat shipped at Duluth last fall, and I shall read it to the House:

"Duluth wheat receipts were, in 1884, 14,000,000 bushels, and shipments, 11,447,449 bushels of wheat. Shipments of flour, in 1884, were about 1,000,000 barrels, which, reduced to wheat, at 4½ bushels to the barrel, would make 4,500,000 bushels, which, added to wheat shipments above given, would make a total of 15,947,499 bushels that Duluth has furnished an outlet for in 1884. This exceeds Chicago, or any other lake port, for the same time. In 1884 the departures were 902, without counting tugs, making a total tonnage standard of 594,235 tons. In 1880 the arrivals were 524, and tonnage 302,865.

"These figures are significant in more ways than one. In the first place, they show that, as the prairies to the west fill up with settlement, the trade of Duluth increases in a corresponding ratio; and, in the next, they demonstrate the very interesting fact, that railways cannot wholly, or to any overwhelming extent, divert the carriage of grain from such navigation as is presented by the great lakes. From Fargo, which lies 250 miles west of Duluth, to Chicago, the railways afford facilities for transportation that are not surpassed by any similar means of conveyance on the continent; and yet a great portion of the grain produced in the regions traversed by these railways, to the westward of Duluth, finds its way to Duluth, to be there shipped and carried by water, in some cases all the way, and in others a great part of the way to its destination."

Now, these countries to the west are developing rapidly, and the quantities of wheat that they will be able to export in a few years are beyond computation. The scheme now proposed could not, I think, in any way interfere with the Canadian Pacific Railway, or deprive it of any of its carrying trade. On the contrary, I think it would be the means of bringing traffic to that railway from the other side of the lakes. I would be sorry to advocate any scheme which would diminish the traffic on that great national work, to which the country is pledged, and which has already cost so much. Another canal which has been advocated for the western trade is the Huron and Ontario ship canal; but that project has, I think, been given up, to a great extent, as it has been found to be impracticable. The Trent Valley Canal would, no doubt, be a useful work, but it would be on too diminutive a scale for the traffic of the great lakes. Of all the schemes which have been proposed, I think the present one is the best. I do not advocate its immediate adoption, but I think it should be kept in view as one of the great works of the country, which is to form one of the future avenues of the trade of the North-West. But, in the meantime, and I hardly imagine the people of the Ottawa region, or even the people of the lakes, expect, with the great works which the Government has now in

hand, that this work should be immediately undertaken; but I think that they might all reasonably expect, if circumstances allow, and the Government be able to do it, that a comprehensive series of surveys may be made, which will enable a proper estimate to be arrived at.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I am sure the House was glad to have had an opportunity of hearing the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Cockburn) give us the benefit of his practical experience and knowledge of navigation at Lake Nipissing, and the Ottawa waters, as affecting the question which the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) has brought before the House. The question is a very important one, no doubt, but probably one in the remote future, as the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) rather indicated by his remarks he was bound to admit that it was; but there was one statement made by the hon. member for North Ontario which attracted my attention particularly, and it was this. As I understood his statement, Mr. Shanly reported it would be necessary to raise the water of Lake Nipissing a height of 23 feet, in order to make a canal of 10 feet depth of water practicable, and my hon. friend followed that with the statement that to raise the waters of Lake Nipissing a height of 12 feet would put thirty miles of Canadian Pacific Railway track under water. If I understood my hon. friend aright, and these are the facts, it shows that the whole sheme, at the present, at any rate, is completely impracticable. I do not know if this is the true result, and I am sorry to see that my hon. friend is not in his place, but if I am not mistaken he made those statements in reference to the matter. The project indicated by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) is to make the canal from French River to Lake Nipissing for lake-going vessels which shall there tranship their cargoes, to be carried thence in barges to the head of eastern navigation. I do not know whether, as part of that scheme, it would be necessary to make Lake Nipissing navigable for those large vessels; if it would, probably the same difficulty would arise as that pointed out by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Cockburn). I am glad that hon. gentleman, interested, as I understand he largely is, in navigation matters on Lake Nipissing, did not loose sight of that project in which his constituents, as well as mine, are so very largely and vitally interested—I mean the Trent navigation works. His constituency as well as mine is much interested in that work, and of course any opposition works, such as the Ottawa River canal, would naturally come in direct competition with it. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) has, I think, rather decried the Trent navigation works by saying that they are altogether too diminutive in their aspect for the great trade of the west. All that is intended by the Trent navigation works is to make a barge canal, a canal of 6 feet depth of water, adequate for the passage of barges, the scheme being that the vessels should tranship their grain cargoes, as they can now readily, by the use of elevators, at the Georgian Bay, into barges which will pass through without breaking bulk, as they would be able to do by the Trent navigation system, to Montreal, where the grain cargoes could be again shipped into the ocean-going vessels by the use of floating elevators. A canal of that kind, which would certainly carry the grain by the shortest and the most expeditious route, through the heart of Canada, and developing, as it would, the lumbering and other commercial interests of the centre of the Province of Ontario, is a work which would secure to us many and great advantages, and probably, within our lifetime, at any rate, would be quite adequate for supplying all the wants of the trade of the North-West and the western States, added to the other routes for carriage of those products, such as the Welland Canal, upon which we have spent and are spending so much money, and which will, undoubtedly, for many years, be the highway for these large 14 feet draught of water vessels, of which the hon. member for Algoma has spoken. I trust that in this larger project now submitted, a project I think which, if ever considered at all, will only be considered in the remote future, of a ship canal from Georgian Bay to the head of navigation at Montreal, the more important and more immediate, and I think I may safely say the more practicable and useful scheme of the completion of the Trent navigation canal will not be lost sight of.

Mr. TASSE. I fully concur in the views expressed by the mover and seconder of this resolution. The scheme, now before us is a great scheme, an important scheme, one of the greatest, one of the most important ever submitted to this Parliament. If carried out—and it will be carried out, because it is vital to our national interests—it will create a revolution in the trade of this country, aye, in the trade of this continent. Many years ago an American statesman, the founder of the Democratic party, predicted that "the west was the future." That future has been reached; it is the present for the United States. And we, also, shall see the day when our own west shall become, if not the ruling power, the great factor in our destinies. Since the prediction of Jefferson, territories have been organized, States have been created, some doubling their population in ten years; cities and towns have sprung up as if by magic, and to-day the richest and the most populous portion of the Republic lies on the western side of the Alleghanies. The producing power of this region has been developed to an unparalleled degree—to such a degree that it has not only disturbed and, even, controlled the markets of the old world, to such an extent indeed that, notwithstanding the wonted energy of our neighbors, their own means of transportation for the surplus products have proved insufficient. Such a result is astounding, when we consider that there are more railways in the United States than on the whole continent of Europe; that more than seven thousand millions of dollars have been spent on the construction of railways and canals; that the Erie Canal alone has absorbed more than sixty million dollars; and that the largest percentage of railway mileage is to be found in the western States. In 1883, out of a total of 120,552 miles of railroad, the western States could claim 70,345 miles—considerably more than one-half—built at the enormous cost of $3,441,141,046. Sir, the trade of the west is assuming the most gigantic proportions, and its importance cannot be over-rated. One may judge of its ever increasing volume in comparing the exports of grain and breadstuffs from the United States during thirty years. In 1850 the value was estimated at $13,066,509; in 1860, at $24,422,320; in 1870, at $72,250,933, and in 1880, at $288,036,835. Quadrupling the export of grain in a single decade was a stupendous leap. It is true that the year 1880, owing to exceptional causes, witnessed the largest export of cereals, but the quantity is still enormous, representing a money value of more than $208,040,000 in the year 1883. It is not surprising that we have contended strenuously for a portion of that great and growing traffic. We have offered a shorter route to the ocean, the great route of the St. Lawrence, the great natural outlet of the upper lakes. Sir, we are all proud of the St. Lawrence, whether we live or not on its banks. That noble river is the Mississippi of Canada. It was truly depicted by the eloquent Joseph Howe when he said: "Take the Italian's Po, the Frenchman's Rhone, the Englishman's Thames, the German's Rhine and the Spaniard's Tagus, and roll them all into one channel, and you then only have a stream equal to the St. Lawrence." Forty millions of dollars have already been spent by the Canadian people on improving this route of the St. Lawrence, and no one will grudge the additional millions required to make our great highway not only equal but superior to any

American route. We have just enlarged the Welland Canal, our great link between Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, and it can now accommodate boats of 1,500 tons, having a carrying capacity of 60,000 bushels; this is a most important result, the tendency in the construction of vessels being to increase their tonnage. Twenty years ago they did not carry more than 30,000 bushels, whilst now there are boats on the lakes which can transport 80,000 bushels. The larger the ship the lesser the freight. We have also enlarged the Lachine Canal at the other end to a navigable depth of 14 feet, but common sense tells us that the intervening section must have a corresponding depth of water, that we must have a uniform system, as far as the St. Lawrence and Welland canals are concerned. So long as these canals are not enlarged, and a great effort should be made in that direction. I apprehend we are building up Oswego and Ogdensburg in bringing to them vessels of 1,500 tons from the lakes, to the prejudice of our Canadian ports. When the whole route is opened to its fullest capacity propellers having cargoes of 50,000 or 60,000 bushels could descend from the lakes to Montreal or Quebec, or proceed to Halifax, without breaking bulk. This would be a great, a glorious result for Canada. From the foregoing remarks, it will be seen that no one recognises more fully than I do the importance of the St. Lawrence for the carrying trade of the west. But, however valuable it may be, there is a route which in many respects outrivals even its great advantages. That route was for a long time our only communication with the west. It was followed by Champlain, when he, the first white, planted the flag of civilisation on the shores of Lake Huron in 1615; it was followed by Lasalle when he left Lachine in search of another and greater *Chine* which he could not reach; it was followed by our first missionaries, by our first traders and voyageurs, when fur formed the staple trade. As it has already been explained, it would unite the ocean navigation at Montreal with Lake Huron. Its length would comprise 430 miles, distributed as follows: French River, forty-nine miles, Lake Nipissing, thirty miles, Mattawa river, forty-six, and the Ottawa river, 305 miles. Trade follows the safest, the shortest, and the cheapest route. This is one of the first laws which it obeys. It knows no frontier, no country, no nationality. It may have preferences, but not to its detriment. If this contention be undisputed, then those who advocate the construction of the Ottawa ship canal have established their case on the soundest possible basis. As it has been already demonstrated, the route of the Ottawa is the shortest communication between tidewater and the lakes. Taking Chicago as the point of embarkment, and Montreal or New York as the destination, the Ottawa route is 270 miles shorter than the St. Lawrence and 338 miles shorter than by the Erie Canal. And if, instead of Montreal or New York, we take Liverpool as the terminal point, the distance by the Erie is 4,983 miles, and by the Ottawa 4,207—a difference of 776 miles in favor of the Ottawa, or of more than 1,500 miles for a complete trip. Such is the superiority of the Ottawa ship canal that it is also, by 150 miles, the shortest route between the west and the New England States. And this is no mean advantage, for a great portion of the products of the west is transhipped to those States for home consumption. Besides, the journey would be shortened by the fact that the length of canal on the Ottawa and French riverr, would be but one-sixth of that on the New York route, and 20 per cent. less than on the Welland and St. Lawrence. The Ottawa follows a more northern route, and its cool waters are thus better adapted than those of the Erie or the Mississippi for the carriage of grain. It would open later and close earlier than the St Lawrence. But as there would be a saving of four days on each complete trip from Chicago to Montreal, the difference would be more than compensated.

The Ottawa is also the safest route. It would save 600 miles of lake navigation, a navigation full of risks and dangers. The cost of transportation would be thus reduced, not only by the shortening of the distance at least 10 per cent., but also by the diminished rates of insurance, which can fairly be put at 30 per cent. less. To realise how dangerous is the navigation on the lakes, let me submit the following figures relating to the wrecks and casualties thereon to American merchant vessels, from 1875 to 1883:

Year.	Number.	Tonnage.	Total Loss.	Partial Loss.	Lives Lost.
1875	515	150,297	...	....	69
1876	509	158,873	51	458	94
1877	288	99,286	39	249	50
1878	464	143,837	63	402	63
1879	391	130,171	33	358	48
1880	547	207,318	48	499	76
1881	533	189,000	56	477	109
1882	490	184,720	34	456	78
1883	453	175,940	46	407	100
	4,191	1,439,449	370	3,306	747

Lest the very great losses shown by these figures should raise a suspicion of exaggeration, I may say that they are taken from the Life Saving Report, published at Washington. I regret that our statistics are so incomplete that I do not care to give the figures representing Canadian losses during the same period. The Ottawa route presents another feature of great consequence. One of the disadvantages against which the St. Lawrence has to contend is the absence or the insufficiency of return freights. Such a trade is a prime necessity to shipping. With this route the boats, laden with grain or minerals, could return to Chicago, Duluth, Port Arthur and other ports with a cargo of sawed lumber, for which there is an inexhaustible demand in that region. Better prices and an additional market would be thus secured for our lumber, the importance of which as an export article is only excelled by agriculture. We all know that Chicago is the greatest centre of distribution, not only for grain and live stock, but also for lumber. During the year 1883 it received by lake and by rail 1,909,910,000 feet of lumber, of which more than 1,065,000,000 were reshipped, the railroads receiving $4,000,000 and the ship owners $3,000,000. A large portion is dressed and manufactured in the city, representing, for that year, about $12,000,000. In 1862 the quantity forwarded did not exceed 189,277,079 feet—which shows what expansion that branch of the Chicago trade has assumed. While on the subject, let me observe that the magnificent pineries of the lumber-producing States of the West—Michigan, Wisconsin and Minnesota—are fast disappearing. Thirty years ago the northern peninsula of Michigan contained a quantity of 150,000,000,000 feet, whilst it was reduced, in 1880—the whole State included—to 35,000,000,000 feet. So rapid is the extinction of those forests that Mr. Charles S. Sarjent, who prepared the report on the forests of North America for the last American census, comes to the conclusion that the west must soon depend for building material upon the more remote pine forests of the Gulf region or those of the Pacific coasts. I may here mention, incidentally, that the prospect foreshadowed in the last volume of the United States census should not be lost sight of by the limit holders of Canada. Mr. Speaker, if the Ottawa has not the magnitude of the St. Lawrence, it is second in importance only to that noble river. It has a course of about 750 miles, a great number of tributaries, and drains an area of nearly 80,000 square miles—an area as large as that of all the Maritime Provinces, or the whole New England States. That region contains millions of acres of fertile land, notably on the shores of Lake Temiscamingue, which would be opened to cultivation. The falls of the river are renowned throughout the world, and they can supply more motive power than is actually employed on the entire continent. Manufactories would

rise all along the watercourse, and mills would be erected to grind the grain and prepare it for the foreign market. The valley of the Ottawa would become one of the great manufacturing districts of America, and this city, which is already a great railroad centre, a great industrial centre, would reach the highest rank, thus fully justifying the choice made of her as our political metropolis. At the entrance of French River, where a safe and deep harbor has been found, another Buffalo would rise in a few years. In a word, the Ottawa canal would produce for this region the wonders which the Erie Canal has realized in the State of New York, where it has built almost a continuous city, with its suburbs, from the Hudson to her western border. Its benefitting influence would also affect, to a high degree, the city of Montreal, from which most of our grain is shipped to Europe or to the lower Provinces. A leading paper of Milwaukee, having discussed thoroughly the subject, did not hesitate to assert that with such a route Montreal would supplant New York as a shipping port for the grain trade. Instead of increasing, however, the export trade of Montreal has been declining steadily during the last four years, owing to various causes, which, it is true, were not all under our control. Whatever may have been those causes, the following figures, which cover fourteen years, are full of significance and demostrate how pressing, how important it is to increase our means of transportation :

Year.	Bushels.
1870	13,601,310
1871	16,186,484
1872	17,522,957
1873	17,912,572
1874	16,739,580
1875	15,363,184
1876	18,167,642
1877	17,346,678
1878	20,899,187
1879	22,755,946
1880	27,200,905
1881	18,567,360
1882	14,878,923
1883	9,781,001
1884	7,421,152

Sir, we have not reached yet the millenium. Mr. Gladstone dreamed once of universal peace, of the settlement of all international difficulties by arbitration, but unfortunately it was a mere dream. To-day the clouds of war are hanging in almost every sky, and, unfortunately we have not escaped this universal alarm. I hope that our neighbors have given up the aggressive spirit which they exhibited on two solemn occasions, and which it was our duty, our patriotic duty, to resist triumphantly. I hope they have ceased to cherish the idea of a so-called manifest destiny, by which the American Eagle's wings would overshadow the whole continent. But whatever may be their present aspirations, we should not fail to provide for the future. *Si vis pacem para bellum.* In a case of war, the St. Lawrence could not protect us, and our boats could be blown up without the enemy setting foot on our soil. On the contrary, the Ottawa, running through the heart of the country, would be a safeguard of our trade, furnish a safe basis of supplies, and offer a line of defence practically unapproachable. Its military advantages have already been recognized by the Imperial authorities, the Grenville Canal, the Carillon Canal, not to speak of the Rideau Canal, having been built by them in the first place. The Ottawa route would be in reality the national route, the St. Lawrence, on its upper course, as well as the great lakes, being half American. The Welland Canal is as much suited to American as to Canadian interests, as long as the canals of the St. Lawrence are not properly enlarged, whilst the Ottawa belongs as much to Ontario as to Quebec, and is a thoroughly Canadian waterway. Mr. Speaker, as long as our domains in the west were not open to cultivation, the construction of the Ottawa ship canal could, perhaps, be delayed, however profitable it might have been to divert the trade of the American west to our seaboard. But now that we have a western country, susceptible of indefinite expansion, of illimitable possibilities, a country superior in extent and agricultural wealth to that of the United States, a country which contains three-fourths of the wheat-producing area of the continent; now that we shall have several millions of bushels of wheat to export annually, the best, the hardest wheat in the world, this enterprise becomes almost an immediate necessity. It is true, we shall have the Pacific railway to transport our cereals but this exit will not be sufficient. Our neighbors have already built three grand trunk lines across the continent, without supplying adequately the wonderful demands of trade. And I venture to predict that ere long we shall have to build a double track between Winnipeg and Port Arthur—nay, that the day is not far distant when we shall have again to span the continent with a railway further north. I can also foresee when there will be an uninterrupted chain of navigation from the Rocky Mountains, from the remote parts of the Saskatchewan to the seaports. To see those great works accomplished it will not be necessary to live the days of Mathusalem. In the meantime, our Pacific Railway will require as many auxiliaries as it can provide for the export trade of the west. Let us not forget that the trade of the lakes is assuming a magnitude undreamed of, representing annually hundreds of millions of dollars, although it is not half a century since the first cargo of grain left Chicago for Buffalo. Let us not forget, also, that the day is not far distant when Lake Superior shall draw a trade to its ports equal, if not superior, to that which centres at Chicago. We have already a share of that traffic; many of our boats visit Duluth, Marquette, and other American ports, and it only requires foresight, boldness and enterprise to direct a large portion of that commerce through Canadian channels. Last summer I accompanied the Press of Ontario in their excursion to the west, and a most pleasant, a most instructive excursion it was; I visited with them Duluth and Port Arthur, the lake termini of the Northern and the Canadian Pacific Railways, and I was amazed at their rapid growth. In that very year, the shipments of wheat and flour from Duluth even exceeded that of Chicago. In two years the population of Port Arthur had increased from 1,500 to 4,000 souls. The mayor, a most representative man, whose operations cover a million of dollars a year, presented us a most glowing address on the prospects of the town, claiming for it a future as brilliant as that of Chicago. It is true that we were promised previously, on a similar occasion, by the mayor of Winnipeg, another Queen of the West, but I really think that the capital of the prairie Province should be satisfied with having been dubbed by Lord Dufferin, in his hyperbolical language, as the "umbilicus" of the Dominion. Two years previous, I had accompanied the fourth estate as far as the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which was then Moose Jaw, and after having visited our great lakes, as wide as the Caspian Sea, in which the whole United Kingdom could easily, if not safely, take a plunge, after having admired the grand, the enchanting, the unparalleled panorama of their surroundings, after having contemplated the vast, the boundless rolling prairies, the seas of golden vegetation, through which runs the railway, I came back with an enlarged, a more accurate comprehension of our immense domain, of its capabilities, of its future greatness, and prouder than ever of my country, of the Canadian name. For the last two years the people of Manitoba—or rather a portion of them—have been clamoring against the dreaded monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway. An hon. member who sits on the other side of the House felt so much depressed on the subject that he almost preached rebellion—preached what others are practising just now. To escape that so-called monopoly—although the rates of

the Canadian Pacific Railway are lower than those of the American competing lines—our Manitoba friends seem determined to build a railway to Hudson's Bay—which, to many, till a few years ago, would have looked as feasible as the fantastical journey of Jules Verne to the stars. But we live in the age of wonders. Napoleon said that impossible was not a French word. The men of the north wish to repeat the boast. Supposing that a railway to those arctic regions be not visionary, the bay could not be made navigable for more than three months—four, at the utmost—whilst they could have seven months of uninterrupted navigation on the lakes and on the Ottawa ship canal. The Hudson's Bay scheme cannot be accomplished before many years elapse; but, in the meantime, the best energies of the Prairie Province should be concentrated, I think, towards securing the more practicable route, which is their natural outlet to the ocean. If a railway be built towards Hudson's Bay, who can say that in these days of railway consolidation, extension or absorption, the enterprising managers of the Canadian Pacific Railway will not succeed in acquiring its controlling power? Whilst, with the Ottawa ship canal, no such result could be apprehended. Its rates would be regulated by the Government, and they would act as a moderator, as a counterpoise to any railway monopoly. It may be said that the projected canal will injure the Pacific Railway, for which we are making such sacrifices. No doubt, the railroad must run alongside the canal, throughout a great portion of its eastern course. But, instead of depreciating the railroad, the Ottawa ship canal would be a powerful feeder, its most effective complement. It would increase its light freight and passenger traffic, the two paying powers. The special functions of railways and canals are becoming more and more distinct, the heavy, the less profitable freight, being assigned to water routes. The Canadian Pacific Railway could not, for instance, carry the very rich minerals around Lake Superior and the upper Ottawa region, with advantage to its proprietors and customers, the actual condition of the Grand Trunk amply proving that a large amount of heavy traffic may be far from profitable. I am not of those who believe that canals are the superannuated competitors of railways, that they have outlived their age, that their usefulness is gone. And the Government show their appreciation of their advantages in demanding an appropriation of $2,287,900 for the current year! Water transportation is just as necessary to railroads as railway transport is necessary to water navigation. The best patronised lines of railways in the State of New York are those that run close to the Erie Canal, the New York Central having even had to quadruple its track. The Grand Trunk Railway has felt, for a long time, the necessity of doubling its track, although it is bordering upon the St. Lawrence for several hundred miles. It will be remembered that in 1878 M. de Freycinet, an eminent engineer, then Minister of Public Works of France, submitted a vast plan of internal improvement, by which it was proposed to spend from $15,000,000 to $20,000,000 per annum during fifteen years, two-thirds of which was intended for railways and the balance for canals. The views expressed by M. de Freycinet cover the very ground which I am now discussing, and I will quote them briefly:

"It is acknowledged that water ways (or canals) and railways are destined, not to supplant one another, but rather to supplement each other, and thereby effect a natural division of duties. To the railway belongs the lighter traffic, which demands speed and punctuality, and which can command high rates for its service. To the navigable waterways appertain those heavy and cheap commodities which only yield to the railway an illusory profit, and which encumbers rather than benefits them.

"Navigable water courses fill another function. By their very existence they restrain and moderate the charges on such goods as seek the railway; they are, for the railway manager, a warning not to exceed the line beyond which commerce would not hesitate to sacrifice regularity to economy. In this respect, navigable water-ways are much more powerful than any competition that may arise between different railway lines, inasmuch as the latter carry on their struggle with similar weapons, and generally wind up by coming to a mutual understanding rather than draw on themselves inevitable ruin; whereas the boat and the rail naturally appropriate to themselves the special traffic for which they are adapted.

"Such is the actual work of the canals, to outstrip the railways in point of cheapness, and even to compel the latter to follow their example, as constituting the only serious opposition they have to encounter on this continent, and thus becoming the moderator, curb and counterpoise to railroad monopoly. Assuredly this part is an important one and sufficient to justify the special solicitude of the Government and the generosity of the legislator."

Mr. Speaker, as it has been so well demonstrated by preceding speakers, it is not the first time that Parliament is called upon to consider the merits and demerits of this scheme. As far back as 1856 a survey was made of the proposed route, under the direction of a very eminent engineer, Mr. Walter Shanly, and two years afterwards another survey was ordered under Mr. Clark, another distinguished member of the same profession. Both came to the conclusion that the route was feasible, that it was the best, the safest, the cheapest, the shortest exit for the western trade. Mr. Shanly estimated that 58 miles of a canal of 10 feet would be necessary, entailing a cost of $24,000,000. But we must not forget that subsequent information led him to reduce his estimate to $21,000,000. Mr. Shanly held also the opinion that the route could be adapted to vessels of 8 feet for about $16,000,000. On the other hand, Mr. Clark estimated the whole cost at $12,000,000, for a depth of 12 feet, and the length of canalling at 21 miles, not including the Lachine Canal or the improvements below St. Anne's locks. The main difference in their estimates is due to the fact that Mr. Clark suggested the damming up of the Ottawa and Mattawa Rivers to a far greater degree than was proposed by the project of Mr. Shanly, thus reducing the length of canalling. As the Lachine Canal, the St. Anne's lock, the Carillon and Grenville Canals have since been enlarged, the expenditure to be incurred would be thus reduced by several millions of dollars. In 1863, in 1869 and 1870, the importance of this scheme was recognised by Parliament, committees were appointed, and on each favorable reports were submitted. The first committee selected as chairman the late lamented Robert Bell, the builder of the pioneer Ottawa railway, the Prescott and St. Lawrence. The other members of the committee were Messrs. A. Mackenzie, Dawson, Daoust, Morris, Simard, Kierkowski, D. A. Macdonald, Haultain and Morrison. The subsequent committees were presided over by the universally respected member for the county of Ottawa, another popular member—so popular that he has attained royal rank in a very democratic country. Valuable as they were, the labors of those committees have not yet produced all the fruits which one could have reasonably expected from them. Such an important matter could not fail being brought before the Dominion Board of Trade—an institution which has rendered great service, which is now defunct, but which ought to be revived. At its meeting of 1871, a very exhaustive paper was submitted by Mr. Geo. H. Perry, a prominent engineer, who had been engaged in the survey of the proposed canal, and who at all times warmly and ably advocated this scheme. I may add also that the association found a very zealous and indefatigable champion of that scheme in the person of the late lamented Senator Skead, one of the most enlightened and truest citizens the city of Ottawa ever possessed. I have mentioned the hon. member for East York as being a member of the first committee that studied the question of the Ottawa ship canal, and although I do not agree with most of his political opinions, I am bound to say that I fully approve of his views on this very matter. In 1865 that hon. gentleman made a speech, a very eloquent speech, on Confederation, and in the course of his remarks he paid the following tribute to the scheme now before the House:

"I think it is absolutely necessary for the prosperity of this colony that our canal connections with the upper lakes should be perfected as

early as possible. Our canal system must be improved, so as to accommodate the large trade that is coming from the North-West. On the northern shores of Lake Superior we have sources of wealth that are perfectly inexhaustible. We read only the other day that a mountain of iron had been discovered close to the coast, quite sufficient to supply the demands of the world for 500 years. We have in that locality an abundant supply of minerals of all kinds, and unless our canals are made capable of carrying that traffic, it will necessarily find channels in another direction. There is an agitation among a portion of the community for making a new canal from Toronto to the Georgian Bay, and I admit it is very desirable it should be constructed, though I do not think it ever can be; and even if it could be, it is entirely beyond our resources at the present time. I am convinced that the true route for a canal (if a new one should be undertaken) to the Georgian Bay, is up the Ottawa, because that would be giving a great backbone to the country. If we had a fine canal, capable of carrying vessels of war in that direction, it would be a splendid means of defence, as well as a great highway for the commercial products of the west."

I presume it was with the intention of giving a temporary substitute or a useful adjunct to the Ottawa ship canal—so impressed was he with the importance of this region—that the same hon. gentleman undertook, in 1874, as soon as he was Prime Minister, with very extraordinary haste, without an instrumental survey, the building of the Georgian Bay branch, one of the many unsuccessful experiments of a very unsuccessful Government. Two years later, that hon. gentleman held three public meetings in the county represented by the hon. mover of this resolution—the county of North Renfrew. That campaign was a very disastrous one for the Liberal party, and there the Liberal leader met a foeman worthy of his steel, that eloquent, that courageous tribune of the Conservative party, Sir Charles Tupper. The two champions of our two great parties vied in their eulogy of the Ottawa Valley, and the hon. member for East York used the following language:

"I am tolerably well acquainted with the geographical features of the Ottawa Valley, having for the last fifteen years been actively interested in all the questions which most closely affect its people. The very first year I was in Parliament, I was one of a committee appointed to investigate the question of canal navigation on the upper Ottawa, and from that time I have been perfectly satisfied that the valley presents the greatest facilities of any route upon the continent for the transportation of the products of the North-West to the Atlantic Ocean, or rather I should say to the head of the Atlantic navigation."

From these remarks, it is evident that the Ottawa ship canal will meet with some favor on the other side of the House; and it has already been advocated in the instructive speech which has been delivered to-night by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Cockburn). I do not know what are the views of the leader of the Opposition, but I feel confident that if the hon. member for East York was still commander of the Liberal forces, his active sympathy would be given to the motion of the hon. member for North Renfrew. Mr. Speaker, I will not leave the House under the impression that the leaders of the Conservative party—the progressive leaders of a progressive party, the party that has built the greatest bridge, one of the wonders of the age, the greatest railway, a greater wonder of the age—have not fully realised the pregnant results that may be expected from that measure. The late lamented Sir George E. Cartier was always one of its warmest supporters. And his views, I am proud to say, were in full accord with those of the right hon. gentleman who has conducted for so many years the affairs of this country. At a public dinner given in 1869, in this city, the right hon. gentleman proclaimed that the Ottawa ship canal had an importance almost equal to that of the Pacific Railway, and that its construction would be accomplished ere long:

"To consolidate and bind those great colonies together, the link referred to by the chairman, the Ottawa Canal, had almost become a necessity, and the day when it must be constructed is much nearer than their friends believe. As soon as the resources of the country now rapidly developing, become adequate to the undertaking, both the canal and Pacific Railway must be constructed, and no voice would be raised against the great national work, which would open the Western States and colonies to the seaboard."

Sir, the boldest and the most expensive part of this programme has already been successfully accomplished, or is on the eve of accomplishment. The great dream of laying the iron band across this northern portion of the continent has become a reality. We may now almost believe that Canada is a nation. But there are still great deeds that remain to be done. Let the right hon. gentleman continue his noble work, let him remove the physical obstructions to the free navigation of the rivers between Lake Huron and our seaports, and we shall see in a near future thousands of wealth-laden steamers and barges plying on their waters. I know, Sir, that for the moment the resources of the country are heavily taxed in order to accomplish public works, which no people of our numbers would have dared to execute or even to conceive. These works may increase our public debt, but they multiply our resources, our population, our taxing capacity, in a far greater degree. They do not impoverish, they enrich the country. They are the most productive national investments. Such is the importance of the measure now before us that it cannot be pressed too often and too urgently before the Parliament, before the country. If we cannot now accomplish that scheme *in toto*, let us adopt its principle, let us devote every year a portion of the public moneys towards its achievement, let every improvement, every section, every lock, every chamber, be made in accordance with a general plan, and in a few years we shall have the satisfaction of seeing the whole scheme fully realised. Sir, we are engaged in a great struggle with our neighbors for the carrying trade of the west. That struggle is fraught with momentous results, it means the commercial supremacy on this continent. Such a goal is well worth fighting for. Two years ago the State of New York abolished its tolls on the Erie Canal, and now it has to pay, out of direct taxation, for its maintenance, not less than $1,600,000 per annum. In his message of last year, Mr. Cleveland, then Governor of New York—now President of the United States—fully endorsed that policy in the following terms:—

"Remarkable proof of the increased commerce attracted to those waterways, by the abolition of tolls, is found in the fact that the shipments of grain from Buffalo, by canal this year, aggregated 42,350,916 bushels, against 29,439,688 bushels last year; and the statistics, which will be transmitted by the Superintendent of Public Works, will exhibit like increase in the other freights which comprise the great bulk of the canal traffic.

"These figures assure those interested in canal navigation that the liberal policy adopted by the State will make reasonably certain a continuance of employment and opportunities for the capital and labor of our citizens. They also give promise to the people, who have assumed the expense of maintaining the canals, of a full return, in the benefits which must accrue from securing to our State a traffic of such importance as to add materially to its business and wealth."

That expenditure of $1,600,000 may be a great sacrifice; it may show how the State of New York values the trade of the west, but let us not forget that from 1862 to 1883 the canals produced a revenue of $56,795,944, against an expenditure of $27,210,264, the surplus revenue reaching the sum of $29,585,680, not to speak of the numberless advantages, direct or indirect, which it has produced. Sir, England was made great and glorious by the carrying trade of the world. Let us follow in her footsteps. Let us secure if possible the trade of the west, and the trade of the Pacific will fall into line. We are already one of the great maritime powers; our vessels float on every ocean, but I feel alarmed at the fact that our tonnage has decreased during the past years, its volume being now smaller than in 1876. It has been said that the nation that had the most ships has had the most influence. Let us then make a most energetic effort to regain the ground lost. Let us accomplish an enterprise which will develop our internal trade and marine, and foster at the same time our foreign commerce. It would be an unwise policy to improve only the frontier; let us give width and breadth to the Dominion, in developing its central points.

Let us forge another powerful link between the east and the west, and let us cement and consolidate some of the most essential parts of our economic and national fabric. Let us be equal to the occasion. Let us rise to the height of the interests involved. "Don't give up the ship," exclaimed the American sailor Lawrence, in dying bravely for his country. "Don't give up the ship," I would say to the Government—we are all deeply interested in its course towards our destiny, but do give us one of the safest, one of the most important channels through which it could be directed, distributing wealth all along its passage. Impressed as I am with the magnitude, with the necessity, with the far reaching results of this plan, I have no hesitation in saying that the Government that will accomplish this work will be a patriotic, a far-seeing Government, a Government that will deserve to be commemorated in Canadian history.

Mr. HILLIARD. I regret I was not present when this measure was introduced, and consequently did not hear those hon. gentlemen who spoke on it; but I gather from others that there was a harmony of opinion among those who addressed the House with respect to the advantages accruing from our inland waterways. There are two routes before the public at present; the one the Ottawa River route and the other the Trent Valley Canal. Unfortunately those routes have been compared, to a large extent, with the Erie Canal, which, I think, is rather unfortunate, as the Erie Canal is nothing more or less than a respectable ditch. Now, Sir, I think that these waterways should be compared very largely to the navigation of the Hudson River. Freight, I may say, is carried on the Hudson River a distance of 180 miles at the rate of 15 cents per ton, or $1.50 per car load of 10 tons; this route—I speak more particularly of the Trent Valley Canal now—is a very similar route to the Hudson. The Trent Valley Canal route would afford navigation suitable to connected bands of canal boats of probably ten or fifteen together, except for a very short distance of artificial work, and in that respect it compares very favorably with the Hudson River. When we see that the Hudson route affords the means of carrying freight at the rate of 15 cents per ton for 180 miles, no one will dispute the fact that that rate is as low as the work can possibly be done for, if not lower than by any other route. There has been an opinion prevalent, and I do not know whether it prevails to-day, that railways are about to supersede or have superseded waterways. I think I can state positively that the railways will not carry freight 180 miles at the rate of 15 cents per ton; and if that be the case, it is a fact that it can be carried at that rate for that distance by a waterway similar to those we have to offer, it is proof evident that the railways are not going to supersede the waterways. In the Trent Valley route we have large stretches of land-locked water, perfectly protected from storms, so that vessels can be lashed together in bands with perfect safety, and large quantities of grain can be carried in that way. Thus, vessels carrying 10,000 bushels each may be banded together, say ten in one lock, and towed, making 150,000 bushels in one tow. There are 60 miles of solid embankment, most of it rock-bound shores, so that tugs can be used on this route with perfect success. Comparing this route with the Erie Canal, I may say that tugs cannot be used in the latter. The trial has been made, but the agitation of the water is of such a nature that it is impossible to use steam to any extent. At one time the State of New York offered $10,000 for an improved method of propelling canal boats by steam; I think that offer is standing yet, and has not been accepted. It was then proposed to lay down a cable, which is known as the Belgian cable, the idea being to lay it down as a fixture on the bed of the canal, and the boats were to take it up and work it by machinery. That proved unsuccessful, from the fact that if you take up a line and draw it taut, it will draw it straight, and there was no provision made for the serpentine windings of the canal. In our route, in the only artificial work on it, we have a solid embankment, a rock embankment, so that we can put on steam tugs and they can work away without danger at all. This route from the Georgian Bay to the Bay of Quiné, is only 200 miles in length, and, out of that, 140 miles is now navigable by steamer, and has been navigable for some years. This Trent route is not a new one. In 1836 the Government of that day took up the scheme, and actually commenced work, locks having been built at several places at that early period; but, for some reason, it was abandoned, I understand in consequence of a lack of funds to carry it on. At a later date, the larger interest representing the frontier and the Welland Canal region, brought influence to bear on the Government, which resulted in the opening of the Welland Canal route, and consequently the other was abandoned, I hope only for a time. As was stated by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé), the Trent Valley route also shortens the distance from the west. It will shorten the distance between common points, from the Straits of Mackinaw or the Sault Ste. Marie to Montreal, by upwards of 300 miles, nearly 400 miles. Not only that, but it avoids the most dangerous route we have to contend with on the lakes, that is, that portion of Lake Superior which runs north and south. All who are acquainted with navigable waters, and especially with large sheets of navigable water, know that vessels, on these inland waters trending to the north and south, have more difficulty than on those which run east and west, because our prevailing winds are from the west and strike them broadside. We escape that portion of Lake Huron and the whole of Lakes Erie and Ontario by this route, and, in doing so, we avoid great risks. The hon. member who just spoken has given you the figures of the loss of life and property from 1874 to 1883, which in itself is enormous and is worthy of the consideration of this country. I think I can safely say that we have a route to offer that will, to a certain extent, avoid those difficulties, certainly the danger of being wrecked by storms. It is a safe land-locked route. Then, as to the capabilities of a route of this kind for the carrying trade, in comparison with a larger route, I may say that we can carry more cheaply. The largest vessels we have now on the lakes carry something less than 100,000 bushels. If these routes were open, and twelve or fifteen boats were lashed side by side in a flotilla, where there is no danger, carrying each its 10,000 bushels, we should have a carrying capacity of 150,000 bushels, which evidently could be carried cheaper than by the other route, while the tugs which are employed are not laid up at the time of taking in and discharging a cargo, but as soon as they deliver their boats at the destination, can return and take up another flotilla, or can take one back, and are so employed all the time. The vessels to be employed in this are of a cheap style, are manned by few men, and can be operated very cheaply in consequence. I think, in view of these facts, that people who argue that freight can only be carried cheaply in large vessels will have to reconsider their opinion. I admit that large vessels are necessary on wide waters, where there is danger, and you cannot keep two vessels side by side but must separate them; but, in a land-locked water, such as we have to offer through these routes, it is different. The question will be upon the two routes, the Ottawa River and the Trent Valley Canal. I hope the time is not far distant when they both will be required; but, at the present time, I think I am safe in saying that the 60 miles of artificial work on the Trent Valley Canal can be completed for $5,000,000, whereas the other route is estimated to cost $21,000,000 at least, and probably $24,000,000, which is an item of some importance to this country. The hon. gentleman who just sat down spoke of the advantages of the

Ottawa route on account of its being a more northern route, less subject to heats than the St. Lawrence. The difference between the Trent Valley and the Ottawa route is very slight in that respect; they are both northern routes, and I may say they are equal in that point of view. I hope that the Government, having undertaken the Trent route, having certain sections of it under contract at the present time, will not delay in getting the whole work carried through. There are certain sections in that route which ought to be opened immediately, with great advantage to the inhabitants along the line. I refer to the section from the town I represent, northward for a distance of nine miles. If that were opened, and I think it could be for less than a million of dollars, it would give us continuous navigable water for 140 miles, which would be of great advantage to that inland country. It would connect us with the different lines of railway now in existence all along the line of canals. There are large quantities of minerals in that section of the country and large quantities of lumber, all requiring a cheap means of getting it to the market. I hope that the Government will push that section forward rapidly.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have listened to the speeches of hon. gentlemen on this question with a great deal of interest. The speeches are certainly much above the average of speeches made in this House. Evidently, hon. gentlemen have studied this question very specially, and their speeches will be read afterwards with great interest, as they contain, besides the strong arguments they have been using, a great deal of valuable information. The mover of this resolution certainly did justice to his subject, and he presented it with great force to the attention of this House. I need not speak of my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr Tassé) who, as usual, presented this subject in a very interesting, able and eloquent speech. I might also say the same of a number of other gentlemen—of my hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Dawson) who had studied this subject attentively, and shown that the large expenditure which Mr. Shanly thought would be incurred by the building of this great work might be reduced by using that canal, at all events, a large portion of it, for flat boats and tugs. Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate very highly the importance of this work; it is one which, as the First Minister said, according to the quotation given by the hon. gentleman from Ottawa (Mr. Tassé), is to be built at a future time; but I am sure that the hon. gentlemen who have discussed this matter and presented it with so much ability to this House, do not expect that the Government can undertake this work at present. It is a work of great magnitude, and the First Minister coupled it with the Canadian Pacific Railway. But we have not yet completed the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we do not yet know the magnitude of the trade that is to be created by the construction of that railway; but, from what we have seen during the last two years, we have reason to expect a very large trade from the west, and this railway may not be sufficient, even in an early future, to carry that trade; and then, perhaps, it may be necessary to build another railway. I hope that second railway will not be required very soon, although we desire to see that country opened up, settled and prosperous. But it is one of those works that we should hesitate in beginning, even for the purpose of opening up that large territory where, unfortunately, we have trouble just now. The hon. mover of this resolution will, no doubt, be satisfied in having called forth the expression of opinion of so many members of this House, and brought this measure to the attention of Parliament and of the public. But in the present state of our finances, with the large works we already have on hand, and to complete which we are straining our resources, the hon. gentleman can hardly expect that the Government should undertake this work at present; therefore, I would ask my hon. friend not to call for a division, but to withdraw his motion.

Mr. BLAKE. I agree with my hon. friend who has just spoken, that the speeches that we have listened to have been very good and interesting. Whether, in view of his declaration, they will be equally practical, so far as results are concerned, those hon. gentlemen themselves are as good judges as myself. I was surprised, however, to hear the hon. Minister of Public Works declare that he hoped that we would not soon require to build a second Pacific Railway. I should have thought he would have been hoping earnestly that we would soon require to build a second railway, and in view of the admirable arrangements which the hon. gentlemen opposite have made for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the admirable results, financial and otherwise, they have achieved in the construction of that railway, how the hon. gentleman could express the hope that we would not be called upon to renew the operation at an early day, I really do not understand. Now, with reference to that which is the immediate subject of this motion—the Ottawa Canal, the hon. Minister of Public Works was, of course, correct in indicating that any statements that have been made by the Government and the First Minister were of a prospective character. It was the future; and, perhaps, after what he had said, we may say, the dim, remote, misty and uncertain future, that was spoken of with reference to that enterprise. But there is another canal which was spoken of by several hon. members—and I presume the hon. gentleman's compliments were intended to be confined to the advocates of the Ottawa ship canal—there is another great waterway which also formed the subject of discussion this evening, and with respect to which the promises of the Government are of a positive character. They were precise; they were definite; they were made before the last election. I refer to the Trent Valley Canal. I want to say to the hon. gentleman that very early in the Session I moved for the papers and information which would indicate to us the result of the action of the Government, from the reports, explorations, etc., that have yet been made; and we would like very much indeed to see what actual progress has been made with reference to the Trent Valley navigation, with respect to which the promises and pledges of the Government were of a very different character from those given with respect to the Ottawa Canal. The hon. gentleman paid very high compliments to the supporters of the latter scheme, but he will allow me to quote an English proverb, which applies to to his compliments—"Fine words butter no parsnips."

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Before this debate closes I may be permitted to say a word or two with reference to some observations which have fallen from some of the speakers. I do not desire to throw any obstacle in the way of the construction of the Trent Valley Canal. Those of us who advocate the opening up of the navigation of the Ottawa, do not desire in any way to throw any obstacle in the way of those gentlemen who are advocating that other work which is, no doubt, of very considerable importance to the country. But, I may say, in reference to one or two observations which fell from the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Cockburn) respecting the result of the raising of Lake Nipissing: If he had looked into Mr. Clark's report he would have found that another scheme was proposed by that gentleman, different from the one proposed by Mr. Shanly, and one that would not have the disastrous effect which the hon. member for North Ontario, and the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) anticipated from raising the water of Lake Nipissing to the height of 23 feet. Mr. Clark says:

"My early attention was called to the question of supply of water, upon which the success of which the whole project depends, and more particularly directed to the practicability of the plan of elevating Lake Nipissing to the summit level, as proposed by Mr. Shanly, both by the general instructions of the Board of Public Works and by your letter of instructions.

"Mr. Shanly, in his report on the 'Ottawa Surveys,' says: 'It may at once be stated that the summit does not furnish water sufficient to meet

the demands of even a far inferior scale of navigation to that which the general character of the route would warrant us in looking forward to.'

"To this opinion of Mr. Shanly's respecting the supply of water from the summit, that is, from Trout and Turtle Lakes, I agree; and after a careful examination of the whole subject, I would recommend the following plan for the supply of water: It is proposed to raise Lake Nipissing 9·46 feet above high water, and lower Trout Lake 7·85 feet, and Turtle Lake 6·95 feet, and Turtle Lake outlet to the same level, and to raise Lac Talon 20·95 feet, which brings it up to the same height, making a summit level for navigation of 57·12 miles in length, with an area of watershed of 31·65 square miles and a reception basin of 80 miles in length, and varying from one-half of a mile to 12 miles in width, giving a surface of about 330 square miles. By this provision it does not become necessary to make any provision for a storage reservoir. The waters of Lake Nipissing are sufficient for any scale of navigation, and for all time to come.

"There are but few objectionable features to this mode of supplying the necessary water for navigation, and of raising Lake Nipissing to the height above stated. The first and almost the only one is the overflowing of the lands bordering on the lakes.

"The entire southern shore of Lake Nipissing, east of the Chaudière portage, is bounded by high, barren, rocky cliffs, with a scanty growth of evergreens covering the whole, except a strip on the east end of the lake, about eight miles long, and varying from one-tenth to one-fourth of a mile in width, one-half of which is annually inundated by the spring freshets. The shore of the east bay and the east end of the lake, for the distance of ten miles, will be overflown; a large portion of this tract is annually submerged by the freshets, and nearly the whole is one extended tamarac swamp or an alder marsh. The north shore, for two-thirds of its length, is high, and out of the reach of this height of water.

"In the vicinity of the Hudson's Bay post, at the mouth of the Sturgeon River, the largest tract on the borders of the lake will be submerged, say from ten to twelve miles in length and from two to three miles in width; one-third of the tract is low, open marsh, about one-third swamp, annually overflowed, and the remaining third tolerably fair land for agricultural purposes.

"In the western bay there is an occasional narrow strip that will be drowned out. Taking the whole land that will be drowned by the rising of Lake Nipissing, it will be inconsiderable when compared with the length of shore, and that but of small value for agricultural purposes."

I do not propose to make another speech on this subject; but I should like to say that my purpose will not be finally served by having brought this matter before the attention of the House. I brought it before the House with the full conviction that it would commend itself to the House, and that the Government would be prepared to take some action in regard to it. I observe that the leader of the Opposition is not prepared to express an opinion on the subject—at least he has not expressed an opinion. I said, in my opening remarks, that I did not expect the Government to commence the work at the present moment; but what I asked was, that they should ascertain, by some moderate expenditure, whether the estimate made by Mr. Shanly, or that by Mr. Clark, was nearest to the mark, and, in point of fact, ascertain, by the expenditure of a comparatively small sum what the cost of the improvement would be, and thus be in a position to state, at some period in the near future, the exact cost of this great work, which seems to have commended itself to the leaders of both political parties. I think the Government might have gone to that extent, that they might appropriate a sum for the purpose of ascertaining the actual facts in relation to this work. Of course, if the Government have determined to oppose this motion, it is very little use attempting to further press it on the House. I therefore ask leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 21st April, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 129) to amend the Act respecting the Central Prison of Ontario—(*from the Senate*).—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew).

THE STATUTES OF CANADA.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 130) to consolidate and revise the Statutes of Canada. He said: The Bill is framed on the lines of Bills introduced in the several Legislatures for the consolidation of the statutes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Before the Orders of the Day are entered upon, I desire to ask the First Minister whether he will consent to concurrence in the resolution from Committee of the Whole with respect to the Liquor or License Act being taken, it having been allowed to stand over until to-day. It is a very important matter, and I trust the Government will at once introduce a Bill on the subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes. The reason why I asked the hon. gentleman to allow it to stand over was this, that on concurrence a Bill might be introduced. The Minister of Inland Revenue has charge of the matter and is having a Bill prepared.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Then the First Minister desires it to stand until the Bill is ready?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

THE ELECTORAL FRANCHISE.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 103) respecting the electoral franchise.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Mr. FAIRBANK. Mr. Speaker, the Bill, the discussion of which we resume to-day, is one which proposes to change the system that has existed since Confederation. It necessitates two sets of qualifications for voters; one for local, the other for Dominion purposes. It proposes two voters' lists, the qualifications under which, for the two purposes, will vary. To use perhaps a somewhat inelegant expression, but a common one, it will be a whale of a Bill. It is like a whale in some respects. Its strength is in its tail. The tail of this Bill is the revising barristers. Without the tail its usefulness would be gone. Clause 10 reads thus:

"The Governor in Council may, within three months after the coming into force of this Act, and from time to time thereafter, when the office is vacant, appoint a person to be called 'the revising officer,' for each or any of the electoral districts of Canada, who shall hold office during good behavior, but who shall be removable on an address by the House of Commons, and whose duties shall be to prepare, revise and complete, in the manner hereinafter provided, the lists of persons entitled to vote under the provisions of this Act."

It provides that he shall procure the last revised assessment roll and the list of voters.

"And he shall proceed as speedily as possible with the aid thereof and of such other information as he can obtain, to ascertain and prepare a list of the persons, who, according to the provisions of this Act, are entitled to be registered as voters."

It provides for a preliminary revision and a final revision, and, at the close, it provides that he may "affirm or amend the list according as he may think right or proper." In introducing his able, eloquent, logical, and unanswerable arguments against the Bill, the leader of the Opposition on Friday last gave us a chronological sketch of the labors, adventures, toils and sufferings of the Premier in searching for a Dominion franchise, and we see him as one of old in "journeyings often, in weariness and painfulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, through a period of eighteen years." Sir, this is a long period. Those who, at the beginning of that period were young and curly, have grown old to-day, and perhaps some of them are tottering to their decline and fall. During that period we have largely increased our territory, we have added Province to Pro-

vince, and have prospered to a considerable extent, and we have talked about our prosperity a good deal more than we have prospered. We have constructed a railway almost from ocean to ocean—well, Sir, we have not exactly done that, but we have furnished the money to do it, which is just about the same thing. We have collected money from our people to as great an extent as we could, and have borrowed what other people had to spare. All this we have been able to accomplish without a Dominion franchise. We have placed ourselves in a position to attract attention. People who are largely in debt always receive a great deal of attention from those to whom they are indebted. We have made ourselves respectable in this regard—we have piled up a handsome debt—a debt amounting to over two hundred millions of dollars. Our creditors will give us attention hereafter—we shall not be neglected. It is a debt which rests on an average to the extent of $250 on each family in the Dominion of Canada; a debt which, if many of them realised, they would look upon us as a little differently from what they do to day. We are preparing to leave this legacy to our children as a proof of our tender regard for them. We have achieved this without the aid of a second franchise. Hon. gentlemen opposite have, during those eighteen years, been in authority the greater portion of the time; they cannot complain of their want of powers under existing laws. But this is not the crowning glory of what we have been able to accomplish. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been able to hive the Grits—to gerrymander Ontario, and they have done this without the aid of 200 political tools, whom this Bill christens revising officers. Mr. Speaker, the honor which attaches to that measure I want no share in. There has been another thing accomplished—an event that occured recently. We have a live insurrection on our hands. This has been brought about by the aid of Mr. Riel, and without the use of the usurpation and tyranny which is possible under the provisions of this Act. In that now historical speech which consumed eight and a half valuable minutes, when the principles of this Bill were being affirmed, the First Minister said the present position was an anomaly. I understand this to mean "deviating from the ordinary rule—irregular." I would ask what rule is it contrary to? Is it contrary to the rule in Great Britain and Ireland? Sir, the measure is not English even in name. Need I enquire, have they provincial franchises in England, Wales, Scotland and Ireland? Have they Provincial Legislatures? Have they a federal union? To apply English rules in this regard is no more applicable or proper than it would be to attempt to measure molasses with a tape-line. We might as soon take our horses to a jeweller to be shod as attempt a comparison between England and Canada in this regard. Where should we look for a rule? Where do we look for rules? We look to those places where similar circumstances exist, and in this respect we have not far to look. We have only to cross the border and we find a rule there which has stood the test of 100 years, and is now successfully exercised over 50,000,000 of people. And is it beneath our dignity to draw any inspiration from that immense republic? When it suited hon. gentlemen opposite to introduce a certain measure they had no objection; in the language of the First Minister, to "take a leaf out of their book." I do not think it would be derogatory to our dignity to take another "leaf" out of their book in this respect—a leaf which we have been using for the last 18 years. The present position, Sir, is not an anomaly; it is in harmony with the best authorities existing on that subject. The First Minister goes on to say that "sooner or later this principle must be affirmed." "Must," is a word best fitted to the mouth of kings; here we only obey it when embodied in the statute. "Sooner or later"—if it is all the same to the gentlemen opposite we will take it later, and considerably later. Again the First Minister said: "I think and the Government thinks"—it would appear from this that the First Minister and the Government do not always think alike, but on this occasion they did—"I think and the Government think that no time is more opportune to affirm that principle by practical legislation than the present moment." What is there about the present moment that particularly fits it for the pressing of this measure? Why, in all the eighteen years that have passed, is the present moment so particularly adapted to this business? Is it because it is the last half of the third month of the Session, and our real business hardly begun? Is it because our members, composed of farmers, professional men and business men, who have their own affairs to attend to, who have to earn their own living, have spent nearly three months here and are anxious to return to their homes? In this country we have no leisured class to carry on our legislation for us, and perhaps it is well that we have not. I doubt very much, if we had, that they would possess that knowledge which is necessary to the successful legislation for a new country. But is there anything transpiring at the present moment that makes it particularly "opportune" for this measure? Let us see. An armed rebellion has lifted its head within our borders. Is it on account of that? Is it because police and citizens are confined within stockades in the North-West? Is it because settlers have abandoned their homes to pillage, and are fleeing from the frontier? Is it because destruction and desolation are being spread over an immense area in that land? Is it because the blood of our slain citizens and soldiers is not yet dry upon the banks of the Saskatchewan? Is it because three columns of our citizen soldiers are now marching to the relief of those who are imprisoned within those stockades—are marching to the putting down of this rebellion, and the restoration of law and order? Is it because thousands of families have no ear for any news except that which comes from the North-West, and which pertains to their husbands, and fathers and sons and brothers who have responded to the call to arms? Is it because in tens of thousands of households their whole attention is absorbed in anxiety for their sons and daughters who are scattered over that vast and to a great extent still lone land? Is it because in many a Canadian home of luxury, in many a humble cottage, anxiety has banished sleep, and the mother nightly paces to and fro like a sentinel on his beat, with one thought, one prayer, and that for her absent son, though that son is to manhood grown, and sleeps on his knapsack with his rifle by his side, still as much her boy as when he rested on her bosom? Is it because the eye of the press, that national police who we expect will give warning of approaching danger, is fixed on the North-West, and on it alone that this is so opportune a moment for pressing this measure? During this long period of eighteen years, is this the one thing that was wanted, the one thing waited for, in order to press this measure? When the fire bells ring, and the fire engines are hurrying through the streets to contend with the conflagration, when all attention is centered on the flames, that is the time, Sir, when the burglar delights to ply his art; that is the time when the merchant's goods, and the banker's treasures are most exposed. Is this the opportune moment, long and anxiously waited for, when a hand is to be stretched forth to grasp the ballot box? We do not see the smoke of the conflagration, but we get a strong smell of sulpher. "I think, and the Government think, no time more opportune to affirm that principle by practical legislation than the present moment." This term "opportune" assumes a special prominence in this connection; and I propose to examine the exact meaning of that word. "Opportune," I find, is from the Latin word "*opportunus*," and means, literally, "at or before the port." Are there any indications of a gathering tempest? Is there a storm centre now moving along the Saskatchewan? Is it specially desirable for gentlemen to be "near the port?" I find further that the

definition given is "present at a proper time, recurring, or furnished at a needed or suitable occasion," and in illustrating the meaning of the word a quotation is made by the author from Milton:

> "Perhaps in view
> Of those bright confines, whence with neighboring arms
> And opportune excursion we may chance
> Reenter heaven."

There is but one general principle in this Bill, as I understand it, namely, the retention of power; the details of the Bill are the manner to do it. There is one other principle mentioned in it, that of woman suffrage; but even in the mention of it, during that celebrated minute and forty-five seconds devoted to it, the quickest time on record—no square trotter ever did it in that time, not even a pacer—even in that short time the consent is given to strangle this part of the measure, to kill the child. It is true, the Minister says he would mourn somewhat for it, but he won't prevent the killing. I do not envy the position gentlemen find themselves in with regard to woman suffrage. I think it will be an embarrassing position. They have proposed three times to take the spinsters and the widows to the circus, and now they seem prepared to assert that their big brother will not let them do it. Now, this kind of conduct may be all very well for politicans, it may answer very well for men, but it will never work with widows. This Bill is at variance with the rule, the most prominent rule we have in relation to Confederations. This Bill is adverse to every provincial feeling; if carried out, it will be attended with untold trouble, trouble to an extent which, I believe, must exclude from this House many who it is in the interest of the country should be here. It is pouring sand into the journals of Confederation, and those journals are sufficiently heated; they do not require sand, but tallow. It will be attended with endless confusion—with its two sets of voters' lists. Already what with municipal elections, school elections, provincial elections, and Dominion elections, and the preparations and protests, people are saying, and correctly saying, that we have too much of this thing to the acre. It will be attended with a large and utter waste of money. Does our financial position warrant this? We have at the present time a far too large floating liability, a floating liability which has been rapidly increasing; it is not in harmony with sound finance, and if it extends much further it may become dangerous to our credit. We are at present pawning our credit at the local banks; we are not prepared, indeed, it seems we dare not prepare, to fund our floating debt which is assuming alarming proportions; we have just given authority, for the expenditure of $700,000 for the restoration of order in the North-West. This is but the beginning; I see nothing in our financial position which warrants the measure before us. Is it at such time that it is desirable or statesmanlike to add 200 more Government offices to the list, and expensive offices too. These will not be ordinary gentlemen; they will be gentlemen who, when they perform services, expect full pay; some of them, I understand, are already waiting, are already here; there must have been a taint in the air, even at a distance they seem to smell something dead and want a piece of it. Is it necessary? Cannot the Provinces fix the franchise suitable to their local surroundings better than we can? Has not the experience of 18 years shown that they can do so? There is no doubt but what the general sentiment of the country is in favor of an advance movement in relation to extending the franchise; are not the Provinces responsive to this sentiment? Are they not responsible governments, quickly reached by the sentiments of the people? Reached faster than can be done by the Dominion Government? In its workings, wherever this measure effects a change, it will produce hostility; in every Province it will disfranchise some who now enjoy the franchise, and wherever that occurs it will produce hostility. I believe that this measure is purely and simply political; I challenge any fair-minded Conservative in the Dominion to show that any practical benefit can come to Canada from it, and that anything beneficial can be expected from it; all that is claimed and expected from it is some partisan gain, and that is by no means a certainty. I believe the people will not sanction it, and I doubt seriously whether under it any party gain will be attained. I call upon hon. gentlemen opposite to give a proof, at this particular time, of their boasted patriotism; I call upon them to show that their patriotism means something more than a greed of office; I call upon them, when they are pressing a measure for which there is no necessity, to the exclusion of legislation that is necessary, to show that they are really patriotic and not seeking their own gain, by withdrawing this Bill, and allowing us to come to practical legislation, legislation seriously demanded and now too long delayed.

Mr. WOODWORTH. After hearing the long, elaborate and able speeches of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) and some of his friends behind him, to which we listened, as we always do, with great patience, the speech of the last speaker (Mr. Fairbank) seemed a little out of place. It reminded me of the story of the old Scotch minister who, after it had rained for about eight weeks without intermission, save an occasional hour or so, went to church and prayed to the great architect of the universe who rules all things to close the flood gates of heaven and let out a little sunshine, and not submerge the earth beneath a new deluge; and as he went on to show the reasonableness of his prayer, pointing to the rainbow in the sky as a sign of the divine promise that another deluge would not occur, there was a rift in the clouds, the heavens became clear again, and the sunshine streamed gaily down. Lifting up his hands most fervently, he said: "O, Lord, we thank thee for answering our prayer so speedily;" but hardly had he uttered this pious ejaculation when the clouds came together again and the rain poured down as if it had never rained before. Then the minister, sadly shaking his head, said: "Oh, Lord, this is simply ridiculous." Thus, after the speeches of the leader of the Opposition and those who followed him the other day rained upon us, we come to that of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. I will not say it was simply ridiculous, but it seemed a little too much for our patience. I could not understand the drift of his argument, or how to attempt to reply to it. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) took some three hours of the time of this House to elaborate a speech against the principles of the Franchise Bill, as introduced by the Premier this Session. After he had shown that there was no time to discuss it, he went on to show that the principle of the Bill was wrong, that the Provincial Legislatures were the proper authorities to determine what the franchise should be for the election of members to this House, and he stated most emphatically that he and his party had been opposed to the principle of uniform franchise. He stated that the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) had, in 1874, introduced a Bill into this House carrying out the principle for which he and the hon. member for West Durham and his party had long contended, as against the principles for which the right hon. Premier contended. He said this:

> "My hon. friend was returned to power in January, 1874; and true to his pledge he introduced his Bill and asked the Parliament of Canada to consecrate the principle for which he had been contending, in opposition to the principle for which the hon. gentleman opposite had been contending, the principle, namely, that the franchise which the Provincial Legislatures adopted for the Legislative Assemblies should be the franchise for the election of members to this House."

Why, in 1870; a Franchise Bill, almost precisely as it is introduced to-day, was introduced into this House by the same gentleman who has introduced this one, and, upon that occasion, the only man who opposed its provisions, who opposed the details of it, although he did not even oppose the principles of the Bill, was the hon. member for South Bruce, now for West Durham. The hon. member for Both-

well (Mr. Mills) shakes his head. I know he did not oppose the second reading of the Bill. I know that he opposed it in committee, but he did not oppose the second reading of the Bill, and I am strictly correct. The hon. gentlemen then in Opposition, led not by the hon. member then for South Bruce and now for West Durham, but by the present member for East York, did not oppose the Bill as a party. The Hon. Mr. Mackenzie said, as leader of his party:

"When the hon. the Minister of Justice introduced the Bill, he had stated that it was not a party measure, and the Opposition were quite disposed to treat it in that way."

So I say that the hon. member for West Durham, when he undertook to show that the hon. member for East York, true to his pledge, introduced a Bill in opposition to the principle for which the right hon. the Premier was contending, in regard to uniform franchise, was not correct, for his party never divided the House on the subject, never dared to move an amendment, but he himself, the member then for South Bruce and now for West Durham, after complimenting the member for Kingston, the Premier of that day as he is the Premier of to-day, upon the full statement of details, upon the full explanation that he had given, said:

"They were all agreed as to the necessity of an Election Act, and, however he might oppose some of the details of that measure, he had no idea of opposing the second reading."

That was read to him the other night in this House, and how did he meet it? When the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) read it to him, how did he meet it? He said this:

"Hear, hear. The hon. member for East York passed an election law."

He knew, when he said that, that the election law passed by the hon. member for East York in 1874 was not the uniform Franchise Act of 1870, which he said he would not oppose the principle and would not oppose the second reading. Let me show how he had proved to the House in his previous speech that that was in his mind and how disingenuous his interruption was when he was confronted with it. He had gone—and I found the places carefully marked — to the Library, he had searched to see what he had said, and he had found himself confronted with this, and had asked himself: How am I to meet it if the Government side find it out? I will meet it, he said, with the statement that the member for East York passed an Election Act. He said on Friday night:

"In the year 1870 the Speech from the Throne was more comprehensive:

"'The laws in force on the subject of the elective franchise and the regulation of parliamentary elections in the several Provinces of the Dominion vary very much in their operations, and it is important that a uniform provision should be made, settling the franchise and regulating elections to the House of Commons, and measures upon these subjects will be submitted to your consideration.'

"'We were told that uniformity was the difficulty; that this want of uniformity was a blemish. It offended hon. gentlemen opposite. They did not like it. It is as apostles of the great doctrine of uniformity, it is as exponents of the necessity of a uniform provision, that the right hon. gentleman induced his colleagues to come forward when they, for the third time, in the Speech from the Throne, announced such a measure."

And, when that measure was announced, and these apostles of uniformity announced it, he said they were all agreed as to the necessity of an Election Act, and he had no intention of opposing the second reading. And yet he interrupted the hon. member for Cardwell to say that his excuse was that the hon. member for East York had introduced an election law which, he declares on Friday night, was in opposition to the principle of a uniform franchise. I never heard in my life of any member in a deliberative assembly, affecting to lead public opinion, making an interruption like that, and attempting by a quibble of a most trivial character to get out of a solemn announcement which he made at that time. One would think that it had been opposed by these hon. gentlemen. The hon. member for West Durham traced it for eighteen long years, traced the measures introduced and considered, and, during all those long years, we have heard for the first time on Friday night that he was opposed to the principle, that he was going to oppose the second reading of the Bill and the principle of the Bill. But he was not the only one who took that ground. The House will notice that, in 1870, when the Bill was introduced, and all along, when it was introduced, the hon. member for East York said nothing. He knew that his colleague and friend, Mr. Dorion, was opposed to the franchise being other than as the Provincial Legislatures determined it. They sat there and said nothing. They said it was not a party measure, but the hon. member for West Durham was the only one who made an elaborate speech, except the hon. member for Bothwell, but the *Globe* newspaper of that date, which was as much of a guide to these gentleman at that time as the pillar of fire was by night and the cloud by day to the Israelites, which was as much of a Bible to them as the Koran is to the Mussulman, which was edited and controlled by that grim old Reformer George Brown, who allowed no kicking over the traces and kept his party pretty well together, came out in 1870, and I want to contrast its utterances then and its utterances now, and to state why there is a change between that time and this. This is from the *Globe* of March 15th, 1870:

"There is no doubt that a good judicious election law is very much needed."

On May 20th, 1869, the *Globe* delivered itself as follows:

"The income franchise is an excellent feature in the ministerial measure. It is simply provided that an income of $400, of which a man has been actually in receipt for one year, shall give the qualification for a vote. The Provinces, moreover, are constantly altering their assessment law, and it would hardly do to pass a new election law for the Dominion every time the mode of assessment changes in any Province. A way out of this difficulty might be found by accepting the franchise as adopted in the different Provinces as the franchise for the Dominion, but that would be at the expense of uniformity."

This is the *Globe* that led the party, as I said before, as much as any people were ever led by an organ in the wide world. The *Globe* went on to say:

"In the United States the qualifications for voters for Congressmen are settled by State law. It therefore happens that Virginia Congressmen, under an educational restriction, that in some States only whites can vote for members of Congress while in others there is no distinction of color—and that in some States the foreigner has a voice in national affairs much sooner than in others. If we intend to avoid such inconsistencies and to have the same conditions confer the Dominion franchise on all parts of the Dominion, we cannot leave the qualification or registration of electors to the Provinces."

That is the *Globe* of that date. Now, Sir, I ask this House if, with the declaration of the hon. member then for South Bruce (Mr. Blake), backed up by the *Globe* for their party, and the leader of their party declaring on the floor of this House that it was not a bad measure, with the fact that they did not divide the House, but allowed it to go to committee after the second reading—how is it possible for these gentlemen to come here to-day and, man after man of them, stand up and say: Let this exercise of power remain with the Provincial Legislatures, as it ought to. Sir, I will put side by side the *Globe's* utterances then and the *Globe's* utterances now; I will put side by side hon. gentlemen's statements then and their statements now, and you will see the incongruity and hypocrisy of the whole affair; you will see that the *Globe* and the hon. gentlemen opposite have been taking sweet counsel together, and they have all changed their base. Since this discussion commenced the *Globe* came out the other day and said:

"The pretence was that the provisions of the Bill were so well known to all that lengthened explanation would simply be a defenceless waste of time. Never was pretence more transparent or more defenceless. The provisions of the Bill were not so known and were by no means so transparently reasonable as to need no defence. The very introduction of such a measure needed defence, for, as Sir John himself acknowledged, it had never been contemplated by the North America Act——"

That is not correct.

"which took it for granted that the regulation of the franchise would remain with the Provinces, as in all reason it ought to do."

That is the *Globe* of to-day which, in 1870, had declared itself in favor of a uniform franchise, and declared that we

should avoid the inconsistencies of the United States, and have a universal franchise for this Dominion. But, more, Sir, in 1865, when the Parliament of Upper and Lower Canada were convened, the Hon. George Brown, in speaking upon the resolutions passed by the delegates of the Maritime Provinces and Upper and Lower Canada, at Quebec, made use of these words:

"A Federal Parliament will, of course, have full power to regulate all arrangements for the election of its own members."

That is on the debate on those resolutions, and it shows that at the very inception of Confederation, it was agreed and understood that this Parliament should, for the time, accept the registration of voters as it then existed in the different Provinces, until the Parliament of Canada should otherwise provide, and should accept all the laws in force in the several Provinces which existed the same as they are to-day. That is in the 41st clause of our constitution. But in the 26th resolution passed by the Canadian House of Parliament in 1865, the clause read a little different. It commenced by stating that until provisions were made by the general Parliament, all the laws which were in existence at the date of the proclamation constituting the union should be in force in the different Provinces. Well, Sir, the hon. member for West Durham has shown that the present Premier of this country, for 18 long years, has been attempting to carry out the basis of the Confederation Act, has been asking this House to carry out the basis of the Confederation Act. We are opposed to-day by hon. gentlemen opposite, who are possessed of great command of language and great volubility, and who tell us, as the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) told us, that it is a civil right and belongs to the Provinces. The hon. member for St. John knew as well as any other lawyer in this House, as well as any layman—and every layman knows it—that it was one of the provisions of the constitution under which we live, under which we are enacting laws here, that only until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provided, the provincial franchise should be retained, and the laws of the Local Legislature should be in force. Why, Sir, that was a necessity. We could not run an election without we took their laws. It was necessary to have that done, and it was a wise provision to have it done. But whoever heard tell of the principal, when he comes upon the scene of action and asks his agent to give way to him, and says: I have allowed you to go on with the business so far; I will now resume the reins of power myself, and take charge of my own affairs; and the agent saying in return: I have been here for eighteen years. You have allowed me to do this work; it is a civil right that I have got, and you cannot undo it? Why, Sir, the idea is preposterous. Therefore I say, by the constitution under which we live, by the attempt to pass this Act for eighteen long years, beginning in 1867; by the declaration of hon. members opposite who have addressed this House; by their own organ, and by the consensus of universal opinion, this question is one that shall be decided by this Parliament, and this Parliament alone shall take charge of its own franchise. The hon. member for St. John used this language:

"I believe that the people in their Local Legislatures are the parties who have the right to regulate the franchise, and that it is one of their civil rights which may fairly be said to be under the control of the Local Legislature."

In the face of the Federal Act under which we are working, in the face of all the evidence before the country, the hon. member for St. John, who is a lawyer, stood up in this House and uttered that language. Well, Sir, I do not know what explanation he can give the House or what apology he can make for using that language. Now, Sir, it has been said here that we have no time this Session to discuss this Bill. The hon. member for West Durham stated, with all the positiveness possible, that because the Premier stated, in 1867, that it would take a whole Session to discuss the Franchise Bill that was then introduced into this House, therefore we were bound to take a whole Session to discuss this Bill now before the House. The hon. gentlemen opposite have endeavored to show that although 18 years of light had been thrown on this subject, we were still not in possession of all the facts in relation to it. Let me quote again the *Globe* on this question. On 20th May, 1872 the *Globe* said:

"The Election Bill was not even pressed to a second reading."

They were complaining because the second reading did not take place.

"There was no pretence whatsoever for saying that more information on such a topic was needed by anyone. The past experience of some two or three abortive election law Bills, has given the Government whatever light they needed with regard to the wishes of Parliament and the country."

That was in 1873. There were Bills introduced in successive Sessions, and we have the same Bill to-day, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that a whole Session of Parliament will be required to discuss it. It has also been contended by hon. gentlemen opposite that we ought to follow the United States plan. I have read what the *Globe* said, but in dealing with this subject on its merits ourselves hon. gentlemen opposite declare that we should take the American plan, and that the State Legislatures, which stand in the same position to Congress as our Local Legislatures here do towards the Federal Parliament, regulated the franchise and performed those functions. But hon. gentlemen opposite should know, and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) knows well, that the State Legislatures have constitutions of their own. Every State has a written constitution, and the qualification of voters is one of the written laws of each State; and you cannot change the laws in regard to the qualification of voters without you first change the constitution of the State. That has been decided over and over again by the Supreme Court. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) again shakes his head. I know whereof I am speaking, and I repeat that it has been decided over and over again by the Supreme Court at Washington that no State Legislature can change the franchise without first changing its constitution. Our Local Legislatures, on the other hand, can chance the franchise at their own sweet will. Let me read to the hon. member—as a barrister once said to a legal light, let me read Blackstone in order to show what a fool Blackstone is—McCrary on American law of elections. He says:

"There the constitution prescribes the qualifications."

Mr. MILLS. There was not a single instance of any state constitution containing such a provision at the time the federal constitution was adopted. Not one.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Every State of the United States to-day possesses a constitution in which it is declared what shall be the qualification of voters.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Yes; that cannot be changed by any Act of the Legislature without first changing the constitution.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Then there is no contention between us. This authority goes on to say:

"Whoever possess them has a constitutional right to vote, and of this right he cannot be deprived by legislative enactment."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. WOODWORTH. That is so. And therefore I say there is a guard and check in the United States which we do not possess here. The Local Legislature in Nova Scotia, in 1871, changed the law respecting the franchise, and disfranchised all Dominion officials. The Parliament had to

step in and relieve them from that disfranchisement. That Legislature passed a law on the subject this winter, and disfranchised, as I understand, a large number of people who vote for the National Policy, men who, believing in the National Policy, and throwing off the trammels of party, voted for the National Policy candidates; and the Local Legislature, by this Act, as I am informed—I do not state it authoritatively, but I believe I am correct—disfranchised them. Thus our Local Legislatures step in and disfranchise a number of electors at their own will and fancy, while this House lies powerless at their feet. This will continue until this House takes action, and it is provided by our constitution that at some time this should be done. We are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that there are provincial rights, and you must not entrench on provincial rights. Am I not, however, interested in provincial rights as regards Nova Scotia; are we not all interested in the rights of our respective Provinces; and are we precluded from considering them the moment we come here? Is it true that after the strife and turmoil of Dominion elections we come here perfectly regardless of the interests of our Provinces, and it becomes necessary for the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), to call on the provincial authorities to exercise their rights and to declare that they are being invaded. Why, when we attempted in this House last year to pass a railway Bill giving subsidies to the different Provinces, I thought it was one of the most innocent measures, and that it would prove very beneficial to the Provinces; but the hon. member for West Durham rose and declared it was another attack on provincial rights. Let me read the strong language he used on that occasion. He said:

"I say the policy of the hon. gentleman is a degrading and demoralising policy. It is objectionable on other grounds. It is an assumption of provincial functions, and it is centralisation in its most dangerous because in a material way and in its most inviting form."

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The hon. gentleman says, hear, hear. Although the hon. member for West Durham occupied four hours in endeavoring to show that the Bill was, first, dishonest, and secondly, unconstitutional, he was deserted in the hour of his utmost need by his own friends from the Maritime Provinces, and only one member from Quebec, Mr. Scriver, voted with him on that occasion. After that occasion millions of money were voted in Supply by the House without the votes receiving the criticism of the hon. gentleman, who remained on the back benches. The moment a Provincial Act is disallowed by the Government, hon. gentlemen opposite declare it is an invasion of provincial rights. They say you must not disallow. Yet this power was vested in the Federal Government, and should therefore be exercised at the proper time. No matter how or when this power is exercised by this Government, we always hear the cry that provincial rights are being invaded. But what about federal rights? Are there no federal rights? Does the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) and his friends expect the people of this Dominion to rise in their might against the Federal Government and federal authority because the hon. gentleman says that provincial rights have been invaded? Does he desire to arouse the people to make this Confederation, which cost so much thought and concession of opinion, and so much expense and trouble, unworkable? If he and his friends were so fortunate as to come into power he might expect, like the horses of Diomedes, which were taught by their master to eat human flesh, that they would turn round and eat him up. Why, Sir, it would be impossible for him, even supposing he got power to-morrow, to attempt to do what his declarations require and demand of him should be done. He would be bound by what he has told the House in past years; he would be bound by his own speeches, and he would find that the friction of Government would be such that he could not carry it on for six weeks. Sir, all Government is Government by concession. If every man stood here and took his own individual private opinion and put it against that of his fellows, Government could not be carried on for a day or for an hour. In all Government there must be concession, and much more does it require concession in a country like this, consisting of seven Provinces, heterogeneous as they are, composed of different races and different creeds; men must necessarily in such a nation, when they come to the Federal Parliament, give up something for the general good of the whole nation. Sir, we had in the Government of the hon. Premier—the Government of 1870, such men as the Hon. Joseph Howe and Sir George Cartier, and I think we had Sir Leonard Tilley—though I am sure the others I have mentioned were members of that Government. All these men agreed to the principle of a uniform franchise, and yet there was no greater stickler for provincial rights in the whole Dominion than Joseph Howe. He did not see any infringement of provincial rights in the principle of a uniform franchise—none whatever, and therefore when we find these great lights of public thought, these great leaders of the public, gathering round the hon. Premier—many of them have since gone to their rest, we cannot have them with us now—we find they all agreed with him that a uniform franchise was necessary in order to carry out the charter under which we live. The hon. member for West Durham could not, I say, carry on Government for an hour upon the plan he has laid down, and why then does he proceed in this course, why does he clamor for power at any sacrifice, why does he throw out baits and allurements every time he gets a chance, in the hope of catching some stray, straggling vote? It reminds me of a story of two colored men who were going down a stream on a raft. They were coming to a very bad cateract and Jim says to Ned, "Can you pray? If you can, you do the praying and I will do the poling." Ned commenced to pray, and promised the Lord that if he got ashore he would give Him $10,000. Jim said to him, "Why you know you have not got a cent in the world; why do you make a promise like that?" The other said, "Hold your tongue, wait till we get ashore." The hon. leader of the Opposition says, only let me get power; never mind only let me get ashore. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) who has some consistency, who led his Government here, I must say, with a great deal of ability, who was a staunch old Reformer, one that stood by the *Globe* and George Brown—that hon. member must lift his eyes in holy horror to find his former trusty lieutenant and his present leader, going whither he knows not; going all sorts of erratic ways, guided by no principle; he must say to him, surely you cannot expect, if you get into power, to fulfil all these promises, to govern by all these principles or want of principles. I can fancy the reply: Never mind, hold your tongues, let us get ashore; give me the Government for a day or an hour, give me the Government at all hazards. John Knox, the old reformer of Scotland, said, Give me Scotland or I die, and the leader of the Opposition says, Give me Canada or I die, but I am afraid if he got it, we would all die instead of him. I do not think he uses that conciliatory manner which would give him power. Some men you feel like standing by even if they are a little wrong because they are kind, affable, bland, and charitable; they never sneer, they never come down on a weak opponent with a heavy hand whenever they get the chance; they observe the amenities of private and social life, and for such men, I say, even if they are a little wrong, you have a feeling of tenderness, for them, you feel like being, "to their faults a little blind, and to their virtues very kind." I do not think the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) will get even one of his own party to say that of him. It is said in a book from which

hon. gentleman sometimes quotes, "for scarcely for a righteous man will one die; yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die," and for a good square pleasant fellow we would be inclined even to go a little wrong. But what kind of bait is it which is thrown out to this side of the House? It is the provincial rights bait; it is that gorgon, that hydra-headed monster of provincial rights, that is called forth every time that a Bill is introduced into this House; it is called forth every time the hon. gentleman can hang the slightest particle of clothing upon it; it is the only bait, the only allurement, he seems able to hold forth. The hon. member for West Durham sneered at my hon. friend the Secretary of State; he thought he had a chance of saying he sneered at the Provinces. Well, I am not here to defend the Secretary of State—he can do that much better for himself than I can—but as I have the floor I may say that we all know how eloquent that hon. gentleman is in English, although it is not his mother tongue. We know how aptly he puts his remarks and how acceptable they are to the House. But sometimes he will make a slip, as the best of us would make a slip if we were to speak in French. I can fancy that even the hon. member for West Durham, if he attempted to address the House in French, would make many a slip, but I cannot fancy a single Frenchman in this House taking him to task for it. The Secretary of State took occasion to allude to the Provinces other than Ontario—the Province upon which the hon. member for West Durham always has his mind—speaking of Quebec, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick he used the words little Provinces in a way in which we do not use them, and not speaking English as his native language. He used it not in an offensive sense, but as contra-distinguishing these from the great Federal Parliament which governs all the Provinces. Three different times the hon. member for West Durham sneered at him because he used that word, when he knew it was a slip of the tongue, when he knew that my hon. friend was not intimately acquainted with the English language, and at last the Secretary of State said, interrupting him, in stating that he was sneering at these Provinces: "I did not sneer;" and the hon. member for West Durham replied, in effect: "I accept your explanation, but you certainly said it." The hon. member for West Durham took a tour through his own Province last summer. He had addresses presented to him, and he accepted them, as Mr. Blaine accepted the address of Mr. Burchard—he bowed his head, he took all their compliments; but I wonder if he thought of some of these addresses when he made this allusion to the hon. Secretary of State. Mark you! the hon. member for West Durham knows English, he has full command of it, he knows every cranny and crevice of its import, and knows what it means in all its relations, its verbs, its substantives, its adjectives. Yet we heard no word of complaint over the expression which I shall quote from one of these addresses, and therefore I put it to him whether it was fair to sneer at the word "little," used by any hon. member in the sense in which it was used, and much less the Secretary of State. This is an extract from one of the addresses which was presented to him in Ontario last summer:

"We further wish to place on record our disapproval of the wholesale system of bribery recently inaugurated by the Government, under the guise of grants to railways, by which Ontario was robbed for the benefit of the smaller and poorer Provinces."

He accepted that: that was all right; he was in Ontario, and there was not a word of apology; he thought he would take what little political advantage he could; and yet when the Secretary of State in excellent English, in beautiful English, in eloquent tone, spoke to the House and happened to use the word little, in the sense I have described, he is taken to task, first by sneers, and secondly, by the hon. member for West Durham when he rises to his feet and addresses the House. There is an old adage which says that those who live in glass houses should never throw stones; but I say it is not a parallel case, as the hon. Secretary of State did not mention it in the sense the hon. member for West Durham attached to it. Now, I want just to allude to a letter from Mr. Davies, of Prince Edward Island, a Reformer, who formerly occupied a seat in this House. He writes to the Charlottetown *Examiner* in reply to a member of this House, Mr. Hackett, and this is what he says:

"I was not in favor of depriving the young men of their franchise votes; but I was and am strongly in favor of a registration of voters, and I was in favor of a uniform qualification for electors for the Commons all over the Dominion."

But, Sir, the member for West Durham when he was in the Government, passed an election law. It was introduced by Mr. Dorion, under the auspices of the then leader of the Government, the member for East York. What did it provide? Did it provide that the voters' lists in the Provinces should not be interfered with? Did it provide that the Local Legislatures were the best judges of what franchises should be had for this House, and that the lists should be left as the Local Legislatures made them? No, Sir, it did not. It provided that they should in all the Provinces except Prince Edward Island. Why they left that Province out I do not know—perhaps the hon. member will tell us; but instead of accepting the suffrages of the people who elected the members of the Assembly of Prince Edward Island, they took the franchise of the upper House, which was £100 worth of real property, and tacked that on to their Bill, thus disfranchising, according to Mr. Laird, one of the Ministers, who made a speech in the House of Commons, one-third of the voters on the island. In speaking in the debate in 1874, he (Mr. Laird) said:

"He denied *in toto* that anything like two-thirds of the electors of Prince Edward Island would be disfranchised by this Bill, and asserted that it would not exceed one-third."

Showing, according to the statement of one of their own Ministers, that at one stroke of their pen they deprived one-third of the electors of Prince Edward Island their votes. Was this an invasion of provincial rights? What did that mean? Why, Sir, it meant a good deal like the old couplet:

"The devil was sick, the devil a monk would be;
The devil was well, the devil a monk was he."

At that time, when they were in power, they were willing to strike down one-third of the electors of Prince Edward Island; but the moment they get into Opposition they say: Don't you interfere with the electoral lists, because you may hurt someone. Now, I know that this Bill does not curtail the franchise; I know that it gives a better franchise than there was before. It does not affect the franchise by restricting it; it helps the franchise; but that is a matter of detail that I need not go into now. I want to say one word about the revising barristers. Mr. Dorion, in introducing his Bill in 1874, to show why he did not wish to have a uniform franchise, used these words regarding revising barristers:

"Besides saving a considerable sum of money in making up lists, employing revising barristers, and such other means as were necessary to obtain a correct list of voters in each constituency every year, it would be far better, as a matter of principle, to adopt both the franchise and the machinery of the Local Legislatures in elections for the Commons."

That was his idea if he had got a uniform franchise; and everybody knows he was against a uniform franchise, although some of his colleagues were not against, and the Government of that day was not against it. One of the reasons he gave was that he would have to employ revising barristers. The member for Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Davies) spoke of this feature of the Bill, and one would have thought from his language that he had never heard of such a thing; "arbitrary," "unjust," "villainous,"—these are some of the adjectives he used with regard to this Bill. The hon. gentleman happened once to be a member of the Local Legislature of

Prince Edward Island, and he introduced an election Bill there in 1877, and carried it too; and this was one of the clauses of that Bill:

"The said lists of electors shall be subject to revision by the judge of the County Court, at the time and place and in the manner set forth in this Act, at the instance of any voter on the ground of votes being omitted from the lists, or from either of them, or being wrongly stated therein, or of names of persons being inserted on the lists or either of them who are not entitled to vote; and upon such revision the assessment roll shall not be conclusive evidence in regard to any particular, and the decision of the judge under this Act in regard to the right of any person to vote, shall be final."

There are three judges on the island, every one appointed by the hon gentleman's friends; and, to use the words of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), do you suppose for a moment that because a man is appointed a judge he will be a non-political judge? No, Sir, he said, he will be a political judge. Did he know it because his own party have been so extremely anxious about and have looked so carefully after the electoral lists? Is it because they have been making up the lists to suit themselves that they assume that this Government and this party will do the same? This Bill provides for a revising judge or a revising barrister of five years' standing. He revises the lists twice, every vote is given, and every publicity is had, and there is not a final decision until the last revision. The Bill of the hon. member for Queen's provided for one revision, I won't say by a partisan judge, as hon. gentlemen opposite would say, were he appointed by a Conservative Government, but by one of their own friends appointed by themselves, and his decision was to be final. We hear a great deal about these electoral lists. I know that they are anxious about them. The hon. member for West Durham, when he was down in the Maritime Provinces, told his followers there: Look out for your electoral lists; your speeches are all very well, but keep your eye on your electoral lists; and one of his friends down in Annapolis took his advice and made out a new list altogether, the clerk of sessions made out a new list, and it was an extraordinary thing that the Tories were left off and the Reformers put on. He did not give a reason, but I suppose he would have said: Our great leader was down here, and he told us to keep our eye on the electoral lists, and I did it and made out a new one. Now, I say that any lawyer of five years' standing of any degree of respectability, can be safely entrusted with the revision of the lists, living in the county, coming into daily contact with the public, holding an open court in open day, subpœnas being issued and every facility given to produce evidence—I say that lawyers of any respectability at all of five years standing will not make the mistakes that the revisers, to-day make. Why, to-day in Nova Scotia we have revisors who are appointed by political influence and who revise the assessment rolls, their revision being final, no appeal being allowed to any court or judge. Is not the system proposed in this Bill a preferable one? Hon. gentlemen opposite have raised the bugbear that these revising officers are to be a great power behind the Throne, that they can do as they like, and that we are attempting to retain office by their means and their influence. In this hon. gentleman opposite raise an unnecessary alarm; they are continually striving to create feelings of prejudice. They preach provincial rights in Quebec when it suits them, and in Ontario when it suits them; they call the Maritime Provinces the smaller Provinces when they are in Ontario, and describe us as the Saviours of the Dominion when addressing the people down by the sea; but despite all these sectional appeals, steadily the right hon. the leader of the Government and his party go on from victory to victory, holding their own wherever an opening is made, and sometimes more than their own, despite the cries of alarm continually being raised by hon. gentlemen opposite. Only the other day their organ in this city described this measure as an infamous one, and stated if it passed there would be a white rebellion. Such attempts to excite prejudice are unworthy of statesmen, they are unworthy of men who are trying to lead public opinion, and who have behind them many men of solid information and judgment, good, patriotic.——

Mr. LANDERKIN. Loyal.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Yes, loyal; but I know there are annexationists in this House in the vicinity from which came this interruption. I shall not particularise them, but there are to-day seated in the ranks of the Opposition gentlemen who would prefer annexation to the United States than to continue living under our federal charter. I honor the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) for the part he took in this charter, for his consistency in trying to work it out, for his ardor and hard toil in aiding to perfect it, and I tell him that when he and the men with him who traced the charter of our constitution, when their eloquent lips are hushed, when the spirits that sustained and nourished and resolved this charter will have departed, their influence will still survive.

"These shall resist the empire of decay,
When time is o'er and worlds have passed away,
Deep in the earth the perished heart may lie,
But that which warmed it once can never die."

The hon. member for East York is a loyal man, loyal to confederacy, loyal in heart and principle. He does not quote Tennyson as glibly as does his leader and former lieutenant; he does not come here with Tennyson in his arms and recite for half an hour from that poet's works; he does not give us pictures of the lion and the tiger, and the raven and misery and crime and death and life and all these descriptions of storm and tempest, and, weaving them into one great mass, say that from these miseries our finite minds will rise some time and know their reasons now so mysterious. Why does not the hon. gentleman, who is so fond of losing himself in these speculations, try to evolve harmony out of the heterogeneous elements of confederacy? Why does he not, before going to that higher sphere, use his abilities and talents in the endeavor to harmonise the elements of this confederacy, and build up here, side by side with co-workers, a vigorous nation? Why does he not engage in that work, instead of casting sneers at and heaping opprobrium upon the hon. the Secretary of State, who in happy and choice language showed the equilibrium that existed among the various elements in our confederacy, as for instance exemplified in the making of the courts by the Provincial Legislature and the appointment of the judges by this Government and Legislature? The hon. the leader of the Opposition is fond of quoting Tennyson. Is not this from Tennyson? and would it not have been more appropriate in his case than the paraphrase he gave:

"For nature is at one with rapine—a harm no preacher can heal;
The May fly is torn by the swallow, the sparrow is spear'd by the shrike,
And the whole little wood where I sit is a world of plunder and prey."

He should have quoted that instead of paraphrasing and plagiarising Tennyson, but with all his great rhetorical abilities I would not give one ounce of the solid hard work given by that loyal Canadian, the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), who does not, I am sorry to say, often address the House now, but whom we regard with all the more respect that he does not make speeches of four hours and three hours in length on provincial rights, going through all the range of history and giving vent to all sorts of utopian ideas when we have practical work to perform when we have a country to build up. Why does not the hon. the leader of the Opposition take the lines from Tennyson to heart, which appeal to our national sympathies. Why does not his heart beat:

"In the steamship, in the railway, in the thoughts that shake mankind;"

Why does not the hon. gentleman use his talents and abilities, side by side with his fellowmen, in helping to build up this great country with:

"Men, my brothers, men, the workers, ever reaping something new,
That which they have done but earnest of the things that they shall do."

Let him give up dealing in rhetoric and turn his attention to facts. This is an age of facts; his rhetoric might very well have suited centuries ago when people had plenty of time on their hands and events marched slowly, when now it is better to have "fifty years of Europe than a cycle of Cathay;" but it is out of place in this practical age, and I trust we have had the last of three and four hour speeches on Tennyson and the North-West troubles and every conceivable trouble thrown into one Bill, merely to show how able a man can make a speech with nothing in it. With these remarks I will conclude. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill which has been 18 years before Parliament and which it is now high time should be passed, will receive its second reading by a very large majority.

Mr. DUPONT. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have heard the hon. members opposite charging the Government with having delayed too long in submitting this Bill to the consideration of the House. I cannot agree on that ground with the hon. members of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition. On the contrary, I think, not only that this measure has been introduced early enough, but also that it should never have been introduced at all. I consider the Government scheme, politically speaking, as a Tower of Babel—as a political impossibility. For the last eighteen years, since Confederation, or the federal compact, is in force in British North America, the various Provinces have had the privilege of determining their electoral franchise to send their representatives even in this Parliament, and no evil whatever has resulted from the fact that the Provinces have had the control of their own electoral franchise. Each Province, in fact, is the best judge of the mode of franchise which is best suited to it. We must not forget that the federal system under which we live is an organisation which is rather federal than unionist; therefore, the Provinces themselves have to see in what manner they will be represented here. The proof that this assertion is true lies in the fact that each of the Provinces within the Confederation thinks it possesses the best system of franchise. Nearly all the modes now in force in the various Provinces differ from one another. We have manhood suffrage in British Columbia; and in the eastern Provinces a suffrage excessively broad, and verging upon universal suffrage; in the Province of Ontario, and in the Province of Quebec, qualification is based wholly on the right of property. How is it that in this Confederation of ours we should have so many different systems? This lies in the fact that each Local Parliament has chosen the mode of suffrage, which was best suited to the people whom they were called upon to govern. Each Province sends a certain fixed number of representatives to the Federal Parliament. The mission of these members is to defend the general interest of each of these Provinces in the Federal Parliament, with respect to the general interest of the other Provinces. I consider, Mr. Speaker, that in order to attain this end, we must leave to the Local Legislature the absolute control of the electoral franchise. Besides, there cannot be uniformity in the electoral franchise. In the Eastern Provinces and in British Columbia, real property may be worth less than in the Province of Ontario, and in the Province of Quebec. $100 or $150 worth of real estate in British Columbia, in Nova Scotia and in Prince Edward Island, may represent a property far more extensive than the same amount would represent in the Province of Quebec or Ontario. That is to say, if a property valued at $100 in British Columbia was in the Province of Ontario it might be worth thousands of dollars. Therefore, I say, it is impossible to establish a uniform mode of electoral franchise. And, Mr. Speaker, in which Province of Confederation have people suffered from the present system? What complaints were brought before the Government urging them to come down with their scheme, and submit it to the consideration of the House? I fail to see any; the whole scheme is based on hypothesis, on conjectures, which I consider as chimerical. They are mere pretexts to carry through a most extraordinary legislation. The First Minister seems to have thought it very peculiar that a man from the Province of Ontario might be qualified as a voter, while an inhabitant of the Province of Quebec should be deprived of it. For my part, I see nothing strange in that. Sir, the laws are quite different in the various Provinces of the Dominion. The municipal system and the civil laws differ according to the Provinces. It is impossible to have uniformity everywhere, and I do not think that it would be desirable. I might recall to the hon. First Minister, an axiom which is nearly as old as the French language itself, and which is this:

"L'ennui naquit un jour de l'uniformité."

And I much fear that with such a Bill as this, the First Minister or the Government may end in wearying a great many of their friends and followers. Mr. Speaker, laws should be made for the public, and the public is not obliged to get accustomed to laws which are made for it. In the present case, I consider that we are compelling the people of the different Provinces in the Dominion to adopt an electoral law which will certainly displease a great many, for in the Province of Quebec the extension of suffrage granted by this Bill will be objected to, while in the Province of Ontario and in British Columbia it will be thought that the suffrage is too restricted. Now, the electors of the different Provinces of the Dominion will be compelled to abide by a law which does not suit them, and which is probably not in keeping with competency, their wants and their way of thinking on electoral law. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill is useless, and moreover, that it is contrary to the spirit of our constitution. It is an infringement on the rights of the Provinces, and it will give satisfaction to none of them. But, indeed, this is not the only fault of the Bill now before the House. Let us examine its intrinsic merit, and let us see whether it is entitled to a special consideration on our part, and whether it deserves to be favorably received by the electorate of this country. This Bill does not rest upon any principle. Besides, there is a certain class of people who should never become electors under any law. Well, I observe that the Bill provides for woman suffrage. Mr. Speaker, this is the upsetting of all the ideas which we of the Province of Quebec have entertained, at least up to this day, on the question of the mode of suffrage. In fact, what is the appointed lot of woman in the community? I do not hesitate to say that her mission is far different from that which the Government assigns to her by this Bill. The mission of woman in the community is to watch over domestic happiness, to educate her children, to cultivate in the hearts of her offspring those civic virtues which will render them useful citizens, devoted to society and humanity. Such, in my opinion, is the mission of woman in the world. It is not proper that she should meddle with our electoral contests any more than it would be proper to send her on the battlefield. In the one case you would expose her to death, in the other you expose her to insult. You cannot shield her from insult at the polls any more than you could shield her from death on the battlefield, if she mingled with the male soldiers. Sir, if such is the mission of woman, then if you compel her to enter in the political arena, you cause her to deviate from the true path which she ought to follow. She is a bright luminary, a shining star, but if you cause this luminary to depart from its route, consequences will follow which will be quite serious for society. Even, as if in the celestial world, one of the

luminaries should cease to follow the route, which has been assigned to it by the Creator of all things, immense trouble and disorder would follow. So if you prevent women from fulfilling her mission, indescribable trouble and disorder will be the result for society. Sir, the political school for women has never produced anything else—and history is there to prove it—but such women as Charlotte Corday and Louise Michel. The present Bill also offers other faults which I cannot refrain from pointing out to this hon. House. Each one views them from his own standpoint, and I feel rather inclined to explain to this House how I appreciate the objectionable features I find in the other parts of this Government measure. It will be exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, for one officer to prepare the voters' lists for one large county. Let us enquire how much work is required to prepare one voters' list in one municipality of a county. Let us ask the opinion of well informed men. For my part I have, as secretary-treasurer of a municipality, been preparing voters' lists for the last eighteen years, and I have had occasion to notice the great difficulties with which these officers have to contend. Now, how can you expect that a stranger, a young lawyer from the city or a judge from another county, men who do not know the voters personally as the secretary-treasurer of a municipality knows them, how can you expect, I say, that this unknown individual, when he arrives in a county, will be able, even with half of the municipal papers, to prepare a complete list of voters? The municipal papers often require corrections, and how will he know that these documents ought to be corrected, when he does not know any of the inhabitants of the municipality. It will be absolutely necessary for him to do as the Census Commissioner does, to travel through each muncipality, from one house to the other, and how much time will it take to travel over such an immense county as Gaspé, for instance, and many other counties in the Dominion. The result will be, Mr. Speaker, that the officer charged with the duty of making such a list will be obliged to commence it over again when he gets at the end of the county, or else he will have to employ a host of assistants to aid him in the performance of his work; and then what will be the cost of preparing the list, if this revising officer is obliged to have under his command forty or fifty employés for each county municipality? I can foresee that the lists will cost enormous sums of money, amounts that will be far larger than the Government can expect. I venture to say I am not exaggerating when I state that by the proposed system the voters' list will cost over $300,000. To-day the municipal officiers, or the officers charged with the duty of preparing the voters' lists in the different Provinces in the Dominion, do not themselves determine the value of real estate; they are not clothed with that absolute power which is conferred to the revising officers by the present Bill. On the contrary, these officers are obliged to take valuation rolls from the different municipalities, these valuations are not made for electoral purposes, but they are generally made in a fair manner for the assessment of the burden of taxation among the ratepayers of the municipalities. It is the municipal authority which presides over the dispensation of justice to the ratepayers, for a certain fixed taxation, through a valuation which is the same in proportion for all the inhabitants of the municipalities. In the Province of Quebec, at least, we have excellent voters' list, which are prepared with a great deal of care; these lists hardly cost anything, and the officer who prepares them is not charged with the almost impossible task of valuating the real estate himself; on the contrary, he takes an official document, in which he has no right to charge an iota, and the lists are made according to this document. There, Sir, is a guarantee for the electorate of the municipalities, there is a guarantee for the electorate of a county, a guarantee which I do not find in the Government Bill since the power of determining the valuation is conferred upon one man. According to the Bill the officer must take cognizance of the valuation rolls, of the assessment rolls and of the voters' lists; he may get help from all these, but if my property is worth $5,000, and he feels inclined to say that it is only worty $5, he has that power and I have no means of asking redress from the injustice done to me by that officer. Such is the position in which the Government Bill puts us. Mr. Speaker, I fear the Government and the party to which I was always proud to belong, have laid themselves open to the charge of extravagance on the part of the electorate. In what a predicament are we to-day? We have to contend with a rebellion, the cause of which the people think is due to the bad policy of the Government. I do not wish to pronounce on the policy of my friends. I claim the right of hearing their justification before judging them. I wish to deal fairly with them, but I say that in the Province of Quebec such is the direction which public opinion has taken. Here we are, going to squander in the North West, in order to quell this outbreak, several hundreds of thousands of dollars, and we may consider ourselves lucky if we can put it down without having to pay millions in expenditure. And the remainder of our surpluses, what are we going to do with them, Mr. Speaker? We are going to spend it in preparing bad voters' lists, while we will abandon our railway schemes, which are waiting for Government subsidies in order to open out the untilled land of our Provinces. We are going to leave these railways, without any subsidies, in order to spend each year, amounts which will represent millions, for the preparation of voters' lists which will be not only useless, but injarious to the interest of the party to which I have the honor to belong. Sir, what is the revising officer? Why, it is an extraordinary officer! Why, he is more than a judge from the Superior Court! Why he is more than a judge from the Supreme Court! Because we can appeal to the Sovereign from the decision of the Supreme Court. Well, from the decision of the revising officer, there will be no appeal unless he is willing to allow it. Sir, I think that an officer clothed with such power is a fact without a precedent in any legislation, not only as regards electoral matters but also as regards any other subject. It seems to me that the Conservative party and the Liberal party have their guarantee in the laws now in force in the different Provinces of the Dominion. The two victories of 1878 and 1882, prove that our leaders have had full liberty and that the Provincial Government have not interfered in any way with the conduct of the federal elections. Mr. Speaker, I would be ashamed to go back to my constituency after having sanctioned by my vote, such a monstrous principle as that which is consecrated in the Bill now before us. I would prefer to be defeated in any electoral contest, with three-fourths of my party than to achieve a victory which might be suspected of being the result of such a tyrannical law as that which is now before us. War comparisons are in order in time of war, I shall make one: It would be better for the general of an army to lose a battle fairly and while knowing the result beforehand, than to employ, in order to achieve victory, destructive weapons which are prohibited by the laws of civilized warfare. If he employs these destructive weapons which are forbidden by the international law, he will have against him the whole world who will march against his army, and will crush him if he has been victorious. On the contrary, if after having fought fairly and loyally, he is beaten after having shown that courage which one has a right to expect from the chief of an army, then he will, at least, have the consolation of saying with the illustrious vainquished of Pavia: "All is lost save the honor." Just so in political contests. Never should any party do anything which is not according to the law of nations in order to get the control over straightforward opponents. Now, I consider that the present Bill is an infringement on the law of nations. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, could any one

imagine a law which would be more contrary to the principles of constitutional government, a more arbitrary law? A law so extraordinary in fact, that I believe, that even if we should use the means which it puts at our disposal to control the electorate, we would be crushed in the next electoral contest; because, in my opinion, this law will have the result of stirring up against us our own followers, who will say: If to-day we deprive our opponents from their liberty, to-morrow they may deprive us from the liberty we now enjoy. Mr. Speaker, what is the position in which the judges of Ontario are now put? We make them come down from the bench to become electoral agents. But it may be said: The judges are superior men, men who enjoy the respect and confidence of those who are under their jurisdiction. I believe that is true, but then that is no reason why we should take means to make them lose that respect and that confidence. Indeed I consider that in compelling them to meddle so actively with politics, we will deprive the courts over which they preside, from that respect which they now enjoy. The judges will lose their character the moment they become electoral agents. There are men in whose breast you will awaken the slumbering political passions and party spirit; the more so, as there will be no appeal from their decisions. They will act, not as judges, but as political and salaried agents of a Government. And there will be no appeal from their decision. They will only be responsible to the House, and to what kind of a House will they be responsible to, if they commit irregularities? To a House whose election will be partly due to their irregularities. We all know that such a House will never blame these officers, through whose exertions it shall have been elected, and through whose exertions the members will unjustly retain their seats. But, perhaps, I may be told that I am putting things to the worse, that I see everything in dark colors; that the electoral officers will not act so; that they will all be honest, and will allow them to act according to law, and according to the dictates of their conscience. Sir, under the existing laws, the electoral officers are amenable to the courts. Severe penalties are dealt to those who violate the laws; and still, at every general election, a certain number of these officers do violate the laws. Why should we lead one or the other of the two parties into the temptation of appointing election officers, who will control the electorate in a shameful manner? Why should we consecrate the principle by a formal law if it is not to be used? I fail to see the reason of this, and I await an explanation from the hon. Ministers on this point. And, Mr. Speaker, when a political party will leave power, bequeathing to their successors the legacy of such a law under which exactions will perhaps have been committed, what can we expect? I do not allude to either of the two political parties in particular—we must expect retaliation, and where will retalliation lead us? They will lead us to political anarchy. Mr. Speaker, if the Conservative party consider as a present the electoral war steed which is offered to them by their Government, they are sadly mistaken. It is a dangerous gift, it is a present which carries in its entrails the death of many a member of the Conservative party. I may perhaps be considered by some as being rash and foolhardy; I know not what lot is in store for me after to-day, I know not whether my lot will be that of that imprudent youth who having one day thrown a spear in the side of a large wooden colossus before Troy was devoured by serpents. I hope not, I know that such will not be my fate. But it is quite possible that my political reputation will be damaged by journalists who are too zealous in favor of the Government. Nevertheless, I think I have done my duty, and I do not think that in spite of common sense, in spite of justice, we are obliged to introduce into our legislation this electoral war horse. I am not making a threat, but I believe that if this Bill becomes law, such as it is drafted, without amending it so as to change its nature, great injury to the Conservative party will be the result; I believe both political parties will suffer from it. I think it will lead to political anarchy, and that it will completely rout the compact phalanx over which the hon. leader of the Government has presided for such a great number of years. Once again, this is not a threat which I make, it is a conviction which I frankly and candidly express.

Mr. TASCHEREAU. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I certainly did not expect to address the House on the second reading of the Bill now submitted to our consideration, but after having heard the eloquent speech, the passionate plea of the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) I feel it my duty, as a representative of the people, to try and express also my opinion on this Bill.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to remark that it is impossible for him to make his speech in ten minutes, and he would probably prefer that the House should declare that it is six o'clock.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. TASCHEREAU. (Translation.) Well, I was saying that I feel it my duty to also express my own way of thinking on this Bill, to not give a silent vote, and to say why, as a member, just as consciencious, just as independent, and just as enlightened, I hope, as the hon. member for Bagot. I shall vote in favor of the second reading of this Bill. I shall give my vote in favor of the second reading of this Bill, for the chief reason that it contains a conservative idea, a conservative principle, and that it is conservative in its very essence. It is conservative as a whole, and will be conservative in its consequences. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, what do we see to-day in every part of the Dominion, that immense country which is composed of many Provinces, every one of which has franchise of its own? In one you have qualification based entirely on real property, as in the Province of Quebec; and in other Provinces, as in British Columbia and some other Provinces in the east, you have universal suffrage. Now, what is the result of this law? It will tend to establish uniformity of the conservative principle in all parts of the Dominion, to base the qualification of all the inhabitants of the Dominion of Canada on the conservative principle, that whoever pays taxes has a right to vote. In fact, by referring to the Bill you will find in it that principle affirmed in its broadest sense; that is to say, there is no more what the English call manhood suffrage; but you will find in it the suffrage given to the elector who is owner of property, or lessee, or who has a certain income. This is the essence of the conservative principle, as regards the right of suffrage. I believe that this Bill is conservative in its essence, and for that reason it was right it should be introduced by the leader of the Conservative party, and for that reason I think it ought to be supported by every one who calls himself a Conservative, and who have acted as such up to this day. Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the objections raised by the hon. member for Bagot against this Bill is that it interferes with the rights of the Provinces. I will ask wherein it does interfere with the rights of the Provinces? A law interferes with the rights of the Provinces whenever, by virtue of the constitution, it is not within the jurisdiction of the Parliaments who have passed it. For instance, the argument might apply in the case of the License Act. In that case there were doubts as to which Parliament had jurisdiction with regard to the License Act. The law passed in 1883 was such as to create, as it has created, a number of difficulties; because, on the one hand, the Provinces claimed the right of legislating on this matter, and, on the other hand, the Dominion Government claimed the same right. But the case is not the same to-day, for it is written in black and white, in the Act of British North America, that the Canadian Parliament shall have the right to pass a law

uniformly regulating the electoral franchise. Therefore, the Bill does not interfere, in this manner, on local legislation. In what manner could it interfere with it? In passing this law, are we to touch any of the privileges of the Provincial Legislatures? Are we to infringe, in any way, on their right of passing such a law? Has their right of regulating the Dominion franchise been vested in them by virtue of any of the provisions of the Act of British North America? I do not think it; and if I was not satisfied that the Bill which is submitted to our adoption, on the present occasion, does not in any way interfere with the legislation of the Provinces, or encroach in any way upon their jurisdiction, I would oppose it with all my might. Another objection raised by the hon. member for Bagot, against the Bill now before the House, is that by giving the right of suffrage to women we would be creating a monstrous legislation. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not now wish to discuss that part of the question which is more intricate. This innovation in our legislation may lead to serious consequences, and I suppose it will be discussed when the Bill is examined in committee. But for the same reason which I have given a while ago, it seems to me that the fact of granting the right of suffrage to women is pushing the conservative principle to its last limits, so to speak. If we take it as a conservative principle that the right of suffrage should be granted to whoever pays the taxes, and if a woman pays taxes, owns property and is interested in the good legislation, and in the welfare and prosperity of the country, by virtue of what principle could we refuse to give her the right of voting? Have we not seen in our municipal elections, at least I can affirm that it was so in the city of Quebec, a few years ago, women having a right to go to the polls and to vote for the aldermen or the mayor whom they thought was best qualified to defend their property and their municipal interests, and I do not think that any serious evils followed. But, as I said a while ago, this new legislation involves consequences which are too serious to allow me to form an opinion just now on this matter, and I intend to do it when the Bill comes before the Committee of the Whole House. The third objection raised by the hon. member for Bagot has reference to the question of revising officers. He has specially urged two leading arguments. The first is the question of expenditure, and the second is the want of guarantee which would be offered to the electorate by the action of these revising officers. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think with the hon. member, that this appointment of revising officers, and this revision of lists will, for the first year, cause considerable expenditure. I scarcely know the counties of the other Provinces, but I know that in the Province of Quebec, the counties are large, the population is numerous, and in order to prepare a list which will be satisfactory to all concerned, it will be necessary for the revising officer, during the first year, to devote most of his time to it, and this will involve a pretty large expenditure. But it is so with all laws when they are first put in force; this inconvenience will take place, but it will not last long. Though, if I rightly understand the present Bill, when once the voters' lists are prepared, when once they are completed, so to speak, all that will be necessary will be to revise them; that is to say, all the revising officers will have to do will be to go in the counties and cause to be inserted in the new lists, the names of those who have become qualified to vote since the previous year, and at the same time remove therefrom the names of those who have died or have become disqualified in any other manner. It seems to me that this will not cause a great loss of time nor involve a great amount of cost.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. TASCHEREAU. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair before recess, I had stated that I should vote for the second reading of the Bill because it appeared to me that the Bill was consecrating a conservative principle; secondly, because the Bill was not interfering either directly or indirectly with the provincial rights, and thirdly, I said that the revision of the list by a lawyer called "revising barrister" would not, after the first year, involve a greater amount of cost, and I was just saying that by this Bill the whole of the electorate of the Dominion will have as full a guarantee as if we followed the same mode which has heretofore been followed in making and preparing the voters' lists. I will limit my remarks to the Province of Quebec, to which the hon. member for Bagot has referred in the speech he delivered this afternoon. He said that in the Province of Quebec, the valuation rolls on which the voters' lists were based, offered an important guarantee to the electorate. But, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this guarantee will still exist in the same manner that it existed heretofore. The voters' list which will be prepared by the revising barrister will also be based, to a certain extent, on the valuation roll, and if it is allowed to give evidence before this revising barrister, in order to insert the names on the voter's list, the first document which will have to be consulted, the first evidence which will have to be adduced before him, will necessarily have to be the valuation roll itself, which will be the most important basis of the voters' list. To-day this valuation roll is not the only document on which the list is based, and we can also appeal from the valuation roll itself. Thus, supposing there should be an appeal from the voters' list prepared by the municipal councils, it is allowed to prove by witness against the valuation roll, and it will still be permitted to prove the same thing before this revising barrister, it will be possible to adduce the same evidence against the valuation roll or in support of it, which it is to-day allowed to make in case of an appeal before a judge. I hold, Mr. Speaker, that that tribunal being more important, having more prestige, surrounded with more splendor than the municipal council, the electors will be more eager to have their names on the voters' list than they are to-day; and I think that consequently the lists will be prepared in better shape than they are to-day, and that a smaller number of persons will be deprived of their votes, either willingly or unwillingly. Sir, the hon. member for Bagot, in the speech he has just delivered, has used an argument which is so violent, that it is upset by its own violence. He stated that this Bill was an infringement on the law of nations. Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that no hon. member, not even those who are most opposed to the Government, none of those who have discussed this Bill with the greatest warmth, and who have opposed it the most strongly, have dared to use such an argument, such an expression. The leader of the Opposition, in the speech he delivered last Friday, admitted that, according to the Act of British North America, the Bill was constitutional. To say that this Bill is against the law of nations one must say that the authors of Confederation, when they inserted in the Act of British North America the sub-section which authorises the Dominion of Canada to enact a law to establish uniformity in the qualification of voters throughout the Dominion, have introduced a principle which is against the law of nations, and say that those who took part in the contest at the time, and who had far more experience than the hon. member for Bagot has now, have not discovered such a principle, and that neither them nor those who are even now fighting the authors of Confederation, have discovered it. Why then should this Bill involve an infringement on the laws of nations? Does it contain a principle which is against natural law? Has not any Parliament, any nation, the right of passing laws regulating the mode of suffrage? Are there not in any county different systems of franchise? Has not France her own mode of suffrage? Has not England a system of franchise which is different from that

of France? And has not Belgium a different mode of her own? Now, if we come to the Confederation of Canada, do we not see that almost every Province has a special mode of regulating their franchise? Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do not see where is the infringement on the law of nations in this Bill. Is it because the officer who is to be called a "revising barrister" will be appointed by the Government? Well, if it is on that account, I think that the danger arising from that appointment is greatly exaggerated, but perhaps this will offer the greatest difficulty in carrying out the law. The law is good in its known principle, as, I think, I have pointed out, but in order that it may be good in its application, the Government must chose a revising barrister who shall be considered as an able lawyer, who shall be awake to the sense of his responsibility, who shall have sufficient knowledge and prestige to place himself above party prejudices, above popular passions and who will be able to give a sound and impartial decision on all questions which will be submitted to him. Mr. Speaker, the Government will have to exercise a great discretion in the appointment of these. If these voters' lists are not prepared by judges already appointed, as long as the revising officers are chosen among men of high standing, men who are responsible in all respects. I believe there will be no danger in the carrying out of that law. But it may be said: These revising officers are appointed by the Government, therefore they will be the Government's creatures and will be interested in putting on the voters' list only persons who are supporters of the Government. Well, this is a poor reason to give. It is showing very little confidence in the moral sense of the people, it is showing very little confidence in their learning and independence to state that the electors of the whole Dominion are so little enlightened that their votes will be influenced because the revising officer shall have put their names on the voters' list. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we must place ourselves on a higher standpoint in order to judge these questions and that we ought to consider the electorate of the Dominion of Canada from another standpoint, consider it as being more enlightened, more independent and not use such reasons as these to oppose this Bill. The hon. member for Bagot said: These judges will be the agents of the Government. Well, I still fail to see that their position will make them electoral agents. As I said a while ago, they would be men who would have the sense of their position, and why should they be electoral agents? Why should they come down from the seat in which they would have been placed by the confidence of the public? Why should they stoop from the dignity to which they would have been raised through the confidence of the Government, and consequently of the public, to become low electoral agents and to try and defraud the electors of their franchise? I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that this argument is irresistible and I have too much confidence in the members of the bar and in the electorate as a whole, to believe that such an argument might prevail. Besides, the municipal councils who now prepare the lists are generally composed of members of both political parties, are generally Conservatives or Liberals, and did we ever see that there was irretrievable abuses? Well, I do not see why these revising officers, who will be better scholars than the municipal councillors generally are, should not keep their independence and should not be worthy of their country and of the Government who appointed them. And more than that, Mr. Speaker, the Bill provides that their independence will be wholly left to them. These judges will not be Government employés, when once they shall have been appointed. These officers will not be in the service of the Government, but they will be at the service of the country at large. They will only be dependent on the House itself, which will have the power to dismiss them; and, therefore, the argument that being officers of the Government they must work in the interest of their masters, falls to the ground. I think, that as a rule, people are greatly mistaken about this law. I think this law, or another of the kind is necessary, if we wish to become a united people over the whole of the Dominion. The inhabitants of one Province must enjoy the same rights and privileges, as those of all the other Provinces. For that reason, I also think, that if we wish to avoid the difficulties which sometimes crop up between the various Provinces and the Federal Parliament, each one must keep within their own jurisdiction. We must remove all circumstances in which conflicts may arise between the rights and privileges of each Legislature. Provincial Legislatures must pass their own laws, and the Dominion Parliament must not interfere with them. On the other hand, the Dominion Parliament must be at liberty to make laws, with which the Provinces will not interfere. For the reasons I have just given, Mr. Speaker, I shall vote in favor of the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. AUGER. I think it is my duty to say a few words on this question. It is an important question, and I think I would not be doing my duty to myself, to my constituents, or to the country, if I did not enter my protest against the Bill before the House. The hon. the Minister of Public Works and the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr White), when they spoke on this question, found fault with this side of the House because, according to their ideas, we discussed the matter rather too much. The member for Cardwell went so far as to state that the member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) had spoken forty-seven times on the Civil Service Bill. Well, it does not make any difference how many times an hon. member speaks on a measure if he speaks well and brings out good arguments. I think it would have been better for the hon. member for Cardwell to have taken the small speeches of the hon. member for Elgin and shown which of them was useless and ought not to have been spoken. I think we are here to discuss. But I have the report of the answer of the Secretary of State to the arguments of the Minister of Public Works and the member for Cardwell. The Secretary of State said: Discussion brings good results. Well, if it brings good results, I think the Opposition ought to be congratulated upon doing their duty. Has there been any reason advanced for the necessity of this Bill? The present system has existed for eighteen years. No one has found fault, everyone has been satisfied, there has been no petition, no one has asked to change the law. The reason given by the Secretary of State and the member for Cardwell is that we ought to have uniform legislation. Will they have it by this Bill? I believe not. If you take this Bill and go over all its details, over section after section, you will find that we have not a uniform Bill. For instance, in some Provinces, the Bill gives the right to fishermen to be qualified on moveable property, but elsewhere other classes of people have not that right. In towns, a man who has a lot that may be worth $200 and who may have a span of horses worth $400 or $500, who is earning his living and doing good to the country, has no right to vote, while a fisherman in the Maritime Provinces may have a foot of ground worth 25 cents, but, if he has a boat and tackle, he has a right to vote. Is that uniform? Is the principle just? No, it is not just, and I think the hon. members on the other side know that it is not just and that it is not uniform; it is only a pretext. The second reason given is that we have no control over the local officers. That argument has been advanced by the hon. member for Cardwell and the hon. the Secretary of State. Are they serious about that? If they are serious, they cannot have read the Bill, but they cannot be serious; they must have read the Bill; the Secretary of State, who is a member of the Government, must know something about the Bill; so I think this argu-

ment is only used to throw dust in the eyes of their followers. They say we have no control over the local officers. Let us see whether that is so. Section 61 of the Bill says this:

"Every officer or person who is by law the custodian of any assessment roll, or list of voters, or of any other list or document, which, under section 12 or section 30, the revising officer is required to obtain and use for the purpose of preparing any voters' list, or of any duplicate or duly certified copy thereof, shall furnish the same, or a certified copy or copies thereof to the revising officer, as by him required; and any such officer or person refusing or omitting to furnish the same to the revising officer within a reasonable time, shall, for such refusal or omission, incur a penalty of not less than two hundred dollars, and not exceeding one thousand dollars."

Now, if you can force the municipal officer, the secretary of a council, to furnish a copy of the valuation roll, or a copy of the voters list, can you not force him just the same to make the list? It is one or the other. Has there been a case where the local officers have refused to comply with the requirements of the Federal Legislature? No. The hon. member for Cardwell seems to give two reasons for the only pretext the Government might have for passing such a law. He says that, in Nova Scotia, the Liberal Government passed a law in 1871 by which they disfranchised a certain class so as to lessen the influence and the power of the Conservative party. Here are his words:

"I have here a Statute passed in 1871, I presume when their own local elections were coming on, in which it declares as follows."

I will not read the section now.

"That was passed in 1871 by the Local Government. Why? Because they supposed that some of those electors, being officers in some sense, or employees of the Dominion Government, might have influence in Dominion elections, and they passed that law practically to disenfranchise them, practically to lessen the power of the Conservative party in that Province."

Let us see what class of voters they wanted to strike off:

"It shall not be lawful for any person to vote at any election for a member or members to represent the people in a General Assembly of this Province, who, at any time within fifteen days before the day of election, was in receipt of wages or emolument of any kind as an employee in the Post office, the Custom house, the Inland Revenue Department, the lighthouse service, on the Government railways, in the Crown land office or the local Public Works and Mines."

Now, in the Province of Quebec, in 1875, the Conservative arty passed a law, and let us see what are the exemptions made by the Conservative party, in order so see whether they did it to lessen the power of the Conservative party. Here are the exceptions: Custom house officers, clerks of the Crown, clerks of the peace, registrars, sheriffs, deputy sheriffs, deputy clerks of the Crown, officers and men of the provincial and municipal police, Crown land agents, postmasters in cities and towns, all officers employed to collect duties payable to Her Majesty, including Excise, and those that are under the local or Federal Government. That was passed by the Conservative party of the Province of Quebec. Did they do it to lessen the power of the Conservative party in the Federal Government. The hon. member for Cardwell, who is always ready to throw hints against the Liberal party, was ready to make believe that the Provincial Government of Nova Scotia passed that law on purpose to lessen the power of the Conservative party. no, Mr. Speaker, I believe that if we leave the Conservative party alone they will lessen their power soon enough. These are the only reasons given by the hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, I am opposed to this Bill for several reasons. One of them is that in the state of our finances, when, as the Minister of Public Works said last night, our financial position is such that we cannot undertake useful public works, when we are engaged in putting down a rebellion in this country that will likely cost millions, when we have to go to a foreign market to borrow money to meet our necessities, and when we have to go from bank to bank to borrow millions to keep the Government going, I think it is no time to put the country to such a cost—for cost it will be, and a great cost, more, I think, than some hon. gentlemen have estimated. I think it will cost over $300,000. Now we are to have over 200 of these revising officers. They will be lawyers, and we know that lawyers do not work for nothing. Then you would have as many bailiffs, then as many clerks, and in some instances, more clerks. Then there will be the printing. You will have to have a great many copies of the lists. I have made a calculation for my own county, and I find the revising officer would have to furnish 275 copies of the list. That will cost a good deal of money. Then there would be the confusion between the Provincial voters' list and the Dominion voters' list which will prove very troublesome. Then it would force a Province to accept a franchise to which it is opposed. In British Columbia, I think, they have manhood suffrage, and also in Prince Edward Island; while in the Province of Quebec we have a land and property suffrage. I think it would be contrary to the wishes of the people to assimilate all the suffrages of the several Provinces. I know in my own Province we would rather fix our own franchise, and I think the other Provinces desire to do the same. That is only just. The Province of Quebec sends 65 members here. What difference does it make to Ontario or the other Provinces how we send them? It is for us to judge by whom we are to be represented and not for the other Provinces. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) has said that there will be an appeal under this Act from the decision of the revising officer, and said there would be a better appeal under this Act thau there is under the local law. Well, now, if he was a member for the Province of Quebec, he would know better, but I excuse him because he belongs to Ontario. In the Province of Quebec the council appoints three valuators, who make the roll. The roll is advertised, and it is brought before the local council by whom it is revised. It is not a political affair; it is revised in case of mistakes, and then, if any one feels that injustice has been done him, he can appeal to the county council or to the courts. The secretary-treasurer is bound to make his voters' list from that roll after it is revised. After he makes the list he deposits it for thirty days, and during that time notice is given to the electors, if they have any complaint to make, to come before the council and there state their case. If their names have been left out, and they can show the council that they have a right to have their names put on, the council decides whether they shall be put or or not. If anyone feels aggrieved at the action of the council, he has a right to appeal to the courts. But it does not cost him anything, except when he appeals to the courts. The appeal to the council does not cost him anything, and of course he would be more likely to get justice from seven councillors, elected by the people, than from officers appointed by the Government. Still, if he is not satisfied, he can appeal to the court, and it is only then that he has to pay anything; and if he is right and succeeds in his suit, it is the municipal council who has refused to do him justice that bears the cost. But the hon. Secretary of State and the hon. member for Cardwell said there was an appeal. Now, let us see what kind of an appeal there is. The Secretary of State, of course, is a clever lawyer, and he read the clause concerning an appeal. Let us take the first clause that grants appeal and see what it says:

"Any person or persons who, under the foregoing sections, shall have made complaint according to the practice therein provided for in respect of the list of voters in any polling district, the final revision thereof, whether such list be the first or any subsequent voters' list for the polling district prepared under this Act; or any person or persons, with reference to whom such complaint was made, who shall be dissatisfied with the decision on any point of law of the revising officer, in respect of such complaint, may give to the revising officer on the day of such decision——

See the injustice of that. Suppose the decision is given at half-past three o'clock in the afternoon. The man is there without a lawyer to defend him. That very day he must

give notice to the revising officer; and more than that, in that notice he must state all the reasons. He has not time to think about it; he has no chance to consult a lawyer; he must give the reasons at once. Well, of course, Mr. Speaker, you are not likely to have such an experience, because, I believe, you are a lawyer; but if you were a farmer, and were before the revising officer, pleading your case, and you had only from half-past three o'clock or a quarter to four to state your case, and if you did not do that, he would decide that you had no right to have your name on the list, you would think that was pretty hard. But in a court of law you would have time to give the reasons. The Bill goes on to say:

"And before the adjournment of the court on that day, notice in writing of his desire to appeal to a superior court from such decision, stating shortly in such notice the decision complained of and his reasons for appealing against it."

In some cases it may be possible to do so when the matter is decided early in the morning; but when it is decided later, just before the court adjourns, how is there time to give reasons? Of course, the Government does not intend that this shall be done at all. The party may have only one minute in which to give that notice in writing. If the officer—

"Thinks it reasonable and proper to allow such appeal, he shall, as soon as he can conveniently do so, state, in the form of a special case, the facts established, according to his opinion by the evidence, and necessary to be laid before the court above, in order to determine the said point of law, also his own decision on the same, as nearly as may be according to the form and practice provided for the stating and hearing of a special case in the court intended to be appealed to, and he shall then sign the same as revising officer."

He will do that, if he thinks proper. If he does not think proper, he will not do it. We know there will not be many officers who will grant the appeal. But is it right and just that we should be placed in that position, that a nominee of the Government—for, of course, they will appoint their friends—should possess this power; it is possible there may be 211 honest lawyers, but, of course, lawyers of any standing will not accept the positions. They will have to be filled by lawyers of the lowest grade, by some of those who go round the election courts and earn 75 cents a day, or so. So I say, that even though the Government are able to find 211 honest lawyers in the country, yet they will not be of this class. Thus we shall be placed in the power of the lawyers. It is ridiculous and against common sense; and I am surprised that a man of the standing of the First Minister should bring in such a Bill and submit it to the country. It is surprising, and I believe he is surprised himself. I am satisfied he knows better. The hon. Secretary of State said the other night he was for the autonomy of the Provinces. I doubt it, somewhat. I believe I have a right to have my doubts on the question. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, why I doubt it. I doubt it because he is a member of the Government which presented this Bill, that seeks to take away the rights of the Provinces. He is a member of the Government that desired, when the courts decided that the Provinces had the right to pass laws respecting the liquor license question, to carry the case to appeal, and endeavor to take away the rights of the Provinces. These facts speak stronger than words. The difficulty of preparing these lists by the revising officer will be great. Of course, as has as been said by other speakers, the treasurer of a municipality, who is on the spot all the time, knows everybody and all the property; he has the voters' roll before him, and it is pretty easy, therefore, to make up a list; but even in that case there are mistakes committed. Take a man, especially a lawyer, and what does he know about property? Lawyers know only about cases. If the Government had taken the secretaries of municipalities, they would have been more qualified to prepare lists, because they deal with property all the time; they make deeds, not for themselves, but for others. But what does a lawyer of five years' practice know? Take any lawyer in my county, and what does he know about property in the county? He will have to go from house to house, if he is an honest man. But he cannot do it, if he wished to do so. Then look at the cost and trouble. First, the officer is to find the roll and make the list. He is not bound to take the roll; he is not to take it as a basis but as a guide only. He then makes enquiries of this man and that woman, and finds out who are widows, old maids, and so forth. After that he gives notice that on a certain day he will visit the county and make a revision. He has to visit every municipality of the county and hold a meeting to make a final revision. In my county there are fourteen municipalities. It is out of the question that you can appoint a judge to do this work. They are too much engaged already, and the other day it was found necessary to bring Judge Mousseau from a distance to hold court in my county. How could a judge hold fifteen meetings in one county. The consequence is, that he will require more than one clerk—he would require a staff of clerks, and the county will have to pay for them. Any practical man in this House recognises the fact that it is impossible for the revising barrister to make a list correctly, unless he spends his whole time at the work; and in that case we would have to pay him well. I have no confidence in the appointments which the Government will make. How can we trust the Government to do justice in this case—a Government that passed the Gerrymandering Bill of last Session, a Government that wants to take away power from the people, a Government that wants to take advantage of its strength in Parliament to carry the next general elections. That is the meaning of the speech of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) the other night. I have heard, during last Session, and ever since I came into the House, that hon. gentlemen opposite were strong, and were not afraid to go before the electors; but I believe they have been afraid of the electors all the time. They are afraid of the electors now. They dare not go to the electors now, with the law we have; and why? Because they have not carried on the affairs of the country as they ought to have carried them on, and hence they are afraid to meet the electors. Some of the speakers have said that they would go to the same electors; but I say no. If, for instance, the hon. member for Missisisquoi (Mr. Baker) were here, he would tell you that in his own county, in the town of Farnham, this Bill would take away from him 100 electors who voted for him before, because the qualification, which is $200 now, would be $300 under this Bill, and the same may be true of some other members. Now, Mr. Speaker, others will address the House, and I think I have said enough.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. AUGER. Yes; I think I have said enough to satisfy any reasonable man that the Bill is unjust, but of course I cannot satisfy the hon. gentleman for Perth, and others on that side. I think I have said enough to convince any fair minded man who is not a partisan, who works only for the interests of the people, that he should not vote for the Bill. But a further proof that this Bill is contrary to justice, that it is hard to be swallowed, even by hon. members from the other side, is, that the Government dare not let them free to vote for themselves, but the Minister of Public Works turns round and tells them that if they voted for the motion of the hon. member for South Huron they would vote against the Government, and to beware of the consequences. That shows that they are afraid to meet the subject freely, and have the members on the other side vote according to their consciences. They must not vote according to their conciences, but according to their party. If the measure was so necessary and so just, why not make it an open question, as the hon. Premier proposes to make that part of

Bill with reference to women franchise. Why do they not do so? It is because they know the Bill would not pass. But the Premier says he will not insist on that clause about the female franchise. Of course, I am going to vote against women franchise, for I am opposed to it. I do not believe there is a man in this House likes a woman better than I do. I like a woman, but I like her in her place, in the sphere which Providence provided for her. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I would be placed in a bad position if this Bill should pass—not on account of my looks, because I think the man opposing me might, perhaps, be a worse looking man than I am; but we know we are going to have widows voting, and most likely we will have old maids, and it would not do to have a public meeting attended by these widows and old maids, so we would have to have private meetings. The candidate would have to be there, and that would be placing me in a very bad position; for what would my wife say? Perhaps some old men would like to be placed in that position; perhaps the Premier himself might like it, as I think he is at an age when there would be no danger. But to be serious, Mr. Speaker, I want to show you the injustice of the proposed female franchise. Because a widow or an old maid has some property, she has a right to vote, but a married woman, who does more good for the country than widows or old maids, may have property, and the Government will qualify her husband on that property, and still she will not have the right to vote. The man may have no property; he may be a spendthrift, and cannot keep his property, and the woman may be a clever, smart woman; the man would not vote if it were on his own property, and the Government gives the man a right to vote on his wife's property, but it debars that clever woman, who is raising a family of children, who takes care of them and perhaps takes care of her husband—the Government debars that woman from voting. Now, if you were to give the franchise to any class of women I would begin with married women, because we know it is not good for widows and old maids to be going from door to door, and so on, for they would get to be too talkative. That would be the effect, for if the candidate was not a married man, and was a good looking fellow, they would take an interest in getting him elected; perhaps they might do so with me; they might go from house to house, and just think of a young widow or an old maid doing that kind of work. I think it is absurd. Now I will leave the subject. If this Bill passes I do not fear it so much as some persons do. I do not believe if it passes it will carry the Conservative party into power, for I believe there is public opinion enough in the country to drive them out of power when they see its injustice, and that it is a grab on their rights, that it is taking away the rights of the people altogether, and putting every elector of the country into the power of the revising officers—yes, and of the Government that nominates them. I think, however, the Bill will not pass. I think the Premier, after he has looked over matters, after he has heard the Bill discussed on both sides, will see his way to withdraw the Bill, and if he does so it will be so much in his favor. If he does pass the Bill I do not believe it will hurt us as a party, but it will hurt the country. It will help to set Province against Province and party against party. And supposing they pass the Bill, and we are returned to power, would not we be tempted to follow their example and to retaliate in some measure. That is the conclusion of this party feeling—doing everything through party, so that I hope the hon. Premier will see his way clear to withdraw the Bill, and keep the little confidence which the country has in him now.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. Mr. Speaker. It must be reassuring to gentlemen on this side of the House to discover how quickly the equanimity of our friends opposite has been restored by the jocular remarks of my hon. friend from Shefford (Mr. Auger). I think, in discussing this question, we should at the same time look into the record of those who profess to criticise the Bill introduced by the right hon. leader of the Government. We have been told that this measure has been introduced too suddenly—that there has not been time given for the country to consider it, that it has been sprung upon this House and country. I ask hon. gentlemen to look back and weigh the question fairly, generously and in an unbiassed spirit, and then to say whether the Government have taken the public into their confidence, or basely betrayed that confidence. All the speakers on the opposite side who have preceded me, referred to the fact that this Bill was introduced fifteen years ago. When it came before the House on the 13th of April, 1883, I find that the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) said:

"We should have had a full opportunity, not merely to consider the provisions here, but also to consult the constituencies throughout the various parts of this extensive country."

At that time the hon. gentleman complained that the people had not been consulted; he asked for time, and the hon. leader of the Government gave him time. Putting it at the shortest period, the hon. leader of the Opposition has had two years during which to consult the feelings of the constituencies. I ask him and his supporters in this House, whether they have done so—whether they have taken advantage of the time at their disposal, and whether they are now dealing honestly or fairly with the Government, in declaring that no time has been allowed for discussing this matter. More than this. I find that my hon. friend, the able and accomplished member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), in his remarks the other day, said:

"During the nearly eighteen years that this Confederation has lasted, the hon. gentleman has made seven attempts to establish a uniform franchise throughout the Dominion, but each time, until now, he has been forced to abandon the attempt."

And further, he said:

"Public opinion generally manifests itself either by petitions at the bar of this House, or by resolutions of public meetings, or through the press. Now, where are the petitions that have been presented in favor of it? Not one has been presented this Session, nor at any previous Session, that I am aware of. Where have public meetings been held in favor of a uniform Dominion franchise? I defy the hon. gentleman to point out one instance where any public meeting has passed a resolution to that effect."

I ask hon. gentlemen to criticise the measure according to this standard; I ask whether the people, when they have great wrongs to be redressed, when there are great questions to be considered, when they feel that their rights are being trampled upon, do not approach this House by petitions or public meetings, or manifest their feelings in some tangible form; and I ask whether they have expressed themselves in any of these ways against this measure? We have had no petitions against it; but as the hon. member for Quebec East says, eighteen years have elapsed, during which there was ample time for this question to be discussed; and although there have been scores of public meetings and elections during that time, in many of which I have taken part, I have never yet heard this question of the franchise introduced by one of the hon. gentlemen, who now denounce it as an outrage upon a free people. Now, I remember that my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Tupper), in moving the Address, quoted from the Halifax *Chronicle*, in February, 1883, as follows:—

"It will soon be necessary for the franchise to be made uniform by the Dominion Government."

At that time the Liberal party of Nova Scotia were in favor of a uniform franchise; but the moment the party tocsin sounded and the watchword went forth to oppose such a measure, hon. gentlemen opposite opposed it, and that very paper casts its own articles to the winds and turns about, as some hon. gentlemen on the

other side have done, and denounces this Government for giving it to the country. Now, it has been said that the people's rights have been trampled upon; but when such a charge is made, we may reasonably ask what is the record of these hon. gentlemen who prefer it? I propose to look into the records of hon. gentlemen opposite, to see whether they have, in the past, shown any respect for the franchise, and whether, when the courts of law were in their way, they did not use their votes in Parliament to pass Bills for the removal of disqualification and for the whitewashing of returning officers who strangled the prnciples which Liberals profess to hold dear. I undertake to prove that they have done so, and I ask any hon. gentleman in this House to disprove it. Now, Sir, I do not really believe that my hon. friends on the other side of the House are sincerely opposed to a Dominion franchise; I do not believe that they intend to attempt to prove that provincial rights have been trampled upon. The only points with reference to which I have heard them raise objections were, as to whether the judges should be the revising officers, whether the Government should word the Bill to say "shall" instead of "may," and as to the assertion of a change being made in the character of the electorate. Now, with regard to our judges, I think every man in this House, at least every man reflecting the feelings of the public without, will say that we desire to maintain the character of our judiciary as pure and honorable and high, in every sense of the word, as possible. But what do we find, looking at the past? I remember when Judge Wilson, on one occasion, gave a judgment in a trial, he was denounced in unmeasured terms by the Liberal newspapers; I remember, on a recent occasion, that Judge Wilson, after charging a jury, was told that "Ottawa is the source for the promotion of the judiciary;" and I remember other cases which might be quoted, of attacks on Mr. Justice M. C. Cameron, a gentleman of as high and pure a character as any man who as ever sat in Parliament, and a judge of unimpeachable integrity. I say therefore that the Government have acted wisely in inserting the word "may" instead of "shall," for it is quite possible certain county judges might decline to act or feel that duties where thrust upon them for which their previous training unfitted them. If there is one thing that the right hon. leader of the Government holds dear, if there is one thing he respects, and that the people respect him for, it is the high character that he has always maintained in our judiciary. That being so, we look back, and ask, why is it that there is such a feeling among our Liberal friends with regard to the judges of the land? Why is it that they want to have provincial franchises—to have things left as they are? I remember a time when the Conservative party was betrayed in Ontario; I remember also when a learned judge cast the ermine from his shoulders and entered the arena of politics, admitting that he had, whilst acting as a judge, taken a warm interest in politics; and we must all remember that that gentleman did not, on all occasions, since he became Premier, respect the law, so far as the law should be administered by upright and honest men, either as politicians or judges. But, Sir, let us consider the question of revising the lists. I find, on looking over the official reports, that in 1883 the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), when the right hon. leader of the Government introduced his Bill, said:—

"Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman has failed to state who shall make the list of voters primarily.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The revising barrister. He has to take the assessment roll and the voters' list in the different constituencies as being *primâ facie* evidence, and hold the court as in England; any person who has to make a claim puts it before him, and there can be the same system of objections that now exists in the two Provinces with which I am most familiar, Ontario and Quebec."

There we find that the local lists are made from municipal returns and all objections to voters placed on the lists can be made before the revising barrister, and I ask hon. gentlemen opposite whether they believe any barrister of position in this country, any barrister who has a public future, or any man who has a political future, would be willing to degrade himself by becoming the tool of any Government, in order to have a candidate returned for any particular constituency. I know that in Ontario, having spent my life in that Province, there is not one barrister, who has any regard for his reputation and desires to advance in his profession, who would so degrade himself. I say more; no revising barrister dare do it. The independent sentiment of the constituency and the country would be so strongly aroused against any such action that neither the revising barrister nor the candidate in whose interest the outrage was committed would dare venture to face public sentiment. That is the greatest safeguard, where a wide franchise exists, against wrongdoing on the part of a judge or revising barrister. I have said that the Dominion Government, from 1874 to 1878, never stopped for a moment to consider whether it was right or wrong to endeavor to strengthen their supporters in various constituencies by special legislation, and I think I can prove that statement. You, Mr. Speaker, and others who were in Parliament then, will remember the well known Tuckersmith Bill. I think the political crime then committed will always remain green in the memory of those who had an opportunity of considering it. Had it not been for the Senate, that high power to which most of our legislation is submitted, we would have had, in 1874, a constituency represented by the hon. gentleman who now represents it, represented in such a way that a gross and grave wrong would have been done to the electors. The then hon. member for South Wentworth, Mr. Rymal, gave a very brief summary of the reasons why the Government supporters of that day were willing to support this contemplated outrage. It was this: "I will vote for the Bill, for I want to give Mr. Cameron a chance to come back to Parliament again." Now, you will remember that the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) had at that time been elected for that constituency by a small majority, 86 I believe. Under the Redistribution Act of 1872 the population of North Huron was 21,862, Centre 22,790, and South 21,512. The hon. gentleman ran for the south riding, was elected and his election protested; what did we find? A Bill was brought in, and there are hon. gentlemen opposite who supported it—I do not know whether on account of the principle or the want of principle of the measure—which proposed to take Tuckersmith from Centre Huron and add it to South Huron, because in a prior election the Conservative candidate had had a majority of 200 votes Reform votes, cast against him in that particular township. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite had not on that occasion a word to say about trampling on the rights of the people or about violations of the constitution, as they have to-day, when the right hon. the leader of the Government introduces a measure lowering the franchise, by giving every man who ought to have it the right to vote. How did hon. gentlemen opposite endeavor to change the character of the electorate of South Huron? They proposed to give North Huron 21,812, South Huron 25,211, leaving only 19,000 in Centre Huron, because there they had a sufficient majority to elect a Reformer every time. Yet to-day, these gentlemen say the supporters of the Government have no case to defend and therefore remain silent. For my part, I remained silent, amazed at the audacity of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I take this opportunity of holding up a mirror in which I think the people throughout the Dominion will know them as they are. That Bill to which I refer was passed by this House by a large majority, but was rejected by the Senate. The election trial for South Huron took place, the sitting member was unseated and when the case came before the judges, in appeal, they said:

"There are strong grounds for thinking that the respondent (Malcolm Colin Cameron, ex-M.P. for South Huron) was guilty of personal bribery, and had the learned judge who tried the case and who unseated him found the respondent guilty of personal bribery, we should have sustained the judgment."

This was a judgment given by Justices Hagarty, Gwynne and Galt. There we find a case where evidence was given to prove conduct verging upon personal bribery; and yet within the walls of this Parliament was introduced, by the so-called Reform party, a measure to relieve the gentleman against whom this charge was pending, by adding 200 Reform votes to his constituency, making the Reform candidate safe for re-election should the seat be vacated. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to consider that point before I give them one or two others. We will now take up the question of redistribution in Ontario. Of what use is the franchise to the people, if the Government of the day can so change it, so redistribute the seats, as to completely take from the people the exercise of the franchise, by concentrating their votes in such a way that but one result may be expected? The hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Auger) has spoken of the so-called Gerrymandering Bill, introduced by the right hon. leader of the Government in 1882, but that measure did what hon. gentlemen opposite never did; it admitted and acknowledged the principle of representation by population, and when that Bill was brought down it was shown that the population was proportionately about 22,000 to every county. What was the action of the Liberals in Ontario? The way they gave the people the right of the franchise was to nullfy the franchise by so redistributing the counties as to hive the Conservatives. In Muskoka, Cornwall, Algoma, Brockville, Elgin West, Stormont, North Brant, Monck: the total population in, 1874-5 was 77,000. Mr. Mowat gave eight members, or one for every 9,665, in these Reform constituencies. Turning to some Conservative constituencies, what do we find? We find he treated them in a very different manner. Thus, Toronto East, Toronto West, Ottawa, Russell, London, Carleton, Dufferin, had a total population of 154,000. We got seven members for those constituencies, making one member for every 22,000. Hence, the Ontario Premier actually gave eight members to 77,000 in Reform constituencies and only seven to 154,000 in Conservative ridings. In other words, this Bill was framed on the principle that one Reformer was entitled to more representation than two Tories. If the Provincial Legislature can so redistribute the constituencies, and they have done it again in Toronto this year, as to absolutely nullify the franchise, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite on what ground they can declaim about the rights of the people being trampled upon, and yet justify this high-handed and inconsistent action of Mr. Mowat? The question, to my mind, when this Bill came in, was whether the Dominion had the right to pass that Bill, whether the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government had the right to give us a Bill for the Dominion; and, finding that we have that right, the question naturally suggests itself: why should we not have the advantage of proving to the people that we are so desirous of vindicating the position of the Conservative party that we can go to the constituencies and appeal to them on our record, without asking the hon. gentleman who presides over the Province of Ontario to settle the question of the franchise for us? My hon. friend from King's (Mr. Woodworth) to-day spoke of the question of sectionalism. I believe —I have been forced to believe, by listening to the debates in this House during the last two years—that hon. gentlemen opposite have for their design the spreading of ill-feeling, the sowing of acrimony, the sowing of contention throughout the different Provinces. I ask them to look at the chronicle of their amendments moved in previous years, as they sat at your left, Mr. Speaker, and to see whether they have not systematically endeavored to array Province against Province, race against race, brother against brother, and section against section? I say that advisedly, and I do not say it in any spirit of ill-feeling; because, while I am a strong party man, while I believe in Conservative principles, I would be prepared to condemn any party—my own party or the party opposite—for introducing a principle, or a want of principle, so dangerous, as, carried too far may end, as my hon. friend from Norfolk said the other night, in secession and disintegration. My hon. friend from King's to-day quoted a resolution which was passed in Ontario, I think in the county of Simcoe, by the Reform party last year. It was this:

"We further wish to place on record our disapproval of the wholesale system of bribery recently inaugurated by the Government, under the guise of granting aid to railways, by which Ontario was robbed for the benefit of the smaller and poorer Provinces."

My hon. friend quoted that sentence to-day, but I think it bears a further application. I think I can prove what I have stated, by also quoting from the remarks of the hon. the leader of the Opposition on a former occasion. I find that at that time his chief aim and the chief aim of his party was to create dissension among the Lower Provinces, and to make them feel that Ontario was receiving too many benefits. I find, by the *Hansard*, that in 1883 the member for West Durham said:

"The other changes (in the Cabinet) gave rise to some results differing a little from what the First Minister propounded on the inception of Confederation. At that time he laid down the constitutional rule that the Cabinet ought to be represented from the several Provinces, in the proportion of five Ministers from Ontario, four from Quebec and two each from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. There were now six Ontario members in the Cabinet, independently of the two great political prizes, the Speakerships of both Chambers, which were now held by Ontario representatives, thus practically giving to Ontario eight out of the sixteen highest positions in the gift of the Government."

Here was the hon. gentleman receiving addresses from his supporters in Ontario, on the ground that he was fighting the lower Provinces, that he was fighting against the smaller Provinces, that he was counteracting the greed of the smaller Provinces, and the year before he was appealing to hon. gentlemen from the lower Provinces, and showing them that Ontario was getting all the prizes. There is the poison, there the danger, for I believe that, if there is any man in this country to-day who would stand up for his country if he realised the danger, it is the hon. member for West Durham. I know that as a Canadian he nourishes those sentiments, that as an educated man he nourishes those sentiments, and that as a loyal man it is his duty to nourish those sentiments, and it will be a sad day for Canada when her sons, for party purposes, are willing to ride into power, over the ruins of their country. I hold, Sir, that hon. gentlemen who use sectional questions in this House, to stir up sectional animosity, array up race against race, commit a crime and jeopardises the interests of Confederation. What does Confederation mean? It means the joining together of a number of Provinces, formerly of antagonistic tariffs, formerly of antagonistic laws, and certainly formerly having antagonistic feelings, under a code of laws, under a broad constitutional system, which guarantees to each its free and independent institutions, yet binds all to respect and maintain national autonomy. We can remember when the people of Ontario were taught to fly at the throats of the people of Quebec, but all that has passed away, and, when the Hon. George Brown joined that Government, and formulated the British North America Act, and sat in conference at Quebec, agreeing to bury the hatchet and assist in solving the question of building up a great country, an empire, which in the future might be not only a dependency but an ally of Great Britain—all classes of politicians hoped that a better and higher era had dawned. Knowing that, and realising that, as a young man I trust I shall never raise my voice or give my vote for any sectional question, or cease to condemn any hon. gentleman, occupying the high position which the leader of the Opposition occupies, and which some of

his supporters occupy, when endeavoring to spread sectional discord throughout the community. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite are not very anxious about the franchise, but they prefer manhood suffrage. Perhaps a majority of them would probably vote for manhood suffrage to-night. Having lived in Ontario for a great many years, having participated in a great many elections, having lived in Western Ontario all my early life, I took some interest in visiting constituencies, in seeing how voters' lists were prepared, and in organising the party; and I find, as year after year passes, that the vote increases in every polling sub-division where there is a Liberal vote, and I frequently said to my friends: How does this occur? I was told "Mr. so-and-so has his five sons put on, and Mr. so-and-so has his three sons put on," and wherever I went I was impressed with the belief and the conviction that the hon. gentleman and their party now enjoy manhood suffrage in this country, and that this Bill, and even the Bill passed by the hon. Mr. Mowat, will strengthen the Conservative party, because I believe the Liberals have every vote they can possibly squeeze into the lists now. The member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says:

"The hon. gentleman proposes by this very Bill that we shall not go back to the same people. He proposes that nearly one-half the voters in Prince Edward Island and one-half in British Colombia should be disfranchised."

The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) says:

"In the Province from which I come this Bill will throttle the voices and the votes of a large number of people, and I cannot remain silent."

I ask hon. gentlemen opposite if this is consistent, if it is logical? They first tell the Dominion Government that it is wrong to trample on the rights of the people, to have a newly framed franchise, and while they are uttering these words, they have changed the franchise in Nova Scotia, while in Ontario it has already been changed. Was it the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government who changed those franchises? No; it was two Liberal Premiers, and yet this Government is to be blamed because two Liberal Premiers change the vote, change the entire complexion of the vote, change the political franchise, and force the Dominion Government to abide by such changes! As to what has been said by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies), I may remind the House that there was a time, I think in 1874, when an hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island was Minister of the Interior. There was a time when the hon. member for East York, who was then Premier, introduced a Franchise Bill in this House, and what do we find? We find that at the dictation of Mr. Laird, then Minister of the Interior, a Bill was adopted disfranchising half the people of Prince Edward Island, disfranchising the whole Catholic vote of that island, because it was antagonistic to him. My hon. friend from Queen's was not here at the time, but I never heard a protest from him when he was at home on the Island. He may possibly have entered a protest privately. When that Bill went to the Senate it was rejected. An exception was made in favor of Prince Edward Island, and it was placed in the same position it occupied previously. In that Bill, I find they had manhood suffrage for the Assembly, and a property qualification for the Legislative Council. The hon. gentlemen opposite changed the whole position of the franchise, and instead of manhood suffrage they imposed a property qualification for the Legislative Assembly, similar to that for the Legislative Council. Now, I call hon. gentlemen's attention to this fact. I have shown that, in so far as Ontario was concerned, the party of the hon. gentlemen opposite never scrupled, where the franchise was against them, to bring in an Act covering either redistribution of a constituency, or for whitewashing a friend of theirs who had been corruptly elected? Every time the Government perpetrated an Act like that it degraded the electorate which it professed to endeavor to elevate. I say, under these circumstances, this Dominion Government, having the power to fix a franchise of its own, would be derelict in its duty if it did not make a uniform franchise. I think, however, that the Government ought to take into consideration the circumstances of some of the Provinces. I regret it has not seen its way clear, while adopting a uniform franchise, for the older Province to make an exception in favor of Prince Edward Island. The object of the Bill should not be to curtail the franchise, I take it that the desire is to enlarge and extend it. Where an enlarged franchise is enjoyed by a small Province like Prince Edward Island, I would like to see it retain the manhood suffrage which it now enjoys. But, Sir, our hon. friends opposite have another plan. If they find an election going against them, if they find a franchise is detrimental to them, they change it by another process. They send a returning officer out, and he is made to understand that whatever he does the Government will see him through. Consequently, when Mr. Apjohn—and a very apt John he was—was sent to Prince Arthur's Landing, or some other point in Algoma, to act as returning officer, we find him acting illegally; and when the courts of law fined him heavily, the Government brought in a Bill whitewashing him. Now, I ask our hon. friends opposite, if they desire that a Government like that sitting in Toronto should make a franchise for us? I say no. I say that public feeling and public sentiment will sustain this Government in adopting a uniform franchise for the protection of this House; I say any hon. gentleman who talks about provincial rights in connection with such a matter has never studied the question at all. I am sure the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) would never have dared publicly to state that the rights of the Provinces were being trampled on, by the Parliament adopting a franchise of its own. He says that in 1874 there was a *pronunciamento* issued by the Reform party, that we should adopt the franchise of the different Provinces. Now, I think that they only represented the country for a brief period; that Government was driven from office. It only remained in power until 1878, until the people had an opportunity of delivering a second verdict. Therefore, it is not very generous or reasonable to ask us to go back and adopt the policy of a Government which was driven from the Treasury benches in disgrace. Consequently, I hold, that in adopting a Dominion franchise the Government is doing right, and every reasonable man throughout Canada will support them. I have often noticed that hon. gentlemen opposite evade the issue when they attempt to discuss questions in this House. For instance, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton)—whom we always like to hear speak, because he always says something that I hope he did not mean to say—in his speech the other night, said:

"I feel that this high-handed act of despotism, this measure which is to trample upon the liberties of the people of Canada, is fraught with danger. This Confederation is already subjected to a dangerous strain. It may be possible that this Confederation, without further strain put upon it, already totters to its fall, and if the people of this Dominion are worthy to be considered free men, if the people of this Dominion value the privileges and the liberties that have descended to them from their forefathers, they will never submit to these usurpations that are practised by these political tricksters who occupy the Government benches. We are in danger of having our institutions subverted by secession."

Now, I ask who uttered these words, and whence came he? Can it be that an honest Canadian sends abroad sentiments such as these? If I were a stranger in this country, could I believe that a gentleman who utters these words is a member of this House? Could I believe that one of the loyal and true constituencies in Ontario sends him here by an immense majority? No; I could not believe it. But happily we know the man; happily we know that in our political conflicts men use words that they regret afterwards. We know that if we use harsh and thoughtless

language on the spur of the moment, we can meet afterwards and apologise for them. But these words burn on the page of our political records forever. These are words not likely to be passed over, seeds that may germinate in such a manner as to bring trouble and disgrace upon this country. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Fairbank), in speaking this afternoon, simply revelled in pictures of blood. He talked about the blood that moistened the soil in the North-West; he talked about the lives sacrificed, as if he were gloating over it. I felt, in listening to him, that though he was at present a Canadian, and representing a Canadian constituency, he was doing wrong to himself, wrong to this House, and wrong to the country, by making such unwise and inflammatory remarks. I knew that he was being carried away by his party zeal, his party fealty and his partisan prejudices, and that those sentiments did not really spring from his heart. When an insurrection is in progress in this country, and we know not how soon a gloom may be cast over the whole community from some great misfortune, and hon. gentlemen opposite, in face of these facts, can speak in such a manner on a Bill like the Franchise Bill, it shows that there is but one question uppermost in their minds, and that the disasters and troubles and adversities threatening Canada in the North West. As a Canadian, I have no other feeling, and no other desire than to promote the interests of my native country, and as a Canadian I feel degraded and lowered when I reflect that on the records of this House are placed words and sentiments that I am sure those who uttered them cannot feel in their hearts. But they are there, and the hon. gentlemen who put them there are making a terrible mistake. Now, Mr. Speaker, when they tell us that we are adopting a franchise to day different from that of England, they cannot know what the facts are. They ask why we do not adopt the same system as prevails in England, where each country has a different franchise. Why, what are they doing to-day in England? They are endeavoring to assimilate the franchise and make it uniform. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says that, so far as the vote is concerned, we go back to a new set of electors. Why, let him look at the provisions of Mr. Gladstone's Franchise Bill. When Mr. Gladstone goes back to the country in 1886 he will appeal to a constituency with 2,000,000 more votes on the list than in 1880; to a totally changed state of the constituencies. Yet the hon. gentlemen opposite, while they quoted only a portion of Mr. Gladstone's scheme, as something that we should follow, left out another part of it. Now what do I find? I find that Mr. John D. Mayne, an eminent English barrister, in discussing the Franchise Bill in the Edinburgh *Review* of April, 1884, said:

"In point of fact, the provisions for equalising and assimilating the franchise will, under the Bill, be extended to all parts of the United Kingdom, and a uniform franchise will, if the Bill becomes law, be established for England, Ireland and Scotland."

Mr. Gladstone and the Liberal Government sought to give a uniform franchise to the United Kingdom; and yet here we find hon. gentlemen opposite asking why we want to secure that which the Liberals have given to England, instead of having different franchises for all the Provinces. I have shown by the records of the country, the records of the House of Commons and by the public journals, that this is the very system that Mr. Gladstone has been aiming at, namely, to enlarge and assimilate the franchise—which he has done by adding over 2,000,000 voters—assimilating and making it uniform. I do not desire to detain the House more than a few minutes longer; but I want to show the ultra-toryism which pervades the Liberal party when it has an opportunity of exercising its power. We have heard a great deal about the enlargement of the franchise, and I dare say much time has been spent by certain Ministers in Toronto in so manipulating their franchise scheme as to deprive conservatives of votes. One of the greatest factors, so far as votes are concerned in a number of the close constituencies in Ontario, is that of non-resident voters. Why, I ask, is it that Mr. Mowat's Government struck out that vote, so that owners of property will not be allowed to vote on their own property unless they are residents? Not less than 12,000 or 15,000 persons will thus be disfranchised; and nine-tenths, or at least seven-tenths of the non-resident voters are Conservatives. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite have told us to-night that we are bound to adopt the franchise prepared by Mr. Mowat. If we did so, what would be the result? Suppose a great national question arose, and there were certain provincial questions involved therein. What would there be to prevent the seven Provinces adopting seven different franchises, and thus making a concentrated attack on the central power? Poison the fountain whence springs provincial vitality, and the whole fabric of Confederation is jeopardised and a national mistake made that may ultimately lead to our absorption in the American Union. Surely that is not a result which hon. gentlemen opposite desire. They have given the House no reasons why the Government should not adopt this Franchise Bill and reserve to themselves the power to say "may" or "shall" in regard to the appointment of a revising power. Why should we follow Mr. Mowat's franchise? I have shown this House the record of that hon. gentleman on all occasions. Only the other day, in regard to the McLaren-Caldwell case, which was carried on appeal to England, we found the Ontario Government paying out of the public exchequer no less than $10,000 to Mr. Caldwell, a supporter of the Government in the House, in order to pay his costs in this suit. The significant facts that are occurring every day should teach hon. gentlemen opposite discretion, should teach them reticence and the value and wisdom of silence; in fact, the spirit recently displayed in this country must have satisfied them as to the instincts of the country. It must have taught them a lesson as to the unity and union of all sections of the Dominion, when we saw a regiment passing through this city from Halifax to the North-West, and regiments going from Montreal and Quebec, and almost every Province, to the North-West, to maintain the integrity of the Empire, the integrity of Confederation and of our own homes—that fact must have taught every man, with any heart or sympathy, and any thought for the future of his country, that we are still strong, still united; that no matter what hon. gentlemen may say, no matter what reports may be sent abroad, no matter how extreme may be their statements, and how violently they may be expressed—and I know that very often they regret them the very next day—the country is safe; and the Conservative party, that party which has successfully governed this country, will continue to prove, beyond question, that our institutions are safe in their hands, that under their policy all races, sections and creeds will be equally protected; and that they will work out successfully the problem of maintaining this great Confederation, one of the greatest Confederations of freemen the world has ever known.

Mr. GIGAULT. In answering all the objections raised to this Bill, the defenders of the Government have always given as their reasons for supporting it that the constitution allows this Parliament to pass an Act respecting the electoral franchise, and when they have given that reason they seem to think they have answered victoriously all the arguments of the opponents of the Bill. As has been properly said by the member for Bagot (Mr. *Dupont*), where are the petitions demanding a change in the present electoral system? Where are the abuses which are said to have resulted from this system? There are none whatever. The only objections, the only abuses quoted in defence of the Bill, are that changes have been made sometimes by Pro-

vinces with respect to the electoral franchise. Such is not an abuse; it is a right which the Provinces have exercised by virtue of the constitution, and it is a right which has not been taken away by the establishment of a Dominion electoral franchise since this Confederation has been established. If there is any necessity for the change, why was not the change made before this time? The last speaker stated that no petitions had been presented against a Dominion electoral franchise. Well, it was not necessary until to-day to present any petition, because every time the Electoral Franchise Bill was presented it had to be withdrawn, because of its unpopularity, in the presence of the opposition, shown even by supporters of the Government. I, myself, two years ago, opposed that measure, as I oppose it to-day; and I believe that this measure is not such a one as we should adopt and enact as the law of this Dominion. Why should we not leave every Province to deal with its own franchise? Why should the different Provinces come and say to Ontario: Although you have the right to elect a certain number of members, we will fix what electoral franchise you must have. It would not be fair for the other Provinces to impose on Ontario an electoral system which it did not desire. So it would not be fair if Ontario and the other Provinces were to say to Quebec: You may not like universal suffrage, yet we will force you to accept it. You are allowed to elect sixty-five members to the House of Commons, but we will compel you to accept our views as to the franchise under which they shall be elected. Notwithstanding what the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Taschereau) has said this afternoon, I say that this Bill is a centralisation measure. In answer, they may say: Has not this Parliament the right to enact a Dominion electoral franchise? Does not the constitution say that we can enact such a franchise? Yes; the constitution says so, but when we are allowed to enact a law, does it mean that we are obliged to enact it; does it mean that if there is any defect in the constitution, if there are some provisions in the constitution which are contrary to the spirit of Confederation, we are obliged even to abide by those defects, to adopt laws which we do not like, to adopt laws which take away from the Provinces the right they have enjoyed until to-day, of determining their own franchises, and choosing the class of electors who will elect members to come to this House, to defend the interests of their Provinces at the same time as the general interests of the Dominion? I think we should reflect twice before we adopt such a measure. It is certainly inopportune. It is hostile to the spirit of the Confederation. It is also anti-conservative—hostile to the conservative idea, which we have always maintained in the Province of Quebec. The hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Taschereau), after having declared that he was opposed to manhood suffrage, said this Bill was conservative in its principles. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have only to look at an article which was published on the 20th of April, instant, in the Montreal *Herald*, to come to the conclusion that this Bill does not contain conservative principles. The editor of that newspaper, after having pronounced himself in favor of universal suffrage, says:

"There is not an argument that can be adduced against manhood suffrage that does not apply with equal force to the enfranchisement of the sons of farmers and mechanics, or, for that matter, to any extension of the franchise whatever."

The editor of this paper is certainly right in saying that the fact of giving up the principle of property qualification naturally leads to universal suffrage, and by adopting this Bill we give up that principle with respect to farmers' sons and owners' sons—a principle which we have always, in the Province of Quebec, considered as one of the most conservative principles. We remember what has happened in the Province of Ontario. There, at first, the franchise was granted only to farmers' sons, but that concession called for another. The mechanics' sons said afterwards: Since you gave the right of franchise to the farmers' sons, we have a right to have the same privilege; and their wish was complied with. I am sorry to see some Conservatives of Ontario strongly in favor of manhood suffrage, and we are very likely, if this measure is adopted, to see very soon those Conservatives trying to impose here the same principle which they advocated in the Provincial Legislature. On the 20th of March last, in the Provincial Legislature of Ontario, Mr. Meredith, the leader of the Conservative party, moved the following resolution:—

"That the following words be added to the motion: 'And while assenting to the second reading of the Bill, and thereby to the principle that an extension of the franchise is necessary and expedient, this House desires to express its opinion that no such extension, which does not, under a proper system of registration, and while excluding the criminal and non-sane classes, aliens and persons disqualified under the provisions of the Election Acts, confer the franchise upon every male resident of the Province of the full age of 21 years, ought to be adopted by this House.'"

So it is evident that the Conservatives of Ontario entertain a different opinion from those which we hold in the Province of Quebec as to universal suffrage. It is easy to understand how dangerous it is to allow this Parliament to deal with the franchise. We see to what conclusion, to what legislation, this first step of adopting this electoral franchise will lead us. Now, in order to have this Bill pass, the Conservatives of Ontario may not press the adoption of manhood suffrage; but what guarantee have we that next Session those Conservatives of Ontario will not come with an amendment to that same Bill, and say: Now that the principle of having a franchise for the whole Dominion is accepted, manhood suffrage must be adopted and must be established for the whole Dominion. And that is one of the reasons, and one of the strong reasons, why I oppose this measure—because I see that in the very near future, on account of the existence of the opinions which are spreading in other Provinces, sooner or later the members for those Provinces will compel the people of Quebec to accept an electoral system which they do not like. Those will be the evil consequences which will result from the adoption of this Bill. According to the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Taschereau) there is in this Bill no infringement on provincial rights. That gentleman knows that since Confederation was established, the Provincial Legislatures have always had the right to determine their own franchise as they liked, but as soon as the Bill is adopted those rights will be done away with as to Dominion elections. Now, though I contend that this Bill is useless, that it is unnecessary, anti-conservative, and contrary to the spirit of our constitution, let us admit for a moment that this Bill is necessary. But does the necessity of passing such a Bill involve the necessity of enacting such an arbitrary, such an unjust law, as the one which is now being discussed and considered by this House? I do not approve of the mania of always copying English laws, without taking into account the difference between our circumstances and institutions and those of England. England is a Legislative Union, while Canada is a Confederation, and laws which may be good laws in England may not be at all adapted to the circumstances in which we live here. That country is far from having the same perfect municipal organisations we have here. I have read a portion of the English electoral law as it at present exists, and I may say safely that we have copied only the worst features of that law, and have omitted all that portion which gives the people any supervision or control over the preparation and revision of the lists and frees the revising barrister from the influence of the political party in power. We have taken only the arbitrary portions of that law, which vest the revising barristers with exorbitant powers, but we have left that portion which gives to the people some safeguards to enable them to protect their electoral rights and

franchises. In England, the revising barristers revise the lists made by the overseers, who are officers of the different municipalities. Those overseers prepare the lists, taking, as a basis, with respect to certain classes of electors, the poor rate books. But here, what do we propose? The revising barrister shall be controlled by nobody; there is nothing to hinder him doing the grossest wrong to the electorate and the public; he is not even obliged to take the valuation roll as the basis of the value of the land which will qualify a man to vote, so that this Bill is far from being in order. To show that the powers of the revising barristers in England are limited by those of the overseers, I will cite a judgment from Grady on the law of elections, which says:

"If the qualification of the voter is made on the face of the register, the revising barrister has no power to strike out such voter's name, on the ground that the qualification is insufficient in law, unless the retention of the name on the list has been duly objected to."

Here all that safeguard has been done away with, and the revising barrister will be the potentate who will have the electorate at his mercy. But it has been said by the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Taschereau): Oh, you need not be afraid of those revising barristers; they will be eminent lawyers; they will be fair men; and their decisions will be such that no injustice will be done. Well, if we are sure that no injustice will be done, why should we be afraid of giving the right of appeal to the electors? If no injustice is to be done, why should we grant the right of appeal only if the revising barrister thinks fit to consent to it? The appeal, moreover, lies only on questions of law, and not on questions of fact. There is no appeal from the decision of the revising barrister as to the evidence adduced, so that his will is supreme and arbitrary, and no one can feel that he will obtain justice if that revising barrister is ill-intentioned, and wishes to manufacture votes or to deprive the electors of their rights. I will read a judgment which was rendered in an English court as to that provision which says there shall be no appeal on points of fact. In a certain case an elector had tried to bring evidence to prove that the property which was intended to qualify a voter was outside of the limits of the borough for which the electoral list was made. There was an appeal made by that elector, and the Superior Court decided as follows:—The judgment was:

"Certain evidence was received at the Registry Sessions to prove that the premises out of which the claiment sought to register were outside the limits of the borough. Held: that this was a question of fact, and no appeal lay from the decision of the barrister as to the items of that evidence."

This shows what arbitrary powers are vested in the revising barrister. Some electors' names will be inserted on the electoral list; some persons will try to adduce evidence that the property which is to qualify those electors is situated outside of the limits of the electoral district for which the list is prepared; and yet upon that point there will be no appeal. Here, as in England, the judge will say that the decision of the revising barrister is supreme, and that he cannot reverse his judgment. Now, I have endeavored to find if there was any precedent which could justify the Bill proposed by the Government; and I have studied the different electoral systems of various countries, as to the right of appeal and as to the mode of preparing the electoral lists. In France the electoral list is prepared by the mayor, a delegate of the warden or prefect, and a delegate of the municipal council. There are appeals to the justices of the peace from the decisions of that commission; and even from the decisions of the justices of the peace we can appeal to *la cour de cassation*, and that court may refer the case back to another justice of the peace for another hearing. In the German Confederation, now the German Empire which is composed, like our Confederation, of different States, the electoral lists are prepared by the municipal authorities. An appeal lies to the judiciary, which must decide within three weeks. In Spain, the electoral lists are made by a commission composed of the alcade and four persons appointed by the municipal council, and an appeal lies from their decisions to the judicial authorities. In Italy, the electoral lists are made by an organisation similar to our municipal council, and an appeal lies to a provincial commission, and from the commission to the *cour de cassation*. Now, let us examine what are the different laws that existed in Canada with reference to the preparation and revision of the electoral lists. I see by the revised statutes of Ontario of 1877 that:

"Alphabetical list of voters is made by the clerk of the municipality from the assessment roll; the said list of voters shall be subject to revision by the county judge, at the instance of any voter or person entitled to be a voter in the municipality for which the list is made, or in the electoral district in which the municipality is situated, on the ground of the names of voters being omitted from the list as being wrongly stated therein, or of names of persons being inserted on the list who were not entitled to vote. Any voter or person entitled to be a voter making any complaint of any error or omission in the said list shall, within 30 days after the clerk of the municipality has posted up the said list in his office, give to the clerk or leave for him at his residence notice in writing of his complaint and intention to apply to the judge in respect thereof."

So that in Ontario an appeal lies from the decision of the clerk to the county judge, and that appeal is not only on question of law, but also on question of fact. In Manitoba, according to the Consolidated Statutes of Manitoba, in 1880, the voters' lists are prepared by enumerators appointed either by the Lieutenant Governor or by the municipal clerk, and delivered to the clerk of the county court. It is afterwards revised by and before a judge of the court for the electoral district for which the lists have been prepared, and I see no distinction between questions of law and questions of fact. Now, in the Province of Quebec the people have the greatest safeguards for the exercise of the electoral franchise and for the preparation of the electoral lists. The hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Taschereau) fell into an error this afternoon, when he said that the assessment roll was not the basis for the qualification of the voters or of the persons entitled to vote in the Province of Quebec. The value fixed by the assessors cannot be changed, either by the council or by the judge, when the lists are revised, and is the test of the value of the lands which entitle the electors to vote. In the Province of Quebec the assessment is made by three sworn assessors. There is an appeal as to the valuation of the land from the decision of the assessor to the local council; and when the clerk is called to prepare his electoral lists, he must take as a basis of his lists the valuation roll, as it has been prepared by those assessors; and that roll is of great importance, because it is the work of impartial persons, made subject to supervision and appeal. The electoral lists are prepared by the secretary of the council; there is an appeal from the decision of the secretary to the local council; and after the list is revised by the council there is also an appeal from the decision of the council to the Superior Court. The appeal lies as well upon questions of fact as upon questions of law. According to the measure which is submitted to this Parliament, the revising barrister will monopolise the powers of the assessors, the secretary of the council, of the local council, and even of the Superior Court judge. To rule his country, the Czar of Russia has some powers which are more arbitrary than those conferred on the revising barrister for the preparation of the electoral lists. The operation of the English electoral law involves great expenditure. According to Grady, in every electoral district each party must have an organisation to supervise the preparation of the lists. There is a general manager for each political party, and besides that, an agent in each municipality to control the revising barrister. The general manager receives a remuneration, and only aristocrats and very wealthy people can make the necessary expenditure to control the preparation of the lists; and even

as to the appeals which can be made, the poor man who will appear before a revising barrister will have to be attended by a lawyer, in order to write out his notice giving the grounds for which he appeals; he is obliged to file that notice of appeal while the court is sitting. He cannot file it after the court is adjourned, as we now have the right to do before our local municipal councils. This Franchise Act will involve an enormous expenditure. it will not only create a very heavy burden upon the public Treasury, but will be also a source of great expenditure to the public and the electors. It is not surprising that in England to-day only wealthy people can afford to become members of Parliament. Among the 600 members who to-day compose the House of Commons in England, the agricultural class is represented only by four farmers, and the laboring class is represented only by one mason and one miner. All the other members are aristocrats or very wealthy persons. The last speaker, the member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh), said that the revising barristers will always act fairly towards the public and towards the electors; that there is no danger that any wrong will be done to the electors. That member has certainly forgotton the events which have taken place here in Canada, and what partisanship may actuate Government officials to do. At the elections of 1841, in Lower Canada, the Government officials fixed the polling places far from populous centres and disfranchised a large portion of the population in order to favor their political friends. Some years ago in the United States, have not some Government officials declared as elected for the Presidency of the States a candidate against whom the great majority of the people had voted. In presence of these facts, in presence of those frauds and infamies which were resorted to by Lord Sydenham in 1841, how can we pretend that Government officials will always deal fairly and may not take the means to extort from the people a verdict which would not be the expression of the popular will? For the reasons I have given, I took the determination to part from my political friends on this question. I cannot support this measure, which I consider unnecessary, unfair and unjust. I cannot approve of a Bill which vests some Government officials with most exorbitant and arbitrary powers, and which may bring about most deplorable consequences.

Mr. COURSOL. I intend to vote in favor of the second reading of this measure. I have listened with unbroken attention to the speeches which have been made on the other side of the House against the measure, but I fail to see in any of them arguments sufficiently strong to convince me that I ought to oppose it at its present stage. A great deal has been said about the injustice committed, about the anarchy that will be produced, about the unfairness of the measure, and so forth, but it seems that the speakers who have dealt with this question have forgotten that they were only discussing a measure at its first stage, and that they were not discussing the details of the measure; that it was not now the time to do so; that hereafter they would have an occasion to discuss them, but that at the present moment it was only the principle of the measure. Well, to my mind the principle of the measure amounts only to establish the fact that this Parliament has a right to legislate on the eligibility of its members. This Parliament does not attempt to coerce the Provinces, to infringe upon the sacred right of those Provinces, but only to show that it has itself a right to legislate. Whenever a measure has been brought before this House affecting the rights or interests of the Dominion at large, it has been the duty, and it has always given to the members an occasion, to maintain the rights of those Provinces. They have looked, and will always look with a jealous eye into any measure of such a description, to see whether it does not contain any infringement on the rights of the Provinces. Does this measure contain any infringement on those rights? Is there one single paragraph in the measure which affects the rights of the Provinces? We have a right to legislate—it has been admitted—and, if we have a right to legislate on this question, why should we call it unconstitutional? Have we not legislated before on this franchise? Has not this Parliament declared already that it had a right to do so? Have we not passed an electoral law for this Parliament, affecting the different Provinces, and those hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, who appear to have taken so much to heart the measure in itself, ought to remember that they themselves were the first, if I remember aright, to legislate on this very subject. Which was the party which, in this House, proposed to abolish and did abolish dual representation? Did they consult the different Provinces in doing so? When they legislated to abolish dual representation, were they not taking a right from the different Provinces? Did they consult the people of the Province of Quebec, for instance, and did they say: You are in the habit of sending a member who is elected for the Local Parliament to the Dominion Parliament, and now we say you shall not send that member any longer? Was it the Conservative party that did so? No; it was the Liberal party. Were they not infringing then on the rights of the Provinces, and how can they now complain that we are encroaching by a measure which we have a clear right to pass. Another question has been brought before this Parliament, another measure has been passed by the Liberal party—the vote by ballot. Who introduced that, if it was not the Liberal party? Who had that passed, if it was not that party? When they did so, did they consult the people of the Province of Quebec? Did not the legislation emanate from this Parliament only, and was it not only after the passing of that measure in this House that they legislated in the Provinces? They had abolished the old right and custom of voting publicly and openly and had substituted the vote by ballot. I believe the measure has been conducive to some good in the prevention of abuses, but at the same time it was affecting the will of the people, and it was done without their sanction, but emanating from this Parliament. Therefore, I say this Parliament has a clear right to legislate on this subject, and if it has a clear right to legislate on the subject, let us see what the measure in itself, at this first stage, contains, which is so obnoxious. We want to have the eligibility of the members fixed by this Parliament, and nothing more. Is this measure so obnoxious that we cannot give it a second reading? I say that the measure, as it stands, contains a principle that we have a right to legislate upon, and if that be so, let the House have an opportunity of pronouncing upon it; the details of the measure can be discussed afterwards. Some of them may be objectionable, but the Government declared in the beginning that they desired to consult the feeling of the House, and if any amendments were proposed they would be accepted, if the Government could see its way clear to accept them. They did that in respect to the provision for woman suffrage. If woman suffrage is not accepted by Quebec, or any other Province, let it be stated here in committee, and that clause will be erased, and I believe it will be erased. As to revising barristers, if it is found that too great a power is given them, or that they are likely to abuse it, an amendment may be made in committee which will meet the difficulty, and which will give a right of appeal to questions of fact as well as questions of law. If the Government refuses to accept the amendments which a majority of this House desire, then let the members stand up and do their duty, and oppose this measure at the proper stage, when the details are discussed. Some of the reasons advanced by the Opposition against this measure I cannot at present approve. They say it has come down too late. I believe myself it has come late, but I do not think that is what troubles the Opposition, because I think that for some of

them it has come too soon. It may be adverse to the Liberal party in Ontario. But if the measure is so bad as they say it is, if it is so radically wrong, I cannot see why the Opposition should oppose it so much. If it is going to ruin the Conservative party at the next election, I cannot see why those gentlemen should so strongly oppose the measure. I don't believe they have a great desire that we should continue in power any longer; I do not believe they ardently wish that the present leader of the Government should remain in office any longer, and if he should ever resign the reins of power there would be rejoicing in the ranks of the Opposition. For my part, I am not afraid to vote for the principle of this measure. The leader of the Opposition, in an exhaustive and elaborate speech, has led the charge against this Bill, and he has been followed by all the brilliant talents around him. He has brought against it, I may say, all his horse, foot and artillery. He has also been assisted by two hon. members who are recruited from our ranks, who came fully equipped, so that surely no complaint can be made about the equipments. I do not see that any sound objection can be taken to our right to legislate on the eligibility of members of this House. We have legislated up to the present time, and we have legislated on the franchise and made it more plain. It has been said that there would be no uniformity in the Provinces. That may be. It is difficult, in a country like ours, with so many different interests and, so many men holding properties under different titles to secure a uniform system; but I believe it is as uniform as possible; and I have no doubt that if this Parliament enacts a Franchise Bill which will be generally acceptable to all the Provinces, the various Local Legislatures will adopt it, and assimilate all their laws to this one. A great deal has been said about the danger of creating dissension in the family, by giving farmer's sons the franchise, in case they should vote one way and the father another. Sir, I think that anyone who knows the families in the Province of Quebec, at any rate, will admit that the sons have been brought up to respect and revere their fathers. The son may have his own opinion on political matters, but if he differs with his father he will not for that reason cease to respect him; and I have no doubt it will be the same in the other Provinces. This Bill proposes to extend the franchise to a class of men who deserve it. It will give the farmers' sons a direct personal interest in the affairs of the country, and they will feel a deeper attachment to the soil, while tilling it, by the sweat of their brow. The Bill also proposes to extend the franchise to thousands of men in cities who do not now enjoy it. Take, for instance, the intelligent class of clerks, those young men who form clubs and societies for mutual improvement. It will give them a vote, and thereby give them confidence and an interest in the country; and those young men, many of them may hereafter become leaders of parties and perhaps members of this House. It will do the same thing for the sons of artisans and manufacturers. When they get votes they will come to the poll unbiassed, and vote for whom they please, feeling, at the same time, that they are performing a duty of which they had been deprived before. It has been said that the people should be consulted on this matter. Sir, why should not the Government lead public opinion in these things? Are not all these measures introduced by the Government? Is it not the duty of the Government to introduce measures for the public good? If this is a progressive measure, then we are a progressive party, and we are the true Liberal party. Now, Sir, the opposition made to this Bill, in my opinion, springs from another motive; it comes from the fear that a Bill of this description might do harm to their party in the Provinces. But to my mind that is not a sufficient objection to the Bill. If the measure in itself is a good one, and calculated to benefit the country at large, I do not think the Province of Ontario or any other particular Province ought to complain. We ought to put the interests of the whole Dominion above the interests of any particular Province, and I say the same thing of the Province of Quebec. Many have said that it will do harm to the Conservative party in the Province of Quebec. I care not whom it harms, if it is the minority. If the majority benefits by it, it is the duty of every patriot, and every citizen, and every member of this House to accept the Bill. These are the true principles which must guide every public man. Let the majority benefit by the vote of the majority; let the majority make rules for the good of the majority; and I believe if those rules are followed, the minority will also find those rules to be beneficial to themselves. Mr. Speaker, I have made these few remarks, without any previous preparation, because I could not give a silent vote on this occasion. I think it is a matter that will affect the laboring classes, the commercial classes, the farming classes, to each of which it will extend the franchise; and I think in a few years the country will find this is a measure for which the Government, instead of being blamed, will be praised. And, no doubt, if the Government in its wisdom will correct certain defects in the Bill and accept such amendments proposed as will prove to the public advantage, the measure will pass. So far as I am concerned, I have every confidence in the Government which has brought it forward. I say that whenever it is said that this is a monstrous measure, whenever that is asserted by friends or former friends of this Government, such expressions cannot be tolerated. Those leaders we have maintained in power for many years past—the venerable and worthy leader of this Government, who has brought in this measure, with the consent of his colleagues from the Province of Quebec, who advocated that such a measure should be brought in; and for hon. gentleman now to say that it is a coercive measure, and one destructive of the rights and against the interests of Quebec and of my own countrymen, is to make a statement that I cannot accept for a moment. If I thought that the hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial benches representing the French element had, at the dictation of the Premier, wilfully and knowingly proposed and supported a measure which would prove destructive to the rights of the people of the Province in which I live, and of those who sent me here to defend their rights, I would not support those hon. gentlemen a single moment longer. But no; I have every confidence that they are acting for the best, and that the leader of the Conservative party, who has led us to victory so often, is, I am sure, at the present moment, acting for the good of all; that this measure will be approved by his colleagues, will be adopted by this House, and that it will be found to result to our common advantage.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I desire, before the second reading is taken, to address a few remarks to the House. One of the leading points made by hon. gentlemen opposite, respecting this Bill, was the late period of the Session at which it has been introduced. We have had several very earnest speeches on that subject from hon. gentlemen opposite, in which the Government have been very severely condemned for not placing the measure before the House at an earlier period. To a certain extent I can concur with hon. gentlemen opposite in that regret. I should have been glad to have had an opportunity of discussing the measure before the House and the country sooner. But my reasons are entirely different from those given by hon. gentlemen opposite. They differ, because in my view of the matter this is an excellent measure, a measure which is required by the people of the country, in fact, which is demanded by the people at the hands of the Government. My regret is not so much that they have brought it down so late, as that they have been so long in bringing it here at all. I know that many hon. mem-

bers on both sides of the House agree with me that this measure should have been introduced and become the law of the land many years ago. I believe it to be the imperative duty of the Government to the people to submit the present measure to Parliament. I should like to ask why hon. gentlemen opposite complain of the lateness of the period at which the Bill has been brought down. They say it is a measure of supreme importance, of far-reaching consequence, and that it deserves mature consideration. I quite agree with them in this regard. It is a matter of great moment, of far-reaching importance, and one which deserves very grave consideration by members of this House and the country. But while I agree with them in that respect, I think the long and elaborate speech of the leader of the Opposition furnishes the best answer that can be given to the complaint that it has been so long delayed. The hon. gentleman gave a history of this measure from Confederation. He has been in the House almost ever since, and he has been intimately acquainted with all the legislation enacted. The hon. gentleman furnished us with an accurate account of what had taken place on this subject since 1867, and I listened to his statements with pleasure and interest. He spoke of the fact that this measure had been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne at almost every Session of Parliament. If it has been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne almost every Session, it must be a matter that has come before the people of this country for their consideration, and it must be a matter to which they have given ample thought and discussion. For about eighteen years the people and the various members who have, from time to time, been elected to Parliament have had an opportunity of giving this subject their attention. It would be unfair to hon. gentlemen opposite to assume that after this subject had been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne so frequently they would ignore it and not give it due consideration, and make up their mind as to what should be the policy of the country with respect to it. A most effectual answer was given by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth) this afternoon, when he showed that not only hon. gentlemen themselves, but the press of the Opposition, had elaborately and fully discussed it from time to time. It is said that the people have not had the question before them. I say, that in view of the statements of the leader of the Opposition and of the Opposition press, that argument falls to the ground, because they do not deny that the subject had been considered by them, and considered by the Opposition press, in a light favorable to the Bill. There is another ground on which to show the subject of the franchise has been discussed fully by the people of this country, and I deal with this point because it has been made a point of considerable importance by the Opposition, that this Bill was sprung upon the country, that it has not been fully considered, that the people have not had an opportunity of weighing the different reasons put forth in favor of this Bill, and why it should be made law at this time. What do we find, with regard to the different Local Legislatures of this country? I find that in the Province of Ontario the subject has been discussed, and a Bill, changing the franchise of that Province, has been enacted there. I find that both in the Province of New Brunswick and in the Province of Nova Scotia, in the Sessions they have held during the the past winter, they have discussed the subject, and in each laws have been enacted, making variations in the franchise in different respects. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, in all fairness, can they say that this question has not been discussed by the people, has not been before them as a subject upon which they should exercise their judgment? I think we must consider that so far as that point is concerned their argument is at an end. Now, I could see a great deal of force in what has been said by the leader of the Opposition and others on that side; I could give much weight to what they have said, if the Government were, at this time, propounding a Bill to Parliament in which they were taking away from the people valuable rights which they now possess.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I concede that at once, and if hon. gentlemen opposite say, "hear, hear," I agree with them that if we were taking from the people any rights which they now possess, I could see some force in their argument, that at this period of the Session and that at this time of day the Government should not bring down such a measure. But is that the case?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I deny it emphatically, and I hope before I take my seat—if hon. gentlemen are drawing any comfort in that respect—to show that they are entirely mistaken, or else that they are endeavoring to mislead the people of this country. Now, how can they say that? I assert, and I assert it with the proof given in the Bill itself, that valuable concessions are given to the people by this Bill; that people who never had the right to vote before will be given that right under this measure. I say, Sir, that in every Province of this Dominion, with the exception of the Provinces of Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, the rights of franchise will be conceded to the people, which they never possessed before. If that is the case, is it right for hon. gentlemen opposite to get up and condemn and anathematise the Government because they give to the people rights and privileges which they did not enjoy before. I say their argument on this point answers itself, and does not require me to extend my remarks in regard to it at any greater length. Now, with regard to the two Provinces of Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, I understand that in them manhood suffrage exists. As to that, hon. gentlemen opposite must take one of two positions. They must either say the Bill is right, in making the franchise uniform in all the Provinces and thus raising the standard of the franchise, or else they must commit themselves to manhood suffrage. If they complain that privileges are taken away, it is only in those two Provinces, and are they prepared to say that manhood suffrage should be the law of this Dominion? I could understand their consistency in saying that, but if not, it shows them to be utterly inconsistent in the arguments which they have been putting forth in this debate. Let me say, with regard to the position of those two Provinces, that hon. gentlemen opposite take the legislation of the great Province of Ontario as their model. What has been done there, so far as I can understand, they consider perfection. If they take that as their standard, I say that to be consistent and honest they should be willing and anxious to support the Government in bringing up the franchise of Prince Edward Island and British Columbia to the same standard as they themselves adopted. They must admit this themselves, that it is the greatest inconsistency, it is intolerable that in this wide Dominion the different Provinces should elect men to this Parliament on different franchises—men who hold property, electing them in one Province, while in others men who have no property have the same rights and privileges. This is an inconsistent position, from which hon. gentlemen themselves must see they will be driven. In listening to the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, I asked myself, what are their real motives in the opposition which they have given to this measure so persistently and obstinately, day after day and night after night? What are the real motives behind all this fighting? I take it that there are two causes; amongst others: First, that any measure

whatever, be it ever so good or beneficial to the people, if it were to confer the greatest advantages, if it proceed from the Government hon. gentlemen opposite are bound to place themselves in opposition to it. We have seen measure after measure brought down this Session, and I know the same thing has taken place in previous Sessions, from what I have read, and simply because they have proceeded from the Government hon. gentlemen have given them untiring opposition. Now, that is the chief reason which leads hon. gentlemen to deal with this measure as they have done, and raise this tremendous howl—if I may be pardoned the use of the expression—which they have made use of in discussing this Bill in the House. Apart from that, they can not mean to oppose it, because it is an extension of the franchise; it is extending rights to the people which they had not before. They would be unworthy of the name of Reformers if they opposed it on that ground. Surely they will not contend that it is not consistent to give to the people of this Dominion a uniform franchise; they cannot give that as a reason for opposing the Bill. They will not certainly deny the right of this Parliament to give a franchise to those who elect its members, so that cannot be their objection. Therefore, I put it down first, to their undying opposition to anything that may be offered to the House by the present Government. But there is clearly another motive which actuates these hon. gentlemen, which they must in their heart of hearts confess to be the main motive, that is, their objection to the provision in the Bill regarding the mode in which the voters' list is to be fixed. I believe that is the sum and substance of the whole of the opposition of these hon. gentlemen. So far as the franchise is concerned, I will do them the credit of believing that they think it is right there should be a uniform franchise for the whole Dominion; and if their main objection is to the mode in which the list is to be fixed, it will be better for them and better for the country if, like honest men, they come forward and say so, and fight out the question on that line, and on that line alone, instead of wearying this House, night after night, in discussing trivial matters in which they themselves have no faith. Now, Sir, if this Bill proves to be a good Bill, I ask hon. gentlemen opposite what capital do they expect to make in the country by this cry of delay? No doubt the great splurge they are making is intended to affect the people; but if the Bill turns out to be acceptable to the people, if they find that they get more rights under it than they have hitherto had, I should like to know who, outside of this House, is going to consider the period of the Session at which it was brought down. If hon. gentlemen think they are going to gain any advantage from that source they will be grievously disappointed, and they had better assume the position of true patriots and help the Government to make it a good, respectable measure. If, on the other hand, the Bill is a bad and vicious one, there is no doubt that this Government will receive the condemnation they would justly deserve at the hands of the people of this country. The people will judge it by its substantial results and not by any captious objections which may be urged by these hon. gentlemen against petty details, or on the ground of delay. Now, this Bill is for the purpose of enabling this Parliament to fix the qualifications of the electors of its members throughout the Dominion, and it is defensible on every logical, political and public ground. In my humble judgment, it is due to the dignity and the supreme authority of this Parliament that it should not be subject to the caprice of outside bodies like the Legislatures of the several Provinces. What position could be more lowering to the dignity of the great Parliament of this Dominion, charged with the management of the affairs of this country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, than that the people who elect them should be decided by bodies totally irresponsible to the people who are represented here—in fact, so far as this Parliament is concerned, utterly foreign bodies. If there was no other argument that should be a sufficient answer to hon. gentlemen opposite. What has struck me from first to last as the greatest justification of this Bill, is that this Parliament should not be dependent on any inferior Legislature. Now, Sir, what is the position of this Parliament at this moment? It is at the mercy of seven different Legislatures. There are seven Provinces in this Dominion, every one of which has the right to legislate on the subject of the franchise, and to adopt such different franchises as they severally choose without the slightest regard to the wishes of this Parliament. Is that a proper position for this Parliament to occupy? Is it proper that the representatives of the people in this Parliament should feel that they are not only responsible to the people directly, but they are beholden to the Legislatures of the different Provinces, elected in an entirely different way and for different purposes? As a matter of fact, all these seven Provinces have different franchises. We have Nova Scotia with one, New Brunswick with a slightly different one, Prince Edward Island with a franchise entirely different, Ontario and Quebec different again, Manitoba different, and British Columbia different. And not only are their franchises different at the present time, but they have the power in the future to change these franchises to suit themselves, without the slightest reference to us. Now, I ask, is it logical, is it fair, is it statesmanlike, in hon. gentlemen opposite, to object to our taking it out of the power of these different Legislatures to make such vital changes as these? But not only is that unfair to this Parliament and an unseemly position for it to be placed in, but it is not fair to the people of the different Provinces who elect members to this Legislature. It is not fair that British Columbia and Prince Edward Island should elect representatives on a manhood suffrage, while the people of the Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, who probably have a larger interest in the Dominion, elect representatives on a property suffrage. I say that is not fair and just, and it is demanded at the hands of this Parliament that it should give the people of all the Provinces an equal right in that respect. I was referring just now to the power in the hands of the Legislature of the different Provinces. It is not a mere matter of imagination; it is a matter of fact, that the Legislature in some of the Provinces have abused the right which this Parliament has so far left to them. I speak now from a Nova Scotia point of view. We find that the Legislature of that Province has actually disfranchised men who have in good conscience a right to vote for members of this Parliament. In Nova Scotia the Legislature actually disfranchised all the officials of the Customs and railway departments; in fact, no Dominion official has any right to vote. Is that the case in any other Province?

An hon. MEMBER. Quebec.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. It may be so, but I say it is not fair; it is not right that they should be disfranchised in Nova Scotia while in other Provinces they have the right to vote. Why were they disfranchised? It was done for the avowed purpose of helping the opponents of the Dominion Government, the majority in the Nova Scotia Parliament being opposed to that Government; and this majority, for this purpose, deliberately undertook to strike off the voters' lists, people who had as good a right to vote as any others on the list. What was done in Nova Scotia the other day? I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to note this fact, which they must not forget in considering this question, for I hope they are patriotic enough to take a broad and statesmanlike view of the matter. The other day the Legislature of Nova Scotia passed an Act, which does not enfranchise men engaged in mining in that Province.

Why? Simply because the mining population in Nova Scotia, owing to the National Policy, are to a unit in favor of the present Government. For that reason alone the Nova Scotia Legislature, in passing their Franchise Bill, enacted a measure not giving the franchise to miners in the Province. Of course there may be exceptions, where these people own property and come under other sections of the Bill, but I ask hon. gentlemen opposite if they are prepared to uphold legislation of that kind. I understand the Province of Ontario has also exercised its rights in disfranchising certain classes of people. I cannot go into this in particular, but I understand they have taken the right to vote from non-resident voters. If the Local Legislatures are ging to exercise their power in that way, it is high time that we should provide our own franchise, and be no longer dependent on them. It has been said that we have got along very well with the present franchise for the past eighteen years, and that we should therefore stick to it. I dissent from that view. I say that while, happily owing to the wise consideration and temperate conduct of the Government and the wise moderation of the people of the different Provinces, we have managed to get along so far; that does not make these various franchises right, and it strikes me that now is the time, while the people of the country are peaceful, and no unhappy difficulty has arisen among the different Provinces, to legislate on this subject. We should not wait for some overwhelming provincial difficulty, which will force us to enact some law, but now is time, while we are united, that we should legislate upon this subject. We have been referred to the United States; but I think the argumen tthat was used with reference to our taking the United States as a model was so effectually dispelled this afternoon by the hon. member from King's (Mr. Woodworth) that I will not say a word on that subject. The British North America Act provides that this legislation should take place, and that the different franchises in the different Provinces, used the last eighteen years, should be taken merely as temporary matter. The leader of the Opposition has proved it was constantly in the contemplation of the Government to change that, and do what the British North America Act contemplated this Legislature should do, namely, make a uniform franchise for the whole Dominion. That being the case, I think that this measure, which is one for the unity of Canada and the completion of the Confederation Act, should be passed, and that no more opportune time could be chosen in which to pass it; and I may add, that I regret, for one, that years ago it was not put on the Statute Book. The Bill extends the franchise in all the Provinces, with the exception of the two I have mentioned, and that being the case, I think it will meet with the universal approval of the people. In the Province of Ontario a Bill has recently been passed, which in some respects is different to this, and in which, as I understand it, people have not the right to vote who have the right under this Bill.

An hon. MEMBER. Who are they?

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I will acknowledge to hon. gentlemen opposite that is a question I have not much studied, but I can mention one class, to which I have already referred, that of non-residents? They have been deprived of votes, and they have the right to vote elsewhere, and the deprivation of this right was done with an avowed political object by the Ontario Legislature; that in itself shows that in Ontario the Legislature has used its power in a manner dangerous and unjustifiable. In the Province of Quebec the franchise will be extended and also in Nova Scotia. It will not affect us very much, but it gives us what I am proud to say will be welcomed by the people; it extends the right to vote to fishermen, who, in many cases, are excluded from it to-day, and it will also enable the mining population to vote, who are under deep debt of gratitude to the Dominion Government for its policy. It will give the franchise to farmers' sons, who had not that right before. It will give the franchise to parties having a certain amount of income, up to $400. There is one change to which I would like to advert, from what they have in the Province of Nova Scotia. According to the law there, parties having $300 personal property, or personal and real together, have the right to vote; this Bill does not go that far, but the other provisions are such that they will certainly cover the case of every person having a vote for that reason; and in New Brunswick it is almost the same. Therefore, with respect to all classes interested, this Bill gives them greater privileges and rights than they had before. As to Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, one of two things must be done. Either we must, in order to make this franchise uniform, bring down the franchise of the Dominion to theirs, or we must bring up theirs to ours. There is no getting over it. If you concede, what every reasonable man must concede, that we should have a franchise enacted by this Parliament, and that it ought, as far as possible, be uniform, then either theirs must come up to ours, or ours must go down to theirs. I believe I am correct in saying that neither of the two parties in this House, as a party, has taken the position that manhood suffrage should be granted; and, if that is admitted, gentlemen opposite are not in a position to say that we are depriving the electors of Prince Edward Island and British Columbia of any rights which they had before that we ought not to take away. I do not believe, and I think most gentlemen will agree with me, that there are few people worthy of a vote either in Prince Edward Island or in British Columbia who will be disfranchised by this Bill. I hold that there are very few persons whose vote is worth anything, who would not have at least $150 worth of real estate, or who would not rent a house that pays $20 a year. How many people will be disfranchised under such a qualification as that? They will be so few, so insignificant, that their loss will never be known. There is a great deal of noise, there is a great deal of sound and fury over that provision of the Bill, which does not amount to much after all. The leader of the Opposition committed himself individually to the proposition that he was prepared to take as the basis of the franchise "citizenship residence and intelligence." I can understand the two first qualifications, those of citizenship and residence, but what the hon. gentleman opposite, an hon. gentleman occupying the lofty position of leader of the Opposition, means by intelligence, is what I cannot understand.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I have not the intelligence to comprehend that, and I should like to know from hon. gentlemen opposite, who appear to be so much exercised over it, what would be the measure of the intelligence that the voter was required to possess in order to have a vote. I should like a definition to be given. Who is to be the judge of the intelligence? Is the intelligence of the voter to be measured by his political views? I cannot comprehend it. It is an abstract idea, very beautiful in one sense, but it has no meaning. I was reading recently a speech of Lord Beaconsfield on that subject. He has been quoted in this House, and, with the permission of the House, I will give his words, which will very pungently express what he thought:

"The House has heard much of late years of what is called an educational franchise."

And I presume the hon. member must have meant an educational franchise when he spoke of intelligence:

"I am bound to say that no plan for the creation of an educational franchise, in a precise sense of that word, which in their opinion would work satisfactorily, has been brought under the consideration of the

Government. It has indeed been proposed that the basis of such a franchise should be sought for among the members of the various learned societies, but as it has been aptly observed, it does not follow that the members of learned societies should be learned. In these days we frequently see names followed by an amount of alphabetical combination which is almost appalling. Yet, though we associate the highest learning, great antiquarian and scientific acquirements with those persons, it sometimes turns out that they only possess a respectable character, and pay ten guineas a year. An educational franchise, according to that high empyrean of imagination which some have attempted to reach, has baffled all our practical efforts."

I think it will baffle the practical efforts of the leader of the Opposition and of the array of gentlemen behind him to define exactly what a franchise of intelligence should be. There is one clause in the Bill to which I cannot give my approval; I refer to the franchise for women. I am opposed to it, believing it would be not only degrading to the sex, but detrimental to the body politic in every sense. It may seem presumption on my part to express these views, when so many able thinkers and writers hold an opposite opinion, but my convictions on this point are very strong. I listened with pleasure, perhaps not with profit, to the eloquence of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Wright) the other evening, when he depicted in such glowing colors the results to humanity which were going to flow from granting the franchise to women, I listened perhaps with some hope that I would be convinced, but I regret to say that I went away utterly unchanged as to the propriety of giving the franchise to the gentler sex. I believe it would be degrading to them. We should be their greatest enemies to give it to them. I believe it would be essentially a mistake, in every sense of the word. Why should she be removed or tempted to leave the sphere in which God has placed her, to enter upon those duties to which she is not, by nature or constitution, adapted? I can see nothing in the argument of any writer on the subject which has convinced me of the propriety of supporting this proposal. I ask hon. members of the House, and through them I ask the people of this Dominion, why should we accord to woman that which she has not asked for? There is no public feeling or sentiment on the subject, and I, for one, declare emphatically against giving a right not asked for by the sex, and which no public duty or public necessity demands. You take from woman what she was constituted for. Instead of being man's helpmate you make her his rival, and you introduce into the family circle seeds of dissension, marring that domestic happiness which should ever exist between members of the same family. Woman's sphere of action is the domestic circle, in the care of the young, in the nursing of the sick, in the consolation of the bereaved, in performing those religious and social duties which contribute to the general good of mankind. We glory to see her engaged in those occupations so necessary to the happiness of mankind. Here is ample scope for the exercise of all her virtues and intelligence. I think it would be a mistake, a mistake which could never be remedied, to take her from her legitimate sphere and give her those privileges which she has not asked for, which would involve her in positions and occupations for which she is not adapted, and which would not be conducive to the interests of our race. It cannot be contended that those duties, which must be performed by somebody, are too well performed at present. It will never be contended that the sick are too well cared for, that those who are in distress and sorrow have too many persons to console them, orthat religious, social, and benevolent works are too well attended to. While men are engaged in the general public occupations, woman should be left to those more gentle and better adapted to her nature. Now, Sir, there is another reason against granting the suffrage to unmarried women and widows, as suggested in this Bill, and that is that if you grant the franchise to those classes, there is no logical reason why you should not grant it to married women. I quite agree with the leader of the Opposition, that there is no defensible ground on which you can refuse the franchise to married women if you grant it to her unmarried sisters. And you must go further. If you grant women the right to vote for members of the Legislature, you must also grant them the right to be representatives. I say that one is the reasonable deduction from the other. If she is fitted for one duty she is equally fitted for the other. You must not only give her that, but you must give her the right to enter all the walks of life open to men. Now, Sir, I ask the members of this House, and the people of this country, if they contemplate such a revolution as would be effected by this change? Do they think that women ought to take part in the deliberations of this House, or of the Local Legislatures? Do they think they should occupy the position of lawyers, or ministers, or of other professions, which heretofore have been open to men only? As surely as you grant the one, the other must inevitably follow in time. Hon. gentlemen may differ from me; nevertheless, that is the opinion I hold on the subject, Now, Sir, no country yet, which has representative institutions, has conceded to women the right to vote, except one or two States of the American Union, and I do not think that they should be held up to this House for imitation. I have heard that in some of the States women serve on juries. Now, Sir, all these things must follow, the moment you give women the right to vote, and in itself this is a most conclusive argument against granting them any such rights at all. A proposition was made in Congress to give women the right to vote in 1883, and it was rejected by a majority of 126 against 85; and I see that last year in England a similar proposition was rejected by a vote of 138; showing that in both the Congress of the United States and the British Parliament, the two Legislatures which might best serve us for examples, this proposition has been rejected by decisive majorities. I may say, further, that no colony under the British Crown has yet adopted any such law; and I ask why then should we rush into this abyss, the dangers and far-reaching consequences of which we ought not to incur without some very strong reason, and none such has yet been given. Now, Sir, I trust that the mature judgment of this House will pronounce against it, and reject the proposition as unnatural, as uncalled for, as impracticable and unprecedented, and as dangerous to society, and to the elevated position which woman holds in every christian nation. It has been argued that woman's emancipation has been gradually advancing with the onward progress of the world. That is true, Sir, but it has not been in the direction proposed by this Bill, in giving her the right to vote. It has been in shaking off the trammels and burdens which, in days of ignorance and prejudice, oppressed her. As to rights of property, as to her social status, as to her protection—in all those matters the position of woman has improved with christianity, but, Sir, not in this direction. Those measures in themselves show to my mind conclusively that there is no reason why woman should have the franchise, that her rights are amply protected by our Legislatures, as at present constituted, and that the mere fact of her being a voter, of being able to take part in the deliberations of the Legislature, would not advance her interests in any respect. Now, Sir, the House will pardon me if I read an extract from a speech of Mr. Goschen on this subject in the British House of Commons, and which puts the matter very clearly:

"Many of us know where to go when we want the views of women upon this or any other subject. And how can the emancipation and the enfranchisement of spinsters enable women to convey to men a better idea of what women want as regards their children? (Cheers and laughter.) I can assure the House that it is not by way of a simple rhetorical argument that I put this point. It lies at the whole root of the case. (Hear.) How are women to make their influence felt? Through their husbands, their sons, their brothers, and their friends. (Hear, hear.) To think that a collection of female voters will better be able to instruct us as to our duties in legislating for women is an assumption which I am unwilling to make. It is said that women cannot now make their influence felt, and this was one of the points raised in the able speech of the member for Stoke. It is alleged that they cannot

make themselves heard, and that they have interests which they cannot follow up. I think, on the contrary, that they do make themselves heard. (Hear, hear.) I am bound to admit that my hon. friend was fair in saying that it was not the intention of this House to oppress women. I should think not. (Hear, hear.) The interests between men and women are not separate interests. The interest of the father is not a separate interest from the interest of the mother. We take a joint interest in our children, be they sons or daughters. We care for the education and the future of our daughters as much as we care for the education and the future of our sons. Now, I venture to think that women in that way, acting through their legitimate representatives, have ample opportunities of being able to influence political men. (Hear, hear.) But women are to make their influence felt. Well, may I ask what hon. member is not or has not been more or less under the influence of a woman? (Hear hear, from Mr. Warton, and laughter.) We know the various classes of women who are able to have an influence in politics. Could we not see from the eloquence of my right hon. friend the member for Halifax how much he had been under the influence of the noble women whom he so well represents, and who made him eloquent on their behalf? (Hear, hear, and a laugh.) There are other women who may be called the Sirens of the political boudoir, and very influential they are sometimes—perhaps quite as influential as the emancipated Amazons of the public platform. (Hear, hear.) On all sides we see the influence they bring to bear upon us, but what I object to, and what has been pointed out by other members, is this: That certain splendid examples of womanhood should be put before the House, and that it should be said because they have so worthily discharged the duties and functions assigned to them, therefore you may enfranchise women generally and place the franchise in the hands of the whole sex. (Cheers.) We have had put before us the case of Miss Octavia Hill. She has done, and is doing, splendid service in an unobtrusive manner; but I doubt whether she would be stronger, either with the public or with this House, if it were by the vote of female electors that she was obliged to make their influence felt. (Hear, hear.) It is not at the polling-booth, but it is through their actions of this kind, that women must influence legislation. Then it is said that women are excellent poor law guardians, and that, therefore, we have before us a proof as to the capacity of the sex for public civic duties. I object to this view, and deny that we can argue from the parish or the municipality to the State.

I think that places the matter very tersely and very plainly so far as regards the position of woman. With respect to this Bill there is one other subject of importance to which I wish to allude, and that is the mode of preparing the lists of electors. This has been objected to by hon. gentlemen on two grounds. First, that it is expensive; and second, that it gives undue influence to the Government. I say, as to the first point, there is no force in it. Once concede that it is the duty and right of this Parliament to fix the franchise, and you must adopt adequate machinery to carry it out. But I differ from hon. gentlemen opposite as to the matter of expense. I think they are mistaken, especially after the first list has been completed, as the expense afterwards will not be large. As to undue influence, hon. gentlemen opposite are unnecessarily alarmed. At the present moment, in most of the Provinces, the list is fixed in the first place by revisors appointed by municipal councils. Those are generally selected according to the political stripe of the particular municipal council. They are selected for that express purpose, because they are political partisans. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, in all fairness, whether barristers of five years' standing cannot be trusted to do the work of revisors as satisfactorily as men thus selected. A revising barrister has every motive to act with greater impartiality than any person appointed by the present mode. First, he has a character to maintain. A respectable barrister, and I am quite sure none other will be appointed, has his character to maintain, and it will be his interest to do his duty impartially. We cannot, of course, expect perfection in this world. He may have his political leanings, but I contend that a gentleman in the position of revising barrister will do his duty, at least as impartially as any one selected according to the present arrangement. He will be a permanent officer, and have to maintain his reputation, both as to legal knowledge and other matters, and he will exercise great care in carrying out his duties, especially as he will know that his conduct must come under the consideration of this House. But suppose he commits a gross outrage in fixing the electoral lists, the result of that must act prejudicially to the party in whose behalf he does it, for no advantage can

can accrue from it. Hon. gentlemen opposite are, therefore, unnecessarily afraid. According to the provisions of this Bill and the lower standard of franchise adopted, there are very few who can be kept off the lists. The most that can be said is, that it can be no worse than the present system. I can only say, in conclusion, that I will support this Bill. I will support it on different grounds. First, I consider it a necessary part of the terms of Confederation and required to secure the completeness of our national existence. I believe that this is the strongest ground on which hon. members are bound to pass this Bill. I support it, moreover, as extending the franchise to many who ought to have it, in a liberal and judicious spirit, and placing the various provinces on the same level in this respect. I think, on other gounds, this House is bound to sustain the Bill. I support it, further, as removing a serious defect from our Statute Book, which, although late in coming, should not be any longer neglected.

Mr. FISHER. I am very glad that when the hon. gentleman who has just sat down rose I was not able to catch your eye, Mr. Speaker, as I had intended doing, because in consequence of that speech I have heard several of the strongest arguments stated against this measure, the expression of which I cannot do better than make in the hon. gentleman's own words. But before going into that matter, I will take the liberty of replying to an attack made by him, in regard to the character of the franchise which the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) said he would favor, and that was the personal intelligence of the elector. The hon. gentleman accused the member for West Durham of giving no criterion by which intelligence could be judged. But on looking at *Hansard* for last Friday, I find these words used by the hon. member for West Durham:

"The basis for that franchise would be citizenship, residence and intelligence—that intelligence established by an easy test, which has been applied in several self-governing states and colonies, the easy test with reference to reading and writing."

The House will, therefore, see that the hon. member for West Durham did give the test by which he would judge of the intelligence of the elector if such a standard as he suggested were adopted. The hon. gentleman who spoke last has accused hon. members on this side of this House of opposing this measure, first and foremost because it was brought forward by the Government, we having no other reason for opposing it, except the natural opposition inherent in us as members of the Opposition. I think that accusation must fall to the ground after the arguments addressed from this side of the House, which have not been fairly stated by hon. gentlemen opposite, arguments which had not been attempted to be met until the hon. gentleman who last spoke addressed the House, because I wish to do him the credit of saying that he, at all events, showed the courage of his convictions, and endeavored, to the utmost of his power, to sustain the case from his standpoint, by argument. But I desire to refer to the statement of the member for Montreal East (Mr. Coursol), when he expressed his confidence in the leader of the Government, which would induce him—and I suppose he spoke for a large number of hon. gentlemen opposite—to support any measure brought forward by that right hon. gentleman, without enquiring into its details; and he seemed to reflect on the hon. members for Bagot and Rouville, because they had discussed those details, and in consequence of the nature of those details they felt bound to sever themselves, so far as this Bill is concerned, from the party of which they have always been followers, and to vote against that party. And, Sir, he was ready to support a Government measure, whatever that Government measure might be, simply because it was introduced by the right hon. gentleman, the leader of the Government. I think that is a much more fair statement, coming as it does from one of themselves, of the

feeling which animates hon. gentlemen supporting the Bill, than any accusation thrown across the House by them against us can be. The hon. gentleman says we oppose this measure because it is a Government measure, but I would ask him what reasons does he give for the hon. member for Rouville (Mr, Gigault) and the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) opposing this measure. Is it because that this is a Government measure, a Conservative measure, that they have opposed it? No, it is not; because they are Conservatives and followers of the Government, or they have been until to-day; so that it is not for those reasons, at all events, that they have opposed the measure, but because the inherent evils of the measure itself are such that they could not accept it, even though introduced by a Government of which they have been supporters. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down asks us whether we oppose it for political reasons. I say we do oppose it for political purposes; we oppose it because we believe it is a bad innovation on the law of our country. We oppose it because we believe it will do harm to the country, until it is repealed, and we do not believe it is wise to put on the Statute Book a law which should be repealed immediately afterwards. I suppose, when the hon. gentleman said we oppose it for political purposes, he meant that we opposed it for party purposes more than for political purposes, and the hon. gentleman professes to think that we oppose it because we believe it will have an evil influence on our party. I do not know what that influence may be, but I should think it would have an evil influence on the other party, judging by what has been expressed by the two hon. members to whom I have referred, who have opposed this measure, although they are Conservatives. They said they spoke for the honor of their party; they spoke because they believed this measure was diametrically opposed to the interests of the country; and if that is the case, I do not think the hon. gentleman will suppose we are opposing it simply because it is diametrically opposed to the interests of our party, unless indeed its evils are of so widespread a character that it not only hurts one party but hurts the other party as well. Sir, the grounds upon which this Bill has been opposed from this side of the House are not, I think, fairly stated by hon. gentlemen opposite. They seem to confuse two or three of the positions which have been taken here. I recollect, the other evening, the hon. the Secretary of State, when alluding to our opposition to this Bill being brought down at this period of the Session, seemed to think that we had already displayed, on this side of the House, a thorough knowledge of its provisions, and had shown ourselves well able to discuss them, and therefore he thought that it would not be any detriment to us or the country that this Bill had been brought down at so late a period. It is true that hon. gentlemen on this side can, I think, discuss this Bill thoroughly, and will, I believe, even at this later period, discuss it; it is true that hon. gentlemen on this side pretty thoroughly understand its bearings and details; but to ask this House to discuss a measure of this importance at this late period of the Session is, I contend, unfair, not only to the House, but to the country, because at such a time as the present, when the attention of the country is turned to other very important events in our history, it is difficult to have the country devote its attention to this measure; and, further, if it is to be discussed to the full extent it should be discussed—and I may say I think it will be—it will necessarily keep the House together to so late a period of the year that it will be unfair to ask hon. members to remain. These are the chief reasons why it was thought unfair to the House that the Bill should be introduced at this late date. I think that hon. members on this side of the House, if not those on the other side, will take the utmost pains, even if it is introduced at this late period, to lay its evil provisions before the country, so that the country will understand it, so that we may get the attention of the country with regard to it, and show them that the Bill will not be passed without strenuous opposition, even if introduced at this late date. The reasons which have been advanced from this side of the House in opposition to this Bill take chiefly two forms. In the first place, we believe it is better for the franchise of the various Provinces to be regulated by the various Governments; and, secondly, we believe that it is not a good thing that the management and making of the lists of those who shall be the electors of this country should be taken out of the hands of the people. There are also other less important provisions of the Bill to which objection has been taken, and to which objection, no doubt, will be taken, but these are the two great reasons why this Bill is objected to. The Secretary of State, and I think the hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Coursol) said the Government would be willing to accept any reasonable amendment. But when hon. gentlemen on this side are directly opposed to the fundamental principles of the Bill we cannot wait until the Bill is before the committee and then propose amendments. The Bill, in its fundamental principles, is objectionable to hon. gentlemen on this side, and it is in consequence of that fact that this discussion has taken place on the second reading, before the principles of the Bill are affirmed, as I have always understood it to be the parliamentary practice that those principles would be affirmed by the second reading of the Bill. I, myself, Sir, have felt it to be my duty to speak on this Bill, not only in consequence of my responsibility in general terms, as representing the county which I have the honor to represent, but because, when two years ago, the right hon. leader of the Government introduced a similar measure, in the first Session of this Parliament, and when I went home to meet my constituents, and went among them, and tried to lay before them the measures proposed and discussed in this House, I laid before them at considerable length the provisions of that Franchise Bill, and when I did so, I was instructed over and over again, by meetings in my county, not only of Reformers, but attended by Conservatives who came to hear—I was instructed to oppose the Bill to the utmost extent possible. Therefore, I felt that I could not vote silently against the Bill, but should lay my reasons before the House for opposing it. So far as the franchise which this Bill proposes is concerned, I confess that, coming from the Province of Quebec, as I do, and believing, as I do, being a Liberal, in progress and advance, I confess I am not opposed to the franchise contained in this Bill in general terms. I find that there is an extension of the franchise, so far as concerns the Province of Quebec, and from that fact I am disposed to support a franchise such as this, except so far as the extension of the franchise to women is concerned, which I shall allude to a little later on. But I find that even as regards the extent and limit of the franchise there are changes made, even in the Province of Quebec, which will not be exactly satisfactory to the electors, and will not be really in their interests. I find that in towns the franchise is increased to the extent of $100; as in Quebec the $300 franchise is limited to cities, while by this Bill that provision is made to apply also to towns. The result will be that in towns the franchise, instead of being extended by this Bill, will be limited; but, as I said a few minutes ago, the result, in general terms, in the Province of Quebec, will be to make a large extension of the franchise. But the question of the franchise itself, the question as to whether the Parliament of the Dominion or the Local Parliaments should regulate the franchise, and the question whether the revising barristers should prepare the lists, or whether the lists of the municipalities should be used, are so connected, that I must deal with them together. The hon. gentlemen opposite said that this Bill, as it extends over the whole Dominion and applies to every Province in the Dominion, must be more or less a question of

give and take. The hon. Secretary of State, the other day, said that a Bill, to be applied to every Province, might not be perhaps equally or absolutely acceptable to all the Provinces. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down stated the case very clearly and distinctly, that you have either to bring the franchise down to the standard of Prince Edward Island or bring that up to the standard of the rest of the Dominion. In other words, in consequence of the attempt to create an equal franchise all over the Dominion, you must do an injustice to some one or more of the Provinces. The hon. gentleman, a few minutes ago, complained that the Nova Scotia Legislature had disfranchised certain people. Does he not consider it an evil that the Administration here is prepared to disfranchise a large number of people in Prince Edward Island, a large number in Manitoba and a large number in British Columbia? And mind you, Sir, that is not done by the representatives of Prince Edward Island, or of Manitoba, or of British Columbia, but it is done by this Parliament of Canada, which represents the other Provinces as well as those Provinces—by a body irresponsible to the electors of those Provinces, and not by the Local Legislatures, which may choose to elevate or lower their franchises, each in its own Province. When hon. gentlemen talk of injustice, I think they had better look at the beam in their own eye instead of the mote in the eyes of other people. But this is one of the points which is inseparably connected with the voters' lists. The hon. gentleman said that since the Dominion must take the franchise in its own hands, it must provide the machinery for preparing the lists. That is quite true, and that is one of the great objections to the Dominion taking that power. The Dominion, I believe, has no right to command the municipal officers of the different Provinces to do this work; consequently, they have to create officials of their own. That, I consider, is a great reason why the Dominion should not do this. The hon. gentleman said it is necessary for the dignity of this Parliament and for the honor of the Dominion, that the franchise all over the Dominion should be equal and uniform; but we have been going on for years back with different franchises, and we have been getting on very well under that system. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not brought forward a single item or a single instance in which any portion of this Dominion has suffered in consequence of this mode of procedure. One hon. member, I think the hon. member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Woodworth) said we were making a great noise over the fact that a Province might suffer for the sake of the Dominion, but, said he, why should the Dominion suffer for the sake of the Provinces. If the Provinces have to suffer for the sake of the Dominion, why should we impose any more suffering upon them? It is true there has to be a certain amount of give and take between the Provinces and the Dominion. It is true, the Provinces in certain ways and on certain occasions, have had to suffer, as I think might very well be shown in consequence of the tariff that hon. gentlemen opposite have imposed on the Dominion. If that is the case, and I quote hon. gentlemen opposite, to show that it is the case, is it not the part of statesmanship and good government to try and mitigate the amount of suffering the Provinces have to endure for the sake of the Dominion? I contend that it is a duty on the part of this Parliament and this Government to do so. But hon. gentlemen opposite have been accusing us of opposing this measure because we believe it to be a matter of provincial rights. Now, I think they have totally and entirely misconceived the opposition raised against this measure on this side of the House. I have not heard one hon. gentleman say that this Parliament has not the right to pass this measure, or that provincial rights are being infringed upon. The hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Coursol) brought forward, in dispute of that statement, the instance of the double mandate, and said that that was a point in which the Dominion Parliament had infringed on the rights of the Local Legislatures, and that consequently working from that precedent, it might go on and pass this, Bill. I believe this Parliament had the right to do away with the double mandate, and I believe it has the right to pass this Bill. But why did it do away with the double mandate? For the purpose of restricting provincial rights? I trow not. It was because it was found to be a practical inconvenience, detrimental to the good of the country, that members should sit in the Dominion as well as the Local Legislatures. It was found to be bad for the Local House and bad for the Dominion House, and it is because this Bill will lead to equal or greater practical inconvenience that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are opposing it. Now, I will take a few minutes to expose some of what I conceive to be the practical inconveniences of this measure. By the creation of a Dominion franchise we necessitate all through the country a double set of voters' lists. We have already the local franchises. I do not suppose that hon. gentlemen on the Government benches expect that all the Local Legislatures are going to assimilate their franchises to this. Do they imagine that Prince Edward Island is going to do away with its manhood suffrage? Do they imagine that the Provinces to the west are going to do away with theirs? I do not think they expect that to take place. Therefore, they pin themselves down to the necessity of double lists. I suppose there is hardly a gentleman in this House who has not experienced the practical inconvenience and the trouble and the difficulty there is in taking care of and managing the voters' list of his constituency. I suppose there is hardly a gentleman who has not spent a good deal of trouble in seeing that the voters' list is properly corrected from year to year. Now, you can easily see, if all that trouble and expense is to be doubled—an expense not only saddled on the officials connected with the Government or with the municipalities, but an expense also in which every individual who takes part in political work has to bear his share, an expense in which the members of this House will have to bear their share, an expense to the whole community, an expense to the electorate themselves, when they will have to go twice to see that their names are upon the lists, and if their names should be omitted from either or both, to see that they are put on; all this work to which I have alluded is, by this Bill, doubled. I am not going to count up, in dollars and cents, the amount that these revising barristers and their secretaries and other officers attending on them are going to cost, but I think I pointed out pretty clearly, in a few words, that what they will cost will be a very large amount and will have to be borne by the whole community. I will now touch upon what I consider to be the crying injustice and evil of this Bill. The question of the franchise is an important one; the question as to whether the Provinces should have the right of making the franchise is a very important one; but when we come to this question of appointing barristers and to the manner in which the voters' lists are to be created under this Bill, we touch a question which strikes at the very root of representative institutions in this country, and one in which an absolute wrong is being done, not to the politicians of the country, not to the members of Parliament, but to the electorate themselves, who, by the provisions of this Bill, are in danger of having their franchise taken away from them. In saying this I am not referring to those men in the country who are going to be deprived of their franchise, as in Prince Edward Island and the other Provinces, where they have universal suffrage—but I refer to the men who will suffer injustice at the hands of the revising barrister in consequence of the machinery proposed by this measure. I will compare very briefly the manner in which the voters' lists under this Bill are to be conducted, and that in which they are conducted in the Province of Quebec to-day. I can only speak of that Province with any authority and knowledge,

but in it I know well how the voters' lists are made up, and I believe in their management, although, of course, subject to some slight difficulty and danger, the people themselves have the ultimate decision; whereas, under this Bill, the party nominated revising barrister is the only one who will have a voice in the matter at all. In the Province of Quebec lists are based on the valuation rolls of the municipalities; these valuation rolls are made for the purpose of taxation, and, consequently, it is in the interest of every elector and of every person whose name is on these rolls to have the valuation at which he is assessed made as low as possible; because, if he choses to raise it, he will have to pay taxation corresponding to the increase of his assessment. The result is, that, no man will ask for an addition to his assessment willingly to any extent; but under this new system the revising barrister, although he has to take as his first guide the municipal rolls, still has a right to make a change in them if he thinks fit, and he will be able to raise and give a nominal value on the assessment roll to any piece of property he likes, for the purpose of making a vote, without any corresponding disadvantage in the shape of increased taxation being attendant on it. The result is, the greatest safeguard that can possibly be imagined is taken away, the danger of increasing the valuation for the express purpose of obtaining a vote is incurred. Then, to-day, our municipal councils are obliged to revise the voters' lists, which are based upon the municipal rolls. These municipal councils are affected by the people of the municipalities which they represent. The people therefore have in their own power the nomination of the men who shall control their lists; the people have control over these men, because if they believe they are not acting fairly, rightly and lawfully, they can defeat them at the next municipal elections. The result is, that the municipal councils, as a rule, act fairly and honestly. In almost all cases the councils are likely to be composed partly of one political party and partly of the other political party; and the result is, that while one is in the majority, the other have a minority there to watch the proceedings. No party advantage can, therefore, be taken to any considerable extent in the preparation of the voters' lists. The hon. gentleman from Cumberland (Mr. Townshend) a few minutes ago alluded to the fact that in Nova Scotia the municipal council nominate revising barristers, and he held there was no more harm that the Government should nominate them than that the municipal council should. Those councils, he said, are composed of party men, and the result will be that the revising barrister will be elected by the representatives of the one party or the other. But the hon. gentleman forgets that under the present Bill revising barristers over the whole country will be representatives of only one party; while under the other circumstances if it was found that the municipal officers had not acted fairly and honestly in the matter, the people would have the course in their hands of not reelecting them. In the Province of Quebec the municipal councils have the revision of the voters' lists, but if, in consequence of any party manifestation on their part, anybody thinks himself wronged, he has immediately an appeal to the court of the district in which he lives. The Secretary of State, the other evening, alluded to the fact that there was an appeal under the Bill, and that appeal would not be more expensive than an appeal under the old law. I am sure the hon. gentleman was not reflecting upon what he said at the time. In the first place, he confused the appeal to the revising barristers with the appeal from the revising barrister; but even if he did not make that confusion, and he really meant the appeal from the revising barrister, he must know well enough that by this law in the Province of Quebec all cases appealed from the revising barrister must be taken to the city of Montreal or Quebec and not to the courts of the district in which the councils are held, and he must know that the difference in expense will be much greater indeed than if taken from the municipal councils of the Provinces to the court in the districts in which they are. But that is not the worst of the matter. As the hon. gentleman for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) said, this Bill provides clearly and distinctly that the revising barrister's decision is only subject for appeal when the revising barrister himself is willing, and the result is practically there is no appeal. It is perfectly absurd to say that there is an appeal from the decision of a court, when that court itself has the decision as to whether there should be an appeal or not; and by the wording of this Bill the appeal is only to be taken on questions of law. There is to be no appeal on questions of fact, that is to say, there is to be no appeal if the valuation is incorrect, which this revising barrister chooses to put on the property of any person; there is to be no appeal as to whether a person is of full age or not, there is to be no appeal as to whether that person is qualified as a farmer's son or in any other way by the different franchises under this Act. It is simply upon a legal point, on a question of interpretation of the Act, and then only is it allowable with the consent of the revising barrister. Then, this Act has a plausible clause in it, by which the said revising barristers are to be removable at the will of the House of Commons. I have no doubt that, in doing that, the people generally throughout the country will imagine that the Government are putting out of their own hands their power or control over the revising barristers. They are doing so, but the only way by which any control can be had over these revising barristers by this clause is in the hands of the House of Commons. Now, a good many years ago a law was passed in this country, taking out of the hands of the House of Commons the decision of election cases. I believe that law was passed with the full consensus of the people of the country. I believe it was a good law. I believe that the state of affairs which existed before, when a party majority in this House could vote to have a man in this House or to turn him out of the House, was one which ought not to have existed. But by this law you are going to reinstate that condition of affairs. Whenever there is a question of dispute as to an election, based upon the electoral lists, you are going to bring before this House the action of the revising barrister, you are going to ask for a party vote on the question of whether that revising barrister shall be dismissed from his office or not. And who are going to vote upon that question? It is the members of this House of Commons who have been elected, not by the people, but by the people that these revising barristers, nominated by the Government, representing the majority of the House, have appointed. This shows the fallacy which underlies this clause, which is held out to the people of the country as a safeguard. I have no doubt it is done because the people are not expected to understand. I believe the people throughout the country will think it is a safeguard, and will trust to the House of Commons to defend their rights; but they do not know the full meaning and extent of that clause; they do not appreciate the fact that it is practically restoring a state of affairs which the Parliament of this country decided long ago was a bad state of affairs, in which a party majority in this House could do just what it liked with the electorate. I think that this question of making the lists and the revision of the lists is the great blemish on this Bill. As far as I am personally concerned, were there no other objections to the Bill at all, I would find myself bound, in honor to my constituency, and in honor to the safety of the electorate of the country, to vote against it on this ground alone, and I am convinced that the people at large, if they could once appreciate the extent of the powers which are going to be given to these men, would protest against them most solemnly and energetically. They will not have time to so protest, and therefore it is the

duty of members of this House who sympathise in this feeling to protest as energetically as they possibly can. Now, I must come to the question of the woman suffrage, which has been dealt with by one or two gentlemen before, and I wish to state very shortly the reasons for my intention to vote against that clause of the Bill. I dare say that my action in this respect, will not meet with the approval of some of my friends. It may be considered in some respects, especially in view of the fact that I am a strong temperance man, to be shortsighted; but I feel that this paltry attempt to introduce this question, in the way in which it has been introduced is unworthy of the Government which has done it and of the Parliament which considers it. I believe that this is really trifling with the question of woman suffrage. As my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Townshend) said a few moments ago, if the unmarried woman or the widow is to have the suffrage, what possible ground can be adduced, reasonably and logically, why the married woman, too, should not have the suffrage. If we are to give women the franchise, if we are to give them the right to decide who shall sit in this House of Commons, why, logically, should we deny them the right to sit here, too? The provisions of this Bill are illogical and inconsequent, in this respect, all through. The hon. the First Minister says he wishes to give the franchise to the woman who has property sufficient to vote upon. He does so to a few of those women, and to only a few. He does not give the franchise to the farmer's daughter, although he gives it to the farmer's son. If the franchise should be given in any case to the woman, why should it not be given to the woman who is in the same position as all the men are who get the franchise, with the one exception, if the hon. gentleman thought so, for the married women? But, in the case of the married woman, although I am not a lawyer, I know enough of the law of the Province of Quebec to know that, in the case of a man and his wife, they are supposed to have an equal share in the property they in common own. The wife is the equal partner of the husband, and if, by owning property which is sufficient to qualify two persons, this man has a right to vote, in the same way and in the same sense the married woman should have a right to vote. Another anomaly is, that the mother's daughter, should her father choose to deed her a piece of property sufficient to enable her to vote, will have the right, while the mother, who owns half the property which the father is worth, cannot have the right to vote. This is an anomaly, upon the very basis the right hon. the First Minister stated, that the woman who has sufficient property to give her the right to vote should have that vote. But it is perfectly absurd to give the right to vote to unmarried women if you do not give it to all. The hon. member for West Durham the other day, in alluding to this question, showed that of all the unmarried women in this country, about two-thirds are between twenty-one and thirty-one years of age. We know perfectly well that women at that age are not at all likely to take a deep interest in public affairs. They are not at all likely to separate themselves from the ordinary social interests which absorb the young woman between those ages. The great majority of them are probably looking forward to marriage. They are not prepared to study great questions; they are not so well prepared, at all events, to pronounce upon great questions, as those of more advanced age. and yet we find that, among those whom the right hon. gentleman wishes to enfranchise, two-thirds of the whole number of possible electors are between the ages of twenty-one and thirty-one. I do not think we can conclude that these women are better qualified to vote than their mothers, who, however, are not allowed to vote under the Bill. Therefore, I base my objection to this clause, not as against the principle of woman suffrage, but because I consider the provisions of this Bill are inadequate, and do not commend themselves to my judgment. If, at some future time, the women of this country have shown that they desire the suffrage, and, after full discussion, the matter is brought up unencumbered with other difficulties, and the right to vote should be given to all women as it is to all men, surrounded with the same restrictions as surround men's suffrage, reserve to myself the right to vote for or against that measure. But I do not consider that, on this occasion, my vote would be any indication of what I might do under such circumstances. I think that, fairly and fully to discuss the principles of the Bill upon its second reading, it was absolutely necessary to discuss a great many of its details. For instance, in regard to revising barristers, we could not show the evils attendant upon these provisions in the Bill without comparing the proposed system with the present condition of affairs; and without discussing the details of the franchise in the various Provinces, we could not show the inconveniences and objections which exist against making the Dominion franchise the same over the whole country. I have gone over the points which I considered it my duty to deal with, and before closing I desire to make an observation as to the reason which has moved hon. gentlemen opposite to bring down this Bill at this late period of the Session. Why is it that, at this late hour of the Session, with a great deal of important work still before us, the Premier has expressed his determination to put this measure through *coûte que coûte?* I am not at all disposed to impute unworthy motives to the hon. gentlemen opposite, but I cannot help thinking the truth was told by the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont), when, in more powerful language than I can use, he expressed his belief that on the eve of an important battle it was much better for a general to face his adversaries and risk the danger of defeat, without resorting to proceedings which would entail dishonor if he gained the victory, that it was very much better for a general to suffer defeat with honor than to gain a victory with dishonor. Sir, I believe these words clearly point out the true reason for bringing forward this measure to-day; it is becanse hon. gentlemen opposite, fearing the results of future elections, wish to take into their hands the power to gain a victory, by means which have been characterised as dishonorable, by means which I myself am prepared to characterise as an extreme action, an action which strikes at the foundation of our representative institutions, and an action which, Sir, I trust and believe, will recoil upon the heads of the men who have taken it.

Mr. COCKBURN. I wish to state my objections to a few of the features of this Bill. I had hoped, after the experience of the past few years in elections in this country, that a better era was dawning upon us, but I regret to say that this measure is a retrograde step. I will state at present a few of my objections to the Bill, reserving further remarks until the Bill is considered in Committee of the Whole. The chief reason of my opposition to the Bill is that it is not required; it has not been asked for. Another strong reason is, that I think it very unfair. I think it unfair that the Government should take the voters' list into their own hands, as it will be practically, for no doubt these revising barristers will be partisans, and strong political friends of the Government, and perhaps experts in many election contests. It is following out the principle that was stated by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault), for the Government have borrowed the worst features of the English election law and left out the best. We have the voters' list already prepared, which do not cost the country anything. They are well revised, and very satisfactory. Therefore, I think the present Bill is totally uncalled for, as regards the preparation of the lists. I also object to the measure on the score of expense. Our controllable expenditure has already gone far beyond what it should, and this measure is going to add considerably to our controllable expenditure.

I believe that the salaries of these revising barristers, the expenses of printing, secretaries, and clerks, will not amount to less than $250,000 annually, saying nothing of the great expense which will fall on individuals in looking after these matters, who will chiefly be of the Liberal party. I had hoped that any reform measure, respecting the franchise and the voters' lists, would be in a different direction, so that we could have elections carried on in a straightforward manner, as merchants usually transact business between them, but it seems that we have not yet arrived at that happy period. The excuse is set up that we want uniformity of lists throughout the Dominion. Well, I never knew anyone who wanted to perform some bad act or to perpetrate some wrong who did not find some pretext therefor. We have so far got on very well. The provincial lists have given good satisfaction, and cost the Dominion nothing to use them. I observe that the Ontario members of the Ministerial party can never speak on any Dominion question without making an attack on the Ontario Government. I do not see what the Ontario Government have to do with respect to these matters, nor why hon. gentlemen should refer to Gerrymander Bills and such things. It is true that in some constituencies township lines have been changed to a certain extent, but county lines have never been disturbed. The Gerrymander Bill of 1882 passed in this House was a gross anomaly, and even worse than an anomaly, for it was a measure that bore on its features evidences deserving the strongest condemnation. The constituency where I reside is 110 miles long, and only five miles wide in one part; and I have to pass through two other constituencies, South Ontario and South Victoria, before I can reach one part of my constituency. If the antecedents of the hon. First Minister and those associated with him in public affairs were above suspicion, we might not feel so anxious with respect to the working out of the proposed election law now before the House. But we know that one of the tactics of the hon. gentleman and his political admirers– although in this particular they are not supported by independent and fair-minded Conservatives—is to take every advantage of any possible chance in election matters. This Bill is specially designed to give them another advantage. We never get a fair election. That in 1882 was not a fair election, and I propose to give the analysis of the results on that occasion. Party contests were held in 175 out of the 211 constituencies. The total vote polled in those 175 contests was 472,928. Of that number the Conservative party obtained 247,469 votes, the Liberals 225,459, leaving a Conservative majority of 22,510. The Conservatives secured a majority of forty members. The average vote polled in each constituency was 2,703. This divided into the Conservative majority of votes, 22,510, would only give a Conservative majority of eight members instead of forty. The total majority obtained by the Conservatives should have been forty instead of seventy, as at present. Such a result, to some extent, would be obtained under any circumstances, but not in such a glaring degree, except under the operation of the Gerrymander Act, by which the Grits were hived in several of the constituencies. We have had some improvements made in the election law during past years, among them the ballot and simultaneous elections. We recollect that in former times the First Minister held elections at different periods. He always held elections in constituencies where his party was strongest at an early period of the campaign, in order to add to his prestige. An amendment was subsequently made with respect to deposits by candidates. This had the effect of allowing some constituencies to be carried by acclamation, in 1882, which otherwise would have been contested. I remember an instance where a candidate was about to be elected by acclamation, but another candidate was nominated, the deposit put up and the latter candidate elected. I do not, however, lay very much stress on the amendment of the law respecting deposits. To refer to the present Bill, I notice it is proposed to reduce the franchise in townships from $200 to $150. I think the Government might go further, and make the qualification $100 on real estate, which would be a very satisfactory franchise. I infer from the Bill that it is possible Indians may be enfranchised. In the older parts of Ontario they are quite fit to exercise the franchise. I have two bands in my constituency, who, I think, are quite qualified to exercise the great privilege of casting the ballot. I desire to say a few words respecting the remarks of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh), who endeavored to make much of the Tuckersmith question, as regards the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron). The hon. member for Ottawa went so far as to say that the hon. member for West Huron, after the general election of 1872, would have been disqualified—in fact, the judge had about disqualified him, when the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) brought in a whitewashing Bill. That is not in accordance with the facts. The judge never disqualified the hon. member for West Huron, and no such Bill was ever introduced.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. member for Ottawa did not say that the judge disqualified the member for West Huron.

Mr. COCKBURN. He said something amounting to that.

Mr. BOWELL. What he said was this: If the court below had disqualified him, they (the judges) on appeal would have sustained the judgment.

Mr. COCKBURN. He said it was necessary to enact some legislation to whitewash him. I have nothing further to add on this subject. I am sorry the Bill has been introduced, as it is not necessary, and as its provisions are satisfactory neither to the House nor to the country. The Bill increases the number of voters and extends the franchise. I do not find fault with those provisions, and I am willing even to go a step further. As regards the woman's franchise, I do not think that that is going to become part of the Bill; and I infer, from the remarks of the First Minister, that he is going to eliminate that portion in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. KIRK. Hon. gentlemen opposite are in the habit of charging those on this side of the House with making long speeches, for the purpose of obstructing business and prolonging discussion. I do not think I can be accused of doing that, as it is very seldom I rise to address the House. I would not have risen to speak on this occasion had it not been for some remarks which fell from some hon. members from the Province of Nova Scotia—the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth) and the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend). They have given some very highly colored statements with regard to the franchise and other matters in that Province. Sir, the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth) said that the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia had just disfranchised some electors because they were favorable to the National Policy. I wonder where he got that impression. I am sure he did not get it out of the Franchise Bill itself, for that Bill has no such provision. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend) also made use of pretty much the same expressions. He said the Local Legislature had just passed a law by which they disfranchised the miners of Nova Scotia, simply because they were favorable to this Government and the National Policy. I say that no such law has been passed by the Legislature of Nova Scotia. What is the law of Nova Scotia with regard to the franchise? The hon. gentlemen know perfectly well what the law is, as they have both been members of the Local Legislature, and the hon. member for Cumberland was a member of the Government of Nova Scotia for four years, and during those four years he never made the slightest attempt to alter the franchise in Nova Scotia, which he claims to be so

wretched. The franchise which has existed for twenty-three years, up to the present time, was not altered by him, nor was any effort made by him or the Government of which he was a member to alter it. That law, as it stood, gave the right to vote to those assessed on the roll for real estate to the amount of $150, no matter whether they were farmers, fishermen, miners, or what not. They were entitled to be assessed under the law, and if their property was worth $150 they had a right to vote. Then, there was another feature of the law, which gave to parties owning personal property a right to vote. A person not owning real estate at all, if he had $300 worth of personal property, if his name was on the roll, had a right to have a vote, and he had the opportunity of having his name put on, if, by any chance, it was left off. Again, if a man had not a sufficient amount of real estate to entitle him to vote, that is, if he had not $150 worth of real estate or had not $300 worth of personal property, if the two together made that amount, he was entitled to vote. Now, what has the Legislature done this year? They have not changed that provision. They simply extend that law, so that the sons of farmers or fishermen, or any other class, or the sons of widows, of any of those classes, may have a vote; that is, if a farmer owns sufficient property to give him a vote and one of his sons a vote, or more than one, they are entitled to votes, if the property is sufficient to qualify them as voters at $150 each, and the same with regard to personal property. More than that: the sons of widows, who had not votes before, are entitled to vote now, providing their mother has sufficient property to give them votes, at $150 for each, for real estate, or $300 personal property. These people had no votes before, so that the Legislature of Nova Scotia have extended the franchise instead of restricting it. We have never had an income franchise in Nova Scotia; we have not got one now, and the Local Legislature has simply extended the franchise to sons of real estate owners and sons of widows. If the law affects miners I cannot see how they are disfranchised any more than they were previously, and if miners were not enfranchised by the law as it existed previous to this year, whose fault is it? And why did not the hon. member for Cumberland introduce a Bill to enfranchise them? I say, therefore, it was dishonest for any man who knew, as he did, what the law was, to try and prejudice members from the other Provinces, by making a statement of this kind, which was so inaccurate and which he must have known to be inaccurate. The hon. member for Cumberland has found fault with the manner in which the revised lists of voters are made up. Well, I may say, with regard to that, why did he not make an effort to alter the law in that regard? But he never made any such effort. It is true the municipal councils of the different counties appoint three men as revisers, for the purpose of making out the electoral lists. These men make them out first from the assessment rolls, and they are obliged to put every man on the list who is assessed for real or personal property to the amount entitling him to vote, as I have stated, and they are not allowed to place another man on that list; they are bound to go by the assessment roll. Now, there could not be a better basis on which to form the electoral lists, because when that roll is made out the assessors are sworn to assess every man in the county for the full value of his property, and for all the property he owns, and it is done for assessment purposes—for the purpose of collecting the taxes of the county. There can be no motive for the assessors making false assessment rolls, and therefore, when the revisers meet to revise the lists they are bound to take the name of every man on that list who owns sufficient property to entitle him to a vote, and no others. And after they make out a list from the assessment roll, they post it up publicly, with a notice warning the people to appear before them at a time and place named in the notice, for the purpose of correcting any errors that may be made in the posted lists. If it did so happen that the assessors left off the name of a man who owned property and was entitled to vote, that man, by applying to the revisers, could have his name placed on the list. On the other hand, if the revisers place the name of a man on the list who is not possessed of sufficient property to entitle him to vote, they can be notified and have the name taken off. I say that under those circumstances there could not be a better system provided, and it is a system which has proved satisfactory, so far as Nova Scotia is concerned. It has been in use for the last twenty-three years, and there have been no complaints, no petitions coming to the Legislature, asking for a change in the law. Still the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend) and the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth), talk about it here as an outrageous law, and one which should not be continued. Now, Sir, it was said that the Local Legislature did a very corrupt thing when they disfranchised a number of officials in the Province of Nova Scotia in 1871. What did they do on that occasion? They simply applied to Nova Scotia a principle which was applied in the older Provinces of Ontario and Quebec for many years; they simply enacted a law by which Customs and Revenue officers and postmasters should be disfranchised. That I believe had been the law of the older Provinces previous to Confederation, for many years. It never was the law in the Province of Nova Scotia until 1871. No man, under the law previous to that time, was disfranchised, I believe, unless perhaps the judges. But on the occasion referred to, the Legislature believing that the law in Ontario and Quebec was a good law, enacted the same principle, but included also railway officials. I dare say, if there were Government railways in Ontario or Quebec, these also would be disfranchised, on the same principle as Revenue officers and postmasters are disfranchished. The disfranchising law of the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec went a good deal further than our Nova Scotia law. In Ontario the post offices do not include way-offices; consequently, every man appointed was a postmaster, and every postmaster was disfranchised in Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. BOWELL. No; the only postmasters disqualified in Ontario were city postmasters, appointed by Orders in Council and receiving a salary from the Government. No town or village or country postmaster is disqualified. These are paid by fees—by commission.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The postmasters of towns are not allowed to vote.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; they are allowed to vote.

Mr. KIRK. Well, it was understood that all postmasters in Ontario and Quebec were disfranchised. However, the law on that occasion disqualified very few postmasters. We had postmasters only in cities and towns. In the country postmasters were not postmasters really, only way-office keepers and consequently they were not disfranchised. Subsequently, however, this Parliament converted all the way-office keepers in Nova Scotia into postmasters; and the moment that was done the Legislature of Nova Scotia repealed the law, so far as postmasters were concerned, and the result is that all postmasters in Nova Scotia to-day have votes. Now, what has the Local Legislature done, that is deserving of such severe censure as has been pronounced upon it by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth) and the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend)? It is true the Legislature disfranchised railway and other Dominion officials, but this Parliament was able to protect itself, and it passed an Act restoring these officials to the franchise, so that every man was entitled to vote and, I believe, did vote; and I think the hon. members for Halifax know how they did vote. They have

not got votes, I believe, for the Local Legislature, but they vote for this House.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. The local law precludes them.

Mr. KIRK. This Parliament passed a law in 1871 restoring them to the franchise.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. But there was another Act in 1874

Mr. KIRK. Now, the hon. member for Cumberland thought proper to impute motives to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House for opposing this measure. He said we oppose every measure because it comes from the Government. So far as I am concerned, I deny the charge. But is it not true of gentlemen who support the Government? I ask if an hon. gentleman in this House a supporter of the Government did not say, a few nights ago, that he was obliged to give a dishonest vote—Why? Because he did not want to vote against the Government. He knew that the motion, which was moved by an Opposition member, was a proper motion, but he said he could not vote for it, because it was moved by an Opposition member and he did not, but voted for the Government. He knew that if he voted against the Government he would lose the pickings. Every supporter of the Government knows that if he votes against the Government he will not get the patronage, and patronage is what some of them cannot do without. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries said some time ago that a man must sell himself to the Government soul and body like a huckster in order to get the pickings. The hon. Minister is a wonderful prophet, and he was true, on that occasion. The hon. member for Cumberland said there was another reason why we opposed this measure—it was because of the mode of preparing the lists. That is a sufficient reason why any man on the Opposition benches, at least, ought to oppose the measure. The Government take upon themselves the right to make the lists; they appoint revising barristers; they say they may be county court judges or barristers of five years' standing. Some hon. gentlemen say that they will be judges. I venture to say, so far as Nova Scotia is concerned, that not one judge there will be appointed to make the lists. Why? Simply because they have so much work on their hands now that they could not do it. Therefore, the men appointed to prepare the lists will simply be tools of the Government—nothing more and nothing less. The hon. member for Cumberland says they have their legal standing to maintain. I fancy it does not require a great deal of legal knowledge to prepare the voters' lists; and even on that score, no appeal is allowed from the decision of the revising officer on points of law, without the consent of the officer himself; you cannot appeal on matters of fact at all; and you cannot appeal on matters of law without his consent. Therefore, I would like to know where is the security that these lists will be honest? Now, Sir, I object to this law for another reason; I object to it on the ground of expense. There are to be no less than 600 officers appointed; all of these men must be paid; what their salaries are to be we do not know, but we take it for granted that they will be well paid. Probably the revising officers will get $1,000. I do not suppose the Government will offer them less, as it will take a good deal of their time to prepare the lists. But suppose they get $500 each; that will represent a cost to the Dominion of $300,000 to get these lists prepared; and we have lists at present which are just as good, which are prepared just as honestly as these can possibly be, and we have them for nothing. Yet the Government says: We have so much money in the Treasury that we can afford to give snug salaries to 600 of our friends, at a cost to the Dominion of $300,000 annually to prepare lists which we have already for nothing. Now, we know from experience that the money in the Treasury is not any too plentiful. If any of us ask the Government—perhaps it is not so with those who support the Government—but we know that if those who oppose it ask for a sum of money to build a breakwater or improve a harbor, or to put up any public work, they will say they have not the money; yet they will find $300,000 to prepare voters' lists, when there is no necessity to prepare them, for they are ready at hand. I had no intention of speaking on this question, were it not for the statements of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend). I wish to say a word or two, while I am on my feet, with regard to the qualification. Hon. gentlemen opposite pretend that this Bill will extend the franchise with us, but I do not admit that. Under our present system, any man having real property in the city to the extent of $150 is entitled to a vote, but in this Bill he must have real estate to the amount of $300 to be entitled to a vote. Tenants are entitled to a vote, of course, if they pay $20 per annum rent, and are actually on the property; but who is to know if they pay the rent? I think this is a pretty good way to gain the support of the landlords, because it will help to secure rent for them, for the poor man, when he cannot pay the rent, need only, in election times, go to an election agent and have it paid for him. With regard to the fishermen of Nova Scotia, I maintain that this Bill restricts the number of fishermen that will be entitled to vote. They are now entitled to vote, as well as others, if they have real estate to the extent of $150, and real and personal property to the extent of $300. Here they must own $150 real estate before they are entitled to a vote.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. KIRK. Except what may be added in the way of tackle to make up the $150. But the boat and tackle of many of the poor fishermen will not be worth more than $10 or $20, and they have no real estate, while many also may own horses and agricultural implements and nets to the extent of $300, to which they will not be allowed credit at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Nets are part of the tackle.

Mr. KIRK. No, they are not; they are not part of the tackle which belong to the boat. That includes but the ropes, blocks and anchor, when they have one, and does not include nets and other personal property. I say that the fisherman, under those circumstances, if he were allowed to add all his personal property to make up his qualification to $150, would be able to vote in many cases where he will not have that right under this Bill; because his nets and tackle and horse and waggon and other things would entitle him to vote, while he might not have a $100 worth of real estate including boats and tackle.

Mr. KING. It is not my intention to trespass on the time of the House at this late hour, but I cannot allow some of the remarks make by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend), in reference to the Province of New Brunswick, to pass unnoticed. If I understood him rightly, he said the effect of this Bill would be to largely increase the franchise in that Province. I have looked carefully into it, and find that I am unable to see it in that light. If the hon. member for Cumberland had chosen to have said, in the words of the First Minister, in another case, that it was not an increase, but only a readjustment, I could have understood him very much better. At the outset, I will call attention to the law in existence in New Brunswick to-day, regulating the franchise. In the first place, we have a real estate qualification amounting to $100; next, an annual income of $400; then we have $400 personal property qualification. Under the Bill now before us, the real estate qualification has been increased from $100 to $150, and, in addition, farmers' sons are to have the right to vote. It is said by hon. gentlemen opposite, that it will not seriously affect the number of votes on the lists in that

Province; but here I propose to take issue with them. It is quite true that even in so far as regards the real estate qualification it will have the effect of disfranchising a large number of persons in the Province of New Brunswick, who are considered farmers, but this is not the ground on which it is likely to do the greatest injury. There are in that Province a large number of persons who are engaged in the business of lumbering; many of these people have no real estate; some of them have homes, it is true, lots of land, which are of not very much value, yet they are possessed in most cases of a considerable amount of personal property, and many of them have their names on the revised lists in their Province, on account of the personal property qualification which obtains in the law existing in that Province. Every one of these, and they are not a few in my county, and in some other counties in New Brunswick, will be disfranchised under the operation of this Act. In a number of cases this class is confined to young men who reside during the summer with their parents on the farm. They spend the winter and a large portion of the spring in the business of lumbering. It might be said that they could avail themselves of the farmers' son clause. But I wish to point out to the right hon. the leader of the Government that this cannot be so, as they require to be absent from their homes more than the time allowed in the Bill, which is four months in the year, and in most cases they are absent for six or seven months. Therefore, a class of young men—and they are numerous all over the Province where lumbering is carried on—cannot avail themselves of the provisions of the Bill which gives the franchise to farmers' sons. Lumbering, next to farming, is the principal industry of the Province from which I come. It furnishes, as most gentlemen in this House are aware, four-fifths of the exports of that Province, and I think a Bill like this before the House, which, if it becomes law, must have the effect of disfranchising a large number of people who are engaged in the lumber business, is one that ought not to receive the assent of this House. It is true that numbers of persons who are put down as farmers in New Brunswick are living on farms which are not valued at more than $100. I do not pretend to say that any farmer in New Brunswick can subsist and make a living for himself and his family on a farm which is valued at no more than $100, but for a great portion of the year these people turn their attention to the business of lumbering, or some other occupation, and under this Bill they, too, will be deprived of the franchise. It is well known also to hon. gentlemen in this House that the shipping interest of the Maritime Provinces is a large and important interest. If you will turn to the report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, you will find, I think, that in the Dominion of Canada about thirty-seven millions and a-half are invested in shipping. In New Brunswick alone, something like ten millions of dollars in round numbers is invested in shipping, and yet in this Bill I fail to find any provision by which the owner of vessel property in the Maritime Provinces or elsewhere has a right to vote or could be represented in this House. That is not so under the local laws which prevail in the Maritime Provinces, as the personal property provision gives to every vessel owner to the extent of $400 the right to vote. By this Bill he is deprived of that right. Some gentlemen have said that the income derived from that property would entitle the vessel owner to a vote. I am not a lawyer, but, as I understand the law, such would not be the case. I will read the section which applies to the income franchise, sub-section 6 of section 4:

"Is a resident within such electoral district, and derives an income from some trade, office, calling or profession, or from some investment or charge on real property in Canada, of not less than four hundred dollars annually."

Mr. KING.

Now, I do not think, in that section which I have just read, any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House will be able to point out to me that the owner of vessel property any where in New Brunswick or Nova Scotia would be entitled to the franchise. What I am more particularly interested in, however, is not the large ship-owners, but a class of men who are owners or part owners of a smaller class of vessels, ranging from 100 tons downwards. Every year, on the lakes in my county, large numbers of that class of vessels are built by the farmers. In most cases they are owned and manned by the young men belonging to that section of country. They are employed during the season of navigation in carrying on the inland waters, on the lakes and rivers of the Province, and also in the coasting trade. Under our law, as it exists to day, in New Brunswick, every one of these young men, owning $400 in a wood boat, schooner or coaster, would have the right to be placed on our revised list, and in many cases they do vote on that kind of property. Under the provisions of this Bill everyone of those men must be struck off this list. I ask why this discrimination? I ask why provision should be made to enfranchise the fishermen with a boat worth $150, and to disfranchise the owner of a ship, the man who works in the lumber woods, or I might say the mechanic or the miner? Then again, in this case, it might be said that these young men who follow the business of coasting, as they reside for a portion of the year at their homes with their parents, could avail themselves of the provision for the farmer's son, but here again a difficulty arises, as they require to be absent for at least seven or eight months in the year. Therefore, unless that is changed, they cannot avail themselves of that provision of the Act. I think it is very unfair to that class of men. I do not complain of the advantages which are likely to be afforded under this Bill to the fishermen. I think, perhaps, it is a step in the right direction. At all events, I have no disposition to find fault with it, but I would like to call the attention of hon. gentlemen to it. I will read the section:

"Is a fisherman, and is the owner of real property, and boats and tackle within any such electoral district, which together are of the actual value of $150."

Now, it does appear to me that, so far as the real property is concerned, it is a mere myth. I have no doubt that I could go to the county of Charlotte and buy 100 acres of rocks for $100, and lay that off in lots of a quarter of an acre each, deed it to 400 fishermen, and qualify them, as far as the real property was concerned, for 25 cents each. Then, if each of them owned boats and tackle of the value of $149.75, they could be placed on the revised list. I think I can claim, notwithstanding the words "real property" are in that section, it is practically retaining in the interest of the fishermen, and of the fishermen alone, the personal property qualification which, under the present law, applies to others in the Province of New Brunswick. I think that is unfair. I am quite sure that the lumbermen and the vessel owners of New Brunswick, so far as they are affected by this Bill, will readily come to the conclusion—unless some change is made, that it is an attempt to stifle the expression of the opinion of these people at the polls. It is a well known fact that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite bears more heavily on these people in the Maritime Provinces than on any other class of people there. I do not understand why they should be singled out to be disfranchised. They are not dependent upon this Government for bounties, and I cannot see, for the life of me, why a Micmac Indian in the Maritime Provinces, with his scoop net, his spear, and his dugout, is to count for more than a vessel-owner or lumberman. I have shown to the House that in the words of the First Minister this Franchise Bill is no increase, only a readjustment at the best. With regard to the appointment of revising barristers, I would like to make a suggestion that would

simplify matters a good deal. I would suggest that, instead of a revising barrister, the Government should simply appoint my opponent—if I should happen to meet one at the next election—and allow him to make the list. It would save trouble and expense. He would do the work for nothing, and no doubt would make a list to suit himself, at all events. I cannot see that there is very much difference between allowing him to revise the list and the proposition now before the House. Some hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to assure us that they did not want to take any advantage of the Bill in the appointment of revising barristers. Well, that may be so, but we cannot see it in that light. However, I can tell the hon. gentleman that it is a game two can play at. If the hon. members opposite who come from New Brunswick are so anxious to take the power into their own hands, in making the lists to order for the next election, it is just possible that in the Local Legislature next year another Franchise Bill may be introduced there, framed upon the same principle and adopting the same tactics as are employed here, and that it will have the same effect that is anticipated from this Bill. I do not believe in that kind of thing, however. The hon. members from Ontario who sit on the Ministerial benches seem to carry the idea that this is a fight between Ontario and the Dominion Government, and that the Maritime Provinces and Quebec have nothing to do with it. But I must say that we do hope, in the Maritime Provinces, that at some day a change of Government will take place—or at all events, that a change of policy may be brought about, and such a change of policy can only be brought about by putting the Liberal party into power again. But if this Bill strikes a blow at Ontario, it strikes a blow equally at the Maritime Provinces, and our people will look at it in that light.

Mr. BOWELL. I merely want to say that in the remarks I made a few moments ago I was in error in saying that the postmasters in towns are not disqualified. I find that in the Ontario Act, postmasters of cities and towns are disqualified, but not country postmasters.

Mr. CASEY. I have waited two or three times for some of the hon. gentlemen opposite to rise in support of this measure. I could scarcely believe that it would be allowed to go through, without some further explanation from its author. It is usual, even on an ordinary Bill, to give more than eight minutes of explanatory statements regarding it, and I am quite sure that the right hon. Premier, who has such a capacity for explaining things that he himself has created, is quite able to give us more than eight minutes of reasons why we should pass this Bill. If it is customary to make explanations in regard to an ordinary Bill, how much more so should it be when we have a revolutionary Bill—for I can characterise it by no other term; it is a revolution in the whole practice and theory of our constitution hitherto in regard to our franchise. When we have a revolutionary and radical Bill brought down by a Conservative Premier, I think it deserves more explanation than he has given to us.

Mr. LAURIER. It is a conspiracy Bill.

Mr. CASEY. I do not know how far we could prove the conspiracy, but I am quite sure that if the right hon. gentleman wished to create the impression that this was a conspiracy Bill, and that he did not wish it talked about, on the theory that the least said the soonest mended, he could not have taken a better course than he has done. We have been told no reasons at all why this Bill, which has been hanging fire for eighteen years, should now be pressed to a decision. It is true that the right hon. gentleman, in his prelude to the discussion—for it was not a contribution to the discussion—gave a hint of certain reasons that might have influenced him to propose the Bill on former occasions, to carry it a certain distance, and then to drop it; but he gave us no reason why the hankering, which he confesses to have felt for a Bill of this kind, which he has manifested for so many years in introducing and then withdrawing it, is only now to be satisfied by pushing this Bill on to its final passage. He told us merely that we had undoubtedly the power to pass such an Act, but not why it is to be pushed through now. Since we have not been told, we are compelled to guess. And I do not think it is very difficult to guess. This Bill has been kept in reserve in the arsenal of the hon. gentleman's forces as a desperate resort in case of a desperate emergency. He has tried it once and again, and found that it was rather premature; that some of his friends did not like it, as they do not like it now. But now it appears that a desperate emergency has arisen, requiring a resort to this desperate remedy, and we have to guess again what that emergency may be. I do not think it is hard to guess. I think the right hon. gentleman's conduct during the whole of this Session, the conduct of his friends and supporters, and the tone of their press, have shown that a crisis has arrived in the history of that party. If anything were needed to precipitate that crisis, it has been the events of the past few weeks. I am not going to discuss those events now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on; go on.

Mr. CASEY. We will discuss them enough by and by, perhaps. There are several stages in this Bill yet, and hon. gentlemen will have quite as much discussion as they can wish. I say that the events of the past few weeks undoubtedly added gravity to the crisis. The Government have been embarrassed for some time by the failure of their National Policy.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. Yes; and voices from all parts of Canada would cry, "here, here," in answer to that statement. In every part of the country somebody can cry: Here is a man who has felt that policy to be a failure. Now we have the additional embarrassment caused by the disastrous, the sad and lamentable, failure of their policy in the North-West Territory, a failure which has brought about the events of the last few weeks. Under all these circumstances, it is perhaps not to be wondered at that the hon. gentleman should have resorted to that policy which he has kept in reserve for an occasion demanding its production. At the last elections it was found that something was needed to reinforce the Government—something in addition to the glories of the National Policy, which was then booming. At that time, in 1882, an attempt was made to strengthen the hands of the Government by an extraordinary measure. The Gerrymander Bill was used on that occasion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. Hon. gentlemen may well cheer the name of that famous Bill, which was conceived in their interest, and, if it did not fulfil all the expectations of its authors, it was not their fault. It was not completely successful and was only partial in its operation, as it applied to only one Province in the Dominion. Those to whom the right hon. gentleman entrusted the task of advising him with respect to that Bill did not prove good advisers, as in some of the constituencies where it was expected to operate with certainty it absolutely failed. In Bothwell, West Middlesex, one of the Hurons, one of the Bruces, East Elgin, Brant, and in several other places where the hon. gentleman thought it would inevitably bring success, it failed. On this occasion, when the embarrassments are infinitely greater, and when the hon. gentleman knows that in two years, probably in a shorter time, he must go to the country, he feels he must adopt a wider policy than the Gerrymander Bill. He cannot have the excuse of the census for

another Gerrymander, and he must go in, I say, for a wider policy. He has done so, as I hope to point out in more detail before I close. The policy of the Gerrymander Bill was a policy which was designated at the time as a jury-packing policy; it was an attempt to select from the jurors already in existence those who were expected to give favorable verdicts to the right hon. gentleman, and to collect those together in such a manner that the aggregate of all their verdicts would be favorable to the hon. gentleman. He has gone, on this occasion, beyond packing the petit jury; he has gone down to the root and branch of the matter and packed the whole panel. He is not going merely to select the jury, but to select a whole panel, from which the jury is to be selected. The hon. gentleman has taken into his hands the right of naming the officer who shall select the jury to try the case. He has taken the whole panel into his hands, because, when we speak of the act and pleasure of the Government, we know whose act and pleasure it is. We know that the right hon. gentleman is the head, heart, soul and brain and the moving power of the party; we know, in short, that he is the party. We do not say there are not other men of brain and power in the Government; far from it; but every other brain, energy and will are as completely subservient to the will and brain of the right hon. gentleman as if those other members did not exist. Therefore, every act and pleasure of the Government, whether in pursuance of this Bill or in any other way, have to be credited to the account of the right hon. gentleman himself. I say he has taken power to pack the panel by the appointment of what he calls revising officers. It has been pointed out time and again that this is a misnomer, that they are not to be compared with those officers who are generally called revising officers in other countries. These are officers appointed to construct voters' lists. The officer is directed to procure the assessment rolls of the district, from which to prepare the list, and he is instructed to proceed as rapidly as possible with preparing the list, by procuring other information. He is, in short, by the provisions of the Bill, absolutely free, as regards the choice of evidence upon which he is to frame his voters' list, and as to the law applicable in each case. Having framed his voters' list in this way, taking what evidence he thinks fit, he roughly revises it. He then gives notice of the final revision. Who is to revise the action of this revising officer? Is it to go to the county judge or any other judge, or to a revising barrister? Not at all. This officer, who is given the utmost freedom in preparing the list, is to revise it himself and to be sole judge of what is evidence and what that evidence means, and as to what is the law; and an appeal cannot be taken against a decision, even on a point of law, unless his own consent is given to such appeal. That shows the absurdity of calling him a revising officer. He is a constructing and cooking officer. He is not to revise but to cook the voters' list. If that assertion is too strong, I challenge the leader of the Government to take all the force out of it, by submitting the final list cooked by this officer to an impartial reviser. I am not particular by whom it is revised, provided it is not handed over to the original cooker of the list. If the right hon. gentleman is willing to do that, I am willing to withdraw this phrase, that he is intended to be a cooking officer, but until such a provision is made I shall call him by no other name than the chief cook of the voters' list. The course proposed to be pursued of preparing these lists in privacy is different from that prevailing in Ontario. When our voters' list is made up from the assessment roll it is printed. A large number of copies are distributed; ten to each member in each House and defeated candidates for each House; ten to the reeve of each township and a certain number to each councilor, one to every schoolmaster in the township, and practically a copy is given by the township clerk to every-

body who asks for one. Then we have thirty days within which to enter appeals. They are entered and tried before the county judge, who may or may not be a partisan, but who at all events is not the individual who in the first instance put the list together, and who has, therefore, no personal interest in maintaining it in the shape in which it was originally submitted. I say, then, that the voters' list, as at present prepared in Ontario, is prepared with the greatest publicity, and copies of it can be obtained without cost by anyone. The result is, that publicity produces the effect it always produces in the conduct of public officers, that the assessors, township clerks, and revising judges all become more and more punctilious in following the law; there are fewer appeals every year, and the voters' lists are generally admitted to be in a better condition than formerly. Now, as to the course of this Dominion official. He is to send two copies each to the member or members in the Dominion House. He is to send two copies to the reeve, clerk and treasurer and other municipal officers. Are these to be printed lists? It does not seem so. He has not necessarily to print these lists, and in case they are not printed, he is bound to furnish copies at the rate of 6 cents for every ten names on the list. Perhaps hon. gentlemen do not realise what a beautiful little tax this will be upon any person not happening to be the member for the county, or the reeve, or the warden, who may wish to criticise the voters' list. Supposing it is a county where the member is perfectly well satisfied with the voters' lists, as I have no doubt most Conservative members will be—supposing a candidate were to oppose the sitting member, and should wish to have a look at the voters' list, he would have to pay 6 cents for every ten names on the list for a copy. Take the average constituency, which is from three to four thousand voters, and from $18 to $24 is a considerable tax to impose on any person wishing to have a look at the voters' list, for the purpose of a revision. I may be told that he has to post up a certain number at certain public places. But I would like to ask who is going to stand in a public office until he has gone over the whole voters' list for an electoral division, and compared the names on it with his notes, and ascertained whether every person is on that should be on, or whether there are some on the list who should not be there. I say that is not a sufficient publication of the list, and that no publication is sufficient without printing and publication as now done in the Province of Ontario. But we are told this officer is subject to a check on his actions, because, although he is irremovable during good behavior, in order that he may be independent, he is made removable for bad behavior, on an address of the House of Commons, exactly in the same way as a judge. Now, Sir, this arrangement for securing the independence of these officers is very pretty, when it is recollected that they are all to be appointed by the present Government, and will probably remain in office during a great many years, when the successors of this Government are in office, or would so remain, if the law should be left unchanged. It would be a very nice thing for the Government to leave behind them a large number of irremovable officials, appointed by them in their interests, to serve those interests, and no doubt a dutiful feeling on their part would cause them to be true to the interests for which they were appointed. But we are told there is a check on these officers, because they are removable by an address. Now I think this so-called check is as unwholesome and improper as the original appointment. They are to be continued in office during good behavior. I would ask what would seem bad behavior to a Conservative majority in this House, on the part of revising officers appointed for their own purposes? What would be good behavior? An hon. member beside me says "to put out all the Grits." That is what they are appointed for, and as long as they do that their

behavior will be good, and as soon as they show a little independence they will be removed by a vote of the majority of this House. The only condition of the continuance in the office of political agents, as the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) correctly calls these officers, is subservience, and the only condition of tenure of office by these so-called revising officers would be subservience which, no doubt, will characterise them, so long as they are in that position. The parallel with the case of judges does not apply to all. A judge is not appointed for a political purpose; his duties are not political, except in so far as he deals occasionally with voters' lists, or, in the case of the higher judges, with controverted elections. He may be a partisan, but as the great bulk of his time is taken up with judicial duties, he is likely to attain to a judicial frame of mind and to perform his semi-political duties in that spirit. These men, however, will be appointed for political reasons, probably for political services, and to do political work. They will be there to do that work with all the zeal and energy of political partisans. The hon. member for Ottawa said that no barrister who respected himself would act as a partisan in these matters. Let us take the most favorable view of the question. Supposing that the Government did not appoint any barrister, but men of the highest reputation, men of high honor and integrity. We know perfectly well that they would not appoint men who are not partisans, and we know that such men, who are set to do political work, would do that work, because they are partisans; but even if they appointed men of high reputation, if they are partisans, they would be more than human if they did not allow their partisanship to influence their decisions, either consciously or unconsciously. I do not say that in all cases this influence would be conscious; no doubt it would in others; but it is equally beyond doubt that if not consciously, their decisions would be influenced unconsciously to themselves. Therefore, I conclude that the whole Bill is a scheme to secure the absolute control of the voters' list in the interest of the Government. I say the whole Bill is a scheme for that purpose, because all the rest of the Bill is of comparatively little moment to the Government. The excuse for the introduction of this Bill is the Government's professed desire to have a uniform system of franchise; for unless something of that kind were proposed, it would seem absurd to appoint Dominion officers to make the voters' lists. Some excuse for appointing those officers must be given, and that excuse is a uniform franchise for the Dominion. But, Sir, this pretence is not carried out; it is not a uniform franchise. It is absurd to say that the provision that $150 worth of real estate, or $400 of income, shall be a qualification all over the Dominion, makes the franchise uniform. As has been pointed out time and time again in this debate, and most clearly pointed out by the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont), this does not mean a uniform franchise, for the purchasing power of money and the value of property are so different in different parts of the Dominion that when you establish any fixed sum you like as a qualification, it does not mean the same thing all over the Dominion, and therefore the excuse proposed for introducing the Bill does not hold good and is not consistent. Supposing we were going to have a really uniform franchise, of what nature could it be? Is it possible to have any such franchise throughout the Dominion? It is, but only in one way. The only sort of uniform franchise possible in the Dominion is manhood suffrage. You cannot make money a standard which will be uniform, but you can make the standard a personal one, for a man is a man in whatever Province he is. A dollar means so much property in one Province and so much more in another; an acre means so much value in one Province and so much less in another; but a man is a man everywhere; and if you come down to the root of the matter, and really wish to establish a uniform franchise, no other is possible except manhood suffrage. Now, do hon. gentlemen wish a uniform suffrage throughout the Dominion? If so, they have only one course open to them. Let them take the course which has been taken in Ontario by the lieutenant of the right hon. gentleman, and I am sure he did not act in that matter without the advice and consent of his superior here. Let them take that leap; whether a "leap in the dark" or not, I do not say, but let them take that leap, and go in for manhood suffrage. The action of Mr. Meredith has been referred to already; but I do not know that his motion in amendment to the Ontario Franchise Bill has yet been given to the House. On the second reading of that Bill Mr. Meredith moved:

"While assenting to the second reading of the Bill, and thereby to the principle that an extension of the franchise is necessary and expedient, this House desires to express the opinion that no such extension, which does not, under a proper system of registration, and while excluding the criminal and non-sane classes, aliens and persons disqualified under the provisions of the Election Act, confer the franchise upon every other male resident of the Province, of the full age of 21 years, ought to be adopted by this House."

That is the carefully prepared and clearly expressed policy of the leader of the Conservative Opposition of Ontario; and judging by our past knowledge of the party, it is perfectly certain that Mr. Meredith proposed that amendment with the knowledge and consent of his leader in this House, without whose consent he does nothing, and by whose order he has done so many things which have caused his exclusion from office in the Province to which he belongs. Now, this is something which ought to be kept in mind by those members of the Conservative party who are not so radical as their leaders on this subject. Let them remember that if we once establish a uniform franchise throughout the Dominion, that will lead to its logical conclusion of a universal franchise sooner or later; and the Government is now taking the first step in the direction of universal suffrage. Mr. Meredith, in support of his motion, made a long speech. He did not recommend the adoption of manhood suffrage as a question of expediency. He claimed it as a question of right. He said:

"The idea of property as a basis of the franchise had come down to us largely from feudal times. In these modern days every intelligent man in the country, who had the means of forming an intelligent judgment on the affairs of the country, should be allowed to vote. He went on to argue that property was no test of intelligence * * * So far as he could voice the opinion of the Conservative votes of this Province, he held that this was a Democratic country, socially and politically, and they recognised that the franchise should be based on the broadest possible lines—the right of every man who was a good citizen to have a voice in the affairs of the country."

Is every Conservative in this House who is going to vote for this Bill prepared to echo the words of Mr. Meredith? If so, some remarkable change has lately come over the spirit of the party. I doubt if all of them are ready to echo that view. I doubt, even, if the party in Ontario were sincere in the expression of that view. It was taken up for the purpose of outbidding Mr. Mowat, if that could be done; and yet the sublime spectacle remains, of the Conservative minority in Ontario advocating manhood suffrage, while the Conservative majority in this House tries to force upon Ontario a more limited franchise than that Province now possesses. It must be remembered that this Bill is not only going to disfranchise many Liberals, but many Conservatives, who were given the franchise by Mr. Mowat; and for what reason? Because the Government have any particular views on the subject of the property franchise? Not at all; but they must get in their scheme as to the revising officers, and this is the only way to do it. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont) pointed out very clearly that there was no general principle in this Bill. He pointed out a good deal of what I have already called attention to, that it was a mere mass of details, pitchforked together

for a certain purpose, and was founded on no such general principle as ought to afford the *raison d'être* for a national measure. But it appears that the right hon. leader of the Government himself has not always felt as keenly as he does now on this subject. Frequent allusion has been made to the Bill passed by the hon. member for East York in 1874, adopting the provincial franchises. Now, it is a matter of history that although the present leader of the Government expressed his preference at that time for a uniform franchise, he gave his support to that Bill to the extent that he did not oppose it, and called for no divisions upon it, and offered to the then leader of the Government his cordial assistance in perfecting the Bill in committee, and he granted that assistance. He gave his assent to it, as far as a member of Parliament could give his assent to a Bill without actually voting for it, and he has given us no reasons since to show why he should now believe the application of that principle necessary which he did not not think was necessary at that time, although he expressed a personal preference for it. Sir, I cannot close without a few references to the remarks made by the hon. member for Ottawa city (Mr. Mackintosh) who spoke earlier in the evening. He gave voice to some of the ordinary objections which are made to our course in regard to this Bill. He said we complained that we had not time to fully discuss the Bill. Why, he said, it has been up time and again for fifteen years back; and surely, if the Opposition have been paying attention to the affairs of the country, they must know what is in it. The hon. gentleman forgot that this Bill is not now in all respects what it was before. When it was up before it had not this revolutionary feature of the appointment of revising officers to make lists *ab initio*. We have had the Bill up with a provision for a revising board to correct the lists made by the municipal officers. We have had it up without female suffrage. We have had it up in all shapes, but not as it now stands. We have not had it before with all its present objectionable features. There is another reason why we did not pay much attention to this Bill. The right hon. father of the Bill cried wolf so often, he told us that it was going to be brought into the world so many times, that we gave up believing him. We thought it was kept on hand for us to hack at when we had not very much to do. We did not think we should be called upon at this period of the parliamentary term to consider a Bill which had almost become a laughingstock from the number of times it had been introduced and withdrawn. We did not believe he was going to force upon the country a Bill like this, changing the whole basis of our representative system, without submitting it to the people. We did not imagine that he could so far forget all the principles of contstitutional government as to change the voting power in the constituencies, without asking the opinion of the present constituencies upon it. This proposal has scarcely ever been discussed on any platform, yet he now wants to change completely the whole basis of our representation. We may be told that it will be discussed at the next elections. But who will pronounce judgment then? The people whose franchise is now at stake? Not at all; it will be pronounced upon by a new list of voters, made by the hon. gentlemen's patent machine and not by those whose interests we are now considering; those who will be disfranchised by this Act will have no opportunity of being consulted on the subject at all; they will be given no opportunity of expressing their opinion on their disfranchisement. It may be very well to say: Give us the means of packing the jury, let us put whom we like upon the voters' lists, and then we will submit to the verdict of the country; but that is not a course which is in accord with the spirit of our constitution. The hon. gentleman whose remarks I am discussing proposed to show that we, on this side, have no regard for the franchise, and that we had overridden the rights of the people and the rights of the judges on some occasions, when we have had the power, and that Mr. Mowat carried on a similar course of action in Ontario. The hon. gentleman, I say, proposed to show this, but he did not get beyond the proposal; the only instance of overriding anybody which he referred to, was in the case of Judge Wilson, who was criticised by the *Globe* newspaper, in connection with his action in an election case, but when the motion was made to show rule why Mr. Brown should not be committed for contempt of court, this case was argued in court before three judges, including Judge Wilson, who, however, did not pronounce on the case; the other judges differing, the decision was that there should be no rule granted. There was an overriding in that case, but it was an overriding of the pretention of Judge Wilson, that his action was not subject to criticism, and in many subsequent election cases the result of that wholesome lesson has been apparent. The hon. gentleman said this Government would be derelict in its duty if it did not pass an uniform franchise, but still he would have liked to see the Bill amended and made suitable, in the case of Prince Edward Island to the inhabitants of that Province, That was a most remarkable sentence, expressing the average clearness of view which prevails on the other side of the House on this subject. They think the Government ought to do this, but are not prepared to blame the Government in not having done it before; and now that they are doing it, they think the Government would do well to make such breaches in the uniformity of the Bill as to render it acceptable to the various Provinces. I hope amendments will be made in this sense, in favor of each Province individually, because it will render more clear to the general public what now is evident to us, that every provision of the Bill is a farce, except the one provision, which is the life and soul of the Bill, and for which the right hon. Premier would sacrifice all the rest of the provisions, namely, the one giving him control of the voters' lists. I am not going more into detail; I should hardly have spoken at this late stage were it not for the fact that I believe so revolutionary, so unconstitutional a Bill—let me go further, and quote the language of one of the gentleman's supporters of the Government, who, however, on this occasion, has shown his independence, by shaking off the trammels of party—this monstrous Bill, which should put to the blush the people who propose it, and which will crush the Government at the next elections. Yet even those bold, manly words are not strong enough to characterise this attempt upon the liberties of the country in the manner in which they should be characterised. It is as gross an attack upon our principles as would be an attack on our personal property—on our possessions. There is no civil right which is more sacred than the franchise, and a Bill which proposes to take the adjudication of the right of the franchise from the courts, and put it in the hands of the Government, is nothing less than a monstrous and shameless attack upon the liberties of the people.

Mr. GILLMOR. This is the most remarkable audience I ever attempted to address since I have been in public life—125 empty chairs and about twenty members asleep. If you were only asleep yourself, Mr. Speaker, the picture would be perfect; and I do not see any members of New Brunswick on the Conservative side at all.

Mr. BLAKE. There is one.

Mr. GILLMOR. Yes; I see my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), the last rose of summer, not exactly blooming, but sleeping alone. I have always thought that Parliament was a deliberative assembly, that we were here for the purpose of discussion, to advance arguments, and to listen to arguments, in order that we might come to a correct judgment on the questions before the House; but that system has long since passed away, and legislation is no longer considered in Parliament. It is now considered in

the caucus, and it is not worth while, after a measure has been decided by the majority of the caucus, to say any more about it. It has been decided in the caucus to introduce this Bill, and the caucus has decided to carry the Bill. I very seldom take up any time, because I do not believe it to be necessary; but, on this important Bill, I think I must express a few thoughts which have occurred to me in connection with it, since it has been under discussion. If I had any influence with the Government, or with the leader of the Government, I would suggest, now that this important measure has been introduced and has been pretty well discussed, so far, has been ventilated in Parliament pretty thoroughly in a discussion which will go to the country, that they would be consulting the best interests of the country and the best interests of the House if they were to withdraw the Bill and allow the people a year to consider the question, and I am sure that hon. members on both sides would come back better prepared to give an intelligent opinion and to express the views of their constituents. This Bill has kept for eighteen years, and I think it would stand another year's test without any injury. On the contrary, I think it would be of great advantage if the Government would now withdraw the Bill, after it has been fully discussed and brought before the people; because I contend that this matter has never yet been submitted to the people. I have listened to the debate, honestly and sincerely, to learn the arguments for and against the measure, and I honestly confess that I have not heard any arguments which have convinced me that this Bill is for the benefit of this Dominion, I have not heard any arguments in favor of this Bill which would influence me to vote for it, and I am not influenced in this matter by any party consideration. So far as I understand my own feelings and motives in regard to this Bill, I am opposed to it. I think that no necessity has arisen for the introduction of this measure. I do not say, and I have not heard any gentleman say, on either side of the House, that this Parliament has not the right, under the constitution, to propose and to carry a Dominion franchise, nor have I heard any member on either side of the House declare that the provincial franchises were unconstitutional. Unless there is some evil under the present system which is to be removed, unless there is some complaint, unless there is some grievance that can be pointed out, why adopt the change? Unless we can improve matters, it is better to let them remain as they are. I can see no improvement that this Bill will make upon the present law under which this Parliament is now constituted. The majority of hon. members who have spoken on this Bill, instead of trying to prove its necessity or its importance, have exercised their ingenuity in trying to convince the country and the House that the hon. the leader of the Opposition, in his efforts, has been trying to sow discord throughout the Dominion. I expected the right hon. mover of this Bill to have explained its provisions, to have explained its importance, to have shown to the country why it was necessary. He did not choose to do so on introducing the Bill, and, since listening to the discussion, with all due respect to the right hon. gentleman, I think the Bill is sufficiently important to demand from him a speech of a little more than a few minutes in length. That is my impression. We did have a complete history of this Bill for eighteen years, but we got that history in a very able and argumentative speech from the hon. the leader of the Opposition. If this measure, eighteen years ago, was so important that it would take, as the mover of the Bill said, a whole Session of Parliament to fully and fairly consider it, was it desirable that, after this Parliament had been in session nearly three months, that Bill should be introduced. Of course, I have heard it intimated that we were pursuing a policy of obstruction on this side of the House. I do not approve of a policy of obstruction. That is not my policy. I got disgusted with the policy of obstruction when the right hon. gentleman led the Opposition. I saw then that hon. members, in order to obstruct the progress of legislation, talked sensibly as long as they could, and then talked nonsense as long as they could, and got piles of books to read from, and kept us here night after night and day after day, purely for the purpose of obstruction. Such a policy, under those circumstances, becomes so ridiculous that I hope no member of the Liberal party will be found in that position. There is a great difference between full and fair discussion of a measure and a policy of obstruction. We do not propose to obstruct legislation or to retard its progress, but I feel that a Bill of this importance deserves a full and free discussion. This Bill is of vast importance. It deals with the dearest interests of free men. It deals with the franchise, and therefore it is a Bill of more than ordinary importance. There is no question in which our constituents are so much interested as in the franchise, and this Bill, as my hon. friend from Queen's, N.B. (Mr. King) has said, disfranchises many of the electors of New Brunswick. I have not looked over the Bill and compared it, and made any calculation of that kind, but I know many who now vote upon personal property, and have voted in that way ever since Confederation, ever since members were elected to represent New Brunswick in this House of Commons will be disfranchised, and it is a serious thing to disfranchise any body of men who have enjoyed the franchise up to this time. I would be glad if the mover of the Bill, if he was going to make a uniform franchise, would strike out upon a basis where uniformity could be carried out throughout the Dominion. I think that manhood suffrage is the only franchise which can be made uniform throughout the Dominion. That extension of the franchise is a very important question, one I do not feel quite at liberty to give my opinion freely upon; but if we are forced, under these circumstances, not having consulted our constituents with regard to this measure and the important changes it contemplates, I would prefer not to vote or to express my opinion on any of those points, because I cannot do it intelligently, understanding the wishes of my constituents, as every hon. member ought to understand them. It has been said that this question has been before the country for eighteen years. I contend that it has not been before the country as an issue at any election; it has never been discussed in the press. I heard an article from the Toronto *Globe* read on this question, but to say that this Dominion franchise has ever been discussed at any election throughout the country, I think is not the fact. It has never been before my constituents. I am satisfied it has never been discussed before any constituency in the Province of New Brunswick, and I undertake to say that no representative from New Brunswick can give an intelligent vote upon this very important question, pretending to represent the feeling of his constituents. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is rather a remarkable circumstance that less than eighteen years ago the right hon. mover of this Bill should have declared that a measure of the same character as this, was of such importance that it would take nearly a whole Session to give it due consideration. Why is it that it does not require any length of time now, with the great majority he has at his back? Have men become so changed? Has party produced its work? Is it possible that the men who first came to this Parliament eighteen years ago came so untrammelled by party that it required deliberation then, and argument to convince them? It seems now unnecessary for the 140 or 150 gentlemen who support the right hon. mover of this Bill to give this measure more than a passing thought; in fact, they were quite willing to have it pass without any discussion at all; they were willing to take the eight and a-half minutes' speech of the First Minister in explanation of this great measure, that will affect every constituency of this

Dominion—willing to let it go without discussion. This Bill would have been introduced, passed its second and third reading, without one minute more of discussion than the eight and a-half minutes given to it by the Premier, so far as hon. gentlemen opposite were concerned. Mr. Speaker, in listening to this discussion I have taken my stand firmly to continue the provincial franchise instead of adopting a Dominion franchise, because I believe that the Provincial Legislatures are better qualified to decide as to the franchise that shall send representatives to this Parliament from the Provinces than the sixteen men who represent New Brunswick in this House, particularly when they are divided in this Parliament on this question. Has there been any difficulty arising under the present system? No hon. gentleman who has spoken has undertaken to say that the present system is not constitutional, and if it has worked well for eighteen years why should it be changed? Why should it be changed without any complaints from any Province, from any party, from any constituency, or from any individual in the Dominion? Nothing of the kind has occurred. Then, if no difficulty has arisen under this system, why insist upon introducing this measure at this time? Of course, I believe it is quite constitutional to do so, but where is the reason for it? While I do not attribute motives to hon. gentlemen, I cannot resist the impression that the passing of this Bill satisfies the Government and their supporters that they will secure a party advantage by it. That conclusion forces itself upon my mind, because none of them, no representative from any Province, has intimated that their people was not satisfied with this. I am satisfied that there is not a Province in the Dominion that expected this legislation at present. Why, Mr. Speaker, what right does our present system infringe? Who does it injure? It does not enable the Provinces to send one more or one less member to this Parliament. Who cares upon what franchise any hon. member is sent here to represent their different Provinces? I do not care whether they come here under manhood suffrage; I do not care whether they are elected by Chinese, if any Province wishes to give them the franchise, or Indians, or any body else. It is none of my business. They are sent here by the different constituents of the different Provinces, and that is all we care about. I do not see that any evil has grown out of the system, while I can see that great wrongs will be committed under this Bill; therefore, I hold to that under which we now act. Now, I do not feel that I am as well qualified to vote in reference to this Bill as I should be if I had a year to consider it—the recess which we have before next meeting of Parliament will afford that opportunity. It is possible that my constituents might favor it. There is something that may be said for it. It seems consistent for the Dominion Parliament to have a Dominion franchise. I admit that is one argument that you have. It is quite consistent, quite constitutional, for this Parliament to be elected by the provincial franchises, or by a Dominion franchise, and of the two I prefer the former. My constituents might prefer a different franchise. My constituents may prefer a qualification for voters which this Bill provides—it is possible. I want to know whether they do or not. Surely, on a measure so important as this, I think it would be in the interests of this country, and of all concerned, if the right hon. mover, after having a discussion here on both sides, were to withdraw this Bill and let us have one recess to consider it. It is undoubtedly my intention to vote against it now; I might vote differently if I found that my constituents were in favor of it; but in the absence of an opportunity to consult them, I am bound to act upon my own convictions of what is for the best. I think this measure ought to have been introduced very much earlier in the Session. I think the Government are very much to blame for allowing so long a time to pass without having introduced some important measure. I do not say that the measures which have been introduced by the Government are not important, but no measure of general importance, attracting the attention of the whole Dominion, has been introduced before this Bill. It seems to be the policy of the hon. gentlemen in power to submit important measures and pass them, and make them law, and then submit them for the consideration of the people, with one exception—the National Policy. I took occasion some time ago to say that they went to the country upon that policy and they were sustained; but other important matters, such as voting a bonus to the Canadian Pacific Railway and granting a loan of $25,000,000 to that company for the completion of the road, that was done without being submitted to the people. It is true that the Government afterwards went to the people, but it was after the money had been expended. They go to the country under different circumstances after the money has been granted. The people say: We are opposed to that action, but we cannot help it now. If the other party were now in power it could not be helped, because the money has been expended; and so we might as well have our friends in power. Again, with respect to the loan of $30,000,000, the Government did not go to the people, although that is a large sum. The people have, in fact, not been consulted on great measures of this kind. The policy of the Government is to introduce measures and pass them, and afterwards submit them to the people, when the evil done cannot be remedied. So it is with respect to this measure; the policy it embodies is not a fair one to the people. I cannot resist the impression that the strongest feature of the policy of the present Administration is a policy to strengthen their own party. Their legislation to a great extent proves this. I thought, when the Gerrymander Bill was proposed, they had done the last act they could do in that line. Hon. gentlemen opposite are, however, exceedingly ingenious in discovering methods by which they can strengthen their party. This measure is even worse than the Gerrymander Act, because the latter only affected Ontario, whereas the Bill now under discussion affects the whole Dominion. Without going into a criticism of the Bill, because it is not my *forte* to do that and this is not the time, I may say that this is a measure which, if they choose to take advantage of it, hon. gentlemen opposite can strengthen their party very materially throughout the whole Dominion. That is quite manifest. I should have thought that a Government claiming to have the confidence of a large majority of the people, and possessing a large majority in Parliament, could afford to be generous. If I were expressing my opinion outside of Parliament, I would say that this is a very cowardly and unmanly act, to take power into the hands of Government to fix the voters' lists and revise those lists by a person whom they may appoint. They may say: We are not going to do anything wrong; but the very fact that the Government are going to take the power by legislation to do an act, gives evidence that they intend to use that power. I believe hon. gentlemen opposite know it can be used to their advantage at the polls. There are many hon. gentlemen on that side of the House who would not take a mean advantage of anyone, in their individual and personal capacity, who will yet, it seems, advocate a measure which will give them undue advantage over their opponents. I am surprised they should lay themselves open to this charge. I know and respect many of those hon. gentlemen, and I know in private matters they would not take a dishonorable advantage, and yet an advantage of that kind will be taken by the present Bill, which will be the means of strengthening their party. I do not know about a Government being weak or strong in the future. When elections come, I make the best effort I can to obtain a majority, honestly and fairly. During thirty years I have never

looked at voters' lists. I always depend on my efforts to convince the electors that I should be their representative, and I have succeeded a great many times without troubling myself about the voters' lists. If this Bill is carried, it will give power to the Government to appoint men who may be unscrupulous—I do not say they will be—but if they are, they will not do much worse than has been done many times before. I was in Parliament when the present election law was passed, in 1874. I have never heard a murmur against it, and have never heard anyone express a wish that it should be changed. I, moreover, never heard anyone in my constituency express the desire that this Parliament should pass a Dominion Franchise Bill. The adoption of this measure will be attended with a great deal of expense, annoyance and trouble. It will prove of great annoyance in the different Provinces, to have two voters' lists. They have been in the habit of voting for both federal and provincial elections on one list. This is a change that is not necessary, and one that will be attended with much annoyance and dissatisfaction. I do not, moreover, see the necessity of it; and if I could influence the Government I would say: Consider this Bill, discuss it thoroughly, then withdraw, so that at the next session of Parliament we may be able to pronounce upon it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). It is not often I trouble the House with any remarks in reference to any measure under discussion, but on this occasion I feel it to be the duty of every hon. member to express his opinion with respect to this important Bill introduced by the leader of the Government. I was of the opinion at the time it was introduced that we would hear a lengthy explanation as to the provisions of the Bill, but the First Minister saw fit to introduce it with but very few remarks, trusting, no doubt, that he would succeed in procuring the support of his followers without giving any further explanation. I suppose it was an understanding in caucus that it was to be put through at any cost, and that his supporters would sustain its provisions. There are one or two thoughts in connection with the Bill that I desire to present to the House. We have had presented during this Session a large number of petitions in favor of the maintenance of the provisions of the Scott Act. Not only have we had petitions from one end of the Dominion to the other asking that the Scott Act should be maintained as it is on the Statute Book, but that if any alterations were allowed, they should only be in the direction of making it more stringent prohibition. We find that the Government paid no attention to those petitions; that the leader of the Government, after being interviewed by a delegation, composed of members of Parliament, sent to him for the purpose of asking him to promote the legislation had in view to enable them to have provisions placed on the Statute Book which would enable them to enforce the Act—after some delay the hon. gentleman refused to comply with the request of that delegation. And so, in that respect, he set his face against the petitions which had been presented to the House, signed by thousands of the electors of this Dominion, asking for that special legislation. Now, in contrast with this, we find that they have introduced a Bill for the purpose of changing the whole electoral franchise of the Dominion, without giving any notice to the electors of this country. We find that there have been no petitions in favor of any change of the electoral franchise. We find that this Bill has not been discussed at any public meetings which have been held through the Dominion, and that at the last general election it was not talked about in any of the ridings. It is true the First Minister saw fit, in former Sessions of Parliament, as far back as the first meeting after Confederation—I did not know that until to-day—to speak about introducing this measure, and that from that time down to the present he has annually re-introduced his Bill with reference to the franchise, whenever he has been on the Ministerial benches. I know that since I have been a member of this House this is the third Session that such a Bill has been introduced, and, of course, the fact that it has been allowed to drop every Session led the people to believe that he had no intention of putting the Bill on the Statute Book. The people have been led into this belief by the hon. gentleman's own action with regard to this measure, and, in consequence, it has not been discussed at public meetings or in the newspapers of this country. If that be the case, and from the fact that the present course is in direct opposition to the course suggested in the petitions sent in with reference to the Scott Act, I think he should give the people proper notice before introducing such a measure; especially when the present system has been accepted by the people of this country, and has been proven to be satisfactory, at least in the Province from which I come, and I suppose in the other Province as well. And why should it not be satisfactory to the people of those Provinces? They have had the control of the electoral franchise in their own hands, and I would like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, if the people, the men who send their representatives here to Parliament, the men who have had control of the matter, are not the proper parties to control it, if they have heretofore done so satisfactorily to themselves? Is it right that this Parliament should interfere with the rights of the people in this respect, any more than in any other respect? No better system could be adopted for purifying the electoral rolls than now prevails in the Province of Ontario. Those who come from that Province know that, in the first place, the assessor makes his assessment, which has to be approved by the municipal council. After that, notice is given that the court of revision will sit, to hear complaints with regard to the roll. The people go before men in their own localities, men whom they have elected to positions of trust in those localities, men in whom they have confidence. When the appeals are made to the municipal councils they are considered, the difficulties are adjusted, so far as possible, and after that they may be appealed to the judge of the county, an official appointed by this Government. I do not see why this Government should require any other official than the one we have now to supervise the preparation of the voters' lists. They have really now the control of the last revising officer, in the person of the judge; the lists are prepared in this way—in a way which is satisfactory to the people who elect these men to represent them in their local municipalities—and I cannot see why the Government should interfere with those rights and put over the heads of the people, who wish to control their own affairs, revising barristers, who will not be amenable to the people in any respect, who are appointed during good behavior, and I suppose good behavior means so long as they serve the purpose for which they are appointed. Now, we find that this system of having the different Provinces in the Dominion prepare their own electoral franchise, or rather attend to its preparation, is not a new one. As has been stated to-night already, in the United States this system has been found to work satisfactorily; it has given every possible satisfaction to that enlightened people on the other side of the line, and in the mother country the electoral franchise is not the same in England, Ireland and Scotland; and why should not the Provinces of this great Dominion have the right to settle their own franchise, and to say who shall be the people to send representatives to this Parliament? There is one point here upon which I wish to remark, and that is, that it does seem strange that the members of this House, sent here from all the different Provinces, should deliberately go to work to disfranchise some of the electors who sent them here, which will be the

case if this Bill passes, because there are a large number of electors, not only in Prince Edward Island, but in British Columbia and the other Provinces, who have voted for and sent men here to represent them in this Parliament, who will be disfranchised by this Bill; and possibly there are some members here from some of those Provinces who will be instrumental in striking off the voters' lists a majority of the voters who sent them here to represent them. Now, I consider this is not very creditable to the members for those Provinces, that they should vote to disfranchise the men who elected and sent them here. Furthermore, with regard to the expense of the new law, if it is put in force: The present system is in many respects an inexpensive system; but if the new system is inaugurated, it will be found to be an extremely expensive one, because we find it will be necessary not only to have revising barristers appointed in the different ridings to superintend the revising of the rolls and make them up in the first place, but they will have clerks and bailiffs, all told, over 600 new officers to be appointed by this Government. No doubt there are a great many people in the Dominion anxiously looking for offices—many people supporting the Government anxiously looking for positions, which it will be necessary to fill if this Bill becomes law. I entirely agree with the remarks made by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Auger), that it is not the best class of barristers who will be picked up to fill these positions. First-class barristers will not accept such positions, because it will take up so much of their time, and I suppose the salary will not be sufficiently large to recompense them for the time occupied in preparing and revising the lists. I must confess that I have no more confidence in the legal fraternity than the hon. member for Shefford has. I know that many members of this House belong to that profession, but if you take the opinions of the people in the country generally, they are inclined rather to trust men of other professions and businesses than the legal profession. I do not know why this should be so, because I do not know that the legal profession entails upon its members an inclination to be dishonorable in the transaction of public business, any more than other professions. But, at all events, that is the opinion of the public, and I share in that opinion, to some extent. I would just call your attention to some of the provisions of this Bill. Section 17 says:

"On the day and at the time and place appointed, the revising officer shall publicly proceed to the preliminary revision of the list, basing such revision on the evidence and statements before him and of the persons who may then be present to give information in support of or in opposition to the written objections, claims for addition, or other proposed amendments, and he shall then and there correct the list, to the best of his judgment and ability upon the evidence or information before him, attesting with his initials any addition to or erasure or change therein."

Now, let us read that in connection with section 34, which says:

"After the lists for the several polling districts in an electoral district have been so completed, revised and corrected, they shall be certified in the form contained in the schedule to this Act by the revising officer, and kept by him for the purposes of this Act, and a duplicate of each, certified as aforesaid, shall be transmitted forthwith by him to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery at Ottawa, who, on the receipt of all the said lists for any electoral district, shall in the next issue of the *Canada Gazette*, insert a notice in the form contained in the schedule to this Act, on and after the publication of which notice in the *Canada Gazette*, the persons whose names are entered on the said lists as voters shall be held to be duly registered voters in and for such electoral district, subject to correction or amendment by the judgment of a Superior Court on appeal as hereinafter mentioned; Provided, however, that in the event of any such appeal, the said lists, after the publication of the last mentioned notice in the *Canada Gazette*, shall apply to and be final and conclusive as to every election for such electoral district, held before such appeal has been disposed of or the result thereof communicated to the revising officer."

Now, I can see great danger in these two sections. The revising officer completes his list and sends it to the *Canada Gazette*. Appeals which may be pending are to

have no force or effect in case of an election occurring in the meantime. Now, I remember a case which occurred in the county of Wentworth some years ago, before the system in operation in Ontario was so perfect as it is at present. Just prior to an election in the south riding of that county, the county judge, who has since deceased, was appealed to by a lawyer, who, in the interest of the Conservative party, requested that he should put upon the list the names of some seventy electors who had not been put on either by the assessor or the court of revision, or at the final revision made by the judge. That judge did place those seventy names on the list, just prior to the election, and there was no appeal from his decision. Now, I can see danger of the same thing occurring under this Bill. Appeals could be made on questions of law, but not on questions of fact, and while those appeals were pending the incomplete list, which had not been revised or certified, might be made use of to hold an election, and a great injustice would thereby be done to the electors of a riding. Then, section 40 says:

"The revising officer shall have power, at any court or sitting held under this Act by him, to amend or give leave to amend, when he sees fit, any of the proceedings taken in reference to any voters' list, to direct notice to be given to other persons, or to dispense with any notices hereinbefore required to be given, and to adjourn any court or sittings, on the hearing of any claim or objection or proposed amendment, to a future day; and he shall not be bound by strict rules of evidence or forms of procedure, but shall hear and determine all matters coming before him as such revising officer in a summary manner, and so as in his judgment to do justice to all parties."

Now, I think he has unlimited powers to do just as he likes. I think that a remark made by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend) was very appropriate in connection with this section. He said that the chief objection entertained by the Opposition to the Bill was on account of the appointment of revising barristers for fixing up the rolls. Now, that just expresses the view held by myself, and no doubt by other gentlemen on this side of the House, that they were to be appointed for fixing up the rolls. That is to be their chief occupation. They are to fix up the rolls, first, by making them, and afterwards by revising them; and if the revision court is not enough to provide for fixing up the rolls, there is a clause which provides that they can afterwards, at any time, fix them up at their convenience, without giving any notice. Clause 55 says:

"It shall be the duty of a revising officer, on any revision under this Act, of his own motion, where there have been no objections, claims or complaints in reference thereto, to strike out the names on the said lists of voters of any persons who have died or become disqualified, and to change the names of others, where the same are incorrectly entered on any list, and generally to correct such lists, so far as any information in his possession will enable him to do so, in order to carry out the intention of this Act."

I have no doubt the hon. member for Cumberland expressed the true meaning and intent of this, when he said that the revising officers were appointed to fix up the rolls. Now, the hon. Secretary of State, in his speech, said that there was an appeal from the revising barristers. Well, I am not a lawyer, but I think I can interpret a sentence sufficiently well to understand it, and I will just read clause 47, so that it may be clearly understood that there is no appeal, notwithstanding the statement made by the hon. Secretary of State:

"No such appeal shall be allowed or entertained against any decision of the revising officer upon any matter of fact, or the admission or rejection of evidence adduced or offered on any matter of fact, but the appeal shall be allowed only on some point or points of law, as before mentioned. With the consent of the revising officer, any number of persons desiring to appeal on the same point or points of law may be joined in the same statement of case, making it one appeal."

Now, I think the plain English of that is, that no appeal is to be taken from the decision of the revising barrister on matters of fact; and I fancy that the matters to be dealt with in preparing and revising these lists will consist chiefly of matters of fact; there will be questions of law, but they will not occur so often as questions of fact. I was rather

amused with the speech delivered by the member for Ottawa city (Mr. Mackintosh), and I will briefly refer to some of the statements made by him. He had the hardihood to speak of a whitewashing Bill. Now, I think that is the last thing that any man sitting on the Ministerial side of the House should speak about. Those who have been members of this House during this parliamentary term know something of whitewashing. We all remember the position occupied by the hon. Minister of Railways during last Session, in regard to that. We know that, night after night, day after day, he came to his place in this House, and stood up in his place, and advocated the measures which the Government desired to be carried; we know that whenever a vote took place he conveniently escaped to the gallery and looked down upon the rest of the members while they voted; and we all know, furthermore, that the Government of the day saw fit, after he had completed his railway legislation, after he had pushed through the additional vote to the Pacific Railway, to introduce a Bill for the purpose of whitewashing Sir Charles Tupper. I think it therefore ill becomes any hon. member on that side of the House to talk about whitewashing Bills. Then he says the Reformers are continually attacking the judges. But those who are conversant with the newspapers of the country know that the judges are sometimes attacked by the leading organs of the Conservative party. We all remember that, during last winter, the Toronto *Mail*, the leading organ of the Conservative party in the Dominion of Canada, had a good deal to say about some of the minor justices in the city of Toronto, who had something to do with bringing to justice the brawling brood of bribers; we need not go further for evidence to show that the Conservatives are not clear on this score. The hon. gentleman further endeavored to show that the members of the Opposition in this House were continually endeavoring to stir up strife, and set class against class and race against race. This is a favorite method members supporting the Government have of dealing with the Opposition; on all occasions, they are ready to bring up their loyalty howl. It is a very common thing for them to claim that they are entitled to all the patriotism that is to be found in the country; but, as was well expressed by one of their members during last Session, and which ought to have had some effect upon them: "Patriotism is the last refuge of scoundrels." On this occasion the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh) went out of his way to bring the loyalty cry into the debate; he also talked about the Opposition not being patriotic, and about their setting class against class and race against race. I do not think the hon. member for Ottawa can point to any single instance in the history of the Opposition in this country in which the members of the Opposition have attempted to set race against race and class against class. I defy hon. members on the Ministerial benches to point their finger to a single instance in which the members of the Opposition have not been as patriotic as those hon. gentlemen, in dealing with the important questions which come up for consideration. The patriotism of hon. gentlemen on this side is not actuated by the same motives as those which actuate hon. gentlemen opposite, whose bosoms throb with patriotism so often. It is well known that this is the lean side of the House; there are no fat things for sons and relations on this side; there are no fertile timber limits to be got for members on this side. The hon. member for Hastings laughs, but, if I am not mistaken, he was after timber limits pretty lively. The correspondence indicates that he was not quiet when the other members were looking after their timber limits.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). You can have them.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. gentleman will be looking for something else if his limits do not pay. There are no fat jobs in the printing line on this side. I do not wonder at hon. gentlemen opposite talking so glibly about their loyalty, because a large number of them do so for special and substantial reasons. They are actuated by motives which are said to sometimes actuate other men in life; they find they are benefited personally by supporting the Government; they are, in fact, paid to do the bidding of the right hon. the leader of the Government, and in many cases they are well paid. Talking of patriotic sentiment, I was rather surprised, when the House was discussing this Bill, at a time when the whole Dominion is exercised over the difficulties which have arisen in the North-West, when the people are in earnest about matters in that territory, when gloom is cast over the whole of the Dominion, to find the right hon. gentleman, the leader of the Government, inducing a supporter of his to sing "Old King Cole;" I think this showed his heart is not very deeply affected by the state of the country, and that this cry about loyalty is not so deep-seated as people think it is.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). What has "King Cole" to do with the franchise?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It was not a coal limit you were after, but a timber limit. When we look back to the history of the Conservative party in this country, we can trace something similar to the introduction of this matter and the steps taken by the right hon. gentleman to induce people to support him in former days. We can all remember the universal disgust and horror which filled the whole nation from one end to the other when the Pacific Scandal revelations were made known. We can all remember at that time that the leader of the Government was driven from his place in disgrace at the time he endeavored to buy the people of this country with their own money; we all know the cheques that were called for from Sir Hugh Allan, the last desperate effort which was made—"another $10,000"—and we all remember that $280,000 was paid by that gentleman on the pledge that he would be recouped, for the purpose of corrupting the electors of the country, and for the purpose of corrupting them with the object in future of returning the Ministerial party to power and place again; we all know that at that time a large number of the Conservative party, disgusted with the course of the Government, for a time left the party and supported the Opposition and we all know the result was, that the Opposition came back to Parliament and took the places on the Treasury benches which had been occupied by the former Government. This was one of his attempts to obtain possession of the electorate of this Dominion, but it was not successful. Then we have to look back to the second attempt which was made, in 1882, when he gerrymandered a large number of the constituencies in the Province of Ontario, the principal Province in the Dominion, when, in order to retain place for himself, he cowardly aimed a shaft at the principal men on this side of the House who were opposed to him. I say it was a cowardly act to attack the seats of the men who were leading the Opposition in the House at that time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is in order, because the hon. the leader of the Government used this term himself, and it is on record in the *Hansard*, when he applied it to Mr. Donald Smith, who is now one of the favorites of the Government. I say it was a cowardly act at that time to gerrymander those constituencies; they boasted of their strength at that time more than they have ever boasted of it since. If they were confident of their strength, if they were con-

fident that they possessed the affections and the confidence of the people of the Province of Ontario, why did they stoop to perform such a mean and contemptible act as to attack the seats of the leading men of the Opposition? But this was on a par with the hon. gentleman's attempt to obtain possession of the electoral vote of the Dominion of Canada by the money which was received from Sir Hugh Allan, and now to crown his efforts in this direction he brings down this Bill, at a late date in the Session, thinking the representatives of the people will be tired out and will not be inclined to fight this Bill, and to fight for the rights of the people. But in this respect he is mistaken. I am satisfied that the small band who sit on the Opposition benches to-day will fight it out all summer on this line.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Barking dogs never bite.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. WHITE. I am in order. Barking dogs never bite.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. All these attempts were in character. In the first place, he tried to corrupt the electorate with money; in the next place, he tried to obtain possession of the votes of the people by his Gerrymander Bill, and now he has introduced this Franchise Bill for the purpose of disfranchising a large number of the electors of the Dominion, and for the purpose of getting control of the revision of the lists and appointing his own creatures to positions of trust and emolument to carry out this attempt to control the electoral vote of the Dominion. I say it is not creditable to the right hon. the Minister who leads the Government, and is not creditable to those who support it, that, in the fullness of their strength, when they are boasting of their strength in every debate which takes place in the House, they should stoop to take such measures as they have taken in introducing this Bill, for the purpose of strengthening their position. If they are strong in the confidence of the people they do not need to introduce any such measure, and, if they do succeed in pushing it through, I am satisfied that there are many independent Conservatives throughout this Dominion who will be able to say that they have given their last Conservative vote. It gives the Opposition party considerable strength to know that a break has been made in the Ministerial ranks, by the fact that at least two gentlemen on that side of the House have had sufficient independence to express their opinions in regard to this iniquitous measure, and I am satisfied that there are many more over there sitting on that side of the House who would gladly endorse their views, were it not that the party whip is brought to bear on them, and they are induced to forego their own convictions and to support this measure.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would not, at this late stage of the debate, have attempted to take up the time of the House, were it not that I feel that, in a measure of such immense importance as the one now before the House, it is the duty of every member to put himself on record. I do not intend to take up the time of the House at any great length; still, there are two or three features of the measure that I wish particularly to notice. The claim has been made that it is necessary that we should have a uniform franchise throughout the whole Dominion, for the sake of uniformity. That, I think, as far as I remember, is about the most cogent argument that has been used by gentlemen on the other side of the House. Now, the question comes: Is there any necessity for this measure? Have the people expressed any wish that such a measure as this should be placed upon the Statute Book? I have not heard the wish expressed by a single elector since I first had the honor of having a seat in this House, and so far as the matter of necessity is concerned, that, I think, is set completely at rest, by the fact that for seventeen or eighteen years we have been working with the franchise that we have adopted, and have never found the least friction or necessity for changing that franchise. If we wanted any further confirmation of it, we can find it in the fact that, in the neighboring Republic, with all their diversified interests, with all their large extent of territory, with all their resources, and with their immense population, for nearly 110 years they have found the State franchise perfectly satisfactory and perfectly sufficient. There was, then, no necessity whatever for introducing this measure. But there are some other questions that have to be taken into consideration. First of all, there is the question of convenience. Now, I have had a good deal to do in elections in my time. I have had a good deal to do with arranging the electoral divisions, and the convenience of the people ought to be one of the first things that the Government and the Parliament consult. I can remember when, in our Province, the municipal franchise was in one form, and the parliamentary franchise in another; when the polling places were not coincident, and there is not a member from Ontario, I believe, but remembers what a trouble it was to get people to understand where they ought to go to vote, and many of the votes were lost, because the people went from one place to another, and could not find the proper place to vote. However, the Government took the matter into consideration, and they fixed the basis of the polling divisions; they also made the number of voters in each polling sub-division the same for both municipal and parliamentary elections, and I think I may say that the municipal councils throughout the country have made the polling divisions for both elections the same. What is proposed by this measure? It proposes that these boundaries shall be completely obliterated, so far as the Dominion elections are concerned, and that these irresponsible parties, these parties who are responsible to no body, should have it in their power to fix the boundaries as they see fit. They may gerrymander them if they see fit, and may make them as long as our friend from North Ontario told us his constituency was, and may put the people to all the inconvenience they may choose. But, fix it how they will, unless they take the same basis as that fixed for the municipal and provincial polling places, confusion and inconvenience must necessarily ensue. Closely connected with the question of convenience is the question of cost. Now, Sir, that is a most serious question. I would like to ask this House if the state of our finances at the present moment warrants us in incurring any additional expenditure? Is there a man who has considered the question intelligently who does not know that if this Bill becomes law a most alarming increase of expenditure must be incurred? The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) fixed the amount at at least half a million dollars, and I believe he was, if anything, below the mark. I speak with knowledge of the subject. I had four years' experience in preparing voters' lists, and after that I had twelve years' experience in paying for them after they were made; and I state, as my firm conviction, that if this Bill becomes law, at least half a million dollars will be involved annually in direct payment by the Government to these officials and the incidental expenses. But there are other considerations than those of cost, which do not seem to weigh much with hon. gentlemen opposite. It was only last night that we heard the hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Coursol) say that we had only to consider the claims of the majority; that if a thing was good for the majority it ought to become law. But there are gentlemen who are in the minority now, and who, if this becomes law, must be put to an enormous expense personally. It will not affect hon. gentlemen opposite; for, according to the Government plan, their expenses will be all paid; but if we look at the cost of the voters' lists and the cost of appeals, you will see that gentlemen on this side of the House, so long as they

remain here, will have an enormous cost to pay. Now, Sir, there is this consideration, that you cannot impoverish one class of the community without so far diminishing the wealth of the nation, and if you take money from them in this way you make the nation to that degree poorer. Now, are we at the present time in a condition to incur this large and needless expenditure? I think there is not a gentleman in this House but who will agree with me that we are not. If there is one fact better understood than another in this House, it is that this year we have to face a very large deficit in the revenue. We are not going to be able to collect enough to meet our ordinary expenditure, and at the end of the current year the balance will be against us. Not only that, but in every Department the expense and charges upon the revenue are running up, and we are increasing our indebtedness at an alarming rate. A great deal has been said this Session about the national debt. We have financial geniuses in this House, who can reason us out of it altogether, who declare it is a mere *bagatelle*. But, Mr. Speaker, there are some plain facts that cannot be ignored and one of these is, that we are running into debt at a fearful rate. We are mortgaging the whole future of the country, and loading it down with a weight of debt from which, I fear, it will not recover. As regards the comparison between the Canadian and United States debts, we had one financial genius here this Session, who by adding the State and municipal debts together, also the provincial, demonstrated that the debt of the United States was 13 cents greater *per capita* than the debt of Canada, but in order to attain that result he had to strike off $71,577,296. Why he did so I cannot tell, unless it was too bulky to handle easily. But I do not think that we can take that as a correct basis in considering the condition of the two countries. There is not a gentleman in this House but will admit that the man who owns $20,000 worth of property, and is in debt for $10,000, if he is wiping off that debt from year to year is in a far better condition than the man who has only $10,000 worth of property, and owes $5,000, and instead of making any advance towards payment, is running deeper into debt every year. That is about the position in which the two countries stand. While the Americans are rapidly paying off their debt, we are as rapidly increasing ours. Let me draw the attention of the House to the way in which the two countries deal with the indebtedness.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am speaking to the question now, and an important part of the question, too. The Finance Minister, in the return he made, stated that the debt of the Dominion was something over $253,000,000. We have been told, and told correctly, that at the end of the war the debt of the United States was $2,773,226,873. Now, let me draw attention to the way the United States have handled their debt in the past. In 1813 the debt of the United States was $55,962,827; in 1835 they had paid that all off, except $37,513; in 1866, after the disastrous war, it had risen to $2,773,226,373, and in 1884 they had reduced it to $1,408,000,000.

Mr. HESSON. That was done by the National Policy.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What have you done to pay off our debt with your National Policy? By your National Policy you have raised the tariff to the very highest possible point, and, notwithstanding that enormous taxation, you have brought us face to face with a deficit. That is what the National Policy has done for us. Now, I submit for this House to consider whether it is worth while to incur all that enormous expenditure merely for the sake of uniformity. There are one or two features of this Bill that require special mention. Special prominence has been given to the question of revising barristers, and that has been pretty well ventilated; but there is another feature to which I wish to draw attention, and that is the question: Who are going to be appointed for that special purpose? Now, the hon. Secretary of State claimed that they were going to appoint the judges. Why? Because the Bill gives to the Government power to appoint the judges if they see fit. We on this side believe that is not what the Government intend to do. They will not appoint judges, because I am proud to say that we have a set of judges who are bound to do justice. We have had experience in revising voters' lists in Ontario, and we have had no reason to complain, but those are not the men who are going to be appointed. They are going to be barristers of five years' standing. What will be the test of their fitness? I am justified by the events of the past in saying that they are going to be chosen for their fitness to manipulate the voters' lists. I know it has been claimed on behalf of the Government that they are going to appoint honorable men to the positions—barristers of five years' standing. I do not want to say anything disrespectful of barristers; the profession of a lawyer is an honorable one, and there are very many honorable members of the profession. But unfortunately, like all other professions, there are shaky characters in it, men extremely suitable for this work. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say there are 206 electoral, divisions and you cannot find that number of such men as I have referred to. The Government have taken care as to that point. They have provided in the Bill that one man may revise the lists of a number of constituencies; so, no doubt, there will be a sufficient supply of men to do all the work required. If there is not a supply sufficient to give one to each constituency, there will be enough, by grouping several divisions, and so the work will be satisfactorily done. Hon. gentlemen may say these are harsh words and they are not justifiable. All we have to guide us as to the future is our experience in the past. I ask hon. gentlemen, without regard to politics, if we are not abundantly justified, by our experience in the past, in arriving at the judgment we place on Government measures now? I have had only a short parliamentary experience; but I have seen, in pursuance of an Act rushed through the House, one leading man in this House, one whom the Government had always cause to fear, kept out of his seat, in pursuance of an Act of Parliament, for a year and a-half. I have seen, during my short experience, a man whom the people chose to represent them driven from the House by a vote of the majority of the House, and a gentleman whom the people rejected elected to take his place. I have also seen an hon. gentleman, who had forfeited his seat, and who had no more right to sit and vote in this House than the Mikado of Japan, elected to a seat by a special Act passed by the votes of the majority of the House. I ask, if in the face of these facts, we have not good reason to believe that what appears on the face of the Bill is not exactly what is intended to be carried out. But we have other evidence to guide us in forming a correct judgment. Reference has been made to the Gerrymander Bill. I do not hesitate to say that that was one of the most infamous measures that any Legislature in any civilised country ever enacted.

Some hon. MEMBERS. How about Mowat's Bill?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Some hon. gentlemen speak of Mowat's Bill. This is neither the time nor the place to enter into a discussion of that Bill; but I am ready to take that Bill and sit down with any hon. member on the other side, and if he is open to conviction, he will admit that that Bill does not contain anything to deprive electors of their rights. As regards the first Gerrymander Bill, I do not want to repeat the remark which I uttered; but this is decidedly a worse measure than the Gerrymander Bill. The election of a man by a vote of the majority of the House had a boldness about it which made us almost feel a

respect for it, and when, by the Gerrymander Bill, hon. gentlemen opposite proposed to legislate out of Parliament, by an Act of Parliament, certain leading members of the House, there was a boldness and a dash about it that half redeemed its infamy. But in regard to the present Bill there is a sort of sneaking villainy about it which gives it a character all its own, and renders it altogether unapproachable in its infamy.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman should hardly characterise, in such terms, a Bill now before the House.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am alluding to this piece of paper. I will try, however, and not use such terms again. Talk about Mr. Mowat's Gerrymander Bill. I do not intend to discuss that Bill; I hardly know its provisions; I have only cursorily looked over it. But we all know what was attempted by the Gerrymander Bill passed by this House. There was the leader of the Opposition, a man who had met the leader of the Government in a hundred fights, a man who never asked for odds or struck below the belt, and who at the time was on a sick bed from which it was hardly expected he would ever rise. How did the right hon. gentle deal with him? He got his henchmen to tie him hand and foot and then dared him to fight. By this measure it is proposed to do something of the same kind—to place in the hands of irresponsible men the power to decide who shall and who shall not be members of Parliament. I want to give one word of warning to the Government. It is within my recollection, although I was very young then, that the people of this country, and especially in Quebec, were driven into rebellion because they were denied their rights. Time brings its revenges. At the opening of this Session we saw the Premier unveil the statue of a man on whose head a price was set at that time, and who was called a rebel. Now we know him as a patriot. Later on, in the years 1869-70, a part of our Dominion was driven into rebellion again—I do not say whether rightly or wrongly, but the people had grievances. They were denied that autonomy which every people has a right to claim under British rule; they were driven to rebellion, and at least one precious life was lost to the country. And, Sir, what is the condition of things to-day. I do not wish to say one word which could in any way be construed to encourage rebellion. I believe it is the duty of the Opposition to do all they can to assist the Government in putting down that rebellion. Sir, we on this side are proud of our leader in this House; we have always felt proud of him, and never have we felt prouder of him than during the last week or two, when with the weapon in his hand, with which he might strike the Government, he has refrained from doing it, and has, by every means in his power, assisted the Government in putting down that rebellion. I repeat that I do not want to say one word that could be construed into anything like sympathy with rebellion, but this I must say, that the manner in which that commission was appointed and hurried away to redress grievances and right wrongs, shows that both grievances and wrongs must have existed. But, Sir, I hope that the matter may soon be settled without any further bloodshed, but I want to warn the Government that there is danger ahead. From one end of the Dominion to the other, there are ominous whisperings and murmurings. People are being ground down by taxes, when they were told that their taxes would not be increased; the revenues are diminishing, so that they will not meet the expenditures, and people are beginning to ask what they have gained by Confederation. By such notorious Acts as the Gerrymander Bill they have been depriving a part of the people of their just rights to representation in this House, and by this Act it is sought to take away from them what little rights they have left. I warn the Government that they had better consider in time, for it may be that a high-spirited people may consider death better than dishonor. If they trample on the rights of the people it may be—I do not want to live to see it—that the time may come when the people will consider that it is dishonorable to live under any such degrading conditions, and that this Confederation, which we so wish to perpetuate, may fall to pieces, as the direct result of the misgovernment of hon. gentlemen opposite. I repeat I do not wish to live to see it, but I want the Government to see and consider the matter in time, and not do anything which will unnecessarily cause friction in the Government of this country.

Mr. WATSON. At this early hour in the morning it is not my intention to occupy more than a few moments. But as this important Bill is one which affects the Province from which I come, I do not wish to give a silent vote upon it. I think it is a Bill which is not calculated in the best interests of the Dominion of Canada, as a whole, or of any particular Province, but that it is introduced for the purpose of promoting the party interests of hon. gentlemen opposite. It is a Bill calculated to disfranchise a certain number of people——

Mr. HESSON. Are they Grits?

Mr. WATSON. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), who is continually interrupting this House, I believe has two sons in our Province, who should be disfranchised, as they are in the employ of the Government. I hope that he will keep quiet, for he has been interrupting the House the whole night. We have a Franchise Bill in Manitoba, with which the people of that Province are perfectly satisfied, as it gives every protection against parties voting who are not entitled to vote and in favor of those who have a right to vote. The qualifications are less than those in the Bill under discussion, because in Manitoba the owner of property to the extent of $100 has a vote, while this Bill requires a much larger qualification. I do not think that the Government should introduce a measure of this kind, unless it is a Bill for universal suffrage, because I believe myself that a Bill extending the franchise to every man in Canada, would be a proper Bill, under present circumstances. Every man contributes to the revenue under the present high protective policy, and therefore he should be a voter, and until the Government and the people see fit to go as far as universal suffrage, I do not think they should legislate in this matter at all. In our Province the voters' lists are prepared by the municipalities; they are posted a sufficient time to give the people a chance to see the lists, and there is then a court of revision under the municipalities which is better calculated to give a better franchise to the people than any revising barristers that could be appointed, for there is less chance of any corruption or any mistakes in the lists. They have power to appeal to the county judge, who is always in a position to be appealed to by the electors who may wish to have names inserted on the list, or improper names struck off. If the Government should see fit to make this clause of the Bill apply so that judges should be the revising barristers, it would not change the effect of the Act in the Province of Manitoba to any great extent, as now they are practically the revising barristers in that Province. But I am satisfied that the Government do not intend to appoint judges as the revising barristers, and, at any rate, the judges, I do not believe, would have the time to devote to this work. I do not think it is the intention of the Government to take the lists as prepared by the municipalities, and as another list would not be satisfactory to the people, or to this side of the House, I shall oppose this Bill at every stage. I think it is an infamous Bill, and one which is not calculated for the best interests of the electors of Canada.

Mr. VAIL. I am very sorry to be obliged to address the House at this hour of the morning, but I have waited until

this time, hoping that some member of the Government or some of their supporters would put before us some good reason why this most objectionable Bill should be forced through the House this Session. But up to this moment I have not heard one reason which may be considered a valid one for this objectionable legislation. There have been no complaints, so far as I know, from any of the Provinces, against the existing franchises. For nearly eighteen years the several Provinces of the Dominion have been working under their own laws, to elect members to represent them in this House, and I have yet to hear the first word of complaint against that system. There can be no reason given for this change, that I know of, except that the Government may hope that by it they will get a more intelligent set of members returned to this House. If that is their expectation, it is a slur upon every gentleman who sits in this House at the present time. Do they expect to get a more intelligent vote? I do not think they will, under this Bill. The Bill, apparently, has been framed to suit one particular Province. Instead of enlarging the franchise, it restricts it many of the Provinces of the Dominion. Some gentlemen have asserted that this Bill could do no harm, because it enlarged the franchise, and gave votes to some persons who are now denied the privilege. I fail to see it in that light. In the Province of Nova Scotia we have a simple franchise which is easily understood; $150 worth of real estate or $300 of personal property, or $300 of real estate and personal property combined, entitles a man to vote; and that is the franchise of Nova Scotia, as it stands at present. Now, this Bill, if it is carried through the House, will deprive a considerable number of persons in Nova Scotia, who have heretofore voted, of the right to vote for members of this House. The measure is largely based upon the principle of the ownership of real estate. It is not intended to give any man a vote who possesses personal property only, no matter how much it may amount to. In the Province of New Brunswick, as my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. King) has shown, it will deprive a large number of electors of the right to vote for representatives in this Parliament; in the Province of Prince Edward Island we know it is calculated largely to limit the franchise that now exists; in the Province of Manitoba, as we have just heard from one of the representatives of that Province, it will largely restrict the franchise; and in the Province of Ontario it will have a like effect; so that I do not understand how the Bill can be received with favor by any gentleman in this House, no matter from what Province he comes. It is all very well to say that the object of the Bill is to create a uniform franchise that will be suited to the whole Dominion, and one that will give the electors of all the Provinces a right to vote under a similar franchise. But I do not see that that will be the effect of the Bill if it becomes law. In fact, the right hon. First Minister, when he introduced it, rather intimated that it would be necessary for him to depart from the uniform principle, to a certain extent; and the very moment he departs from that principle with respect to any one of the Provinces, he destroys the whole principle of the Bill. I can easily understand any gentlemen who is favorable to a legislative rather than to a federal union being favorable to a Bill of this kind; but I cannot see how anybody who is disposed to favor the federal principle could for one moment favor this Bill. If it is the intention to continue to carry out the provisions of the British North America Act, which provides that every Province of the Dominion shall send a certain number of members here to represent it in the Federal House, it seems to me that it is only fair and only common sense to allow the Local Legislatures of the Provinces to fix the franchise under which they will elect representatives to this House. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) referred to a law which was passed by the Nova Scotia Legislature in 1871, whereby certain officials were disfranchised. I think his allusion to, and explanation of, that law was very unfair. I happened to be a member of the Government of Nova Scotia at the time that Bill was passed, and its object was to protect a certain number of officials of the Dominion Government who were favorable to the Local Government of that day. A great many of those men were pressed by the friends of the Dominion Government to go to the polls and vote against the Local Government, which they were not desirous of doing, and if anything could be done by way of legislation to relieve them, they considered that it would be a great advantage, in fact, a God-send to them. We know that at that time the people of Nova Scotia were in a very excited state. We know that the Dominion Government were using every possible means to defeat the Local Government of the day. We know that it was a very common thing for the Dominion officials in the Custom houses, in the post offices, and on the railways of that Province, to go out at any time that the election of a member for the Local House was in progress, and to do their utmost to defeat the Government candidate. Taking all these things into consideration, we decided to pass a Bill disfranchising a certain number of the Dominion and local officials, we did not confine it to the Dominion officials. We included in that disfranchisement the persons employed in the Crown Land Department and the Public Works Department, both local Departments, so that we disfranchised a number of our own men as well as a number of Dominion officials; and I have yet to learn that that was not a very proper Act. This Act went only a little farther than old Canada in disfranchising. I will just run over, for the information of the House, a few of those who were disfranchised under the old Canada Act:

"Judges, commissioners of bankrupts, recorders of cities, all officers of Customs, clerks of the peace, registrars, sheriffs, deputy sheriffs, deputy clerks of the Crown, and all agents for the sale of Crown lands, all officers engaged in the collection of any duties payable to Her Majesty in the name of duties or excise, shall be disqualified."

The hon. the Minister of Customs stated, I think, that postmasters were also disqualified. We went a little farther and disfranchised those employed in the several Departments; we did not say they should not vote for members of the Dominion House, but merely stated that they should not vote for members of the Local House, and a Bill was passed in this House afterwards giving them the right to vote for members of this Parliament. For fear that anybody should be disqualified who ought to have a vote, if he left the employ of the Government, we next year passed a law to which the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) referred, but out of which that hon. gentleman did, as he always does, when he undertakes to quote, leave a portion of it, which explains that we passed that Act to authorise those to vote who had not been in the employ of the Dominion Government for a specified time before the elections took place. This is what the hon. member for Cardwell said:

"The hon. gentleman asked if any evil had resulted. All I know is this: We have had indications of a disposition to cause evil. I have here two statutes passed in the Province of Nova Scotia. I have here a statute passed in 1871, I presume when their own local elections were coming on, in which it declares as follows:—"

Then he read the disfranchising clause:

"It shall not be lawful for any person to vote at an election for a member or members to represent the people in a General Assembly of this Province, who, at any time within fifteen days before the day of election, was in receipt of wages or emolument of any kind as an employee, in the Post Office, the Custom house, the Inland Revenue Department, the lighthouse service, on the Government railways, in the Crown land office, or the local Public Works and Mines."

Then he went on to say:

"That was passed in 1871 by the Local Government. Why? Because they suppose that some of those electors, being officers in some sense, or employees of the Dominion Government, might have influence in Dominion elections, and they passed that law practically to disenfranchise them, practically to lessen the power of the Conservative party in that Province. Having accomplished their object by means of that Act, they went to work, when it was their interest, the Liberal party coming in after the election of 1872, and passed an Act to repeal that law, and give all those men votes again."

That is not true; we did not repeal the law. We merely extended the franchise to those who had left the employ of the Dominion Government, as will be seen by the next clause:

"All persons disqualified under the first section of the Act hereby amended, and whose names shall not have been inserted in the list or register of electors, by virtue of the fourth clause of the Act hereby amended, and whose names shall have been struck off in the manner prescribed in chapter 28 of the Acts of 1863, shall be entitled to vote at any election hereafter to be held in this Province: Provided, he shall have been discharged or ceased to be an employee under the first clause of the Act hereby amended, between the time of making up the final lists of electors and within thirty days before such election, on his taking the following oath:"

There we enfranchise the man who was disfranchised under the Bill, if he ceased to be an employé of the Dominion Government, and the hon. gentleman says we passed that Act in order to disfranchise certain parties whom we supposed would vote against the Dominion Government. The contrary, however, is the fact. It was unfair for the hon. member for Cardwell to quote from this Bill and make it appear that it was quite different from what it is. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth) told the House that a Bill which had been recently passed in the Local Legislature disfranchised a considerable number of the electors who were in favor of the National Policy. I am a little surprised at that statement; had the hon. member read the Bill he could not have made it. Now, I have a copy of the Bill here, and as I stated to the House some time ago, our qualifications of voters was confined to real estate and personal property. Those qualifications are, in the first place, incorporated into the Nova Scotia Bill; after that, every change is intended to enlarge the franchise; it does not disfranchise a man, and how the hon. member for King's could say that it disfranchised a certain number of men who were in favor of the National Policy is something I cannot understand, if he had read the Bill. I have looked pretty carefully into the proposed Act, now before the House, and tried to understand how it would affect Nova Scotia. It is well known that there are a considerable number of people in Nova Scotia who do not hold real estate, but who are largely interested in vessels. Vessel property, under our law, is liable to be assesed for half the value, and a considerable number of people have been placed on the list under this personal property qualification. This Bill will now disfranchise every one of them; but still we are told it is a very liberal Bill, calculated to give the franchise to a great many people who have it not at present. That may be the case in certain instances. I acknowledge that, in regard to the fishermen, it may increase the vote, but it will be to a very limited extent, because the Government do not even give the fishermen the right to vote upon a personal property qualification alone. The fisherman is obliged to have real estate, in the first place, and then he is allowed to add to the value of his real estate the amount of personal property he may have in a boat or vessel, in order to entitle him to a vote, so that none of these fishermen who have an interest in a vessel or a boat or fishing tackle of any kind are enfranchised by this Bill, unless they own real estate of some kind. As my hon. friend from Queen's, N.B. (Mr. King) has said, it may only be of the value of 25 cents, but it must be real estate of some kind. That I consider is a very objectionable feature in the Bill. The vessel-owning people of our Province are a very important portion of the population, and a class of men who are intelligent, and know how to use the franchise, and who ought not to be disfranchised by any Bill. In the Province of Nova Scotia the Bill will disfranchise a large number; in the Province of Prince Edward Island thousands must be disfranchised; in the Province of Manitoba and in the Province of British Columbia a large number will be disfranchised. Then, how is it possible for gentlemen to say that this is a general extension of the franchise, and should be accepted by the people? I do not know what object the Government have in view in introducing this Bill. I can only imagine that it was to strengthen themselves, and I am really disposed to think that it was because of the fight that has been going on between the Local Government of Ontario and the Dominion Government for the last half a dozen years. It seems to me that all the other Provinces are to be sacrificed and to be put at great inconvenience for the sake of giving the Dominion Government an advantage over the Local Government of that Province, by making such a law as will enable them to return a majority of members for the Province of Ontario. Now, I am quite willing to give Ontario its full advantage in this Confederation. It is the largest Province; it is the most intelligent Province.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. VAIL. It is the most important Province in the Dominion, and I am quite willing that it should have every advantage to which it is entitled, but I deny the right of the Dominion Government to pass a law, which is calculated to enable and empower the Conservatives of the Province of Ontario to govern this Dominion for ever hereafter. I say that is the object of this Bill. The hon. the Secretary of State laughs. I ask how any man, being a representative of the Province of Quebec, who considers provincial rights of such paramount importance, can vote for a Bill which is intended to give the power to the Province of Ontario to rule this Dominion, and not the whole of the Province of Ontario, but the Conservative portion of the representatives of the Province of Ontario. If the Goverment could get the advantage by any kind of honest and fair play, I should say they were quite right in doing it; but to pass an Act of this kind, which is calculated to put the whole control in the hands of revisers, who will make use of it to perpetuate their power in this House, is a thing that no man of any independence, no matter from what Province he comes, ought to countenance for a moment. The Province of Nova Scotia is peculiarly situated. It was forced into this Dominion against its will. I will not go so far as to say it is kept in at the present time against its will; but, I am sorry to say, it is kept in against the will of a great many. It has sufered, in common with the other smaller Provinces of this Dominion, to an extent of which the larger Provinces know nothing, under this National Policy. I say it is criminal— perhaps that language is rather strong, and I do not wish to use unparliamentary language—but I say it is cruel for a Government to fasten on that Province any more hardships or deprive it of any more rights than it has been deprived of. I say it is unfair to that Province, to continue to legislate, as the Dominion of Canada has legislated for the last seven or eight years. Only a short time ago, since the Local House met, a resolution was introduced in favor of withdrawing from the Dominion. Now, this is not a pleasant state of things, and I think it would be wise for the Government of the day to consider if there is not some way by which they can make Nova Scotia satisfied in this Dominion; if there is, I believe they are bound to adopt it.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Give us more money.

Mr. VAIL. How much money have they had in the last year? It has been coming from the Province of Nova Scotia and going to the North-West, out of our reach altogether, and that is one of the reasons why Nova Scotia is in the financial state it is now. I do not wish to mention these things or refer to them more than is absolutely necessary; but, when I see the Government of this country, with a great majority behind them, determined to legislate in such a way as to make that portion of the Dominion more dissatisfied than it is at the present time, as a member of this Confederation, I think I am in duty bound to tell them so. There are several other features of this Bill which I have not referred to. There is the woman suffrage. I do

not know, for my own part, that that is very objectionable, provided the women would be willing to exercise the privilege and vote at elections. My own opinion is, that they would not. We allowed women to vote upon property in Nova Scotia up to 1851, and I think; if you were to search the poll books now, you would find that very few indeed, and comparatively none, of the women, took advantage of that privilege. Therefore, I think that if you were to pass this law at the present time or incorporate it into this Bill, it would be a dead letter. It is true a few might take advantage of it, but very few indeed. I, however, do say, that if you give one portion of the women a right to vote you must extend it to the rest, and therefore I hope that if this is adopted it may be extended to all women who own property, whether they be married or single. Now, a word or two in regard to the Province of Quebec. I do not think, so far as I can learn, that this Bill, if enacted into law, is going to be popular in that Province. It may satisfy the larger cities; it may satisfy the city of Quebec and the city of Montreal, where the franchise has been extended, but I cannot believe that it will be satisfactory to the bulk of the people of the Province If there is anything they have expressed a strong opinion upon, it is their desire to maintain their position in the Confederacy as a separate Province, and I contend that this Bill is the first step towards breaking down and obliterating provincial lines and preparing us for a legislative union. If it is intended to do this, as I said before, I can see why there would be a necessity for this Bill. If we are, by and by, to break down these lines, and say that we are to have a representative in this House for every 20,000 inhabitants of the Dominion, without reference to any Province, I can then see that it would be only reasonable and fair that the Dominion should fix the franchise on which to elect the members. But as the provincial franchise has been adopted and used for nearly eighteen years, without any fault having been found, or any evil consequences resulting from it, I think we may safely allow that franchise to continue, and elect our members under it, as we have heretofore done, giving each Province the right to regulate its own franchise, according to the circumstances in which it is placed. Why, Mr. Speaker, what are we doing to-day? If you undertake to fix the franchise in this House, either one of the larger Provinces if so disposed could force this franchise on any of the smaller Provinces, no matter whether it suited them or not. Now, I say that we have no right to force upon each Province any franchise we choose. I say this law will be injurious to several of the Provinces, and will act very detrimentally to their interests. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend) stated very broadly, and he is a lawyer, too, that this did not reduce the franchise in Nova Scotia. Now, I have shown conclusively that it does restrict the franchise in that Province, and will take away the right to vote from a number of electors. He stated that the main objection to this Bill is the way it was prepared. Well, I imagine that it is in the preparation of any Bill that the objections must creep in. If the Bill was prepared in some other way, and a different franchise adopted, and a different mode of appointing revisers, the probability is that it would have been more satisfactory. The revisers in the Province of Nova Scotia are appointed by the municipalities. They appoint three men to revise the list. The assessors are bound to furnish them with the assessment roll, and from that assessment roll the revisers make the voters' list, which they hand in to the clerk of the peace, and from that list the sheriff makes up his list of voters. No list is valid until it is certified to by the clerk of the peace and the sheriff. Now, the hon. member for King's, N. S. (M. Woodworth), told us, to-day, that our present mode was very objectionable; that in the county of Annapolis the clerk of the peace had made a list, and had left off a number of voters. Now, I do not see how that could be. The sheriff of Annapolis county was in full sympathy with the Government of that day; and how the list could be made up by the clerk of the peace, and used by the sheriff, where the law requires both to certify that it is a correct and true list, I cannot understand. I think the hon. member for King's must have been misinformed. I have no doubt he heard so, but I am quite sure such a thing could not occur under our law. If it did take place, the sheriff did not understand his business, or he would not have allowed such a list to be used, and he would have insisted upon the clerk of the peace making the list perfect before he would have used it. I shall not dwell upon this subject any longer. I hardly expected to speak upon this question at all, but I thought it necessary to refer to one or two remarks made by Nova Scotia members before the vote is taken.

House divided on motion of Sir John A. Macdonald for second reading of the Bill.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Dickinson,	McDougald (Pictou),
Bain (Soulanges),	Dodd,	McDougall (C. Breton),
Baker (Missisquoi),	Dugas,	McLelan,
Baker (Victoria),	Dundas,	McNeill,
Barnard,	Farrow,	Massue,
Beaty,	Ferguson (Leeds&Gren)	Mitchell,
Bell,	Ferguson (Welland),	Moffat,
Benoit,	Fortin,	Montplaisir,
Benson,	Gagné,	Paint,
Beggeron,	Girouard,	Patterson (Essex),
Bergin,	Gordon,	Pinsonneault,
Billy,	Grandbois,	Pope,
Blondeau,	Guilbault,	Pruyn,
Bossé,	Guillet,	Riopel,
Bourbeau,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bowell,	Hall,	Royal,
Bryson,	Hay,	Rykert,
Burnham,	Hesson,	Shakespeare,
Burns,	Hickey,	Small,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hilliard,	Sproule,
Cameron (Victoria),	Homer,	Stairs,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hurteau,	Taschereau,
Carling,	Ives,	Tassé,
Caron,	Jenkins,	Taylor,
Chapleau,	Kaulbach,	Temple,
Cimon,	Kilvert,	Townshend,
Cochrane,	Kinney,	Tupper,
Colby,	Kranz,	Valin,
Coughlin,	Labrosse,	Vanasse,
Coursol,	Landry (Montmagny),	Wallace (York),
Curran,	Langevin,	White (Cardwell),
Cuthbert,	Lesage,	White (Hastings),
Daly,	Macdonald (Kings),	White (Renfrew),
Daoust,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wigle,
Dawson,	Mackintosh,	Wood (Brockville),
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McCallum,	Woodworth.—111.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fairbank,	McIsaac,
Armstrong,	Fisher,	McMullen,
Auger,	Fleming,	Mills,
Bain (Wentworth),	Forbes,	Mulock,
Béchard,	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Gigault,	Platt,
Blake,	Gillmor,	Ray,
Bourassa,	Gunn,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Harley,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Cameron (Huron),	Holton,	Scriver,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Innes,	Somerville (Brant),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Irvine,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cartwright,	Jackson,	Springer,
Casey,	King,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casgrain,	Kirk,	Trow,
Catudal,	Landerkin,	Vail,
Charlton,	Langelier,	Watson,
Cockburn,	Laurier,	Weldon,
Davies,	Lister,	Wells,
Dupont,	Livingstone,	Wilson,
Edgar,	McCraney,	Yeo.—63.

Motion agreed to; and Bill read the second time.

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

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 5:10 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 22nd April, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 131) further to amend the Act for the better preservation of the peace in the vicinity of public works, and the Acts in amendment thereof—(*from the Senate*).—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY—SHAREHOLDERS.

Mr. MITCHELL. Before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman whether he is yet in a position to tell me what course the Government intend to take in carrying out the Order of the House for a list of the Grand Trunk stockholders.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand that the manager of the Grant Trunk Railway has sent home to England the Order of the House for the return, where alone the list can be perfected for the purpose of obtaining the information the hon. gentleman wants.

Mr. MITCHELL. I did not quite understand from the right hon. gentleman whether it was understood that the list will be furnished or not. I would like to know that from the right. hon gentleman.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a question I cannot answer. As I understand it, the manager in this country has sent home the return, for the purpose of obtaining the information the hon. gentleman desires to get, but there has been no answer yet from England.

Mr. MITCHELL. Then the Grand Trunk is more powerful than the Government or Parliament, it appears.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Our arm is very long but it cannot reach across the Atlantic.

Mr. MITCHELL. But you can reach over this country.

NAVIGATION OF CANADIAN WATERS.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to consider the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to amend the Act 43 Victoria, Chapter 29, respecting the navigation of Canadian waters, and to enable the Governor in Council to suspend, from time to time, certain provisions of the said Act.

He said: The original Act of 1868, to which this resolution refers, is based upon the regulations of Imperial Orders in Council; and as those regulations are subject to change from time to time, it is desirable that our Acts respecting navigation in Canadian waters, should be conformed to those regulations. Therefore, it is proposed that we should take power to harmonise the two. Since the establishment of the inspection of the hulls and equipment of steamboats, as well as the machinery, the Act of 1868 has been very rigidly enforced by our inspectors. It has been found that the Act requires certain equipment for steamboats on inland waters that is scarcely required under the circumstances, thus causing a hardship to inland ship owners. It is therefore asked that the Government should have power to amend the Act from time to time in accordance with the regulations that may be imposed by Imperial Orders in Council on sea-going ships and to suit the conditions of inland waters.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. WELDON. In what respect does the hon. Minister wish to suspend the provisions of the Act?

Mr. McLELAN. One thing that has been brought to my notice is, that the Act of 1868 requires that every steamship shall be provided, not only with a steam-whistle and a bell, but with a fog-horn, to be sounded by a bellows or other mechanical means. It is not considered necessary that all the small steamers navigating inland waters should have all these three things, and it is proposed to allow them to dispense with the fog-horn. We shall still require them to have the steam-whistle and the bell.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems as if we wanted fog-horns ourselves here, to enable us to hear what the explanations are. Perhaps the Minister will say if there is any other particular in which he proposes to take power to suspend the Act.

Mr. McLELAN. The Imperial regulations are varied from time to time, and it is necessary for the Canadian Act to be in harmony with them, so that the equipment of our sea-going vessels shall be in accordance with the requirements of the Imperial Orders in Council. It is therefore impossible for us to say how it may be necessary to change the requirements for Canadian ships, and it is necessary to have power to make such changes as the Imperial regulations may call for.

Mr. WELDON. I must say that I think our legislation regarding shipping has not always been in the right direction, because it sometimes comes in conflict with Imperial statutes. With regard to our sea-going ships, there is sometimes some confusion as to whether the Imperial Act or our own Act applies. The commission on the consolidation of the statutes has just gone through our Act, and it would be better to have this amendment included in the consolidated statutes than to go on amending from time to time.

Mr. McLELAN. I do not know what steps the commission propose to take; but I suppose that any amendment we make would be embodied in the consolidated statutes.

Mr. BLAKE. Is there any other specific amendment or suspension that the hon. gentleman has in view besides that with regard to fog-horns.

Mr. McLELAN. There are propositions to change the material of life preservers after a thorough test, and a number of other things have been suggested by the owners of ships navigating inland waters which have not yet been decided upon.

Mr. BLAKE. I can suppose that it would be convenient—if our regulations are statutory, and so inflexible without the action of Parliament, while the Imperial Act authorises a constituted body to make regulations—to allow the Government to suspend our statutory regulations on the lines, so far as the circumstances of the country admit, of the Imperial regulations made by Order in Council or other authority. But of course, a simple power to suspend would not be adequate to the occasion, because that would not

involve the power to change. It might be requisite, if some change were made in the Imperial regulations, that the hon. gentleman should have power to change as well as to suspend the Act. The analogous Imperial Act is one which gives power to suspend and to change by Order in Council, and we want to be in the same position and on the same lines. Then the proposal of the hon. gentleman in the Bill should be restricted to those lines. It ought not to be a general proposition to change and suspend, as he thinks fit, but to suspend and change in the sense, so far as the Government thinks fit, of the Imperial legislation. The hon. gentleman will see that else the Act will be almost entirely changed, or rather entirely suspended, although there would be no Imperial action at all which should be the foundation of our action.

Mr. McLELAN. We, at first, thought of proposing to add the word "amend" as well as the word "suspend," but we thought that, perhaps, that would be giving the Governor General in Council more power than the House would be willing to grant. It would be better to come to Parliament, when sitting, when anything was to be imposed upon shipping; but, if there was anything in the Imperial regulations which might make it desirable to suspend our Act, to make it more in harmony with the Imperial regulations, we might have that power.

Mr. BLAKE. I understood that, but the hon. gentleman seemed not to agree to that, because when I asked him whether there was any change in his mind that he intended to make, he told me that he proposed to change the required material for life-preservers.

Mr. McLELAN. That would not be imposing additional burdens.

Mr. BLAKE. No; but it would be changing the regulations; it would not be suspending the regulations, it would be more than the hon. gentleman could accomplish under a suspension.

Mr. WELDON. With regard to that, the English Act allows regulations which can be made by Order in Council, which, in many cases, may be put in the statutes, and sometimes the result is our statute is brought into conflict with the Imperial statute, in which case ours has to give way, and this sometimes creates great confusion. The hon. gentleman will recollect a section I pointed out in our Act which is entirely different in the English Act. It is important our legislation should be in entire accord with that of the Imperial Parliament with regard to sea-going ships.

Committee rose and reported; and resolution concurred in.

Mr. McLELAN moved first reading of Bill (No. 132) to amend the Act 43 Victoria, Chapter 29, respecting the navigation of Canadian waters, and to enable the Governor in Council to suspend from time to time certain provisions of the said Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT, 1882.

Mr. McLELAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient further to amend "The Steamboat Inspection Act of 1882."

He said: In the Steamboat Inspection Act of 1882, provision is only made for three classes of engineers. It is found in practice expedient, in some of the inland waters, that a fourth-class should be added to the Act as assistant to second-class engineers. I, therefore, propose to add a fourth-class with qualifications not so high as provided for in the Inspection Act of 1882, and that that class may be employed in certain capacities and in certain size boats. It is found necessary in the navigation of inland waters that this fourth class should be provided to supply the wants of the trade.

Mr. LISTER. I would like to ask the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether any provision has been made to prevent American engineers from coming into Canada and serving on Canadian boats without first being naturalised. I may say that the American Government prevent our engineers from serving upon American boats unless naturalised, or unless they have declared their intention of becoming naturalised citizens of the United States. Living on the frontier, I have heard many complaints from our engineers that people come from the other side, where the examination is not as strict as with us and where the qualifications are necessarily not so high, and enter into competition with our engineers, although similar privilege is not accorded by the American Government to Canadian engineers. If that is the fact, it is a hardship to our engineers which the Government should enquire into and rectify.

Mr. McLELAN. I do recollect that the question of American engineers serving in Canadian boats has been brought to the notice of the Department, but if their qualifications are less than required by the Canadian Act they cannot so serve. If they are not up to the standard required in our Act, they cannot be employed in our boats, as they must hold a Canadian certificate.

Mr. LISTER. But there is no provision requiring them to be citizens of our country; if they pass the examination prescribed by the Department, they are entitled to a certificate regardless altogether of their nationality. But what I complain of is that while we admit American engineers, the Americans refuse to admit Canadian engineers on any terms, unless they become naturalised or declare their intention to become naturalised, which, of course, has to be done in the form of law.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend's point is that this is a part of the development of the National Policy, reciprocity of action in this regard. The people of the United States will not admit our engineers unless they are naturalised or make the declaration that they intend to become naturalised, and my hon. friend wants the Government to let American engineers understand that they cannot serve in Canadian boats unless they become Canadian citizens.

Mr. McLELAN. That will require to be taken into consideration; the matter has not been brought to the attention of the Department. It has been stated several times that the salaries of engineers are very much higher in American waters and in American employ, than in Canadian waters and in Canadian employ, and there was great difficulty in finding and keeping a sufficient staff of engineers in Canadian waters. I will make enquiry as to the other matter, and will see whether any complaints have been brought to the notice of the Government.

Mr. LISTER. It was only last summer that our engineers were notified that they would not be permitted to work upon American boats.

Mr. COCKBURN. As the hon. gentleman proposes to have a fourth class will that interfere with the former arrangements as to the tug? Will it be obligatory to have licensed engineers on tugs?

Mr. McLELAN. We do not propose to interfere with former arrangements, but we have an additional class of engineers to be employed as assistants.

Mr. COOK. Is this to be a school of education for engineers?

Mr. McLELAN. I would suggest that the details might be better discussed when the Bill is brought down.

Mr. COOK. There are often men capable of passing the board of steamboat inspection who have not served the four years required to make them competent to serve as licensed engineers on steamboats carrying passengers.

Mr. McLELAN. Those men will come in under the fourth class.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I would take this opportunity of impressing upon the hon. the Minister of Marine, while he has under consideration the Steamboat Inspection Act, that provision should be made for the old engineers, those who have been a long time in the service, successfully running steamboats not only on the inland waters of Canada but up and down the coast of the various Provinces. Although they may make what may be termed, to a certain extent, sea voyages, they are nevertheless coasting voyages. I have reference to many in the Province of British Columbia, where they have been for a number of years successfully running steamboats up and down the coast, many of them simply employed as tugs, and now they are called upon to pass a very strict examination before they can be considered qualified to any longer run upon those steamers that they have already been running upon for a number of years. This has been pointed out to me by a number of engineers as a very great hardship, and I think it is, and I should like that, if possible some step should be taken so that those who had actually shown, by practical experience and conduct in the past, that they are capable of taking charge of the engines they now have charge of, should still be considered capable, irrespective of an examination before the board at Toronto or by their appointed deputies. I know that, in the case of masters and mates, those men who have the whole charge and conduct of the vessel, when once they have obtained a certificate of service, apart from a certificate of competency, they are considered eligible for all time to take command of any vessel they may be in command of. The engineer, although he has not, beyond the engine room staff, the lives of any persons under his control, is subjected to an annual examination, and I think this is very hard, in addition to the fact that they are compelled to pass an examination after showing the public and their employers, and proving to the satisfaction of everybody, that they are capable of doing these duties for which they receive their pay. I think the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Cockburn) is in error about the engineers of tugs not being compelled to have licenses. If that be the fact, it will be new to me.

Mr. COCKBURN. It is the fact.

Mr. BAKER. That tugs are not compelled to carry licensed engineers? I should like the Minister to tell me if that is the fact.

Mr. McLELAN. I will take the hon. gentleman's suggestion as to the old engineers into consideration, and will give him the information as to the tugs in committee.

Motion agreed to; and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the committee.)

Mr. WELDON. What will be the qualifications of the fourth class engineers?

Mr. McLELAN. What I propose is that a fourth class engineer shall be twenty-one years of age, shall have served an apprenticeship of not less than thirty-six months in a marine steam-engine shop, and been employed on the making and repairing of such engines, or shall have been employed for not less than thirty-six months as a journeyman mechanic in some workshop on the making and repairing of such engines, or shall have served at least thirty-six months in the engine room of a steamboat as engineer on the watch, or shall have served not less than forty-eight months in the fire-hole of a steamboat of not less than thirty nominal horse power as fireman on the watch, and in any of these cases may have served twelve months of the time prescribed in a boiler shop on the making and repairing of marine boilers; that he shall be able to read, and write a legible hand; that he shall understand the construction and operation of the feed water pump, water gauges and safety valves; that he shall know when a boiler is foaming, and how to stop the foaming, and also the danger from neglect to keep a boiler clean, and the usual methods of cleaning it.

Mr. WELDON. That is pretty nearly the same as is required for a third-class engineer now.

Mr. McLELAN. There is a difference as to the length of time in service.

Mr. WELDON. Would the third-class engineer be authorised to take charge of different boats or of any particular boats?

Mr. McLELAN. It is all laid down in the old Inspection Act, and, when the Bill is under consideration, I may give the whole of the particulars, and then it will be seen wherein this differs from the old Act.

Mr. WELDON. The present Act provides as to what boats the different classes of engineers can take charge of. Is it proposed that the fourth-class engineers shall have charge of the engine in any of these boats?

Mr. McLELAN. No, they are to act as assistants to second-class engineers.

Mr. BAKER. I would like to put that question again to the Minister of Marine: Is the hon. member for North Ontario correct in saying that tugs are not compelled to carry licensed engineers?

Mr. McLELAN. It would depend on whether the vessel is carrying passengers or not. I will give the hon. gentleman the particulars of the case when the Bill is under consideration.

Committee rose and reported; and resolution concurred in.

Mr. McLELAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 133) further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act of 1882.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DISTRIBUTION OF ASSETS OF INSOLVEMT DEBTORS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the Order of the Day for the House to go into Committee on Bill (No. 4) to provide for the distribution of assets of insolvent debtors, be transferred to Government Orders.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not remember at the moment that any Insolvency Bills were read the second time. I think they were referred to a Special Committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. But there was a report.

Mr. BLAKE. But that does not mean a second reading.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is on the paper.

Mr. BLAKE. I know that, but I do not think any of those Bills were read the second time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, they were not read the second time.

Mr. BLAKE. Then, of course, we cannot go into Committee on it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not move to go into committee.

Mr. BEATY. I think it was read the second time, and then referred to the committee.

Mr. BLAKE. Is this Order of the Day correct in stating that this Bill is in a fit shape to be referred to a committee? My recollection is that none of these Bills had been read the second time. The Clerk says it was read the second time. Of course, if it is so, it is all right.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, it was read the second time, and referred to the General Committee appointed by the House; and the committee adopted the course that they had power to report by Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the second reading must have been taken in a very great hurry, and not on the regular Order of the Day, because that one of the Insolvency Bills should have been read a second time without any debate, certainly takes many members of the House by surprise.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Votes and Proceedings of Wednesday, 18th March, state:

"Bill (No. 4) to provide for the distribution of assets of insolvent debtors, was read the second time, and referred to the Special Committee on Banking and Commerce."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I was not aware of it myself.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it must have been done on some other Order, because I am confident the House at large has no idea that any Insolvency Bills have been read the second time.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). It is a strange thing that it should have been read the second time, and none of the members of this House know anything about it.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not able to speak of the variations that have been made in the Bill which it is proposed to deal with now by the committee. But if this and a number of other Bills were regularly read the second time and referred to this committee to report upon, I suppose the committee was authorised to amend them and report them in an amended shape. I do not say that the committee has been doing anything irregular in taking that course, and that consequently it is competent to take the course of assuming the Bill to have got to this stage; but it is a most inconvenient course, because the principle and all this machinery of the Insolvency Bill have been admitted without being discussed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My recollection is not very clear upon the point. But I fancy I moved for the committee and stated the general principles upon which it should act, and I think likely that all the various Bills were left to that committee to consider. I do not remember the second reading of the Bill, but certainly it must have been read the second time.

Mr. BLAKE. I think, perhaps, the most convenient course to preserve to the House its liberty of action in the matter would be to have an understanding—of course the hon. gentleman's motion is quite unobjectionable—that when the motion comes on there be a motion to go into committee on the Bill, and let that be the testing motion instead of the motion for the second reading.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well.

Motion agreed to; and Bill transferred to Government Orders.

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT OF 1883.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron), moved that the resolution agreed to in Committee of the Whole, on the 20th inst., declaring that in the opinion of this House such portions of the Liquor License Act of 1883 and the Act to amend the Liquor License Act of 1883, as the Supreme Court of Canada has declared to be *ultra vires*, should be suspended unless and until the same shall be decided by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to be *intra vires* of the Parliament of Canada, be read the second time and concurred in.

Motion agreed to, and resolution concurred in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 134) respecting the Liquor License Act of 1883. He said: The Bill does not affect the hon. gentleman's resolution It may be considered almost in blank, but, however, it is not in blank. The Department of Inland Revenue may be obliged to add some clauses; but the Bill, as it is presented is simply enacting the resolution in which we have just concurred.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Before the Orders of the Day are called I desire to state that there is too much reason to fear that the rumors which have reached us about a disaster at Fort Pitt are true; but they are not fully confirmed. They come from Battleford and are vague in their nature, and therefore I do not think it will be well, out of consideration for the feelings of those who are interested in the various peoples who are there, to speak more specifically, because all the reports are rumors as yet. But they have sprung from various sources, and therefore one must believe that a massacre has occurred there; but to what extent I am unable to inform the House. The moment I receive information, it will be laid before the House.

CIVIL SERVICE ACTS AMENDMENT.

On order for third reading of Bill (No. 31) to amend and consolidate the Canada Civil Service Acts of 1882, 1883, and 1884.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I desire to have a couple of amendments made in this Bill, and therefore will move that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for further consideration. I propose to restore clause 7 which was struck out of the bill. That clause as it read was found objectionable in this way. It read:

Any person who is a member of the Civil Service at the time of the passing of this Act shall remain classified in the respective class in which he is serving.

Objection was taken, and I think rightly taken, that the word "serving" might be held to confirm the classification of an officer who might be acting *pro tem* in the place of another, which effect was not intended. At the time I thought we might dispense with the clause altogether, but I intend to re-insert it in this form:

'Any person who is a member of the Civil Service at the time of the passing of this Act shall be classified in the respective class in which he is appointed.'

I propose also to make a slight amendment in clause 55. It is there stated: "Nor shall anything herein contained affect any class, salary or emolument granted," and I propose to leave out the word "class."

Motion agreed to; and the House again resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. I do not very well understand yet the object of clause 7.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I cannot give any other explanation than that I have given, and I think it is satisfactory. I say that several employés, appointed in 1882 or before, were, by the theoretical reorganisation of the Departments under that Act, receiving a salary different from the regular salary attached to that class, and in some cases, as in the case of Dixon, last Session, a special vote had to be asked to fill up the difference. We want to get rid of those anomalies. There has been nothing of the kind since the last three years, because the appointments since 1882 have been appointments for such a class as the class to which the salary was attached. That is the reason for making the change. I do not think it can be objectionable, and I know that there is a difficulty in the interpretation of the Act by those who have to do with the working of it.

Mr. BLAKE. If a man is appointed to a class, and his salary for the class regulates his class, and the class regulates his salary, that is, if both harmonise, and this provision is to do away with his class, what is the object of it—what good is to be done?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is simply to make the law clear to those who are interpreting it. In fact the clause means that the present classification of the members of the Civil Service, made in conformity with the Act of 1882 and the Act amending the same, is confirmed.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, but one suspects legislation which is apparently wholly a work of supererogation. When you find a proposal made for which, so far as one can see, there seems to be no reason, then one suspects that there might be some reason—I do not say in the mind of the hon. gentleman, because, of course, he has brought forward this provision because somebody else finds a difficulty in working the Act which he does not find himself. But the difficulty I find is that he should propose a clause to meet the scruples or difficulties of other people. I think if he feels himself that the law is adequate to the occasion, we should act on the law as it is, without proposing this amendment. My difficulty is this—and it seemed to be marked by the language of the clause as it was—namely, that it might be that a person should be by this Act confirmed in a situation in a class, in a rank, to which he was not lawfully entitled, but to which he was entitled *per incuriam*.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not want to do that.

Mr. BLAKE. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman does not want to do anything wrong, but in carrying out the wishes, and meeting the difficulties of other people, he might make that error.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not see the clause can be objectionable. It may be that the hon. gentleman will find it superfluous, but I do not think it is anything more than what I have already stated.

Bill reported with amendments.

On motion for first reading of the amendments,

Mr. MITCHELL. I have already expressed my opinion about this Bill, and about the whole Civil Service arrangements, the feeling I have is that they are not in the interests of the people of this country, and therefore I intend to test the opinion of the House on that subject. I am not going to reopen the discussion which has taken place on the matter, because it has been already very fully discussed, but I am going to move the three month's hoist.

Mr. SPEAKER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will move this amendment on the motion for the third reading.

Amendments concurred in.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. MITCHELL moved:

That all after the word "that" in the motion be expunged, and that the Bill be not now read the third time but that it be read the third time this day three months.

In doing so I may say that I make this motion from the feeling which I believe pervades the whole country, that the whole Civil Service of the country, based as it has been on the system in England—which exists under an entirely different state of things from those which exist here, and deal with an entirely different class of people—is a system which has a tendency to create throughout this country a special class, hereditary class, perpetuated in the Civil Service of Canada. I think it has not been to the advantage of Canada that the Civil Service Bill has been passed. I think it has added very much to the expenditure of the country. and I think that, step by step, the Governments of this country, and certainly this Government, have tended to perpetuate the powers of an *imperium in imperio*, by giving to deputy heads additional powers, as has been done by the legislation of recent years. This amending Act is a step in the same direction, and without going on to take up the time of the House by going into a discussion of the Bill at any length, at this late stage of the Session, I am simply going to test the opinion of the House on the subject. I am not aware whether anybody will second my motion; I do not know whether there is any person in the House who shares my feelings upon the subject, though I believe teere are, but I shall move the motion and allow any person who desires to second it to do so.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). I second the amendment.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I suppose there is no need of entering into a discussion of this Bill, which has already occupied the House for several days. The Bill is founded on the principle of giving as much independence as possible to the Civil Service. It is not perfect—far from it—but I think it is a step in the right direction. It is true it takes away a certain amount of political patronage, but I do not see that that is a bad feature of the measure. The opinion of this House has already been taken on the principle of the Bill, and I need not add anything to the discussion that has taken place upon it. I hope, however, my hon. friend will not press a vote on his amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL. I shall certainly press the vote, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). In seconding the amendment of my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) I do so from a sincere conviction that the Canada Civil Service Act is not good for the civil servants of Canada. It is particularly hard on those who have been a number of years in the service—those who have entered the service with the expectation that they would be promoted according to their skill and ability, and that, so far as the circumstances of the case would warrant, they would be remunerated for their service in keeping with that skill and ability. The Act of 1883 has inflicted on a large number of very estimable officers the necessity of either passing these technical examinations—because after all they are technical examinations—or remaining precisely where they are, without hope of future advancement. This is particularly hard on old officers and I have many such officers in my eye at the present moment, in the Province from which I come, who, at the age of fifty-five or sixty years, are unable to go before the Civil Service Board, or the sub-examiners appointed by that board, and pass the examinations, as prepared by the Civil Service commissioners. I believe in the examination of those entering the service, but when they have once shown their educational fitness by such a test, they should be promoted by their peculiar fitness for the higher grades, ascertained by their superiors by departmental eligiblity, pure and simple, but that those who have been appointed since 1882 should be compelled to pass the examinations, but that those who were in the service previous to the passing of the Act should be compelled to pass those examinations is, I think, one of the greatest

hardships which has ever been inflicted on the Civil Service. I have therefore much pleasure, with all deference to the Government, in seconding the resolution of my hon. friend from Northumberland.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman who has proposed this motion appears to object not only to this Bill, but to any Act respecting the Civil Service as tending to create a professional class. In that respect I am compelled to differ from him. I think there should be a Civil Service Act, and it should be as minute as possible; and the aim of the Act should be to make the Civil Service a profession in every sense of the word, to which young men would come in the hope of reaching the top. I would point out that the postponement of this Bill for three months would not leave us without a Civil Service Act. We should still have the Act which is now in force. But as I do not consider some of the changes proposed by this Bill to be improvements, notably the provision regarding the Civil Service Examiners, I shall be compelled to vote for the amendment if it comes to a vote; but in so doing I do not wish to be understood as expressing full concurrence in the views of the hon. gentleman, or as voting against a Civil Service Act.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I know that we should be making a great mistake if after all the work we have done, we went back to the Act which existed before the introduction of this Bill.

Mr. CHARLTON. There certainly exists a feeling in the country that we are building up a privileged class here composed of Civil Service employés, and the placing of men on the superannuation list who might have done many years of good service,—and many other abuses of the same kind for which the Government are responsible, have served to increase that feeling. I do not believe our Civil Service system is equal to that of the United States, so far as the efficiency of the officers is concerned. I believe that if the American system were adopted here, with competitive examinations, it would be an improvement. In view of the discontent that exists with regard to our Civil Service system, I shall support the amendment of my hon. friend from Northumberland.

Mr. MULOCK. I had occasion at several stages of this Bill to raise my voice against certain clauses in it, and now that this motion has come up, I shall briefly give my reasons for supporting it.

Mr. IVES. Very briefly.

Mr. MULOCK. My hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe requests me to be very brief. No doubt his request is of paramount importance in this House.

Mr. IVES. Rather important.

Mr. MULOCK. Well, I dare say that he will find, judging by the opinion recently expressed in a newspaper published in his own riding, that his voice is not as important there as it was. This Bill proposes to establish a number of new offices in the pay of this Government. It proposes to establish a very expensive system of examination, which, while expensive, is without merit, and is not going to promote, in my opinion, the welfare of the service. During the past three years this system has been on its trial, and has not given satisfaction. It is a system that has not the confidence of the public, as it tends to disturb the minds of many young men, and to divert their thoughts from other callings and lead them to look to the Civil Service as a haven of rest for the remainder of their days. It is on its own account, on account of its expensiveness, on account of the difficulty of working it out, and on account of the disastrous effects it is likely to have on the public that I am glad this motion has come up, and glad to have the opportunity of recording my vote against the Bill. Moreover, in the discussion on the second reading of the Bill and in the Committee of the Whole, the hon. Secretary of State expressed his approval of certain propositions that were made, but he did not go so far as to give his statutory approval of those suggestions, but has persistently adhered to his original views. The system of examinations adopted is not only not economical, but it is not convenient for those who are to be examined; it is a centralising system; there can be very few centres for examinations under this Act, while, if it is necessary to have a system of examinations, I think, for reasons stated at an earlier stage of this Bill, that it is possible to select a better system than that adopted. For these reasons I intend to vote in favor of the amendment.

Mr. MILLS. Without entering into the merits of the system of Civil Service examination, it does seem to me that the changes which the hon. gentleman now proposes by the Bill before the House will not improve the Civil Service. I dare say that many members of this House who are in favor of Civil Service examination, and who would like to see the English competitive system introduced into this country, are not satisfied that the service has been improved by the changes which have been made in the law in recent years. My own opinion is that a Minister of the Crown, giving attention to the duties of his office and being responsible to Parliament for the proper discharge of those duties, is competent to make a better selection than he can possibly do under the limitations of this Bill. No one can look at the examinations required for the Civil Service without seeing that they go a very little way towards determining the qualifications of those appointed by the Government; yet they impose restraints on the Minister and confine his choice within those limits where it is not at all certain that he will find the most competent person for the appointment that he wishes to fill. At present, the powers of the permanent heads of the Departments, whose advice it may be well for the Minister to take in many cases, but whose advice ought not to be obligatory on the responsible head of the Department, are increased, and difficulties are put in the way of the removal of incompetent men. Under the course pursued by the Government the Civil Service has been crammed to repletion, and the effect of the present arrangements has not been so much to provide a competent staff of officials as to prevent the removal for incompetency of any who once succeed in finding their way into a public Department. Now, I think that is a very unsatisfactory condition of things. In my opinion, the law must undergo a radical change; the examinations must be altogether different from what they are; they must wholly be disassociated from every Department of the Government, if they are to place civil servants in a better position than they would be were the whole system swept away. As between the present system and no system at all, I prefer no system at all. As between no system at all and a thorough and complete system of examination, I would prefer the latter. I think that we are in a worse position than that in which we were before. What is the effect of those examinations? The hon. the Minister informs us that 1,200 young men come up every year for the purpose of being examined. The Government have not anything like that number of positions to offer, and what is the consequence? They call away the attention of a large number of young men from the ordinary pursuits of life, who might be profitably engaged in those pursuits, and make them hangers-on of the Government for the time being; looking for places, importuning their friends to secure for them positions. That is a most unsatisfactory and unhealthy state of things; it is the condition produced by the present Civil Service examination, and it will not be remedied by the Bill now before the House. That being the case, I am disposed to support the amendment, not because I am opposed to a system of Civil Service examination, but because I believe it is better the Government should be

unrestrained than that they should be restrained by such a system as that which we now have or that which it will become if the present Bill be adopted.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. One would almost suppose from the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down that he expects very shortly to take a place on this side of the House, and therefore does not want the Civil Service Act in any way to interfere with the independent action of a responsible Minister; that he does not want the present difficulties which are thrown in the way of a responsible Minister, to be allowed any longer to exist. We all remember when Charles Fox had his celebrated interview with the great Napoleon. Napoleon said he objected to the trial by jury because of the difficulties it threw in the way of Government. Mr. Fox said: In England these difficulties are just the reason why we like trial by jury. So it is with the Civil Service Act, the difficulties which the hon. gentleman says it puts in the way of a responsible Minister is just the reason I am strongly in favor of the Civil Service system. The responsible Minister is liable to pressure, he is hu man, and there are political exigencies, and it is of very great importance that, as in England so here, the Government should be saved from that as much as possible; it is important that here, as in England, an officer should be appointed after an examination which shall show he will not be a discredit to the service. The permanent heads who are responsible to every Administration, to the incoming and outgoing Administration, the political Administration, are responsible for the working of the machine. In England that is so well understood that the Ministry of the day take but little interest in the machinery of carrying on the ordinary administration of affairs: the permanent officers are responsible to the Ministry of the day, they are true to that Ministry, but when that Ministry vanishes, as Ministries will vanish, they are equally true to their successors, and they know the character of the men who are appointed; they know who ought to be appointed, they take the responsibility of promotions, and the political Minister casts the responsibility upon them. So much is that the case that Mr. Gladstone said he could not even appoint his own secretary—he did not of course mean his private secretary—so completely was the whole machinery, as it ought to be for the efficiency, the purity of the Administration, under the control of the heads of the Departments. That these difficulties should be thrown in the way of political favoritism is to my mind undoubtedly necessary. The Government of the day always help their own friends, and before the Civil Service Act passed they did so very often.

Mr. MITCHELL. They do it now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have been frequently importuned and menaced, and I daresay my hon. friend has had sometimes, when he had control of a Department, to submit to political exigencies. In order to put an end to that system, in order to remove from the Ministry the temptation to exercise patronage and from their supporters the temptation of trying to place unsuitable men in the Civil Service, the Civil Service Act was introduced. In England this system has produced a most marvelous effect. There is no Civil Service in the world so remarkable for efficiency, purity and zeal as that to be found in England to-day through the operation of the Civil Service Bill. We all know what effect the old system has had upon the United States, and I felt proud of Canadians to think that we had here a system in advance of that in the United States. It is the crying evil of the American system which has occasioned the change in the Administration of that country; it is that more than anything else which has caused the election of a Democratic Administration; the crying evil of the patronage in the control of the political Government of the day was so great that the moral sense of the whole nation revolted against it; and if Mr. Cleveland is to-day the President, it is because, in response to the cry of the honest people of the United States, he said, we must do away with this log rolling, we must put a stop to this system of making patronage a political engine, and we must have only one consideration in view, that is to place efficient men in the service and retain them there so long as they keep their characters clear and do not interfere offensively and ostentatiously, by action or by contribution, to the political struggles of the day. The hon. gentleman says that our present system of examination encourages too many young men to be hangers on to office. That is the necessary consequence of any system. If you have the principle laid down that no person is to hold an office unless by competition or standard examination, the young men who desire to go into the public service will enter the competition, if there is to be a competitive struggle for office, or will work up to the standard if a certain standard be required for applicants; and if a considerable number of young men present themselves for examination, it only shows they consider the service a respectable profession, a desirable one. We know that in England there are many more on the lists than can possibly be utilised, but in England it has been found out, and it will be found out in this country, that if you have a respectable standard, the young man who gets his certificate that he is equal to that standard and is eligible for the public service, will look at it as equal to a diploma of an university in good standing. In England, if a young man applies for a situation in a bank or mercantile house or on a railway, and has passed the Civil Service test, the first thing he sends in with his application is the certificate that shows him to be a well educated man fit for any employment. The time he spends in preparing to pass that examination is not a loss of time at all. These young men are in no way prejudiced, if they have passed a good examination, by not getting the situation any more than it can be considered a disadvantage for a boy to get prizes at a college or for a young man to carry off honors in the university. It gives him a standing, it gives him a status, and it will be of use to him in every walk of life; and I should deeply regret that we should take such a retrograde step, that we should be so false to the principle of trying to relieve the Government and to relieve the supporters of the Government from the nuisance of patronage, as to go back to the old system. It means favoritism, it must mean favoritism, it means promotion without merit, it means appointment without merit. Everybody knows that. This will be all avoided by the maintenance of this system, and I should deeply regret that we should make such a backward step, when we see that England has had this system for years, that it is now adopted and rigidly carried out in the United States, to the joy and exultation of every honest man, of every lover of his country in the United States, as to go back and fall into that old slough from which we have just emerged. But the consequence of the motion of the hon. gentleman will not, I am happy to say, be that the system will be altered; it will be that this Bill will not pass, and that the law will remain as it is on the statute book. I will not be a party, for one, to agree to our returning to the old slough and having people appointed to office without any guarantee to the public that they are fit for office, and to the responsibility being thrown on the Government of appointing men without any such guarantee of qualification by education or ability.

Mr. BLAKE. I have seldom heard a finer display of virtuous indignation or a choicer collection of noble sentiments than those which have fallen from the hon. gentleman, and I have seldom heard him say more things in the

same space of time with which I could heartily agree, except as to their application to the measure now before the House. He has rightly said that the choice which is presented by the motion of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) is whether this Bill should pass or the old law should remain in force, so that we are asked to say whether, on the whole, the Civil Service Act will be improved by the passage of the product of the labors and ingenuity of the Secretary of State for the last few weeks. As to that point, I may say that I think there are several provisions in the hon. gentleman's Bill which are not amendments but which are worse than the provisions in the existing law. That is my opinion of it. I do not state them all, but amongst others is that which places the Board of Civil Service examiners under the supervision of the hon. gentleman and whoever may be his successor in office. But there are several provisions of the Bill which I consider to be positive deteriorations instead of amendments in the law, and therefore, when the choice is offered whether the existing law shall remain or this deterioration of the existing law shall pass, I have no hesitation in voting for the former proposition, and thus for the three months' hoist. As I have said, I have seldom heard more sentiments in the same space of time expressed by the hon. gentleman in which I could agree. I agree with him in the importance of a properly framed Civil Service Act, and I believe it to be of the utmost importance to the public that there should be a properly framed Civil Service Act; I agree with him in the importance of a Civil Service Act framed on proper principles; I agree with him in the laudations which he has expressed of the English Civil Service Act; I agree with him in the statement of the general results which have been obtained under the operations of that Act; I agree with him in the views which he has expressed as to the evils of political patronage, and I am sure that he has given to us a very great and a very valuable testimony to-day of the evils and of the difficulties which surround a Minister or Ministers in dealing with this question of civil service. But what is the hon. gentleman's Act? The hon. gentleman's system is one which does not protect the Government where he says it is weak and ought to be protected, the hon. gentleman's system is one which does not relieve him from political patronage, the hon. gentleman's system is one which does not secure to the best man a place in the Civil Service. The hon. gentleman speaks of his examination; let him look at his examination. Let him look at these wretched little papers, a certain percentage of which these young men are to answer as the test which he speaks of efficiency. Let him look at them and compare them with other examinations which take place in the country, and let him tell us after that investigation that these are any true testimonies of efficiency and standards of the acquisition of learning of which a young man ought to be proud. I do not think they are anything of the kind. I think that a qualifying examination such as we now have is no proof of qualification in the true sense of the term. It is true that it may exclude some, but it is also true that it admits far, far too many amongst the list of those amongst whom the Minister may choose. What is that system which the hon. gentleman has referred to, and which anyone who was not acquainted with the facts would have supposed was the model upon which the system he is lauding here was based? What is the English Civil Service system? It is one in which there is a competitive examination, it is one in which the comparative efficiency in answering the questions gives the right to be tried, not the right to permanent employment, but the right to be tried by the actual test of temporary employment. That is the English system. That is the system which you would have supposed, if you did not know to the contrary, the hon. gentleman was lauding as the system here. But it is not the system here. That is the system under which the English Civil Service has become such as he has depicted it. It is under the influence of a system of this kind, gradually extended, applied first to one great branch of the service and afterwards to others, that the English Civil Service has become that which it now is and which is boasted of. It is by that means and under that system that Mr. Gladstone was able to make the statement which he did make as to the appointment of subordinate officers. But is that to be said here? The hon. Minister knows that—how many were they? Were they 1,200?—1,200 young men passed the qualifying examination to fill—how many offices? Possibly a hundred, possibly fifty, I know not how many; and, so far from not having the power to choose, there was the power to choose out of 1,200 to fill fifty or one hundred places. There was ample opportunity for the exercise of Ministerial favor, there was ample opportunity for Ministerial weakness, there was ample opportunity to yield and to take the worse and leave out the better man in the choice from these 1,200 who had managed to scrape through the so-called qualifying examination to which the hon. gentleman refers. No, while I believe that a good Civil Service Act is a good thing, while I believe that a high standard, to which the hon. gentleman has referred, is an important thing, although, as I have said before in this House and repeat, the passing of a good examination cannot be accepted as the sole test of qualification, although the practical efficiency in the office is to be the ruling condition after a man has had his chance, while I am willing to accept the proposition that a good standard of examination and passing in the comparative order of merit as the test of right to be tried is a good thing, I believe of this system that it is a system which is delusive, that it is a system which is a screen, that it is a system which, under the guise to the public of giving those advantages which the hon. gentleman has so glowingly depicted, of giving those advantages of getting rid of political favoritism and of securing to the most efficient an entrance into the public service, it is none of these things, but it is a system which gives the right to exercise political patronage under a cloud, which gives the right to employ the least deserving instead of the most deserving without the public knowing it, which gives a screen to those transactions which, but for the Act, would take place under the direct responsibility of the Minister, and in respect to which there would be a more accurate appreciation of the neglect of public duty that can exist when the Minister points to his long list and says: I took them out of the qualified lot, they passed the examination, they passed the test, and I am entitled to choose. No, Sir, we have contended on this side of the House for the adoption of the English system, we have pressed for the adoption of it, a majority, I believe of the Commission which the hon. gentleman appointed on this subject, proposed the adoption of that system. Hon. gentlemen opposite deliberately rejected that system; they adhered to the other system, just because they declared that they required that discretion, that power, that choice, that right, that Ministerial right, which the hon. gentleman has told us it is so dangerous to give, and which is so often abused. They want it to remain in the rut, in the slough, of which he has spoken. They refused to be relieved of this clause; they insisted on this which gives them power to do the things at which the hon. gentleman has hinted, and gives them, also, the means to protect themselves against the public in respect of the things they do. That is the provision of the Civil Service Act, and it is to such a provision I object; and it is because I believe that, bad as the present law is, the proposed law is worse, I propose to vote for the motion of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell).

House divided on amendment of Mr. Mitchell, p. 1282.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fairbank,	Mitchell,
Armstrong,	Fisher,	Mulock,
Auger,	Fleming,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain (Wentworth),	Forbes,	Patterson (Essex),
Baker (Victoria),	Gillmor,	Platt,
Béchard,	Gunn,	Ray,
Bernier,	Harley,	Rinfret,
Blake,	Holton,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Bourassa,	Innes,	Scriver,
Burpee,	Irvine,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Jackson,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	King,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Kirk,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Landerkin,	Thompson,
Casey,	Langelier,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Laurier,	Vail,
Catudal,	Lister,	Watson,
Charlton,	Livingston,	Weldon
Cockburn,	Mackenzie,	Wells,
Cook,	McCraney,	Wilson,
Davies,	McMullen,	Wright,
De St. Georges,	Mills,	Yeo.—67.
Edgar,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Dodd,	McCallum,
Allison,	Dugas,	McDougald (Pictou),
Bain (Soulanges),	Dundas,	McDougall (C. Breton),
Baker (Missisquoi),	Dupont,	McLelan,
Barnard,	Farrow,	McNeill,
Beaty,	Ferguson (Leeds&Gren.)	Massue,
Bell,	Ferguson (Welland),	Moffat,
Benoit,	Fortin,	Montplaisir,
Benson,	Gagné,	Paint,
Bergeron,	Gault,	Pope,
Bergin,	Gigault,	Pruyn,
Billy,	Gordon,	Reid,
Blondeau,	Grandbois,	Riopel,
Bossé,	Guilbault,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bourbeau,	Guillet,	Ross,
Bowell,	Hackett,	Royal,
Bryson,	Hall,	Rykert,
Burnham,	Hay,	Shakespeare,
Burns,	Hesson,	Small,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hickey,	Sproule,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hilliard,	Stairs,
Campbell (Victoria),	Homer,	Taschereau,
Carling,	Hurteau,	Tassé,
Caron,	Ives,	Taylor,
Chapleau,	Kaulbach,	Tilley,
Cimon,	Kilvert,	Townshend,
Cochrane,	Kinney,	Tupper,
Colby,	Kranz,	Valin,
Coughlin,	Labrosse,	Vanasse,
Coursol,	Landry (Kent),	Wallace (York),
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	White (Cardwell),
Cuthbert,	Langevin,	White (Hastings),
Daly,	Lesage,	White (Renfrew),
Daoust,	Macdonald (King's),	Wigle,
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wood (Brockville),
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Mackintosh,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Woodworth.—112.
Dickinson,		

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MITCHELL. Although not successful in my motion, I congratulate myself upon a great moral victory.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to call the attention of the Government to one feature in this Bill which, I think, they would do well to amend, and to which, in the discussion, I called the attention of the Premier, and also of the Minister of Finance and the Secretary of State. This Bill, as it now stands, provides, in most cases, that the Governor in Council shall do certain things affecting the Civil Service. Now, in practice, that means that the Secretary of State, acting in the usual mode through the Governor in Council, shall do certain things. My impression is that in this particular case, and in all matters affecting the civil service, it is specially desirable that these questions should be discussed by the board which formerly had charge of them, that is to say, the Treasury board, of which, I may observe, the Secretary of State is, in future, to be a member, if another Bill, which I see on the order Paper, becomes law. Not to detain the House, my amendment is this:

That this Bill be not now read a second time but that it be re-committed with instructions to amend it by inserting thoughout the Act, after the word "council," the words "on the report of the Treasury board."

As I have said, the effect of that is simply that the Treasury board will have to consider and report on the various changes, alterations and promotions affecting the Civil Service, which otherwise would be nominally done by the Governor in Council, but practically, to a great extent, by the Secretary of State, whoever he may be, for the time being.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CASEY. When this Bill was up for the second reading, I declared my intention of moving, on the third reading, an amendment to place on record my objections to the principle of the Bill itself, and my preference for the English system. On that occasion my views were supported, briefly, by an hon. gentleman on the other side, the member for Kings, N. B. (Mr. Foster); and on the present occasion I am happy——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. SPEAKER. I must ask hon. gentlemen to keep order. It will expedite matters much more if order is kept.

Mr. CASEY. On this occasion I am happy to have the support, not only of that very prominent gentleman, but of a still more prominent gentleman, the right hon. Premier himself. We have had from him this afternoon an eloquent eulogy of the English civil service system; we have had the disadvantages of our present system pointed out in some detail; we have had the confession that he himself has been subject to the temptations imposed by the existing patronage system, and has yielded to them, as other politicians have done. He talked to us, Sir, about——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, order, order. I must ask hon. members to keep order. I am sure the hon. gentleman will only be a few minutes.

Mr. CASEY. I can make no promises, Mr. Speaker; but I can assure you of one thing: I have a certain amount to say, and the less I am interrupted, the sooner I shall be able to say it. Sir, the right hon. Premier alluded to some remarks of my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), as to the responsibility of Ministers. He rather twitted him with the assumption that he was to change sides of the House shortly, and desired to keep power in the hands of the responsible Ministers; and the right hon. Premier ridiculed the idea that the responsibility of Ministers was any safeguard in the Civil Service; and he did so justifiably. It is a most ridiculous assumption that the responsibility of Ministers secures the propriety of the appointments made to the Civil Service, or the judicious management of promotions to the Civil Service.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, order, order. I beg that hon. gentlemen will keep order. These noises are most unparliamentary and most undignified.

Mr. CASEY. Well, Sir, I say that in that particular I thoroughly agree with the right hon. Premier. We know that this so-called responsibility, which is supposed to give a guarantee of the fitness of those promoted in the service, has been no safeguard and can be no safeguard. As the hon. gentleman himself has said, the Government and members of the House are subjected to "intolerable pressure" from their supporters to get unfit persons appointed, and he confesses

that even with the Conservative Government of which he is the head, this intolerable pressure will sometimes be successful, and that unfit persons will be appointed. And he acknowledged that such would be the case if any other Government were in power, or if any person with a less firm power of resistance to party pressure were at the head of the Government than the hon. gentleman himself. The right hon. gentleman says there should be every possible obstacle placed in the way of exercising pressure upon Ministers and members; that the system should be completely free from political preferences, as is the Civil Service in England, as exemplified by the remarks of Mr. Gladstone. He says it is necessary to remove temptation from Ministers and members; that the correct principle in dealing with the service is, first, to appoint efficient men, and second, to retain them in the service as long as possible. Our system, he said, was better than that of the United States; and in this remark he was guilty of an anachronism. I think that years ago our system was better than that of the United States, for the reason that though we had political appointments, yet dismissals for political reasons were not common. Now the United States have taken a step ahead. Not only have they adopted the English system of making appointments, by competitive examinations, and promotions on account of proved efficiency, but they have also adopted the English system of continuing a man in office during good behavior. The latter principle is an affair of yesterday, and was due to the triumph of President Cleveland at the polls; for he has, since his accession to office, given the assurance that he will adhere to the principles of the Civil Service Act, which has been in force there for some time, and remove no one from office for political reasons and appoint no one to office except in accordance with the rules of the service, as laid down by that Act. We have been wont to boast with pride of our institutions, but we now admit that something should be done to change the patronage system. This has impressed the leader of the Government and everyone else in the country who possesses experience, and if the English example were not sufficient, we have now the example of people circumstanced like ourselves, a Federal Government in a democratic country, subject to all the pressure and temptations to which this Government can be subjected, following the example of our common sense, businesslike relatives in the old country, and taking away from the Government that power of patronage which has been found injurious to the Government itself as well as to the service at large. I was glad to hear the First Minister acceding to this view of the case. He unquestionably approved of the English system, and I intend to afford him an opportunity of supporting an amendment to this Bill, which, if adopted, will make our system, in effect, like that of England, and carry out, the remedy which has been happily applied there. No doubt the hon. gentleman will have pleasure in endorsing his verbal statement by his vote, and inducing the Government which he leads to adopt the system which is at present in force in England, and the adoption of which in Canada was strongly recommended by the commission appointed by himself in 1880. There is one point in the hon. gentleman's remarks to which I must refer before I pass to the amendment which I intend to move. The evil effect of the examinations, as conducted in this country, has been already pointed out, namely, that they lead many young men who have passed the examinations to expect places in the service. The hon. gentleman admitted it; but he said that there must be a similar trouble in England, under the system in force there. Our Act is worst than theirs in that respect. In England, only a certain number of appointments are advertised as about to be filled. The results of the competitive examinations are speedily made known. Those who come highest in the list secure the appointments. None of those who have failed to get these particular offices obtain positions in the service on account of the examinations to which they have been subjected, and they have no claim on the Government. They are given clearly to understand that fact; and if further vacancies occur, the appointments are not given to those who were candidates at the previous examination, but a new examination is held. So, if a candidate fails to secure an office, he knows he must wait until the next examination, and must then take his chance of coming out at the head of the list. So, there is no temptation to hang round, waiting on Providence for appointments. The candidate knows very soon the result of the examination and whether he has obtained an appointment or not. This provision is framed for the purpose of preventing the formation of a class of young men waiting on Providence for appointments. On the contrary, our system leads to the creation of such a class. Very many of our young people have passed the Civil Service examination, in order thereby to secure appointments. The general impression is that this Bill cannot be such a farce as it seems to be; that if people are invited to pass examinations something is to result. It is not known to the public at large that under this Bill the passing of the examination does nothing towards obtaining office. This should be known to the public, and I hope they will take notice of the fact, and thus save themselves much unnecessary toil and expense. To pass the examinations is not the slightest step towards obtaining an appointment. The first step is to secure political influence. This must be done before any office can be had, and passing the examination is only necessary after this first and vital preliminary work has been accomplished. The difference between the two systems is thus very obvious. Our system tends to create what I might call well-educated young loafers, while the English system prevents the creation of any such class. Coming to speak of the report of the commission appointed in 1880 by the right hon. gentleman himself, I may say that it was composed of gentlemen whose names were calculated to carry weight, whose knowledge of the subject was *primâ facie* large, and was greatly increased by the enquiries they carried out. The commissioners were Messrs. D. McInnis, E. J. Barbeau, J. C. Taché, A. Brunel, W. White, J. Tilton and Mr. R. Mingaye, and Mr. M. J. Griffin was secretary of the commission. They carried out a most complete system of enquiry. They examined a large number of witnesses belonging to all the Departments, in order to obtain the opinion, not only of the leading men in each Department, but of the rank and file, as to the present state of the service, and as to what changes should be made. They were authorised by the Government not only to report on the present state of the service but to make such recommendations as might appear to them desirable. They gave in their report a brief summary of the legislation on the question, and pointed out where it had failed to be effective. They referred to the committee which sat under my own chairmanship in 1877, and performed duties of the same kind, though not to the same extent, and they stated that "this committee examined many witnesses, and that the evidence taken by it had proved of considerable use to the committee in its investigation." I may say that the report of that committee was unanimous in recommending the adoption of the English system of competitive examinations and promotions on merit, in place of the present system. The committee was composed of members from both sides of the House. They go on to note what has been done in England. They say:

"A reform in the administration of the Civil Service of the United Kingdom was inaugurated in 1855, which has been gradually extended and improved up to the present time, without any important opposition having arisen to its progress, or any serious attempt having been made to revert to the system which prevailed previous to that date."

It is, Sir, I think, a sufficiently strong endorsation of the system, that no important opposition has been made to its progress, and no serious attempt made to revert to the system which prevailed previously:

"This system, to which more particular reference will hereafter be made, excludes, so far as is possible, from the administration of the greater number of Departments, political influence, or personal favoritism, and compels aspirants to places in the public service to produce satisfactory evidence as to health and moral character as well, and to submit to a competitive examination, which tests at once their educational status and their fitness for admission into the public service."

Reference is then made to the Civil Service system of different countries; to France, where it is much the same as in England, being based largely on competitive examinations, and on the non-removal of the Civil Service officers on changing Administrations; to Sweden, where the same system in effect prevails; to the German Empire, where admissions are based on educational tests of a high character; and to Belgium, where there is something similar. They also refer to the agitation which was then taking place in the United States, and which has now resulted in the passing of an Act embodying the principles of the English system. They then go on to say:

"While there exists in the public mind a very general belief that the Civil Service is defective and inefficient, and that the true remedy is the abolition of political patronage and personal favoritism in making appointments to public offices, there is, on the other hand, an impression that it is difficult and almost impracticable to apply the remedy, and that those who possess the power of patronage will continue to exercise it, at the sacrifice of an efficient and economical administration of public affairs. We believe this impression to be in the main erroneous, and that public men, realising how much the prosperity and welfare of the country depends on a pure and efficient public service, will not hesitate to abandon a patronage which is found to be injurious to the best interests of the country, and which is generally admitted to be a source of weakness and annoyance to themselves as well as demoralising to the constituencies."

These words convey, in condensed shape, the matured opinion of the commissioners on the whole question, and I think they embody the opinions of all of us who have given any particular attention to the matter. I am sure they embody the opinion of the right hon. the Premier, because he has given utterance to similar opinions to-day, and I hope those opinions will bear proper fruit and will result in the adoption of a better system. I think it is patent to us all that, not only is the present system injurious to the service, but to those who exercise the patronage on which it depends. Those of us who have exercised that kind of patronage in the past, or those who exercise it now, must feel that nothing is more troublesome, nothing has a greater effect, in the way of injuring our personal popularity, than this responsibility of having to recommend some person or other for the public service. It makes for every person who exercises it more enemies than friends, and it must lead in the long run to such an amount of discontent among the larger number who do not get the places, as compared with the small number who do, that it inevitably weakens and finally leads to the defeat of any Government which exercises it. The commission then go on to refer to the Order in Council appointing them, and their remarks are very instructive. It is stated, they say, in the Order in Council, amongst other things:

"That many had, by old age, incapacity, bad habits or continued idleness, become unavailable for useful purposes.

"That the number of men in each Department had increased, it was thought,"——

And, mind you, this was the expression of the Government, of the Committee of Council, and not of the commissioners themselves—

"had increased, it was thought, out of proportion to the needs of the service.

"That young men had been appointed who, from want of education or strength of constitution, or general unfitness, had not made and would not make efficient public servants.

"That the general expense of the service had been increased by the tendency of existing rules to the gradual culmination of officers by mere force of survivorship into the more highly paid classes."

Here is the distinctly expressed opinion that the system we have often objected to, of giving men an annual increase of pay, leads to the results here mentioned. Now, Sir, we go on to notice the recommendations of the commissioners in regard to appointments to office.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 94) to incorporate the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McCallum.)

CIVIL SERVICE ACTS AMENDMENT.

Mr. CASEY. When you left the Chair at six o'clock, I was just about to notice the recommendation of the Civil Service Commissioners of 1880, in regard to appointments to office, and I cannot do better than begin by quoting their language, which I think is full and clear. They say;

"The present mode of nomination by political influence, and appointment without examination as to qualification, which prevails so very generally in the service, seems to us, and is frankly confessed by the majority of the witnesses we have examined, to be defective in the highest degree. It affords no sufficient guarantee of fitness for the discharge of the duties of office. It embarrasses Ministers in providing an efficient public service, and it causes great, and often irresistible pressure to be brought on members of Parliament, to force their consent to the nomination and appointment of unfit persons. It has, we think, a mischievous effect on the public mind, in making the desire for offices too strong an impulse in political conduct; for while the higher offices of State are the laudable and legitimate objects of the ambition of statesmen, the scramble for a paltry patronage, and for the smaller offices of the service, cannot but have a bad effect, alike on those who exercise and those who enjoy such patronage."

Now, there are two or three points in that paragraph to which I wish to call special attention. The commissioners state that it is frankly confessed by the majority of the witnesses that this system is defective in the highest degree; they admit that it affords no sufficient guarantee of fitness on the part of the nominee, and that the responsibility of the Minister is no safeguard; they go on to confess, in language which might be derived from the speech of the hon. Minister this afternoon, that this system causes often irresistible pressure to be brought on Ministers and members of Parliament, and they wind up with a consideration which is perhaps the weightiest of all, that this system actually demoralises that portion of the public who are apt to care for appointments of this kind. Their deliverance on this point is worthy of repetition; they say that it has a mischievous effect on the public mind, in making the desire for office too strong an impulse in political conduct. Now, all of us who have ever conducted a political campaign, are well aware what this means; we know that there is a class of persons in almost every constituency whose sole object in political warfare is to create for themselves an influence on the candidate whom they are supporting and whom they expect to be elected—an influence that will afterwards inure to their benefit, by obtaining for them an office under the Government. The patronage system has the same effect here that it has in any other country where it exists, of creating a class of small office-seekers—men who practise politics, with the only object in view of obtaining a living at the public expense. Now, I am prepared to admit that there is nothing unworthy in a young man looking forward to making a living in the public service. It is, I am free to confess, a worthy ambition, when the means taken to realise the ambition are worthy; but when a man spends the best part of his life, as many men do here and in the United States, in creating an influence, in obtaining the means of bringing pressure to bear on the Government, or on members of Parliament, to get himself, instead of some equally competent

person, appointed to public office, the system which makes that possible is a degrading system, calculated to degrade the individual who follows that course of action, and to unfit him, in the highest degree, for exercising his duties as a citizen.

"Notwithstanding the reluctance of witnesses (say the commissioners) to commit themselves to any specific statements as to the inefficiency of their subordinates, there is sufficient in their general statements on that subject to justify the conclus on that the service is susceptible of very great improvement, and that there have been many appointments to it of persons whose habits, lack of educational requirements, or inaptitude for business, could not fail to produce a state of affairs fully justifying most of the propositions stated in the reference of the commission."

The propositions referred to are the propositions I read to you this afternoon, which pointed out that grave defects exist, in the opinion of the Government itself, in the condition of the service.

"But, apart from any specific statements made in the evidence, we find in its general tenor and what we have ourselves observed, abundant reasons for the conclusions that the service requires reform, and that it has not been sufficiently guarded against the evil effects of political patronage.

"To this baneful influence, we believe, may be traced nearly all that demands change. It is responsible for admission to the service of those who are too old to be efficient; of those whose impaired health and enfeebled constitution forbids the hope that they can ever become useful public servants; of those whose personal habits are an equally fatal objection; of those whose lack of education should disqualify them; and of those whose mental qualities are of an order that has made it impossible for them to succeed in private business. It is responsible, too, for the appointment of those who desire to lead an easy, and what they deem, a genteel life."

I have read these remarks, instead of using original language of my own, for the reason that I think they are as well expressed as anybody could express them—that they are expressed as the result, not merely of the theoretical study of the question, but of an enquiry which extended over weeks and months, and which included the examination of witnesses on oath, a most thorough scrutiny into all the details of the service, as at present managed, and a comparison with the Civil Service systems of various foreign countries. Such being the basis of these remarks of the commission, and such being the concise form in which they have been expressed, I have thought that I would be doing a benefit to the House and the country by putting on record, in a more public form, the words which are now comparatively hidden from the public in this report to the Government. But while I do not feel that I can improve upon their language, I do feel it my duty to call special attention to particular portions of their remarks, and I would, in regard to the quotation I have just made, call particular attention to the phrase that "the service requires reform, and that it has not been sufficiently guarded against the evil effects of political patronage, and that to these evil effects we believe may be traced nearly all that demands change." The particulars of that general charge have been to some extent verified by the discussions that have already taken place in the House, and will further appear from some subsequent remarks of the commissioners. They go on to say, in regard to promotions:

"To the same influence may be ascribed most of the appointments of men taken from beyond the service to the best places, over the heads of tried and efficient servants; and it may fairly be charged with all the discontent and demoralisation arising out of the feeling, justified by bitter experience, that a faithful and zealous performance of duty establishes no sure claim to the prizes of the service, which, as is abundantly shown by the evidence, are too often carried off by persons whose claim to office is mainly founded on the political service they have rendered to their party. These observations, we may add, apply with greater force to the outside as compared with the inside service, in which there is but little chance of advancement or increase of pay."

In those remarks you have an endorsation of the charges made by members on this side of the House time and again, and perhaps those who will not listen to members of the Opposition will listen to the words of their own commissioners, their own political and personal friends, appointed by themselves to consider a matter of national importance. The conclusion of those hon. gentlemen is that there is truth in the accusations made from time to time, that the junior members of the service were discouraged and demoralised by the fact that all the prizes in the service went to the worn out war horses of the party. It is evident the motto "to the war horses belong the spoils," is the ruling motto.

"To this class of appointments," they continue, "and the consequent removal of the chief incentive to zeal, may perhaps be attributed more than to any other single cause the languid interest which many of the public servants feel in the performance of their duties."

That is not to be wondered at when they are aware that the best performance of their duties gives them no claim to the prizes in the service, or, in the words of the commissioners:

"They have but little motive for more than the most perfunctory performance of their work, because they feel they are in that way as likely to gain promotion as by the most active performance of it."

This would be thought strong language if it came from this side of the House, but it is the calm, mature, deliberate expression of opinion of a commission appointed to enquire into the minutest details of the service.—

"Political patronage is responsible for other evils, and we do not hesitate to express the conviction that many unnecessary civil offices have been retained and that new places have been created, for no better purpose than to provide for the followers of influential politicians."

That is not a partisan declaration, but a declaration made in a general way, supposed to be true of all Governments, and I believe it is true of all Governments that have existed and will exist with a system like this; and it is responsible, as I have said, after the creation of new officers, for the erection of new buildings to hold them. With regard to promotion it appears the same deleterious influence is at work:

"Much that has been said with reference to first admission to the service applies with equal force to promotion therein. To cause men in the public service to abandon these legitimate hopes of promotion in rank and improvement in income, which are naturally entertained by most men in the pursuit of private business, or in the employment of private persons, is necessarily to deprive them of all incentive to the active and zealous discharge of their duty. Sometimes promotions have been made by seniority regardless of merit, thus—as suggested by the order of reference"——

So it seems the Ministry were aware of this weak point themselves—

"filling the more highly paid places with men whose chief qualifications are length of service."

This is again a repetition of the point which I noticed before, that the promotion of men by seniority, regardless of merit, promotion in pay though not in duties, has led to very serious abuses. In other cases, promotions have been made, regardless of merit and seniority, and in this way men fully qualified and fairly entitled to promotion have been passed over, while others less qualified have, by undue influence, obtained promotion in their stead.

"We find, too, that in many instances men have been brought from beyond the service and either placed at once over the heads of long tried and efficient men, or, after temporarily filling minor positions, they have been elevated, with unjustifiable rapidity, to places to which they had no previous training."

This judicial deliverance more than justifies all the casual paragraphs we have seen in the papers, and the occasional remarks we have heard in this House about the evil effects of political influence, when it is allowed to interfere with the regular course of promotion in the Departments. I have called attention to the case of the postmaster in this city, and must do so again, not from any personal objection, for I have none, to the kindly and genial gentleman who has been appointed, but because I feel bound to say that injustice was done in giving one of the prizes in the outside service to a mere political friend and favorite, passing over the head of a long-tried and faithful officer, who has discharged and must continue to discharge the greater part, if not the whole, of the responsible duties connected with the

management of the post office; for it is quite impossible that a gentleman like Mr. Gouin, whose experience hitherto has been confined to hotel keeping, even if on a large scale, should be able to take up at once the important duties of city postmaster. Those duties must continue to be performed by the less highly paid official, who has the experience, while the more highly paid official, who has the salary and not experience, is getting all the glory, honor and profit of the appointment. The commissioners continue:

"The efficiency of the service so largely depends on a good system of promotion, that we have felt it necessary to emphasise the importance of avoiding such injustice as we have mentioned, and which cannot fail to be injurious to the best interest of the service. Men whose just claims are thus passed over become discouraged, they lose their self-respect and hope for the future Such injustice destroys all incentive to emulation and all desire to excel. Nor does the mischief end there. It affects the whole service; it is destructive of discipline, and it impairs the usefulness of those who witness it as well as those who suffer it."

They go on to point out that their observations are against the system rather than against the individual. Very often individuals appointed in this way have turned out very well; nevertheless, although those appointments may sometimes turn out satisfactory, they are in effect demoralising and injurious to the service. The commissioners conclude:

"These considerations have forced upon us the conviction that any reform in the administration of the public service must begin with an improvement in the mode of nominations, appointments and promotions."

Then they state that it becomes their duty to submit a remedy for the grievances which they report:

"This, we believe, can only be found in completely eliminating all traces of political patronage. This remedy involves the necessity of substituting some other mode of regulating entrances to the Service, and this, without doubt, is a more difficult task than might at first appear."

They go on then to speak of their investigations of foreign Civil Service systems, and they speak first of that of England. I want to call attention to that in some detail, because the remarks of the right hon. the Premier this afternoon, might have left the impression on the casual reader or hearer of those remarks, that that system was pretty much the same in principle, if not in detail, as the system now in force in Canada. I want to point out to the House that not only are they dissimilar in detail, but that they are dissimilar in principle, that they are dissimilar in the very essence of the theory on which they are based. They are as wide apart as the poles. While the Canadian system retains all the worst evils of the patronage system, the English system gets rid of it altogether. They say:

"The Civil Service Commission of the United Kingdom consists of three commissioners, one of whom is a Privy Councillor."

Then they go on to speak of their duties, and add:

"All appointments in the Civil Service in the Departments mentioned in schedule A"——

That includes most of the Departments; I need not give the list—

"are to be made after competitive examinations, according to regulations to be, from time to time, framed by the Civil Service Commissioners and approved by the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury. After a candidate has passed his examination, he must enter on a six months' term of probation, as a test of his conduct and capacity for the transaction of business, and is not to be finally appointed to the public service until the head of his Department is satisfied of his fitness."

Those two provisions together, I think, constitute a perfect system of safeguards. First, candidates are to obtain the opportunity of being tried in the public service, by competitive examination, that is, by a test which will select from amongst those who present themselves as willing to take service under the Executive, the few who are best qualified by previous education to perform such duties. When I say best qualified, I mean in a *primâ facie* sense. It selects the men who know most, and who may therefore be assumed *primâ facie* to be likely to make the best public servants. In addition to this test of education, and following close upon its heels, comes the test of actual trial. By the two tests of education, and of actual trial in the special duties of the Department to which they are appointed, the head of the Department is able to find out with absolute certainty which of those who have been given to him for trial are likely, and indeed certain, to be good and efficient officers. He recommends the continuance of such, and all whose continuance he does not recommend are dropped, by the mere fact of his omission to recommend them, from the rolls of the service, and cease to have any claim on the Government at all. I pass over a great many points of this system, in regard to the organisation of the service, which are deeply interesting, but do not bear so particularly upon what I have in view in the present amendment. I will, however, quote the summary of the commissioners, after dealing with the English service:

"From what has been stated, it will be seen that the essential principle of the Civil Service regulations of the Imperial Government is OPEN COMPETITIVE EXAMINATION and PROMOTION BY MERIT."

It is just those two principles which I wish, by the amendment which I shall shortly propose, to ask this House to incorporate in the present Bill. Closely connected, however, with the question of admissions and promotions is the question of the general management of the service, and especially of the examinations through which only entrance to the service is to be obtained. Our commissioners recommend strongly the following:—

"Having arrived at the conclusions above stated, as to the advantages of the system we recommend, we have now to propose the means for giving effect to our suggestions. This we believe can only be satisfactorily accomplished by the constitution of a Board of Civil Service Commissioners, as free from political influence as the judiciary happily is."

I am happy to have the support of the commissioners appointed by the present Government against those hon. gentlemen, Ministers and others, on the other side of the House, who have argued against my contention that the members of the Civil Service board should be beyond the reach of political influence:

"To the action of this board we propose to refer all those questions which have heretofore hampered and impaired the administration of the Civil Service."

The present Bill goes in the other direction. It takes away from the present board of the Civil Service examiners—for they are not commissioners—even the little independence they formerly possessed, and proposes to submit them to the supervision of the Secretary of State, so that the Bill originally framed, in opposition, to some extent, to the report of the commission appointed for the special purpose of getting information on which to frame a Bill, is now being made more and more different from that report, is getting further and further away from the recommendations made by those practical and well-informed gentlemen. They say:

"We propose that this board shall be composed of men holding an independent position and capable of commanding general confidence. It should consist of three members, one of whom should be a French Canadian, and they should be appointed in the same manner and hold office on the same tenure as the judges. We believe that the judgments and decisions of an impartial tribunal thus constituted would command the respect and confidence of the public and of the service."

You see that the commissioners desire that not only examinations but the general conduct of the service, the conduct of the routine of it, the promotions and the discipline, and all those things which should not be political questions, which have no political bearing, in the proper sense, should be given to the board of non-political commissioners and taken away from the political heads of the Departments. I am sure it will be generally admitted that it is only by some such plan that the business-like, practical management of the routine and discipline of the service can be insured. Then they go on to notice the objection on the ground of expense to their plan of Civil Service Commissioners. They calculate that it would come to a pretty

considerable sum. I have some reason to differ from their figures. They say it would cost $25,000. I do not think it need cost so much as that, but they argue, and with some force, that even if it did,—

"If the objects aimed at are attained by such an outlay, if the service is reformed, as it is clearly shown it requires to be, and if by the action of the board it is economically and wisely recruited, as we believe it will be, the money thus expended will be among the most judicious and most productive of all the expenditures incurred by the Government. For we have not the slightest doubt but that many times the cost will be annually saved, by the avoidance of unnecessary and unwise appointments."

I confess that I do not think it ought to cost as much as that, but I would much rather agree to an expenditure approaching that named by these commissioners, for the purpose named by them, the purpose of rendering the service non-political and efficient, than agree to the comparatively small increase in the cost of the service made by the provisions of this Bill; for, while the expenditure recommended by the commissioners would undoubtedly lead to great reforms in the service, I think the expenditure provided for by the present Bill tends to increase defects already existing. Then they go on to recommend that here, as in England,—

"With the exception herein mentioned, all appointments made to the Civil Service of Canada after the 1st day of January, 1882, should be by means of competitive examinations, according to regulations to be from time to time framed by the Board of Civil Service Commissioners, and approved by the Privy Council, and all regulations having reference to the qualifications of clerks or officers for any Department should be settled by the commissioners, after consultation with the chief authorities of the Department."

They then go on to provide for preliminary regulations for ascertaining the age, health and moral character of applicants, before they are allowed to be examined for the qualifying examination, something like that now in force; and then they provide that those who have passed that qualifying examination, and shown themselves reasonably fit to be employed in the public service, should be subjected to a competitive examination, and the selection is made from those who are reasonably fitted for employment and who are specially fitted by the amount of education they have obtained. They also make a recommendation which will do away with the grievance I pointed out this afternoon and discussed at some length, the grievance of the creation of a class of office-seeking young men who have passed the examination in the hope of sometime getting a berth. After recommending a provision similar to that of the English Act, for avoiding any such operation of the law, they go at great length into the questions of organisation and discipline, which I need not now discuss. I will quote, however, the closing paragraph of the report, which sums up the effect of the whole:

"The system we have advised cannot, we are convinced, be continuously and properly carried into effect under a law which requires to be supplemented in any essential particular by means of Orders in Council. We are, therefore, of opinion that the only practical way to ensure a thorough and permanent reform in the Civil Service is to give the system recommended by us the force and authority of an Act of Parliament; and if that is done, we have the highest hopes of a beneficial result from our labors."

We have been trying, during the discussion of this Bill, to carry out this recommendation of the committee. We have time and again urged that matters left open by the Bill to to be provided for by Orders in Council should be provided for in the Act—at least, that the general principles under which these matters should be settled should be so definitely stated that the Order in Council should do no more than provide the means for carrying out the clearly expressed intention of the Act. We have not succeeded in all cases, though we have in some, in having those improvements adopted. There was an attempt made this afternoon to place a check on the operation of Orders in Council, and that also failed. I regret that the Bill, as it now stands, with its frequent references to the Governor in Council, who, in this case, means the Secretary of State—because he is specially charged with the management of this Department—I regret that the Bill, with these wide loopholes for the exercise of executive power, really amounts to very little, because there is scarcely one of its provisions which is not capable of being nullified by executive action, taken under pretence of carrying it out. So much for the report of the commissioners, the spirit of which I intend to ask this House to accept. This recommendation has cost us a great deal of money to obtain, and it has cost the commissioners a great deal of trouble and intellectual exertion to prepare it. I think that by adopting these recommendations we should initiate a totally new era in our Civil Service; that we should obtain, by holding out reasonable hopes of reward for industry, application, and special ability, not only as good a class of men as are obtained by any private institution in the country, but a better class of men; that our Civil Service would become not merely what it is now, a genteel profession, as the commissioners called it, but a profession as honorable and distinguished in every way as the Civil Service of England—a profession of such a nature that the mere fact of belonging to it would be considered by the general public, not only a certificate of social standing and of gentlemanly character, but a certificate of a degree of ability sufficient to have raised a man to eminence in any other profession in the land. We are aware that such is not the case now; that although there are many distinguished and able men in the service, the mere fact of belonging to that service is not considered to carry with it any great intellectual distinction. It will, Sir, not only give us a more perfect service in the way of intellectual ability, but by removing that service, from all suspicion of political influence, and by removing from the minds of the young men of the country the hope of obtaining an entrance to that service by political influence, it would exert a highly improving effect upon the general public. We know how the Civil Service can now effect an election. Not only are civil servants allowed to vote themselves by the Bill now under discussion, but they all have an influence, which they can exert. I am not discussing the question whether they should or should not vote, but I am pointing out that they are allowed to vote, and they are likely to vote for the Government, or the party which appoints them and pays them. There is a certain amount of gratitude, even in the official human breast. For instance, my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. White), who is now interrupting me, if he were appointed to an important office, not so high in the service as to prevent him from voting—would not be likely to forget the friends who gave him that appointment and made him comfortable for life. I say would probably so act, and such is the case with all. Therefore, civil servants are almost bound to support the party to which they owe their appointment. We would get rid of that by the introduction of the English system; we would get rid of the temptation held out to those gentlemen to take an active part in elections, as we know they will often do, for the purpose of retaining their friends in power and increasing their own chances of promotion. That grievous scandals have arisen out of this temptation is too notorious to all of us to need elaboration. Sir, I propose to move:

That this Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend it by inserting provisions which shall carry out the spirit of the recommendations made by the Civil Service Commissioners of 1880, namely, that admissions to the service should be made, as a rule, by open competitive examinations, and that promotions should be for merit only.

In the words of the right hon. Premier, who addressed us on the subject this afternoon, I can say that I myself would greatly rejoice at the passing of this amendment, for the reason that it will relieve Ministers and members of this

House from the strong and often irresistible pressure that is brought upon them by political friends, in order to obtain an improper exercise of political patronage. I have no doubt he will support by his vote, and that the other members of his Cabinet will do the same, the system upon which he passed such an eulogy this afternoon, and which he declared to be so necessary for the proper management of our Civil Service.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Before this amendment is put, I desire to make a few remarks in connection with it. The subject of Civil Service examination is one of sufficient consequence to justify some further remarks at the present time. The principle was laid down, as has been shown by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), in the report of the commissioners appointed to examine into that question, that competitive examinations should be recognised in appointments to the Civil Service. In the Bill now on the Statute Book and in the amended Bill now under discussion, that principle has been entirely ignored. It was stated this afternoon by the First Minister that in England the examinations are of such a character as to resemble the taking of a degree at a university. As we are aware, the hon. gentleman himself possesses a diploma from a university; but I should not like this House to remain under the impression that the examination for the Civil Service has any relation or compares in any way whatever to a university examination. I have taken a little trouble to examine the reports of the Civil Service Examiners, in order to ascertain the character of the examinations held. The examination in arithmetic was of a most elementary kind. On the examinations held on 12th and 13th June, 1884, the arithmetic papers, as shown at page 4 of the report, include questions in simple addition, of which the first question is to add nine lines, of eight figures in a line; and the second question is to add nine lines of five figures. Ten marks out of a total of 60 were allowed for those two questions. In subtraction the questions include the subtracting of a line of ten figures and a line of five figures; and these have a value of 10 in a total of 60. In multiplication the examples are equally simple. I should be very sorry, therefore, for the impression to go abroad that such an examination is in any sense the equivalent of an English or Canadian university examination. Let me show the House, very briefly, what is the character of the papers submitted at one of the ordinary examinations in one of our Ontario high schools. In the second form in one of those schools, the following were among the questions on the arithmetic paper given last month:—

ARITHMETIC.

"I. In the expression 6 per cents are at 103, explain fully what is meant? A person sells a certain amount of 5 per cents for 86 and invests in the 6 per cents at 103. By so doing he changes his income by $1.00. How much stock did he sell?

"II. A man buys 150 lbs. of sugar, and after selling 100 lbs., finds he has been parting with it at a loss of 5 per cent. At what rate per cent. advance on cost must he sell the remaining 50 lbs., that he may gain 10 per cent. on the entire transaction?

"III. Find when, after 3 o'clock, the hour and the minute hands of a clock make an angle of 60 degrees with each other.

"IV. Find the present worth of $1,166.40 for two years at 8 per cent. per annum, with compound interest.

"V. A, B, C and D enter into partnership A and B contribute $1,390, B and C $1,590, C and D $1,810, A and D $1,610, A and C $1,500. They gain $1,152. What is the share of each of the gain?"

I would ask hon. members if those questions bear any comparison to the questions contained in the Civil Service examination papers. Let me compare them a little further. In orthography the subject matter of the Civil Service paper is in every way commendable, but at the same time I submit that it is by no means excellent, as showing a knowledge of the language on the part of candidates. The title is: "The men who succeed." It states:

"The great cause of difference among men is energy of character. If each have the same amount of learning and integrity, and each have the same opportunity, energy will make one man a conqueror, the want of it will cause the other to be a failure."

In the dictation paper of one of the high schools, which is also designed to show the acquaintance of the pupil with the language, I find the following: "Galvanism, palpable, embarrass, prejudice, presentable, coercion, icicle, sizable, hypocrite, dilatory, guinea, acoustics," and such like. I hold that the result of a comparison of the examination papers is to the prejudice of the Civil Service papers. They moreover, bear out the statement I have made before in this House, that the entrance examination to the high schools throughout Ontario is a much harder effort than the preliminary entrance examination to the Civil Service. Such being the case, what is the practical result? I am satisfied that hon. gentlemen are well aware of the immense number of those seeking information as to the course to be pursued in order to go up for examination for the Civil Service. The result, is that a great many of our young men are leaving most useful spheres of life, in order to find easy positions in the Civil Service. There are other considerations that, I think, should weigh with us, in our effort to perfect our Civil Service system. It is manifest that it is the intention of the Government not to deprive themselves of the opportunity of appointing their own friends. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to leave that responsibility with them, if they are desirous of assuming it; but I will not say that we should follow the principle that this House is assuming the responsibility while the Government are making the appointments. I think, Sir, that the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) this afternoon, was one which met the case, in this respect, very fully. If the Government of the day is desirous of holding the right to these appointments in their own hand, they should assume the full responsibility; but it is an easy matter, when there are, as there were last year, 1,036 candidates presenting themselves for examination, while there were less, perhaps, than fifty positions to fill, for them to throw the responsibility on Parliament, after having passed this Bill, and at the same time secure those whom they were anxious to secure, in the positions which they would have had under any circumstances. In committee the other night I was desirous of securing an amendment which would have placed whatever positions were vacant in the hands of those who passed highest at the examination. I do not, by any means, assume that those who may pass the highest educational tests would be the best fitted, under all circumstances, to the position; but the provision is, in the present Act, that all appointments are probationary, and this might be continued with the change I suggest. The principle could be continued that the appointments would be still probationary, and the head of the Department could still say whether the accepted candidate had the qualifications necessary to the active discharge of the duties. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which excites a growing interest throughout the country, and if hon. gentlemen on this side of the House show themselves desirous of perfecting a measure of this kind, it is because they are anxious that the Civil Service should be, in fact, what it pretends to be. If we have a Civil Service, the promotions for which are to be by examination, these examinations should be the test, and it follows to my mind that if those examinations are to be the test of entrance to the Civil Service, the examiners themselves should be thoroughly independent of the Government of the day. Instead of that we have a Bill before the House which practically gives the control of the examiners—and more effectively than any previous Bill—to the Government of the day. The Bill now before the House transfers the whole of the examiners to the Department of the Secretary of State. That implies a good deal; and the success of the Act, I think, is practically in the hands of the Secretary of State for the time being. If we

are to follow the English system, if that system has all the merits which the First Minister said it has, if the English system is designed to give us a perfect Civil Service, why should we not adopt that system in its details? We know that there the Civil Service Commissioners are entirely independent of the Government of the day; we know they are, equally with the judges, dependent only, for their positions, on the House of Parliament, and consequently they are in every way independent. Not only so, but every appointment to any vacancy occurring in the Civil Service of England, as was justly said by the First Minister this afternoon, is made on their recommendation entirely. So much is this the case, that even the Prime Minister of England cannot appoint his own secretary. Now, I ask, if that is the case, it follows that the Civil Service Bill now before the House is merely a pretense of what it ought to be; it is not in any sense designed to further the object which it had in view; if we are at all to perfect it in any direction, it ought certainly to be in some such direction as that suggested by the amendment.

The House divided on amendment of Mr. Casey, p. 1291.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Edgar,	McIntyre,
Armstrong,	Fairbank,	McMullen,
Auger,	Fisher,	Mills,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fleming,	Mulock,
Béchard,	Forbes,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Blake,	Gunn,	Ray,
Bourassa,	Harley,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Holton,	Scriver,
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Somerville (Bruce),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Jackson,	Springer,
Cartwright,	King,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casey,	Kirk,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Watson,
Catudal,	Langelier,	Weldon,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Wells,
Cockburn,	Lister,	Wilson,
Cook,	Livingstone,	Yeo.—59.
Davies,	McCraney,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Dickinson,	McCallum,
Allison,	Dodd,	McCarthy,
Bain (Soulanges),	Dugas,	McDougald (Pictou),
Baker (Missisquoi),	Dundas,	McDougall (C. Breton),
Baker (Victoria),	Farrow,	McLelan,
Beaty,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),	McNeill,
Bell,	Ferguson (Welland),	Montplaisir,
Benoit,	Fortin,	Paint,
Benson,	Gagné,	Pinsonneault,
Bergeron,	Gault,	Pope,
Bergin,	Gigault,	Pruyn,
Billy,	Girouard,	Reid,
Blondeau,	Gordon,	Riopel,
Bossé,	Grandbois,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bourbeau,	Guilbault,	Royal,
Bowell,	Guillet,	Rykert,
Bryson,	Hackett,	Shakespeare,
Burnham,	Hay,	Small,
Burns,	Hesson,	Smyth,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hickey,	Sproule,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hilliard,	Stairs,
Campbell (Victoria),	Homer,	Taschereau,
Carling,	Hurteau,	Tassé,
Caron,	Ives,	Taylor,
Chapleau,	Jamieson,	Temple,
Cimon,	Kaulbach,	Townshend,
Cochrane,	Kilvert,	Tupper,
Colby,	Kinney,	Valin,
Coughlin,	Kranz,	Vanasse,
Coursol,	Labrosse,	Wallace (York),
Curran,	Landry (Kent),	White (Cardwell),
Cuthbert,	Landry (Montmagny),	White (Hastings),
Daly,	Langevin,	Wigle,
Daoust,	Macdonald (King's),	Wood (Brockville),
Dawson,	Mackintosh,	Wood (Westm'lnd)—107.
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	

Amendment negatived.

Mr. BLAKE. In pursuance of the notice which I gave in the course of the debate, I rise to call attention to those parts of this measure which prescribe once again the principle on which the salaries and promotion in the Civil Service have been and are to be regulated. The subject is one of very great gravity, in view of the enormous increase which has taken place and is taking place in the cost of the service, and added gravity is attached to this particular part of the system to which I desire to call attention, by the official statement which was made in the earlier part of the Session, as to the effect of the law which we are asked once again to consecrate by the third reading of the Bill. In the Budget debate, on the 3rd of March last, the Finance Minister adverted to the expenditure for civil government in these words:

"While the expenditure of civil government for 1877-78 was $823,369, last year it was $1,584,417, or an increase of $261,047"——

"Mr. CASGRAIN. Hear, hear."

"Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. gentleman says, hear, hear. I do not wonder at it, because hon. gentlemen opposite have made this one of the great charges against the Administration throughout the length and breadth of the country, to prove the extravagance of this Administration. Now, I desire to call the attention of the House to the facts as regards the cost, to the circumstances that have led to this increase of $$61,000 in six years. One of the difficulties that every Government must experience in preparing the Civil Service estimate is the increase that is inevitable under the provision of the Civil Service Act, by which a very large proportion of the employés receive each a yearly increase of $50. This increase for the last six years is estimated as follows: It is estimated that 420 of the Civil Service employees have received an increase of $50 a year, and each year since 1877-78, that is during six years, or a total increase of salary to each employee of $300. That amount for 420 civil servants gives $1,275,000 of an increase."

Now, Sir, there is an addition of $126,000 a year to the cost of the Civil Service. And that addition does not stop there; it is progressive. Under this law it is to be progressive, and you have already accumulated under the law an addition which represents a capital charge of more than $3,000,000. It is as if you had added more than $3,000,000 to the public debt of the country within the three years. If that is necessary, in order to the efficiency of the service, it must of course be borne; but the question is, whether it is necessary. Let me give you the progressive increase, in round numbers, excluding those elements which are statutory, and which do not come within the items of the departmental salaries and contingencies:

	Salaries.	Contingencies.	Totals.
In 1878	$545,000	$158,000	$704,000
" 1879	566,000	177,000	744,000
" 1880	609,000	165,000	776,000
" 1881	632,000	153,000	788,000
" 1882	652,000	167,000	819,000
" 1883	672,000	184,000	857,000
" 1884	763,000	203,000	966,000

Now, the question is, is this necessary, and when is it to stop? I do not know that it is necessary, and I think we ought to take a step towards stopping it, here and now. I do not think it is too early; I think, if anything, it is late enough. Is it necessary? The report of the sub-committee of Council of the present Government, appointed to consider on the condition of the service, in the year 1880, which report was adopted by the Council, contained these words:

"Since the period above referred to, a series of years have elapsed, and many changes in the character, as well as in the extent of the service required in each Department, have developed themselves. The duties of some Departments and some branches of each Department, and of certain officers in each Department, have been varied, diminished or increased; and many men have, by old age, incapacity, bad habits, or continued idleness, become unavailable for useful purposes. The number of men in each Department has increased, it is thought, out of proportion to the needs of the service. Young men have been appointed, who, from want of education or strength of constitution, or general unfitness, have not made, and will never become efficient public servants. The general expense has been increased by the tendency of the existing rules, to the gradual culmination of officers, by mere force of survivorship into the more highly paid classes."

And they recommended the appointment of a commission to consider the whole question, and to report a method of

reorganising the service. Now, that commission did report, and their report contains this language:

"We have been impressed, during the progress of our enquiry, with the conviction that while by far the greater portion of the work of the Departments is of a purely routine character, and such as in private business would be performed by men receiving comparatively low salaries, it has heretofore been largely done by clerks who, by mere force of survival, have been advanced to the highest grade of the service. This, we believe, is a fruitful source of unnecessary cost, and we think the remedy is firmly to restrict the number of employees in the higher grades, and to provide with equal stringency that promotion shall only be made to actual vacancies, and then only upon the certificate of the head of the Department, as to fitness, and of the Civil Service Board, that the qualifications of the person it is proposed to promote have been satisfactorily established, both as to character, business habits, and knowledge of the duties required of the incumbent of the office to which it is proposed to make the appointment."

Going on, they point out:

"It is, we think, abundantly evident that the existing classification is much too complicated, and that while it has a tendency to create discontent it affords too many facilities for the unjustifiable advancement of employees to which we have referred."

And they propose four grades below the deputy heads—chief clerks, first-class, second-class, and third-class clerks, and that the number of chief, first and second class clerkships shall be restricted in the manner stated. As to second-class clerks, equally with the first-class clerks, they point out:

"That clerkships of this class, equally with those in the first-class, should be given only where specific duties have to be provided for, and equal care should be taken to guard against any unnecessary increase in its numbers, thus leaving the great bulk of the routine work of the Department to be performed by the men of the third or junior class."

Then, dealing with the third-class clerks, they say:

"To the class of clerks, will be assigned the routine work of the Departments, such as checking, comparing, copying, compiling and transcribing accounts and documents. This, so far as we can ascertain, comprises four-fifths of the whole work to be done, and requires for its performance no special attainments beyond what can be acquired in the common schools. The clerks in this class should be promoted only on having passed a competitive examination, and thereby attained such a position as the lists herein referred to, of clerks eligible for promotion, as will establish their fitness to fill the vacancies that may occur in the higher grades. The salary, at first entrance, we propose, shall be $500, advancing by biennial increment of $100 to $900."

I shall not read other passages in the report. But I may say that practically the recommendations of the commission are consonant, as I conceive, with the necessities of the case—to establish a set of clerkships, as writerships, attending to that business which is all routine, or as they describe, copying, checking, filing—dealing with that sort of business which requires a neat hand, punctuality and business habits, but requires no more. They do not propose that these clerks shall be eligible for promotion in their own classes; but, of course, and reasonably, they do not propose that in case any of them is of superior merit and superior mettle, he shall be debarred from the opportunity of rising into other classes of clerks, provided there are vacancies in those superior classes. He should have the right, just as the man outside has the right, to rise into the limited number of those for whose work superior qualifications are required, and to whom, therefore, a better pay is assigned. But, Sir, the practical operation of the law, which was passed in conformity with the recommendations of the commission, and which has not worked in conformity with those recommendations, is that there are these increases and these promotions going on steadily; and you have seen, as I have pointed out—from the statement of the Finance Minister himself, excusing the increases in the Civil Service, from the report of the yearly increases which I have given you, from the appalling total of increase in a few years, from the circumstance that that increase is proceeding more rapidly in these late years, since this remodelled Act was passed, than it was before—that the mischiefs to which I refer still prevail, and they prevail to this extent, as the Finance Minister sums up the case, that 420 out of the civil servants of the country have, within the last six years, received increases which make them now in the receipt of $300 a year by virtue of these $50 increases, apart from the promotion increases, or a total of $126,000 a year, which would be equal to the average wages of 420 mechanics, with families. This increase alone of $50 a year, in the course of the six years would support comfortably a town of 2,000 souls, at any rate so far as the bone and sinew are concerned—the mechanic interest. Now, I maintain that the exigencies of the public service do not require this system and that the public service cannot bear its further continuance. I do not object at all to paying fairly what is required, in order to get the proper order of intellect and attainement into the public service, but I do object to this disgraceful system, a system condemned by a committee of the Council of this Government and by the report of the Council and the commissioners, whereby, just by force of survivorship, men go from class to class, from increase to increase, after they have passed the maximum point of efficiency, after they have long passed the salary which they would obtain for similar services and similar capacity in private establishments; yet they go on rolling up increases while in the Civil Service of the country. It is an unreasonable and extravagant and an intolerable arrangement. It has been the subject of discussion for a considerable time; we discussed it when the hon. gentleman's original Bill was before the House, and objected to those results which he said would flow and which experience proved have flowed from it. Experience has been had since; we have had the results given by the Minister of Finance, who does not draw the line between the time before and the time since the new Civil Service Act came into operation, and show such was the result until the passage of the Act and such had been the result since. He goes straight along, passing what ought to be a line of demarcation, without a word. Why? Because, in point of fact, there has been no change; the increases are going on and the system in this regard is practically and measurably the same. I maintain that it ought to be changed; I maintain that the system is a bad one. In those cases in which you give increases, the increases ought not, in my opinion, to be given as this law gives them. I maintain there ought to be no right to an increase, even in those cases in which increases may be given; I maintain that the increase should only be given as a stimulus to extra exertion; whereas, by this law, it is given as a matter of course, for unless a man's conduct is disgracefully bad, the rule is to give the increase. If the rule is not without exceptions, let us hear the exceptions. But I need not argue this point, because the Finance Minister himself describes the increase as an increase inevitable under the provisions of the Civil Service Act; it is an inevitable increase, which has amounted to $126,000 a year in the course of six years. Under these circumstances, I do not think we ought to pass this consolidation Act; I do not think that this system, which has worked so ill, should be continued to be worked on an increasing scale; and we should, I think, make an effort to carry out the true principles, which have been adverted to by the committee of the Council of this Government, and the Civil Service commission, and, in that view, I beg to move the following amendment:—

That all the words after "that," to the end of the question, be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof: A Committee of Council of the present Government, reported, on the 14th June, 1880, on the Civil Service, that the general expense has been increased by the tendency of the existing rules, to the gradual culmination of officers by mere force of survivorship into the more highly paid classes.

That the report of the Civil Service Commission declares that four-fifths of the whole work of the service is routine work, requiring for its performance no special attainments, beyond what can be acquired in the common schools; and that this work has been largely done by clerks who, by mere force of survival, have been advanced to the higher grades of the service, while in private business it would be performed by men receiving comparatively low salaries; and that this is a fruitful source

of unnecessary cost, to be remedied in part by firmly restricting the number of employees of higher grades.

That the practical working of the existing law has resulted in a great increase in the cost of the service, due largely to the increases of salary and the promotions of the clerks of the lower grades.

That the said Bill be referred back to a Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of amending the same, by providing for the modification in future cases of the provisions for yearly increases of salary, and for promotions, so as to lessen the evils above mentioned, and to check the enormous additions which are being made to the cost of the service.

Mr. MULOCK. There is constantly coming up in this House reference to the Civil Service, and I presume that, in that respect, the House is but echoing the sentiments of the country. I am not one of those who see no good in the Civil Service, for my experience has given me to understand that, in the Departments at Ottawa, as well as in the service outside of this city, are men who efficiently discharge their duties. But, if they do so under disadvantageous circumstances, if they do so in despite of defects in the system itself, how much better would the services of those employés be discharged if the system itself was a sounder one. Now, whilst I admit that economy is of the very first importance in all branches of the public service, it is also well to consider, and it is of first importance to consider, the public service itself. If the public service can in no way be endangered by a revision of the present system, it appears to me that it is incumbent on the Government to revise this system. If any economy, if any savings of the public funds can be accomplished, without in any way interfering with the efficiency of the public service, the Government ought to give their attention to such economy. Now, we have it of record, not of record as the outcome of enquiry by adversaries, but we have it of record from a commission issued under the direction of the present Government, that the present system is a vicious one. As I understand the report from which the hon. the leader of the Opposition has read, it is established there beyond controversy that we are now paying at least $120,000 a year more than is necessary in order to secure efficiently the discharge of the public services, by reason of the defective system in force. As I understand the commissioners' report, it is this: that we have not limited the possible number of employees in the higher classes to the demand on the part of the public service for such higher work, but promote employees into higher classes as a matter of course. Now, what is the course pursued by any business man in his own business? Take a merchant; say he is a wholesale merchant; he turns over a certain volume of business each year; he commences business with a certain staff; he has, of course, his highest employé, and there is a gradation down to the lowest porter in the establishment. Well, if the porter remains with him for a certain number of years, it is reasonable that he should receive some little addition from time to time, but he can never attain to the salary that is drawn by one higher than himself in class of work, but he always must draw the salary that attaches to the class of work that he is engaged in doing. The employer does not multiply those in his service who are drawing the highest salaries, simply because of long service. He limits the employment to the demands of the business, and it seems to me that, in the public service, the same business principles should be applied; and, if so, we should be not only saving a vast sum of money, but I submit we should be in no way demoralising the public service. We have it beyond all question, under this report, that we can save $120,000 a year, and notwithstanding this report has been in the possession of the Ministers for some time, we find them to-day forcing upon the House this Bill, which is calculated to perpetuate the present system. It may be that the provisions of the report had not been brought to the attention of the hon. the Secretary of State. When we look at the Bill itself, we find that he proposes to establish a certain number of clerkships. There is a deputy head, with a salary of $3,200, to be increased to $4,000. It is but a short time since the highest salary of the deputy head was $3,200, but now they must all receive an increase of 25 per cent. Why is that? Is it by reason of increase in the cost of living? Is it that everything that they buy now is dearer? Or, is it that their services are more valuable? Or, is it because it is immaterial whether there is economy or not in the public service? It is not more than five or six years, in my recollection, since $3,200 was the highest salary paid to a deputy head, but here we find that, day after day, month after month, and year after year, the cost of maintenance of the Government is increasing, till now we find ourselves facing a deficit, and yet we find propositions to increase the controllable expenditure of the country. Then we have the next class below that of deputy head, the chief clerk. When I asked the Secretary of State if he could give any information at all to the House as to the peculiar duties discharged by the chief clerk, as distinguished from those of the first-class clerk, what did he answer? He did not attempt to give us any information. He simply said that the chief clerk occupied the position of a superior to the first-class clerk. That afforded us no information. Any one knew that there ought to be that relative position, but from the inability or the refusal on the part of the Secretary of State to grant that information, it would appear that the only distinction between these two classes is the amount of salary drawn. When we pass to the first class clerk, we find he draws a salary of $1,400, increasable to $1,800 by an annual increase of $50. Then we descend in the grade, and we find a second-class clerk commencing with $1,000, increasable at the same arbitrary rate, as time rolls on, to $1,400 a year. And then we find a third-class clerk commencing at $400 and increasing to $1,000; that increase, too, is at the arbitrary fixed rate of $50 per year. And last of all, we find a group of employees, messengers, packers, sorters, &c., beginning with a salary of $300, which increases up to $500. Now, when we were in committee I pointed out to the Secretary of State that it appeared to me that the system of increase alone was an unsound one. The same fixed sum of $50 a year is added to the salary of each clerk, whether he is of the lowest class or the highest class. Now, that is contrary to all business principles. The Secretary of State must know that increases in salaries should be in proportion to the value of the services, having due regard to the then salary; whereas, in this case, there is an arbitrary sum of $50 a year, without rhyme or reason, added to the salary of each officer, from the lowest class up to the highest. Mr. Speaker, I submit that this country will not endorse this measure; I submit that the country ought not to be compelled to pay this unnecessary sum for the discharge of the public service; I submit that it is an injustice to waste public money in this manner. There are men who are compelled to contribute towards these salaries who are not as well off as the men to whom they are paid; and if the Secretary of State, if the Government, desire to enjoy the confidence of the public, I think they cannot adopt any better way to secure and retain that confidence than by a due regard to economy. Mr. Speaker, this is no time to waste money; this is, of all times, a time to economise. But this Session, what have we seen already? This is not the first attempt to increase the cost of running the Government. It is not long since we had to discuss the question of examiners, and before this Bill is through I intend to discuss that a little farther. We also have a motion of the hon. Minister of Public Works to establish a court of claims. I do not know how much that is going to cost in the end, but we know it is going to cost a good many thousands in the beginning. Here is another large sum to be saved, and yet they will not save it. Last night we discussed a measure that may involve, if it becomes law, the permanent addition to this country of an army of civil servants. We were discussing last night the Franchise Bill, and we find in that a provision whereby it is competent to

the Government to appoint a revising officer for every riding in Canada—211 revising officers. We also found in that Bill a provision whereby each revising officer was to appoint one clerk—211 clerks. There is also in that Bill a provision for each revising officer to have a constable—211 constables; so that, under that Bill, it is possible for the Governor in Council to appoint, in all, 633 officers. What cost that will be to the country we do not know at present. Already this Session we have all these propositions made to place new burdens on this already over-taxed country. Under this Bill that we discussed last night we have a proposition that will involve us in adding an army of officers to the country, a number of men sufficient to equip two regiments. The hon. Minister of Public Works has his little proposition, too; and I do not suppose that the ingenuity of the hon. gentlemen opposite has failed them, and that they will bring down no more propositions involving public expense. But if we go on like this we shall, in the end, have more officials than non-officials; we will not have enough to equip the service in the end. Now, surely it cannot be necessary to increase the number of officials in the direction indicated. I think, if we took a review, we would find that this practice of increases has been going on systematically. The hon. Minister of Finance made a most illogical answer in reference to this question. It was charged against this Government, in a certain discussion, that the cost of the Civil Service had increased. Well, the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) endeavored to show that the rate per head of the controllable expenditure under the head of Civil Service was not more under the present Government than it had been under the Liberal Government. But the fallacy of that explanation must be apparent to every one. The cost of civic government does not increase rateably with the population. It costs no more for a man to preside over a Department, if the population of this country goes up a few hundred thousand, than if it stands still. Take the first office of the land, the office of Governor General; the expense of that office is not greater if we had ten millions of a population than with five millions. Take the Lieutenant Governors throughout the Dominion. The Lieutenant Governor presides over the Province, no matter how populous it may be, and so on. In answer to the observation of the member for Cardwell, I say that the mere fact that the cost per head has not increased, does not get over the objection that the total amount of expenditure is more than it should be. Now, for all these reasons, I trust that the Secretary of State will see the propriety of economising at this critical time in our history; that he will see the propriety of endeavoring to establish a Civil Service system on a sounder basis. It is absolutely defective, at the present time; it has not the confidence of the public, and although I say that, and say it with regret, I do not wish thereby to be understood as saying that the employees themselves, as a whole, do not endeavor to do their duty to the country. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the Bill will be referred back, and that an attempt will be made to give effect to the amendment of my hon. friend from West Durham.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Blake, p. 1294.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Fairbank,	McIntyre,
Auger,	Fisher,	McMullen,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fleming,	Mills,
Béchard,	Forbes,	Mulock,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Blake,	Gunn,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Harley,	Ray,
Burpee,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Scriver,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Somerville (Brant)
Campbell (Renfrew),	Jackson,	Somerville (Bruce)
Cartwright,	King,	Springer,
Casey,	Kirk,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Trow,
Catudal,	Langelier,	Vail,
Cochrane,	Laurier,	Watson,
Cockburn,	Lister,	Weldon,
Cook,	Livingstone,	Wilson,
Davies,	McCraney,	Yeo.—58.
Edgar,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Dugas,	Mackintosh,
Allison,	Dundas,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Bain (Soulanges),	Dupont,	McCallum,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Farrow,	McCarthy,
Baker (Victoria),	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	McDougald (Pictou),
Beaty,	Ferguson (Welland),	McDougall (C. Breton),
Bell,	Fortin,	McLelan,
Benoit,	Gagné,	McNeill
Benson,	Gault,	Moffat,
Bergeron,	Gigault,	Montplaisir,
Bergin,	Girouard,	Paint,
Billy,	Gordon,	Pinsonneault,
Blondeau,	Grandbois,	Pope,
Bossé,	Guilbault,	Pruyn,
Bourbeau,	Guillet,	Reid,
Bowell,	Hackett,	Riopel,
Bryson,	Hall,	Robertson (Hastings),
Burnham,	Hay,	Royal,
Burns,	Hesson,	Rykert,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hickey,	Small,
Carling,	Hilliard,	Smyth,
Caron,	Homer,	Stairs,
Chapleau,	Hurteau,	Taschereau,
Colby,	Jamieson,	Tassé,
Coughlin,	Jenkins,	Taylor,
Coursol,	Kaulbach,	Temple,
Curran,	Kilvert,	Townshend,
Cuthbert,	Kinney,	Tupper,
Daly,	Kranz,	Vanasse,
Daoust,	Labrosse,	Wallace (York),
Dawson,	Landry (Kent),	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (Maski'ngé)	Landry (Montmagny),	Wigle,
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	Langevin,	Wood (Brockville),
Dickinson,	Macdonald (King's),	Wood (Westm'lnd)—104
Dodd,	Macdonald (Sir John),	

Amendment negatived.

Mr. DAVIES. The amendments made to the Civil Service Act are not thoroughly understood by the House, and do not meet its approval. Under the old Civil Service Act, if an officer of a superior grade were absent on leave, and his duties were performed by another officer, who did not hold the same grade, the latter officer received the pay of the absentee. That principle is not, in itself, a good one. But the amendment which the Secretary of State proposes extends that evil principle still further. The amendment proposed by the hon. Minister not only provides that when a superior officer is absent the same rate of pay shall be received by the officer performing his duties, but in case of the death of a superior officer, and of his duties being discharged during a period of three months by one not of the same rank, the higher salary shall be paid to the *locum tenens*. I think that principle is objectionable in the highest degree, and the explanation given by the Secretary of State was sufficient to convince any person that the amendment should not be adopted. The Secretary of State was asked to give reasons why this pernicious principle should be further extended. Only one idea seemed to pervade the mind of the hon. gentleman in regard to the Civil Service, and that was how the cost of the country can be increased, not how the service can be improved. What was the reason given by the Secretary of State. He said that sometimes, as in the case of the Librarian, an office might become vacant and might be kept vacant for some time. Why? Simply for political purposes. If an office is vacant it becomes the duty of the head of the Department to make an appointment without unnecessary delay, and it is not in the public interest for the Government to keep open the office for one, two or three months, and allow some subordinate to discharge the duties and receive the higher pay. It has been erroneously assumed that each of the different grades of officers had special and distinct duties assigned to them, which those of an inferior grade were unable to discharge; and an attempt was made

to lead the House to the conclusion that if an inferior officer performed the duties of a higher grade, he should receive a higher rate of pay. I was much interested in the discussion, and the questions asked the Minister by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mullock), as to whether special duties were assigned to different grades; and I came to the conclusion that there was very little in it. The hon. gentleman was asked as to what were the duties of chief clerks and as to the duties of first-class clerks. The hon. Minister said the duties of a chief clerk were a chief clerk's duties. This reminded me of the old story about a person at dinner being asked as to what were an archdeacon's duties, to which the reply was given, that his duties were to discharge archideaconal functions. So it appears that the duties of a chief clerk are those of a chief clerk, and the same with respect to a first-class clerk. I have failed to understand that there is any distinction between the duties which those clerks have to perform. I have failed to understand that a first-class clerk is not in every way competent to discharge a chief clerk's duties; and so I might run through the whole gamut of clerks. The deputy heads have responsibilities and duties to discharge which an ordinary man not having experience, cannot discharge. That class of gentlemen stands alone; but as regards the clerks, they have no distinct duties which clerks of an inferior grade are not competent to discharge, so far as we have been able to learn; if they have such duties, the Secretary of State has not deigned to explain them to the House. The amendment I am about to submit is one in the direction of economy, and in the direction of efficiency also. Hon. members must have been interested in listening to the statements made by the hon. member near me, and by the leader of the Opposition, with respect to the recommendations made by the Civil Service Commission. As to the defects which they pointed out as existing in the Civil Service, and as to the recommendations they made to remove those defects, the Government have not attempted to adopt any of the improvements suggested by those gentlemen. The Secretary of State, in this Bill, does not attempt to carry out the recommendations of the commission. We find the commission stating—and it is a fact which I hope will become known throughout the length and breadth of the country, in order that sound public opinion may be formed on this Civil Service question—that four-fifths of the work of the Department is merely mechanical, work that any boy from a public school is fitted to discharge. Yet, in the face of this fact, Parliament is asked to increase the salaries of these mechanical clerks, and give them $50 annual increase. No attempt is made to economise. We heard the statements made by the Minister of Finance, that we are now expending $126,000 a year more than we did six years ago, on account of this annual $50 increase. It is not pretended by hon. gentlemen opposite that the country obtains any proper return for that outlay. There is not a Minister who has arisen to attempt to justify that extraordinary increase, and still we are supposed to pass these enormous increases year by year, and that, too, without any criticism. I maintain that hon. members who look closely into this Bill will oppose every amendment made by the Secretary of the State, which has for its object to increase salaries, unless the hon. gentleman can justify the increases by pointing out that they are necessary. I say no attempt has been made to point out any necessity for the increase. The result will be something like this: Some first-class clerk will die, and a second or third-class clerk will discharge the duties during two or three months. That clerk will not receive the pay of his rank in the service, but the pay of the first-class clerk. That cannot be justified. Personally, I should have liked to have moved a resolution to strike out the whole section, and say that if any officer discharges other duties it does not follow as a consequence that he is entitled to increased pay. I maintain that the conduct of the service should be more and more assimilated to those business principles which control mercantile establishments. You do not find that if a man in the employ of a large mercantile establishment is absent for a week or two, and his duties are performed by another clerk, that that clerk obtains $200 or $300 extra pay. Especially should not that be the case when the work is not harder, and no more brain power is required. It has been suggested that in many cases the work is ever easier in the higher grades. But the proposition is not to increase the work, but, if it is possible, to squeeze an increased pay out of the public Treasury. Scatter the public money right and left, and have no regard to the tax payers! Every amendment is in the direction of getting more money. When the Bill was under discussion in committee, there was not ten members on the opposite side of the House who took the slightest interest in the debate. They did not remain in the House and listen to the explanations. And I suppose they think that that is the proper way of conducting the public business. It may be, in their estimation, but I do not think it will be satisfactory to the general public or to the taxpayers of the country; and I do think that every amendment in the Bill which aims at an increased expenditure, unless it can be justified by showing that the expenditure is necessary, should be voted down. I move in amendment:

That the Bill be referred back, with instructions to amend the second sub-section of the 56th section by expunging the provision allowing extra pay to inferior officers or clerks doing duty after the demise of the superior officer or clerk.

Mr. BOWELL. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to advocate the adoption of the whole of the suggestions made by the Civil Service Commissioners?

Mr. DAVIES. No. The hon. gentleman understood me by my vote just now to support the principle laid down by the amendment of the leader of the Opposition. But I do not adopt all the suggestions made, because I do not think all of them were made with a view of economy, especially some of the heads of Departments, who went for increases of salaries, which I do not approve of. There are other suggestions made which I do not approve of.

Mr. McMULLEN. When this question was before the House before, I took no part in the discussion which then took place on the several clauses of the Bill. I feel it my duty, however, not to give a silent vote on this question, because I feel it is a matter of very great importance. Any person who examines into the operation of the Civil Service Act since its inauguration must come to the conclusion that the amount of money annually spent, under the operation of this Act, has increased year by year, and it is highly desirable that we should give that attention to this question which it deserves at our hands. The remarks of the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment a short time ago are in point. I think the matter is one which requires the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite as well as hon. members on this side of the House. Any person who listened to the speech delivered by the hon. Finance Minister must have been struck with the fact of the announcement he made on that occasion, that an increase of $126,000 annually took place, through the operations of this Act, by giving the increases of $50 a year to the servants in connection with the Civil Service. Now, I hold that there are many points in connection with this statute which are exceedingly objectionable. The question of the manner in which the examinations are conducted was gone into a short time ago. I hold that the expenses in connection with those examinations are not at all necessary, and I believe that a much more efficient, simpler, and less expensive way of these clerks undergoing examination could be adopted, by simply accepting the certificates of boards of education in the different Provinces.

We have, in the several Provinces, boards of education, to whom the candidates seeking certificates for the purpose of becoming school teachers apply, and if those certificates were accepted on behalf of the Civil Service, it would save a great deal of expense, and I cannot very well understand why they should not be accepted. I do not think there can be any just ground shown why the certificates issued under the superintendence of boards of education in the different Provinces should not be as well accepted as the certificates issued under the examinations held by the Board of Civil Service Examiners. I think if that course were adopted, a considerable saving might be effected. I believe, also, that this system of increasing the salaries annually by $50 is a very absurd one. A man is hired to a Department to perform certain duties. If he is capable of performing those duties he should be paid a salary proportionate to the service he renders, and the service he renders should be the ground upon which his salary should be fixed. Once you fix a value upon the services he performs, there is no necessity whatever that there should be an increase annually in the ratio of $50 a year. I do not know, in connection with any other business that any man may adopt in this Dominion, that a system of this kind is in force. I know myself that efficient men in different establishments, in the different banking institutions of the country, are paid very fair and remunerative salaries. I believe, at the same time, that the proper system upon which the whole Civil Service is based should be that each man in the Department should receive a salary proportionate to the service he renders, and that that salary should not be increased by a statutory provision that he should get $50 a year added to his salary year by year. In connection with the question of superannuation, last year I drew the attention of the Government to the fact of this increase, and I enquired whether there was a case of any civil servant in which this increase was held back, on the ground of inefficiency or for any other reason, and no such case was brought forward. Now, any person knowing anything about the qualities of clerks employed in banks or other establishments—anybody who knows anything about the adaptibility or the qualities of a number of clerks, will come to the conclusion that where you have 50 or 100, or 150 clerks, you cannot have them all equally valuable or efficient; and therefore it is evident that these increases are not granted for efficiency, but as a matter of statute, as something which they expect to get when they enter the service, and consequently it is a direct increase and loss. Now, I do not think this system should be allowed to go on. The fact of the matter is, that the expenditure in this respect is becoming alarmingly large, and it is wise that we should give our earnest attention to these matters. I think it is a pity that the Secretary of State should not have taken the whole question into serious consideration, and rather come to Parliament and ask that some restrictions should be placed on the operations of this Act than that he should have added so largely to the burthens of the country, as this Act is doing year by year. I think it is desirable, notwithstanding the different political opinions we hold, notwithstanding the different opinions we hold on great and important questions in this country, that on important questions of this kind we should earnestly and honestly devote our best endeavors to cutting down matters of expediture that can be reasonably reduced. I think it is wise that, in the present condition of things, with evidences of expenditure increasing, with evidences of difficulties which are likely to add largely to our national expenditures and our national debt, I think it is of vital importance that we should pay attention to matters that can be reduced, and not permit laws to be put on our Statute Book which will annually increase the amount of money which we are called on to pay out in this way, item by item, increasing the debt of the country, increasing the amount of our annual expenditure, so that it is mounting up to a sum which is really becoming alarming. Now, I think we should pay some little attention to this matter. For my own part, I have no desire to get up and talk for the purpose of offering any factious opposition to the measures before the House. I simply wish, for myself, and in the interest of those I represent, to express a candid opinion of this question. When the different clause of the Bill were before the House, I did not take any active part in the discussion upon them. I left the discussion of them to those whom I thought better qualified to practically discuss them than myself. But I have listened to the whole discussion on this question, and I think it is highly desirable that we should try to find some way of preventing the increased expenditure that is going to take place under the operation of this Act. I was rather struck with the number of candidates who came before the examiners for examination. It appears that between 1,000 and 1,200 came before those examiners in order to procure certificates, that they might be eligible for positions in the Civil Service, if positions should offer. Now, we find that last year some fifty-six civil servants, were superannuated, whose places will have to be filled up. In addition to that, there are increases going on every year, although it is to be hoped they will not go on as rapidly in the future as they have during the past few years, when it has been necessary, I suppose, owing to the development of the North-West, that an increase should be made to the Post Office and other Departments. Yet we find that for the vacancies thus created we have about 1,200 young men walking about with certificates in their pockets, waiting day after day and month after month, in the hope that perhaps they will get notice from Ottawa that there is a place open for them. Moreover, no doubt, also they will keep pressing upon their political friends to use their influence at Ottawa to get them positions. I say it is injurious to the youth of the country to place them in that unsettled state. We should not hold out to them that it is possible or probable for them to become civil servants. When we remember these things, it is difficult to understand how the Government are able to withstand the applications made to them for positions, month after month and year after year. I do not wonder that some of the Departments are overstocked, when we consider that there are 211 members in this House, and that the Government have the support of two-thirds of that number; and I do not suppose that there is a single member who has not friends and relatives pressing him from day to day to urge on the Government to open up some place for them. The result is that the Government are being continually bored to find places for all kinds of people, when there are in reality 90 to 95 per cent. more in the country holding certificates than are wanted. Now, I do not think that is a proper state of things, and I do not think the system will commend itself to the country. There is another question which I think is closely allied to this. The manner in which people are admitted to the Civil Service tends very largely to augment the number that are removed by superannuation. We have a large number now on the superannuation list, and no doubt from political influence many people are admitted to the Civil Service who should never have got a place there. In many instances a young man is urged upon the Government, and after being kept for some time, perhaps for years, the Government do not like to turn him on the street again. They would rather put up with the very inefficient service such a young man is capable of rendering than give his friends a chance to find fault, and say that he was first admitted and then turned out. In many instances, I have no doubt, men are kept performing duties that are inefficiently performed, are receiving salaries much greater than they are worth. I cannot understand why, when we meet here in Parliament,

the first month of the Session is gone through before we have any of the documents laid before us that are prepared by the Civil Service. I think if efficiency was the rule we should have the papers laid before Parliament in a more efficient and forward condition when we meet here than they are. I do not wish to reflect on any of the Departments. In some of them perhaps the work is increasing, but I think some determined effort should be made by the Government to see that the work in the several Departments here should be in a more forward condition when Parliament meets, so that we should not be here waiting for a month for a number of returns that should be brought down early. Now, in Ottawa, there are 140 clerks, receiving an annual average salary of $1,346.66, and I do not think you could find in any other part of the Dominion such a proportion of clerks drawing an equal salary. I do not see the necessity of adding $50 a year to the salary of a man who is getting $1,200 or $1,500 a year, especially in a country like ours, where the price of everything is moderate. In addition to this, last year these 140 clerks have been paid $412 each for extra services, which makes an average payment to each clerk of $1,758.66. Now, I think that is a very handsome allowance, and any clerk receiving that amount should be satisfied to live on it, without any increase, and considering the limited amount of work the Civil Service clerks have to do. They only serve six hours a day, and if they devoted the balance of their time to purposes of their own, they ought to be able to lay by money upon a salary of that kind. I think this Civil Service Act ought to be altered in toto. I would prefer to see the whole Act wiped out, and something different altogether adopted, so that all this political influence to obtain positions for friends might be removed, and that the members of the Government would not be under the necessity of meeting the wishes of their friends in this respect. I think in all probability we should get a more efficient service, and the Government would be free from the worry they must be now subjected to, in trying to please their friends. The remarks dropped by the leader of the Opposition were very pertinent to this question. I think that the present Act is simply a sham. It only places the Government in a position in which they will have to submit to a certain amount of worry in order to find places and positions for their hangers-on and political friends. The result is, we have more clerks than we would otherwise have, and have men also appointed to positions, the duties of which they are unable efficiently to discharge. To get rid of such men, the Government makes use of the superannuation system, so that the one thing helps the other, and the result is, we have at present a superannuated class of 433 men, walking about doing nothing and drawing an allowance of $200,000 a year, while we are paying others full salary to do their work. There is no class in the Dominion better paid than the public servants, and who do less work for the money they receive; there are none who have easier times or greater privileges, and, everything considered, a stop should be put to all this. Hon. gentlemen opposite will find, when the country gets thoroughly educated to the operations of this system, the people will rise and rebel against it; and I shall be glad if they would, because it is high time a stop should be made to the working of an Act which will add very considerable to the burdens of the country if passed in its present shape. I hope the hon. the Secretary of State will take the question into serious consideration, and withdraw the Bill, on the understanding that something in the character of what hasbeen suggested on this side of the House be adopted, so as to make the service much less expensive, without impairing its efficiency. I consider it my duty to make these remarks, because I think it is the duty of every man to speak his mind when a question of such great importance as this is before the House.

Mr. FISHER. The discussion which has arisen on this Bill this afternoon has shown that notwithstanding the efforts which the hon. the Secretary of State has made towards improving the law, which is in his special charge, he has evidently not succeeded, according to the views of a great many members of this House. Not only is that the case, but when we reflect upon the words of the First Minister this afternoon, it is very evident that the law, which the hon. the Secretary of State has been attempting to amend, does not really embody the essential principles of that law which the First Minister so largely extolled this afternoon. As I understood his words, he held up to us, as an example to be followed, the Civil Service law in England, and expressed his admiration for that law, chiefly on the ground that by it the civil service was entirely removed from any question of party stripe. Now, as I understand the Civil Service examinations in England, they are so removed; and why? Because, chiefly, I might almost say entirely, the rule is laid down in them that office and preferment should be given as the result of competitive examination; that is to say, the grade in which a competitor passes at the examination determines the question of his obtaining his promotion or the place he desires, and more than that——

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I would ask the hon. gentleman to keep to the question. It is all very well to waste the time of the House, as hon. gentlemen opposite have done in discussing, three or four times over, the principle of the Bill; but I think that now the hon. gentleman should keep to the question proposed in the amendment before the Chair.

Mr. FISHER. The question which we are discussing involves, to a great extent, the principles of the Bill. The Bill is a Bill to amend the whole Civil Service Act of the country.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Does the hon. gentleman know what is the question before the Chair?

Mr. FISHER. Certainly.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I doubt it.

Mr. FISHER. I have heard the amendment which has been placed before the House, and I know perfectly well what it is, and what it is aiming at. The question to which I have alluded is, I think, wholly within the purview of the amendment, which is entirely directed towards effecting economy in the Civil Service of the country, and that economy can best be accomplished by removing the Civil Service wholly from the arena of party strife; otherwise, we cannot possibly accomplish the end the mover of this amendment has in view. Hon. gentlemen opposite, in carrying out their desire to reward their supporters, with disregard to the economy of the public service, and instead of dealing with the question entirely in the view of the interests of the public service, will do so with the desire to reward political favorites. I believe that the example which has been held out to us by England is one that ought to be followed by us.

Mr. BOWELL. I rise to a question of order. I would like your ruling, Mr. Speaker, on the question as to whether an amendment proposed to the third reading of a Bill, a full discussion of the merits and principles of the Bill, is in order. Such discussion has been had already, over and over again; and if it is to be repeated on each amendment, there will be no end to it. The question before the House, as embodied in the amendment, is that a certain clause, which grants to an officer, on his performing the duty of another and a higher officer, on account of the death or illness, or the unavoidable absence of the other, shall receive his salary for the time being. The hon. gentleman claims that that involves the whole principle of the Bill, and I must ask your ruling on this point.

Mr. DALY. On the motion for a third reading of a Bill, when there is an amendment of this sort put before the House, it is competent for hon. gentlemen to enter very largely into the discussion of the Bill; but they should confine themselves as much as possible to the resolution in amendment. At the same time, I do not think the hon. gentleman has gone so far as to necessitate my calling him to order.

Mr. BOWELL. What has the examination system in England to do with this amendment?

Mr. FISHER. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, and the House, that I have no desire whatever to take up the time of the House unnecessarily. I desire simply to deal with a question which I consider to be within the scope of the amendment now before us, and I regret that I have even laid myself open in any sense to the imputation that I may have gone beyond that, and will try to the utmost to follow the ruling you have laid down. I was referring to the English Civil Service Act, and our desire in dealing with our Civil Service Act was to adopt that as our standard, as an example we would do well to follow. The amendment of the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) is one the object of which is to restrict extravagance in the Civil Service. In doing so my hon. friend has attempted to do away with what may be considered by hon. gentlemen opposite a very small piece of extravagance, but one which I consider to be absolutely unnecessary for the efficient working of the service. The amendment is to the 52nd section of this Bill, second clause, which reads as follows:—

"When the duties of any superior officer or clerk, during his absence, or by reason of his demise, but not through superannuation, are continuously performed by an officer or clerk of an inferior class or junior rank, during a period of more than three months, the officer or clerk performing such duties may, on the report of the deputy head, concurred in by the head of the Department, by Order in Council, and provided that funds are available under parliamentary vote for such payment, receive, in addition to his ordinary pay, the difference between such ordinary pay and the pay of the officer or clerk whose duties he has performed, for the time he has performed such duties."

The amendment declares that the contrary should be the case; that the clerk or inferior officer who performs these duties, should continue to receive the pay he would receive in his ordinary capacity, and I think that, independent of any question of increased cost to the Civil Service to be brought about by this clause, it is but reasonable that such officer should receive only his pay in the capacity in which he ordinarily serves. Supposing that an officer is performing the duties of a higher position; if he is able to perform those duties, one of two things must follow; either he ought ordinarily to be receiving the pay which these duties deserve, and which the officer who usually performs them gets, or the officer who usually performs those duties only ought to be getting the pay which this other inferior officer usually gets. If that inferior officer is able to perform these duties, there is no reason whatever, in common sense, why another officer should receive higher pay for performing the same duties. But if this lower officer is capable in every way efficiently to perform these duties, he should receive the higher remuneration therefor. But I find, in this report of the Civil Service Commissioners, which has been so frequently referred to here to-day, and which I consider more valuable than almost any report which has lately been issued in the public service, a recommendation that we—

"Provide with equal stringency that promotions shall only be made to actual vacancies, and then only upon the certificate of the head of the Department as to fitness, and of the Civil Service Board that the qualifications of the person it is proposed to promote have been satisfactorily established, both as to character, business habits and knowledge of the duties required of the incumbent of the office to which it is proposed to make the appointment."

Now, Sir, in the circumstance which this sub-section alludes to, there has been no such test of the incumbent's qualification for the office he is going to fill; there has been no test as to whether he is qualified by his knowledge of the duties of the office. I have nothing whatever to say against the hon. gentleman's qualification test as to the character, business habits, etc., because probably an official who has been allowed to carry out the duties of the inferior office must have been able to meet this test in regard to those points. But as to the knowledge required for the fulfilment of the duties of this new office, there is no test whatever; and I think I may safely conclude that in a very large majority of cases the gentleman who has been temporarily put into another office will not perform the duties of that office competently or efficiently, or in the way in which the ordinary incumbent would be able to perform them; and the result would be that these duties would not be performed so well as they were by the ordinary incumbent, and therefore the temporary occupant should not receive the remuneration which the ordinary incumbent of the office would receive. There are two reasons why, in this section, the superior office may be filled by an inferior officer. One is, that in the case of leave of absence. Now, Sir, I suppose that, as a rule, where an officer has been away from his Department for over three months, he has probably got leave of absence. If his duties are being performed by another officer during his leave of absence, this permanent officer is probably receiving his full salary. It is due to the Department generally that some of the officials in that Department should take their own share in doing such work. In any Department there must be leave of absence granted to one or other members of that Department almost continuously, and if on such an occasion an inferior officer is obliged to do the work of a superior officer, probably on another occasion that man himself would get leave of absence, and then perhaps the superior officer would have to do his work. Under such circumstances, I do not think it is any hardship at all to ask that any one officer of a Department may be obliged to do the work of some other officer, who may happen to be absent for a short time in the way I allude to, as a matter of convenience, and to accommodate his fellow official. In the case of a demise, which is the only other reason given for the substitution of one official for another, I do not see why that should be allowed to take place frequently. When an official dies, it seems to me it is the duty of the Government to fill his place immediately, so far as is consistent with the public service; and I believe they ought to be able to produce most satisfactory reasons for departing from the course laid down, which is, that they should fill these offices as soon as possible by the person next in grade in that Department. If this were done, as I believe it ought to be done, and as promptly as possible, there would practically be no necessity for this section in the law. The superior office would be filled by the successor of the officer who had just died, and the result would be that, instead of a temporary occupancy of that office, the official would only get his rights, and be able to succeed the former official and get the full salary and the permanency, instead of taking the office as a mere temporary expedient. I will not go into the other reasons which have been given by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), but I consider that even although the economy that would be accomplished by expunging this section is not a very important economy in itself, it is still of sufficient importance to justify this House, in my opinion, in supporting the amendment of my hon. friend, which I intend to do.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Davies, p. 1297.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Fairbank,	McCraney,
Auger,	Fisher,	McIntyre,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fleming,	McMullen,
Béchard,	Forbes,	Mills,
Bernier,	Geoffrion,	Mulock,

Blake,	Gillmor,	Peterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Gunn,	Platt,
Burpee,	Harley,	Ray,
Cameron (Huron),	Holton,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Innes,	Somerville (Brant),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Irvine,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cartwright,	Jackson,	Springer,
Casey,	King,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casgrain,	Kirk,	Trow,
Catudal,	Landerkin,	Vail,
Cockburn,	Langelier,	Watson,
Cook,	Laurier,	Weldon,
Davies,	Lister,	Wilson,
Edgar,	Livingstone,	Yeo.—57.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Dundas,	McCallum,
Allison,	Dupont,	McCarthy,
Bain (Soulanges),	Farrow,	McDougald (Pictou),
Baker (Missisquoi),	Ferguson (L'ds & Gren.),	McDougall (C. Breton),
Baker (Victoria),	Ferguson (Welland),	McLelan,
Beaty,	Gagné,	McNeill,
Bell,	Gault,	Massue,
Benoit,	Gigault,	Moffat,
Bergeron,	Girouard,	Montplaisir,
Bergin,	Gordon,	Pinsonneault,
Billy,	Grandbois,	Pope,
Blondeau,	Guilbault,	Pruyn,
Bossé,	Guillet,	Reid,
Bourbeau,	Hackett,	Riopel,
Bowell,	Hall,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bryson,	Hesson,	Ross,
Burnham,	Hickey,	Royal,
Burns,	Homer,	Rykert,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hurteau,	Small,
Carling,	Jamieson,	Smyth,
Caron,	Jenkins,	Sproule,
Chapleau,	Kaulbach,	Stairs,
Cimon,	Kilvert,	Taschereau,
Coughlin,	Kinney,	Tassé,
Coursol,	Kranz,	Taylor,
Curran,	Labrosse,	Temple,
Cuthbert,	Landry (Kent),	Townshend,
Daly,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper,
Daoust,	Langevin,	Vanasse,
Dawson,	Lesage,	Wallace (York),
Desaulniers (Maski'gé),	Macdonald (King's),	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wigle,
Dickinson,	Mackintosh,	Wood (Brockville),
Dodd,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wood (Westm'ld).—103.
Dugas,		

Amendment negatived.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have to announce that the following telegram has been received:—

"Pitt policemen under Dickens arrived by river at Battleford this morning. One killed, one wounded. Previous to leaving, all the settlers with McLean gone into the Indian camp."

I understand that McLean is the Indian agent.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What does that mean—"gone into the Indian camp?"

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not know. I have read all that I have.

CIVIL SERVICE ACTS AMENDMENT.

Mr. LISTER. During the past three or four days, while measures of very great importance to this country were under discussion, hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House took the opportunity of charging members on this side with attempting to waste the time of the House. I desire again to remind the hon. the Secretary of State, although he has been frequently reminded of that fact during these discussions, that the House was called here for the transaction of business on the 29th January last; that we have been sitting here from that time up to the present, and that, during the whole of that time, no measures of importance have been brought before us until a very recent date. It is a scandal and a disgrace to the Government of the day to have called hon. members here at a time of the year when they would have been better at home, without first being prepared to submit to Parliament those measures for which they called us together. If there has been any waste of time the Government must be responsible for it, and must answer to the country for it. We are deputed by the people of this country to come here and discuss such measures as may be laid before Parliament, and we are not discharging that duty honestly, we are not faithfully observing the promises which we made, if we do not give that amount of discussion to all measures submitted to Parliament which their importance deserves. How little hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House regard this duty is of no importance to us. We have a duty to discharge, and members on this side will discharge it, regardless altogether of what hon. members on the other side may think. It has been noticeable, throughout this whole Parliament, that hon. members have sat in the back benches on the other side of the House, prepared to vote for any measure that the Government thought proper to introduce, and to vote for it without any discussion at all. They may think that that is discharging fairly and honestly what they have been sent here to discharge. The country, perhaps, may take a different view of the matter. If they are here merely for the purpose of recording their votes, they might have sent those votes to the Speaker, and save the country the expense of their presence in Parliament. I can only say that, no matter what they may consider to be their duty, I consider it to be mine, at all events, to speak freely, and whatever I feel inclined to speak, notwithstanding the interruptions of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I may say that I do not consider it is fair treatment to me, at all events, who have always listened patiently to whatever they may have thought proper to say, whether it was absurd or not, and it has been very often absurd, I must confess. So far as our Civil Service system is concerned, I say it is a farce. I say that the examinations under the Civil Service Act are a simple comedy. To say that this is any test as to the fitness of a candidate, as to the fitness of a person who seeks employment in the public service, to my mind is nonsense. I know that it is no ground for promotion or for employment in the public service, that a man has passed the Civil Service examination. The ability with which he has passed that examination gives him no priority, so far as employment is concerned. In that respect the whole system is a farce. We know that, on the Civil Service examination list to-day, there are hundreds of young men who have passed creditable examinations, and, if their right to be employed in the Civil Service was in accordance with the examination they have passed, they would be employed, but we know that the employment is not in accordance with the creditable character of the examination, but that the employment is dependant upon the political influence that these men can secure for the purpose of getting positions in the service. It is a fact that men who have passed this examination, months—yes, years ago—are to-day unemployed, while to my own knowledge, others who passed but recently, but were able to get together the influence which was necessary, have secured positions in the public service. That is not as it ought to be. If we have a Civil Service, it should be composed of men who have not secured their appointments by political influence and favor, but these appointments should be secured by the ability which they show in these examinations, regardless entirely of what their political feelings or leanings may be. That is not the position of this country to-day, and as a Canadian, desiring to see our Civil Service not filled by a parcel of place-hunters, not filled by men who know their appointment is dependent entirely upon the political influence of a particular political party. I would that the positions in the Civil Service were filled by men who go to discharge the duties, unwedded to one political party or the other, and who have no object but the object and desire to serve the country faithfully and well.

We know that it is not the case to-day, and I would it was the case, because I believe the service would be more efficient and the people of the country would get a better consideration for what they spend .In looking over this Bill I find that the Secretary of State wants to take to himself powers which he never had before. Sub-section 2 of section 8 provides that the board of examiners shall be supervised by the Secretary of State. I find further, in section 10, that all appointments to the Civil Service shall be during pleasure, and no person shall be appointed or promoted to any position, below that of a deputy head, unless he has passed the requisite examination. In 1880, I think, a commission was appointed, for the purpose of investigating and reporting upon the whole question of Civil Service reform. I find that section 36 of that report read thus:

"Having arrived at the conclusion above stated as to the advantages of the system we recommend, we have now to propose the means of giving effect to our suggestion. This, we believe, can only be satisfactorily accomplished by the constitution of a Board of Civil Service Commissioners, as free from political influence as the judiciary happily is. To the action of this board we propose to refer all those questions which heretofore have hampered and imperrilled the administration of the Civil Service. We propose that this board shall be composed of men holding an independent position and capable of obtaining general confidence, the board to consist of three members, one of whom shall be a French Canadian, the members to be appointed in the same manner and hold office on the same tenure as the judges. We believe that the decisions of an impartial tribunal, thus constituted, would command the respect and confidence of the public and of the service."

As the law is to-day, a board of examiners is appointed. That board is under the control of the Secretary of State, and holds office during pleasure. It is needless to say that a board, constituted as that board is, must, to a greater or less extent, be under the influence of the Secretary of State, and, perchance, of other members of the Government. The leader of the Government often tells this House that our legislation is inspired by the legislation of England. If the Secretary of State would adopt the law as it exists in England—providing it is determined to continue the Civil Service examinations—if he would make perfect the Civil Service of this country, he would, in this respect, adopt the law that has been and is in force in England. Under that law a Board of Civil Service Commissioners is appointed, and that board employs and controls the examiners. The Government and, no member of the Government has anything to do with the examiners. They have no power over the commissioners, who hold office during good behavior. Their tenure of office is fixed, as much so as is that of the judges of the land; and so long as they conduct themselves properly the Government has no right to dismiss them. They are there, to a certain extent, and as far as it is possible to make them, entirely independent of the Government. That board of commissioners has, as I have stated, the right to appoint examiners. As the law exists in England, the Civil Service is entirely free from political influence. No member of Parliament, be his influence and power great or small, can affect one iota the appointment of a civil servant. That is as it ought to be. To-day our system in Canada is a pernicious system. To-morrow the Government that is in power to-day may be out of power, and another party may have taken its place. It places the members of the Civil Service in a false position. When many hundreds of them have been appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite, it leaves them open to the suspicion of the men who succeed the Government of the day that they are false to those who then may occupy the Treasury benches. It is not right that civil servants should be subjected to all this suspicion, no matter how groundless it may be. I do not charge the civil servants of this country with any impropriety of that kind; but I do feel that civil servants are open to suspicion, if anything goes wrong in a Department and information leaks out, that they are allowing their political influences to override what should be their proper sense of duty. Under the English system, no such thing is possible. The board of commissioners are appointed and they cannot be removed, except for cause. They appoint a board of examiners, and every office in the Civil Service is recommended by the board of commissioners. So that hon. gentlemen will see that such would be exceedingly difficult, unless the board of commissioners could be approached and they could so far forget the sense of duty which should actuate them in the discharge of so important a duty; and I am safe in saying that no one would attempt to use influence with respect to them. There are men of all political creeds in the Civil Service. The question is not asked whether he is a Liberal or Conservative; but his fitness is proved by the examination, and in due time he receives his appointment. How different that is from the plan in this country. To-day, as I have said, hundreds of young men throughout the length and breadth of the country have been seeking to pass the examinations before the Civil Service examiners, which they consider should entitle them to a position in the service. As has been properly remarked by the hon. member who preceded me, for months and years successful candidates have carried their certificates in their pockets, expecting day by day and month by month to get appointments, when they should have been devoting their energies to something else, that would have, no doubt, proved more beneficial to themselves and the country. Is that a proper position for the service to occupy. When it is not desired to appoint these men, they are told that between 500 and 600 candidates are in advance of them. This House and this country owes it to themselves to have a Civil Service free of all political bias, a Civil Service that recognises only the Government of the country, no matter whether that Government may be filled, for the time being, with Conservatives or Reformers. I say, Sir, it is discreditable to this country to find, when elections are going on, men occupying positions in the Civil Service acting as partisans for one party or the other, and, going further, and advocating the elections on one side or the other. Not only so, but I believe that, in order to place them apart from the political turmoil which is incident to every country with free institutions, it would be just to those men, it would be doing them a real service, if they were not permitted to vote at all. I believe it would have the effect of purifying and elevating the public service of this country, and enabling those men to discharge more satisfactorily the duties which they have to discharge in the offices they occupy. Now, Sir, it seems to me, so far as I have been able to judge, that the whole aim and object of hon. gentlemen opposite is to make places for placemen. I regret that this should be the case at the present time. I regret, Sir, that in view of our present financial position it should be necessary for the Government to take any such position as would increase the burthens of this already overtaxed country. What do we find, Sir? We find that the condition of this country to-day is deplorable in the extreme. We find that the condition of the country is such that, during the present fiscal year, there will be an expenditure of, I am safe in saying, $35,000,000. We can look back a few years and we are reminded that some six years ago that expenditure was only $23,500,000, and that in the short space of six or seven years this Administration has succeeded in rolling up the annual expenditure of the country by something over $12,000,000. In view of that fact, I say the Government should strain every nerve and use every exertion to reduce in every possible way the expenditure of the country, because, as I say, this country is to-day overburthend with taxation; it is fairly exhausted. But, as I stated a moment ago, it seems to be the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, instead of economising the public resources of the country, to take every step possible for the purpose of increasing that already great and enormous expenditure. If the Finance Minister were in his place, I would take this

opportunity of reminding him that when he sought election in 1878 he stated to the people of this country that, if the Conservative party were returned to power, he would be able to conduct the public affairs of this country under an annual expenditure of $22,500,000. I would ask him if he remembers that promise, and I would ask him to explain how he carried it out. We have, in addition to that, a public debt, amounting, I believe, to something like $270,000,000, and that, Sir, in a young country like this is appalling. The people have not considered fairly and properly the position they are in financially. Yet, Sir, in the face of that enormously increasing annual expenditure, I repeat that it seems to be the aim and object of the Government to add to the burthens of this already overtaxed country. Now, Sir, I can only say that, so far as this statute is concerned, I think the clause which the Secretary of State proposes to insert here, giving him the power to supervise the actions of the board of examiners, is a pernicious clause. I think, Sir, it is a power which the Secretary of State should not seek to get hold of. These examiners should not be controlled by him. These examiners should be free to discharge the duty which the law casts upon them, without any influence from the Secretary of State or any other persons. It seems to me that, in attempting to take this power, the Secretary of State has some ulterior object; he has some motive which is not explained to this House. Is it that in amending and consolidating this Act the Secretary of State seeks to take a power which is not given to him in the old Act. Is it that he may control this board? Does the board require to be controlled by the Secretary of State? Does the board not know what its duties are? Have men been appointed who are not prepared to discharge those duties? If they have, then they should be dismissed and others put in their places. But if men of integrity have been appointed to those positions, then the Secretary of State should not attempt to interfere with them, he should not take the power of interfering with them, because the mere fact that this power exists may have the effect of interfering with those men, and causing them to discharge their duties less satisfactorily than they would otherwise do; in a word, it would, to a certain extent, hamper the powers which this statute gives to them. I say that, in this regard, this statute is not a good one, that it should not be approved by this House. I say that we should adopt the system which has been adopted in England, namely, the appointment of a board of commissioners, who should be empowered to provide for examinations, to recommend all appointments and promotions, and that in no way whatever should the Government have the power of influencing or interfering with them in any way, but that their decisions in everything coming under their control should be absolute and final. In that way we would have an efficient Civil Service—a Civil Service removed from all political bias. If continued as it is, it must be as it has been, a body of political partisans. It is a matter of regret to all who take an interest in this country that such a state of affairs should exist. It is always a matter of regret that these men, who should be above all party or political influence, should for a moment rest under the suspicion that they would be influenced in favor of one party or the other, and in order to remove that difficulty, in order to place those men where they ought to be, I think that the Act should be amended in the ways I have briefly and feebly attempted to point out. I beg to move:

That the said Bill be not now read the third time, but be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same by providing, in accordance with the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission of 1880, for the appointment of a Board of Civil Service Commissioners, to hold office during good behavior, and to whom shall be referred all those questions which have hitherto hampered and impaired the administration of the Civil Service; and by striking out the second sub-section of section 8, which provides that the boards of examiners shall be supervised by the Secretary of State.

Mr. CASEY. I have great pleasure in supporting this amendment. I have already, during the course of the discussions on this Bill, called attention to the fact that the best law imaginable concerning the Civil Service would become and remain a nullity as long as the execution of it is left in the hands of a political Minister. Laws concerning the Civil Service are meant to be a check on Ministers in the exercise of patronage. As long as they are allowed to be the judges of what is consistent with the law and what is not, the check does not exist. In order to impose an effectual check on the undue exercise of patronage, and proper restrictions as to the character of those who are admitted into the service, it is necessary, first, to have a good law, and, secondly, to have that law administered by a board impartial and judicial in its tenure of office and in its manner of looking at such questions as these. The hon Secretary of State and other hon. gentlemen opposite who have discussed the question have seemed hitherto unable to separate the idea of a Board of Civil Service Commissioners from that of a Board of Civil Service Examiners, such as we have in Canada. The hon. gentleman who has preceded me has pointed out clearly and concisely the difference between the two boards. In England the Board of Civil Service Commissoners are the actual heads of the service; in their hands lie recommendations for appointments and promotions, the management and discipline of the service, and, in fact, all other matters connected with the routine of that service. The Ministers have not only no control over appointments or promotions, but they have no power to interfere with the discipline of the service or with ordinary departmental routine, with regards to individuals. This I consider a most wholesome and necessary provision in the English system, and one which should be adopted here. I had hoped that, had he been present, we should have had the aid of the right hon. Premier himself on this occasion. I regret that he was not here to vote for the amendment I made in furtherance of his speech in the afternoon, and I regret that he is not here to-night to give his support to this amendment in continuation of his own suggestion as to the introduction of the English system into Canada; but I am comforted by the hope that although he takes no part in the debate or in the voting in the House on the question, his influence will work mightily amongst the members of the Cabinet, and that the views he so vigorously expressed in the few remarks he made will take root and bear fruit in the near future, in the form of such changes as are now suggested. I say that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) is as necessary to the proper carrying out of the Civil Service Act as the introduction of the competitive system, or any other of the reforms constituting the much-admired English system, and for that reason I have great pleasure in supporting it. As I say, I have a great hope that it will ultimately, if not now, prevail, and that in this instance, as in others, the Government will allow themselves to be persuaded into doing what agrees, I have no doubt, with the individual sense of all members of the House and the country, and the experience of that other country from whose experience we have learned so much.

Amendment (Mr. Lister) negatived on the same division

Mr. MULOCK moved:

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but be referred back to a Committee of the Whole House, with instructions to amend the same by providing that Civil Service examiners shall not be appointed permanently, but only for the purpose of the examinations then pending, but who shall be eligible for re-appointment; that such examinations shall be held at convenient points throughout the Dominion, but only when necessary in the public interest.

He said: We have already discussed this point in committee, where a motion to the same effect was moved and

voted down. I simply wish now to call the attention of the House to what is involved in the amendment. It appears that there are now nearly 3,000 candidates who have passed the entrance examination, and who are eligible for appointment; and the probability is, that if we continue to hold these examinations as frequently as heretofore, we shall soon have thousands upon thousands of candidates for appointments in the Civil Service, and no vacancies for them. Now, it seems to me a useless expenditure of public money to hold examinations when there are no vacancies, or when it is not necessary in the public interest that such examinations should be held. At present the Secretary of State holds four examinations each year for entrance—An entrance examination in May and a supplementary examination a little later, and then an entrance examination in November and a supplemetary somewhat later—in all four entrance examinations in each year. This system of holding examinations is calculated to demoralise the youth of the country. It seems to me that the Secretary of State entirely misapprehends the object of the Civil Service examinations. In my opinion, they should not be held any oftener than is necessary to keep up the supply of candidates to enter the service. Then, with regard to the examiners, I have pointed out before that the appointment of a permanent staff is wholly unnecessary. They will not continue at their present number. If I can venture to prophecy at all, and if the Secretary of State should long continue in his present office, we will be able to turn back to this debate and show that the prophecies of to-day are carried out, when we will find him coming down to this House, from time to time, asking for the appointment of more and more permanent officers, who will finally become a great permanent expense to the people. The scheme suggested in the resolution will obviate all such objections; it recommends the appointment of men, for the time being, throughout the country, wherever examinations are held. It is a compliment to a deserving class, and a compliment is due to others than those who may be permanently in the service of the country. The country is well supplied with material, throughout its length and breadth, for the purpose of providing examiners. It is to be borne in mind that these examinations must be held at different points, between the Atlantic and the Pacific, and it is not possible for the examiners, whose head office is in Ottawa, to efficiently conduct such examinations. For these reasons I regret deeply that the Secretary of State has persistently refused to consider any of these objections, or even to discuss them. He has not condescended to discuss them in this House, but he may have an opportunity of discussing them on some other occasion. Certainly this Bill, with all its objectionable features, will not be forgotten. I think the Secretary of State has not done his duty towards this House in declining to enter into any discussion on the Bill, or on the proposed amendments to it, but silently voting and calling on his friends to silently vote. When we were in committee on his resolutions, very few members of the House were present; not one quarter of the strength of the House was present. The resolutions were then thoroughly discussed, and the Secretary of State declined to adopt any of the suggestions proposed, but he gave no reasons for declining. It was not his right to decline, without assigning reasons in committee, but when the matter came before the House, and all the members were present, it was his duty to at least attempt to sustain the principles of this Bill by argument. He did not make the attempt, but I think, with these amendments on record and the arguments advanced in their favor, the time will come when he will have reason to regret that some of the suggestions they embodied were not considered and adopted.

Amendment negatived on the same division; Bill read the third time on a division.

Mr. MULOCK.

SUPPLY—THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. CARON moved:

That the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply on His Excellency's Message, with Estimates and Message, with reference to $700,000 to meet expenses of North-West troubles.

He said: I regret to say that in consequence of illness the hon. the Minister of Finance is not in his seat to-night, and in his absence I have to make this motion. Under the present circumstances I need hardly explain to the House that the amount now asked for is for the purpose of meeting the expenses incurred and to be incurred for the troubles in the North-West, and I am perfectly certain that, under present circumstances, I can count upon hon. gentlemen on the other side to help us in passing the vote and in concurring in it immediately. I may say that the amount of money placed at the disposal of the Department of Militia by the vote taken has been exhausted, and that it is necessary this vote should be taken and concurred in immediately. The amount is made up as follows:—Special credit required for expenses in connection with the troubles in the North-West: Estimate of amount required for a period of two months for pay and subsistance, etc., of 4,000 troops placed on active service, average cost, say, $1.50 per head per day; or for 60 days, $360,000; transport $300,000; supply, equipment, military stores, etc., $40,000; total $700,000.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sure we all regret the circumstances which prevent the hon. Minister of Finance being here to-night to make this motion. I can only say that the hon. gentleman has not unduly counted upon our readiness to facilitate the taking of this vote. I have, for some time, expected that a motion of this description would be laid on the Table, and I was somewhat surprised that it was so long deferred; and that, when presented to the House, it was not earlier considered. It would have been advantageous that it should have been earlier considered, because it is unfortunate that the wise rules laid down in regard to money votes should have to be departed from; but, on the statement of the hon. gentleman, that the supplies are absolutely exhausted, and that the public service requires this immediate concurrence, I shall not interpose any obstacle to his proceeding with the committee, and obtaining this concurrence, although the ordinary rule, which is a very wholesome one, has to be departed from. I suppose that this is to be taken strictly as a vote of credit, for which an account in detail will be given afterwards, as it is as impossible, at present, for the hon. gentleman satisfactorily to defend the details, as it would be for us to criticise them; and I therefore think it better, in the interests of both sides of the House, that it should be strictly a vote of credit, accountable in that way.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LANGELIER. I see that, in the proposal just submitted by the Minister of Militia and Defence, there is a certain amount for the pay of volunteers while on duty. Is it intended to give only the ordinary allowance for the volunteers who are on service, or to give them sufficient pay to support their families? I know that, at present, in Quebec, the families of a good many of these volunteers are supported by public charity. I think this can be done for perhaps a few weeks, perhaps for a month, but I do not think it should be expected that the public would be obliged to support the families of those volunteers who are giving their time to the country, more especially when it is rather humiliating for the families of those who have not been accustomed to live by public charity. Up to this moment there has been no complaint, because it has not been

expected that the Government would be prepared to give these volunteers anything beyond the regular amount allowed by law; but, if this is to extend beyond a certain length of time, I think the Government might consider the propriety of giving them, not, perhaps, the pay they were receiving in their ordinary occupations, but enough to support their families while they are in the service of the country.

Mr. CARON. The action of the Department of Militia is controlled altogether by the law. The statute points out what can be paid to the volunteers on actual service, and outside of that, of course, I cannot go. We have provided that any portion of the pay which is given to the men can be paid over to their families, provided we get proper authority from the men themselves to pay over that amount to their families; but outside of that it is, of course, impossible for the Department to go.

Mr. LANGELIER. I know that if nothing is done it is impossible for the Government to pay more. No blame is, as I stated, to be attached to the Government on that account, because they could not do otherwise. What I wanted to know was, whether it was proposed by the Government to make a temporary alteration in the law, in order to pay, if not all the volunteers, at all events those who cannot afford to support their families, more than is allowed by the law.

Mr. CARON. I am very glad to hear what the hon. gentleman says, that so far no blame can be attached to the Government for what has been done. Of course, as far as providing for what the hon. gentleman has referred to is concerned, this vote which I have asked the House to consent to is merely to meet the requirements which I have already stated to the House, and would not provide for anything contemplated by what the hon. gentleman has said.

Mr. GAULT. I am glad to say that the people of Montreal came nobly to the front, and subscribed over $22,000, not as a charity, but as a duty we owed to the volunteers, who have nobly left their homes to put down this rebellion, for rebellion it is; I do not call it a trouble. The ladies of Montreal, also, have banded together, and provided a great many necessities—not necessities, but luxuries—to be sent forward to the volunteers. Everything that can be done for the volunteers of Montreal, at all events, is being done for them. I am very glad to say that we have done everything possible to make their stay up there pleasant and comfortable.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose this vote is taken for the service of the current year, in the nature of a supplementary estimate?

Mr. CARON. Yes; for the current year.

Committee rose and reported the resolution.

Report received, by unanimous consent.

Mr. CARON moved concurrence in the report.

Mr. BLAKE. Is it the hon. gentleman's intention to found a Bill on this resolution—a special Bill?

Mr. CARON. It is.

Resolution concurred in.

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

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12:35 a.m., Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 23rd April, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ST. GEORGE'S DAY.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE moved:

That when this House rises at six o'clock this evening, it do stand adjourned until to-morrow at three o'clock, in honor of the Patron Saint of Old England.

He said: My reasons for making this motion may be stated very briefly. This is St. George's day, the anniversary of the martyrdom of the patron saint of merry England, of the little England, great in story, mother of immortal men. I, Sir, with becoming modesty, thought it fitting that I, who bear the glorious name of one of these immortal men (William Shakespeare), should be the humble individual to introduce a resolution intended to do honor to St. George, to England and to the whole British Empire. The history of St. George is somewhat obscure; but sufficient is known of him to cause him to be almost universally recognised as the patron saint of chivalry, a brave soldier, fearing God but not man; and, Sir, in these times of war and rumors of war, when stout hearts and strong arms are of equal and perhaps greater value than the wisdom and sagacity of the philosopher and politician, the adjournment of this great political council of this Dominion of ours would be an appropriate recognition of the services of that great soldier who died while deposing the enemies of christianity. I have much pleasure, Sir, in moving this resolution.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is quite impossible that my hon. friend's motion can be carried at this time and under the present circumstances. I have no doubt that under ordinary circumstances, we should be very glad to do honor to St. George and the Red Cross; but just now there is so much business before the House that I think we must celebrate the day in our hearts and not by an adjournment.

Mr. MITCHELL. Let him give us a dinner.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the suggestion of my hon. friend for Northumberland is carried out, I can only say that the Government will not consider it as a vote of want of confidence.

Motion negatived.

GOVERNMENT LOANS FROM BANKS.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, The total amount of temporary loans obtained by the Government from banks or other sources up to April 15th, and at that date unpaid, the date and amount of each such loan and from what source obtained; the terms of each loan as to time and the rate of interest payable upon each.

Mr. BOWELL. Some of the banks object to their transactions with the Government being made public, and, as previously stated, the rates of interest paid for temporary loans are not exactly the same in all cases. The Government therefore consider it not advisable, in the public interest, that the details asked should be given at present. The sum advanced in London is £10,000 less than was stated in reply to the Address of the 18th February. No new loan has been made in Canada since last statement.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—GOVERNMENT ADVANCES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether any sum of money other than or in advance of the amount

actually due for loan or subsidy, has been advanced by the Government to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and if so, what sum was so advanced, and on what terms? Whether Government have become responsible for any sum advanced by other parties to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company?

Mr. BOWELL. No money has been advanced by the Government to the Canadian Pacific Railway beyond the amount actually due for loan or subsidy. The Government have not become responsible for advances made by other persons to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

SHIRTS FOR THE MILITIA.

Mr. RINFRET (Translation) asked, Has Mr. P. H. Chabot, of Ottawa, been awarded a contract for supplying flannel shirts for the use of the Militia? If so, what price does he receive per shirt? By whom is the material supplied, and at what price per yard?

Mr. CARON. (Translation.) Last year we asked for tenders for the supply of flannel shirts for the militia. The lowest tender has been accepted, and the contract price was $1.29 per shirt. When the North-West disturbance began we were obliged to procure a larger number of flannel shirts, and we gave a contract to Mr. Chabot at the same price as that which was paid last year under the lowest tender.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT—DRUGGISTS' LICENSES.

Mr. McCRANEY asked, Are there any provisions in the Liquor License Law, or the Canada Temperance Act, whereby county commissioners would be justified in fixing the price to be charged for druggists' licenses issued in counties where the Canada Temperance Act is in force?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think it is the duty of the Government to answer a question of this kind. The provisions of the two Acts in question speak for themselves.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT—EXPENSES OF PROSECUTIONS.

Mr. McCRANEY asked, Is it the intention of the Government to see that the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act are enforced in counties where adopted, and to provide funds, and to whom entrusted, to pay the inspector, prosecuting attorney and other officers, and from what source are the funds to be taken?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government will carry out any obligations imposed upon them by the Canada Temperance Act, whatever those obligations may be.

HORSES FOR GOVERNOR GENERAL'S BODY GUARD AND MOUNTED POLICE—A. O. F. COLEMAN.

Mr. TROW asked, Whether the Government, during the present month, authorised A. O. F. Coleman, of the city of Ottawa, to purchase horses in the county of Northumberland for the Mounted Police or the Governor General's Body Guard? What number of horses were purchased? When shipped and from what port? Where shipped to? Was A. O. F. Coleman employed by the Government in the month of December, 1881, to purchase horses for the Mounted Police in the same county?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government did not, during the present month, authorise A. O. F. Coleman, of the city of Ottawa, to purchase horses in the county of Northumberland for the Mounted Police, or for the Governor General's Body Guard. A. O. F. Coleman was not employed to purchase horses for the Mounted Police in the same county in December, 1881.

GENERAL MIDDLETON'S INSTRUCTIONS.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether it is true that General Middleton's instructions are to the effect reported by the Toronto *Mail's* correspondent, in its issue of the 20th inst., on the authority of a statement made to that correspondent by General Middleton himself, as follows:—"That the General's only instructions were to quell the rebellion and to hang murderers and responsible head men, and these orders he will carry out?"

Mr. CARON. The General's instructions are to vindicate the law and to put down armed resistance to it. The other portion of the question seems so ridiculous that I do not consider it necessary to be noticed.

JUDICIAL REFORM IN THE TERRITORIES—PETITIONS FROM CALGARY AND ALBERTA.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the Government has received a petition from the residents of Calgary, North-West Territory, on the subject of judicial reform in the Territories, and a petition from the settlers in the district of Alberta, North-West Territory, on various subjects? Whether the said petitions will be laid before the House? Whether any action has been taken or is contemplated on any of the subjects referred to in the petitions?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government have received, not one, but, I believe several petitions, from the residents of Calgary and in the vicinity of Calgary, near the Rocky Mountains, on the subject of judicial alteration in the Territories. There have been also many petitions received from settlers in the district of Alberta on various subjects. The petitions, if moved for, will be laid before the House. The action to be taken on various of these subjects, as may be required, is under the consideration of the Government.

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT, 1874—APPOINTMEMT OF CHIEF INSPECTOR.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the General Inspection Act, 1874, and to provide that a chief inspector of any of the classes of articles to which the said Act relates, may be appointed, who shall have power to decide disputes between inspectors and others in regard to articles inspected, that a deputy inspector may deal in articles which he inspects; but shall brand any article inspected by him in which he has a pecuniary interest with the word "owner"; that the city of Victoria and Port Arthur shall be added to the places mentioned in section 2 of the said Act; that additional provisions be made as to the security to be given by inspectors and deputy inspectors; that the Governor in Council may modify the classification of the several articles to which the said Act relates; that no inspection of any article shall be compulsory under the said Act; that the various grades of grain shall be better defined, and that a board shall meet for the purpose of selecting standards of grain for use by inspectors; that further provision shall be made in relation to the inspection and packing of fish, and especially of herring, gaspereaux, alewives and cod, and that the Governor in Council may appoint at any place an inspector of leather and an inspector of raw hides.

He said: The principal change proposed to be adopted by this Act is to make the inspection of all staple articles voluntary. Under the present Act, the inspection is voluntary except for fish and leather. It is voluntary in two ways. Machinery is provided by the present Act, leaving it optional to any locality to avail itself of the Act; for instance, the first thing to be done under the law, as it now stands, is that the locality should apply to be set off as an inspection district. That being done, they apply for the appointment of an inspector. That inspector is

appointed, having obtained a certificate of qualification from a local board of examiners. In some districts, I think in Prince Edward Island, up to the present time no application has been made to avail themselves of the operation of the inspection law. I think that, by leaving the inspection optional, we shall secure a better inspection. Now, for instance, the inspection of flour is optional, but we find that most of the flour is inspected, because it is supposed to give a value to the article. In the present Bill, I propose that all the machinery for inspection shall be open to every community if they think fit to avail themselves of it. but I do not mean to make the inspection obligatory on any class of articles herein enumerated, another provision is not a change, because two years ago we amended the Act to provide for Manitoba hard wheat. I think the House will understand that Manitoba grows a class of wheat that excels any quality of wheat grown upon this continent. From all we can learn, boards of trade even in the United States, have admitted that Manitoba hard wheat ranges higher than any wheat grown on this continent. I propose to give that its proper grade. Some of our friends in Ontario think they ought to have hard wheat recognised in this Act also. My first impression was to ask the House not to put that classification in the present Bill, but to give power by Order in Council, to give that grade to the wheat in Ontario, whenever reasonable evidence was given that that class of wheat was grown. However, I have yielded this point, and in this Bill I provide that hard Canadian wheat shall be recognised, so as to meet the requirements of the Ontario farmers. Another provision in the Act fixes the standard of barrels of apples and provides for the appointment of a chief inspector by the boards of trade. I think these are the principal changes made by the measure I now propose.

Mr. DAVIES. Will the hon. gentleman kindly explain what the nature of the provisions is in reference to the inspection and packing of fish. He did not refer to that part of the resolution, "and especially of herring, gaspereaux, alewives and cod."

Mr. COSTIGAN. As these are merely matters of detail, I thought it would be better to deal with them in committee.

Mr. DAVIES. I thought he might have stated the general principle of the provisions, but of course I accept his statement that it is only a matter of detail. Are the present compulsory provisions for the inspection of leather and raw hides to be abandoned, and is the inspection hereafter to be voluntary?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is to be voluntary.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. WATSON. I should like to ask the Minister if it is his intention to introduce into this Bill a special grade for Manitoba hard wheat?

Mr. CHARLTON. I should like to ask the Minister what changes he proposes to make in the grading of red and white winter wheat.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In answer to the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), I would say that we recognise a class of Manitoba hard wheat. In Ontario, we give a class of Canadian hard wheat, which, I think, is going perhaps a little in advance, as there is not much of that class produced now. I felt disposed to omit that, and to take power by Order in Council to recognise that grade after evidence was given that this wheat was grown in Ontario.

Mr. CASEY. The resolution says that the various grades of grain shall be better defined, and that the board shall select the standards of grain for use by inspectors. Do I understand the Minister to say that these various kinds of grain only refer to spring wheat?

Mr. COSTIGAN. All grains.

Mr. CASEY. Then the question arises, what change does he propose to make in the present classification of fall wheat?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman had better wait till we reach that change in the Bill.

Mr. CASEY. We might as well have some general idea beforehand. We are considering now the necessity of a Bill for the better definition of grain. I take it that the object of the present resolution in committee, is to affirm that it is advisable to have a Bill for that purpose; therefore before we make any such affirmation, I think we should be told what are the effects in the present system of grading, and why a change is necessary.

Mr. COSTIGAN. On account of the superior excellence of Manitoba wheat I provide in this Bill for a special classification. Looking at the grading fixed by our neighbors to the south of us, I find that it is necessary to alter the classification in many respects in order to place our Manitoba and North-Western farmers in a right position. In Ontario I do not find that a superior quality of hard wheat is grown to such an extent as to necessitate a classification; but I provide in the Bill that it may be classified in case the need for it should ever arise.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. Minister must know that the best fall wheat raised in Ontario holds about as eminent a position amongst winter wheats as the spring wheat of Manitoba holds amongst the spring wheats grown on the continent; and I should suppose he would make some classification with regard to that, from the terms used in the resolution.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does the Minister mean in grading Manitoba hard wheat to adopt the standard of grade that prevails in Minnesota, where they have a similar wheat?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think we provide a higher standard than they do in Minnesota, because it is admitted that our wheat is justly entitled to a higher standard.

Mr. CHARLTON. We have not succeeded in getting an answer from the hon. Minister with regard to what he proposes to do with reference to winter wheat raised in Ontario; whether the present grades are satisfactory or whether he proposes to make any change in the mode of grading winter wheats.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We propose, as I said before, to give Ontario wheat a higher classification by calling it hard wheat, Canadian wheat.

Mr. CASEY. That applies to spring wheat, I understand; but the question of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), which was my own question, referred to fall wheats, which are almost exclusively grown in the western part of Ontario.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In this Bill we have provided for winter wheat.

Mr. CASEY. There are just as many grades of quality in winter wheat as in spring wheat, and a very great variety of price between the different grades. If there is any grading at all of winter wheat, it should correspond with the actual qualities existing in that kind of wheat. I hope he will see the propriety of adopting a more definite grading with regard to these winter wheats.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I may say that the Department are fully impressed with the importance of this measure. We have been in continual communications with the boards of

trade of the different Provinces, and have been getting information from every source where it could be procured. I paid a great deal of regard to the views of the Toronto Board of Trade, because they take particular interest in this question. The Bill has been framed after consultation with the boards of trade.

Mr. CASEY. But the trouble is we do not know what is in the Bill yet.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Perhaps we will make more progress if we take up the different clauses as we reach them.

Mr. CHARLTON. There is another point upon which I would like information, and which no doubt the hon. Minister can give. The largest item of export in our agricultural production is barley. That is an important item of export. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if it is proposed to make any change in the grading of barley. Of course it is sold now upon American grading. The market is largely in Oswego, and the mode of grading adopted by American malsters and dealers is the grading that prevails here. Does the hon. Minister propose to make any change, and to adopt a Canadian standard of grading?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No change is made in the grading of barley for the simple reason that no change has been asked, and I do not propose to make any.

Mr. KIRK. Does this Bill apply to the article of fish?

Mr. COSTIGAN. To all articles.

Mr. COOK. A good many peas are now being destroyed by bugs, and we can scarcely discover any difference between the pea that has a bug, and a pea that has not a bug. I would like to know whether there is going to be any change in the inspection of peas.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is no change in the inspection of peas. The action of bugs upon peas has not been brought to our notice.

Mr. KIRK. What effect does the hon. gentleman expect this clause to have upon the inspection of fish? It is proposed to leave the inspection optional to fishermen or fish dealers.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think I stated that this law at present provides for voluntary inspection; there is no compulsory inspection. I believe in inspection, but I believe in thorough inspection. Under our present law the only articles in respect of which compulsory inspection is provided are leather and fish; in regard to all the other staple articles inspection is voluntary. But although we provide machinery, there is no compulsory inspection of either fish or leather unless application is made by the district to have the Act applied. So the voluntary principle is admitted by the present Act, except as regards fish and leather. I take the article of flour; the inspection is voluntary. Flour, is, however inspected, and that inspection has a value. As regards fish, we provide machinery for inspection and we leave inspection optional. The inspector knows that under the voluntary system, unless he establishes a character for his inspection, it will be useless, and no one will have fish inspected by him. The law has worked so well as regards flour—and inspection has established the character of our flour—that although it is not compulsory still inspection is made.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman knows that for the last ten years the law has made the inspection of fish compulsory. A radical change is now proposed by the hon. Minister, that the compulsory system introduced in 1874, and which has existed ever since, shall be abandoned. In making that proposal he should be able to adduce to the House some evidence that a demand for the change has been made, either by fishermen or those in the trade. Has there been anything in the working of the compulsory system which requires a change from compulsory to voluntary. Not only was the compulsory system introduced in 1874, but it was afterwards provided that Newfoundland fish should be inspected. That was done on the ground that consumers demanded it. I do not mean to say whether the voluntary system is right or wrong, but the hon. gentleman should give the House the data upon which he came to the conclusion that the system which has been in force for ten years should be abolished and a new system introduced. The hon. gentleman has given no reason. Is the hon. gentleman able to state that any evils have grown out of the existing system? All I understand him to state is, that the inspection of certain articles has a commercial value, and he wishes that value to be continued irrespective of the compulsory system. It seems that the compulsory system applies to raw hides and leather. I am aware that the opinion of those engaged in the manufacture of those articles is that the Act has worked well. Has any information been received, either from the inspectors or those engaged in the sale of raw hides, or manufacturers of leather, to induce the Minister to repeal the Act which has been in force ten years, and introduce a new one?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not know what the hon. gentleman would consider a good reason for the proposed change. I have given one. I can give him no better reason than the action of his own Province. I have told him that the Act to-day is voluntary, except as regards fish and leather.

Mr. DAVIES. That is all I spoke of.

Mr. COSTIGAN. And even as regards fish and leather inspection is voluntary, optional. It is compulsory just so soon as you adopt the Act in any district. Does he not know that since the Act has been in force, inspection has been optional in his own Province as it has never asked to have the Act placed in operation there? The hon. gentleman asks me why I change the system and make it voluntary. It has been voluntary, and the people of Prince Edward Island have taken advantage of the optional clause. I do not propose to place them in any worse position than they occupy at the present time, but simply to leave them where they are. I provide machinery for inspection, but do not make it compulsory in any case.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I did not speak from the standpoint of a Province. I did not complain with respect to one particular Province that the Act worked badly; but I was speaking of the principles of the Act, which it is sought to change. It is not voluntary in a general sense. Wherever inspectors are appointed it is compulsory. Take raw hides for example. The hon. gentleman knows that, as regards that article, the Act is compulsory because inspectors have been appointed. From whom does the demand for a change come?

Mr. COSTIGAN. In all cases where inspection has been optional no difficulty has occurred; the difficulty has arisen where it was compulsory. The hon. gentleman will agree with me that I am not putting him in any worse position.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman did not speak for himself, he spoke for other Provinces.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I am speaking of the hon. gentleman's Province. He asked me why I wished Parliament to change the principle of the Act and make inspection optional. I reply that to-day it is optional, except as regards fish and leather; and in even those two articles it is optional, unless the locality asks to come under the operation of the Act. If New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island or Ontario does not ask to establish districts under this law, the inspection of leather or fish is optional. So the Act is really voluntary after all. I have pointed out that as regards the inspection of flour, which is not compulsory, the system has worked well, and I wish to apply

the voluntary principle to all inspection. I do not, however, deprive anyone of the right to have articles inspected if they desire, because we provide machinery for inspection in the Bill.

Mr. KIRK. For my part I am sure the hon. gentleman is doing just what is right. He talks about the compulsory character of the Act at present, and to a certain extent it is so, but so far as Nova Scotia is concerned to a great extent it is not. When an inspector was appointed in the city of Halifax, all fish coming there had to be inspected, and therefore the counties dealing with Halifax were obliged either to submit to a very expensive system of inspection at Halifax or else bring their own counties under the operation of the Act. For that reason some of the counties did bring themselves under the operation of the Act, and the question in my mind with regard to the operation of this Act is, whether or not that system will be continued at Halifax or, if it is continued, if fishermen send fish from my own county, whether they will require to have them inspected, and will be charged for the inspection accordingly.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the Minister will admit that it is justifiable that we should have considerable explanation on the resolutions before us, for evidently the Bill which is to be founded upon them will be a Bill very materially altering the provisions of the Inspection Act of 1874. No doubt the Minister gave a great deal of attention to that Bill, which was a consolidation of the Acts, and also applied them to the whole Dominion, and I think we should know why, at the end of this Session, he is proposing to introduce a Bill which alters the character of that Act in many very material respects. Any one looking at the resolutions will see that we are face to face with a Bill involving, if I understand the resolutions aright, a great deal of extra expenditure on the country. There are changes proposed by these resolutions which seem to me to be so serious, in view of the different clauses of the Act of 1874, that we should have some explanation about them. Now what are the resolutions; the first is:

"Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the General Inspection Act, 1874, and to provide that a chief inspector of any of the classes of articles to which the said Act relates, may be appointed, who shall have power to decide disputes between inspectors and others in regard to articles inspected, that a deputy inspector may deal in articles which he inspects, but shall brand any article inspected by him in which he has a pecuniary interest with the word 'owner.'"

This is a radical change in the provisions of the Act, because, under the existing Act, the deputy-inspector is bound by penalties and by the oath which he takes to abstain from doing the very thing which you now propose to give him power to do. Then there are one or two districts to be added, and as to that I suppose we will have to be satisfied. Again, we find that additional provision is made with regard to the inspectors, and we should know the reasons why this is required, and whether there has been any loss under the securities proposed last Session. Another important provision is that the Governor in Council may modify the classification of the several articles to which the Act relates. Another provides that no inspection of any article shall be compulsory under the Act, that the various grades of grain shall be better defined, and that a board shall meet for the purpose of selecting standards of grain for use by inspectors. That is a very important question, at any rate in Manitoba, if I rightly read the papers from that part of the country. Now, I would submit that these provisions are so important that we should have a full explanation of the various changes in the order in which they occur. With reference to the first, in reading the Act I find that there are several articles numerated, namely, flour and meal, wheat and other grains, meat, potash and pearl ash, pickled fish and fish oil, butter, leather and raw hides. Under the provisions of these resolutions the Minister takes power to appoint a number of chief inspectors if he sees fit, and I suppose they will be salaried officers, and that adequate salaries will have to be paid them. That would seem to be a serious charge on the revenue of the country, and if they are not to be paid by salary, but by fees, then it will be a serious charge on those having articles inspected. I think before assenting to this change we should have very full explanation. The Act has only been in force a few years, and therefore the disputes must have been very numerous to lead him to ask for such a power as this.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The arrangement is one which has been urged upon the Government by boards of trade in the leading cities of Canada. It is not intended that these inspectors shall be appointed as salaried officers. In fact they may not be appointed at all, but we wish to take power to appoint them, on the representation of these boards of trade. The chief inspectors are to be paid by fees and not by salaries. Now with regard to allowing owners to inspect fish and other articles, I found that last year when we were discussing the question, hon. gentlemen urged very strongly that deputy inspectors ought to be appointed from among fishermen or others who had experience, as they were the best qualified to discharge those duties. What we could not concede then when the inspection was compulsory, is a very different thing now when the inspection is voluntary, and there can be no objection to allowing fishermen and other parties interested in the goods to inspect them, when the precaution is taken to have them specially branded, as the amount of inspection the inspector may do will depend on the confidence the people have in him.

Mr. PATERSON. In what manner are the fees to be levied? If there are disputes between the inspectors and those having articles inspected, is there to be a fee for each dispute, and if so, for what rate?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman the rate at present.

Mr. PATERSON. In these disputes if the inspector is found in fault will he pay the fee, or, if the other party is in fault will it be paid by him? What fee is likely to be paid and who will pay it?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman what the fees will be until later on.

Mr. PATERSON It seems to me that it was the duty of the Minister to have put the amount of the fees in the resolution.

Mr. CASEY. I suppose as this involves a tax it must originate by resolution, and should not the amount of the fees be stated in the resolution?

Mr. DUNDAS. I think those in trade will find it very advantageous to have a chief inspector appointed in each Province. At present in Ontario each town and each city has its own inspector, and a separate grade established by the Board of Trade There is no uniformity at all. In the article of barley, for instance, Toronto has one standard and Whitby another, and there is no uniformity either in the classification or in the name of the grade established. The appointment of a chief inspector, whose duty it would be to establish the grade, will be advantageous, I think, not only with regard to the article of grain, but everything else. With regard to voluntary inspection, when an article is inspected, compulsorily, the inspection largely loses its value. Unless it is optional with parties to have their property inspected, and unless that inspection is worth something, there is no object in having it inspected. If the inspected article, by reason of the standard established, is made more valuable to the public, therein lies the value of the inspection.

Mr. STAIRS. This question of inspection is a very important one, especially to the fishing trade of the Lower Provinces. A great deal of consideration has been given to it during the past few years, and I believe the proposal to make the inspection voluntary will commend itself to this House and to the public, and although this view is not in accord with the opinions of some of my friends in Nova Scotia, I know that it is in accord with the views of the majority of those engaged in the fishing trade. As I understand, the reason for the inspection of any article is to induce producers to improve the quality of the article produced; if it has not this effect it can be of no practical good. The experience in Nova Scotia in the last few years has shown that the Act has not hitherto had this effect to as great an extent as is desirable, as the quality of the fish has not materially improved in that time. The hon. Minister in charge of this resolution and my hon. friend who has just spoken are correct in saying that if the inspection is of any commercial value at all, it would be adopted by the dealers; and if the experience of the past few years has proved that the fish inspection has had no commercial value, it is not right that it should be enforced. Why should we hinder and hamper trade by regulations which do that trade no good? In the case of a number of other articles which have been alluded to by the hon. Mininister, the inspection, where voluntary, has worked to greater advantage than where it has been compulsory. I trust that this change will have the effect in the Maritime Provinces of proving to the dealers that the inspection of fish is of practical value, and that it will be more generally adopted; for I am sorry to say that I know of places in Nova Scotia, where the inspection has been compulsory, where there has been an inspector, and where this Inspection Act has been a dead letter. Many fish are packed and sold in Nova Scotia with regard to which it is impossible that the Inspection Act could have any force. They are sent to the United States and are sold entirely on their merits without regard to our inspection. The buyers there do not care what kind of barrels the fish are packed in, so long as they are sufficient to carry them from Halifax to Boston, where on their arrival they are sold in bulk, and the seller is paid according to their weight. There is a great deal to be said in favor of the proposition that owners may become inspectors. One of the strongest reasons in its favor is that in many of the country parts of Nova Scotia, in fishing villages, it is impossible to obtain well qualified inspectors of fish who are not fishermen themselves. The committee can well understand that in these fishing communities scattered along the coasts and rivers of the Maritime Provinces, almost every man is engaged in fishing, and it would be impossible to get an inspector who was not a fisherman. It seems to me that this question of inspection is a matter to be entirely settled between the seller and the buyer. As the hon. Minister has explained, the Government provide the machinery by which the inspection can be made if necessary, and it rests with the people themselves, the producers and the buyers, to say whether this inspection shall be held or not. As to the inspection of hides and leather, I do not know so much about those articles as I do about fish. Still, I think the general opinion in the Province of Nova Scotia will be that it will be utterly impossible to put the inspection of hides in force. To carry out the law as it stands at present would stop all dealings in hides except in large places. Therefore, this voluntary principle will settle the question; if a man wants to sell a hide without inspection, he can do so; but in large places, where an inspection may establish a standard of quality and weight, an inspection may be had; buyers can say, we will not take those hides or goods unless they are inspected. The matter will soon settle itself. As to the point raised by the hon. member for Guysboro (Mr. Kirk), as to whether this Act would be enforced in Halifax, it seems to me that it will work satisfactorily. It will be voluntary there, and it will rest with the merchants to say whether they will buy fish that are not inspected and will therefore become a matter between the seller and the buyer in this case as in any other. The hon. Minister has explained one of the reasons for the appointment of a chief inspector. It has been urged by the board of trade, and was no doubt carefully considered by them; and the inspector will be a valuable addition to the staff in case of disputes. I trust that this resolution will pass, and that the Bill founded upon it will become law.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Would the hon. Minister state what fees are to be paid to the chief inspector and the sources from which they are to be obtained? That ought to be stated in the resolution.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The fees will be determined by the boards of trade.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman must first submit the resolution to a Committee of the Whole, to authorise members of the board of trade to fix the rate. It would be entirely contrary to sound legislation that a tax should be imposed without authority being given by resolution to impose it.

Mr. VAIL. The law is not working satisfactorily. In the Halifax Chamber of Commerce, last autumn, certain recommendations were made to the Department of the Interior and I should like to know if the hon. gentleman adopted those suggestions.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We receive suggestions from the boards of trade in every city, and the House will easily understand these are often conflicting, and the Department has to endeavor to meet, as far as possible, the general view.

Mr. CASEY. I hope you will not get away from this question of fees until we have come to a decision upon it. It is quite clear that the point made by my hon. friend is a sound one, that a Bill cannot be passed imposing taxation or authorising somebody else to impose taxation in the shape of fees, unless this particular portion of the Bill is based upon a resolution adopted by the House.

Mr. BAIN. I can understand the difficulty the hon. the Minister has to meet in dealing with the suggestions of the board of trade, and that is that they look at the question from the standpoint of convenience to themselves and to business, but there is another side of the question, and that is the one which concerns those whose goods are inspected. If they pay a fee for inspection, it is hardly fair that an additional fee should be imposed upon them. It seems to me these extra fees will have to come out of the general revenue of the country or be provided for from some other source. I can understand the Minister's anxiety to concede certain points urged by the board of trade, but there is another side to be considered, and that is the interest of those upon whom additional burdens may be imposed.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). It seems to me that hon. gentlemen opposite lose sight of the functions of this chief inspector when enunciating the principles that the fees to be paid him should be provided for by resolution. As I understand the application of that parliamentary rule, it is that any provision in the law which imposes a fixed and arbitrary tax upon the people should be introduced by resolution. Now this resolution provides for the appointment of a chief inspector to settle disputes between the deputy inspector and the owner of the goods inspected; that is to say, the first inspection is voluntary, but if any person, who is dissatisfied with the decision of the deputy inspector wishes to appeal from that decision, this resolution provides that a chief inspector should be appointed who shall settle such disputes. The reference to him is voluntary, so that the fee to be paid will not be an arbitrary,

a fixed, an absolute charge on the subject, and therefore it does not come within the Parliamentary rule requiring a tax to be originated by resolution.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The Minister said the chief inspector is to be paid by fees.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). He is to be paid by fees; that is to say, he is not to be a salaried officer, and the argument is all the stronger that there need not be a special resolution fixing the salaries or fees to be paid to him because the arbitration is voluntary. In fact this resolution simply proposes to appoint an arbitrating tribunal to which any one dissatisfied with the decision of the deputy inspector shall appeal, and it is perfectly proper for the Bill to provide that a board of trade may settle what the fee should be, and the probability is that, as usual in arbitration, the unsuccessful party will have to pay the fees; it would be reasonable to provide that the unsuccessful party should pay the fees, and the board of trade should have the right to fix the fees.

Mr. CASEY. I think the hon. gentleman has taken rather too narrow a view of the case. I am not aware that parliamentary practice authorises the imposition of any charge, whether a fixed or variable one, upon the people without a resolution. I am not aware that parliamentary practice or constitutional usage would warrant the Government in passing a Bill through the House authorising themselves or anybody else to impose variable fees for any service, at pleasure, without having previously put a resolution through the Committee of the Whole to that effect; but in this case the hon. gentleman argues further that we are not imposing a tax upon anybody, because it is quite optional for parties to ask the interference of this inspector or not, and therefore they are not compulsorily taxed at all. I do not think that very ingenious argument gets this provision out of the category of things that should be provided for by resolution, because we propose by this resolution to establish what the hon. gentleman very well described as a sort of arbitration, to be resorted to, if desired, by any person who feels dissatisfied with the decision of the deputy inspector. In proposing that, we must propose some means of paying the arbitrator, and no means are mentioned in the resolution, so that nothing could be collected by the arbitrators under a Bill based strictly on the resolution. In order that the arbitrator may collect fees, some provision must be made giving him authority to do so. Therefore the Bill founded on this resolution will impose taxation on all those who may avail themselves of its provisions, and in regard to such we are compelled by constitutional usage to follow the constitutional method of fixing such taxation, namely, in the first place, by resolution. The mere fact that the fees are to be fixed by somebody else than the Government does not in the slightest degree alter the constitutional aspect of the case. It is more strongly apparent when we are going to authorise somebody not responsible to the House to fix these fees, that the Government, before doing so, should derive authority to give that power in the ordinary way from the Committee of the Whole. And I do not think that the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) need have defended the position as he did, for I imagine, as I said, that it was merely through inadvertance or from oversight that this provision was left out of the resolution now before the House, and that the hon. Minister, now he has had an opportunity of considering the matter, will see the propriety of putting it in and thereby acting in accordance with ordinary usage.

Mr. PAINT. The preparation of an inspection law for fish is one of the most difficult things to do, and it has seldom proved satisfactory. This Bill, I think, will meet the difficulty threatening us with Newfoundland. We are notified that they have passed stringent Customs laws there lately, and the trade between that colony and the Dominion amounts to $2,000,000. If we tax their pickled fish, they will meet us with a high tariff on flour and other manufactures from this Dominion. If the inspection is left optional, their fish can come in without paying 50 cents per barrel for culling and packing. This liberty, I hold, would be too great a concession for us to make to a neighboring colony remaining outside the Dominion. The cause of the difficulty in fixing an inspection law for fish is, that fish may be worth $30 or $20 a barrel, but, if the brine or pickle runs off, the value is reduced to $5 a barrel. The fees that were charged hitherto were 10 cents per barrel for mackerel, shad and salmon, the most valuable kind of fish, and 5 cents for the inferior kind, herring, alewives or gaspereaux. I think the way in which the Minister of Inland Revenue has framed this measure is the best that can be arrived at to meet all the difficulties and troubles connected with this subject.

Mr. BLAKE. It has always occurred to me, from the moment I saw the resolution on the paper, that a large portion of the Minister's intention has been based on what the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Paint) has just alluded to, namely, the difficulties which had arisen by the action of the Government and Legislature of the colony of Newfoundland; but the Minister has not given any information to us on that subject, and I would like to know if that has had any, and what, bearing on the subject, and whether he has had any communication from the Government of Newfoundland as to their proposed action.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In preparing this measure, the action of Newfoundland had no influence at all upon this Government.

Mr. BLAKE. Does it get rid of the Newfoundland difficulty?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The action of the Newfoundland Government has not influenced us in this measure at all.

Mr. BLAKE. But, as a matter of fact, does it get rid of the Newfoundland difficulty?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not know.

Mr. BLAKE. Oh, the Minister does not know. Has he had any correspondence with the Government of Newfoundland?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) was anxious to get an admission from the Minister of Inland Revenue that the omission from the resolution of any provision as to the fees of chief inspectors was an oversight. I stated the reasons why I thought it was not necessary to provide for that by resolution, and I do not think there was any oversight whatever in omitting it. I have no doubt that these resolutions were carefully considered and properly passed upon by those skilled in parliamentary practice, who know far more on the subject than even my hon. friend opposite or myself. I do not profess to be an authority on the subject any more than I think he is, but I am quite confident that the opinion I express is right, and that there is no occasion for providing by resolution for optional fees of this kind, and that the parliamentary rule provides for fees which are levied for purposes of revenue. This provides for no revenue to the Crown, and it is only in that case that the provisions of any law on the subject should originate by resolution of the House.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad to hear from the hon. member that he does not profess to be an authority on parliamentary practice.

Mr. CAMERON. No better than you are.

Mr. CASEY. Then he does profess to be an authority, but no more of an authority than myself. He admits that we are both authorities, and he evidently thinks I am a very poor one, and therefore he must be a poor one also! I do not profess to be an authority any further than from what I have gathered by twelve years experience in this House, which has certainly taught me something, but I am endorsed in this particular opinion by the opinion of my hon. friend in front of me, who has led a Government in this House for some time and certainly, I think, knows how far a Government might be justified in acting without basing their action on a resolution of the House. But the idea occurs to me that perhaps it is not necessary for the hon. member for North Victoria and myself to argue this point out. The hon. member has given the reasons why he thinks this reference was omitted from the resolution. He says I am very anxious to get an admission that it is an oversight from the Minister of Inland Revenue. I have no anxiety on the point at all. I was not charging the honorable Minister with negligence in omitting it, but I was pointing out that the question had probably not been raised, and that it had not occurred to him or to those who framed the resolution, and it was therefore not inserted. I think, perhaps, it would be as well to hear from the hon. Minister himself why it was omitted. Probably he knows why it was omitted quite as well as the hon. member for Victoria, and can explain as well as that hon. gentleman the reason for its omission. The hon. member for North Victoria says the resolution was framed by somebody who knew as much of parliamentary usage as he or I, but I presume it was framed in the ordinary way by the officials of the Department, who are not parliamentary officials at all but departmental officials, and who are not expected to know parliamentary usage, but are expected simply to frame resolutions showing what they desire to be carried, and cannot be set up against the authority of any member of the House on a point of Parliamentary practice. I now ask the Minister to state why the omission was made.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I cannot say why it was made, but I call attention to the last paragraph of section 11 of the present Act. I will read it:

"Wherever any difference arises between inspectors as to the true quality or grade of any article inspected by one of them and re-inspected by another, such difference shall be definitely determined by reference to such board of arbitration or other authority as the Governor in Council may appoint for that purpose."

That clause gives the Governor in Council the power, and they have had it for fourteen years, to establish a board in case of dispute, in reference to grain or fish or anything else. There is no provision made there for the payment of fees. It was not thought necessary at that time, and that has been on the Statute Book for fourteen years, and I do not think objection can be taken in this case.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). There is a difference. This resolution is not in respect to differences between inspectors, but between inspectors and parties who may be selling. Under that clause the Minister has not the power to enact what he proposes to do in his new Bill. It has reference simply to adjudicating on differences between inspectors, one of whom will pronounce an article to be of such a brand or such a number, and another will pronounce it to be of another brand or number. There is provision made for that, but I do not see any provision made for the appointment of any persons who may act as a board of arbitration. Nor do I know, and the Minister will perhaps tell us, whether, under this inspection, boards of arbitration have been appointed or whether any individual has been appointed and whether there have been any decisions given with respect to that.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. Minister must now see the question that has been raised—and there is a difference of opinion between hon. members—as to whether a clause empowering the exaction of fees can be put into the Bill upon the resolution as it now stands. If the question is not a sound one, he will be unable to proceed with the clause in the Bill which contains such provision. If, according to parliamentary law, this resolution is not adequate to enable him to proceed, then, of course, the Bill will be defective. The question will arise for actual decision when the Bill comes in purporting to be based upon this resolution, which yet contains a clause for the imposition of fees, which, in the opinion of some hon. members, is entirely beyond the power of the committee.

Mr. CASEY. That point being left in abeyance for the time, perhaps the Minister might tell us what is to be the amount of these fees for inspection, and from whom they are to be collected; and is there any intention to limit the powers of the board with regard to fixing the fees?

Mr. COSTIGAN. They are to be limited. The boards of trade will recommend inspectors, and the Government is to appoint them.

Mr. CHARLTON. The resolution contains a provision like this: That additional provision shall be made as to the security to be given by inspectors and deputy inspectors. I wish to enquire what circumstances have arisen to render necessary, in the opinion of the Minister, the provision in this resolution in regard to the security that has been given by inspectors and deputy inspectors.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think I have already explained that. It is to preserve the rights of fishermen in the inspection of their fish. If the fish is owned by the inspector or deputy inspector, besides the inspection brand, something shall be put on the package to show that the fish has been inspected by another inspector who shall be responsible for that inspection. This is done in order to prevent frauds. The hon. gentleman will see that that is sufficient reason why we should enact security.

Mr. JACKSON. I would ask whether there will be any local inspectors appointed in the different counties of Ontario, and whether the inspection will extend to canned fruits and vegetables.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We do not touch them in the Bill.

Mr. KIRK. Is it intended to have a fish inspector in each Province? I do not see that the resolution provides for more than one chief inspector for the whole Dominion. We have an inspector in each county in the Province of Nova Scotia, and one also in the city of Halifax. There are deputy inspectors who inspect the fish in their own county. The way I look at this resolution, though it declares that inspection shall be voluntary, yet in effect it will be just as much compulsory as it ever was, and the effect will be to centralise the inspection in the cities of Halifax and Montreal so far as fish are concerned, and deprive the merchants of the outside counties from having their fish inspected at their own homes. Now we know that if the merchants in outside counties have to send their fish to Halifax to be inspected it will cost them more that it does to have them inspected at home, and the inspection will be no better done. The inspection fee may be the same, perhaps, but the inspection will no doubt cost very much higher in consequence of the high prices charged in these cities for cooperage and packing, if it has to be done in Halifax or Montreal; and I very much fear that the object of the Boards of Trade in recommending the change is to get control of this matter. I am representing a fishing constituency, but I never heard of any complaint from the fishermen or others in my county in regard to the present system—at least they have made no complaint to me. I am not a fisherman myself, and, of course, cannot

speak with much authority in regard to it. I am sorry the Minister did not bring this resolution before the House at an earlier stage of the Session, so that we could have an opportunity of consulting the fishermen and fish dealers in the different counties in regard to the matter. The more I consider the resolution, the more suspicious it looks to me. I know that the Boards of Trade of Montreal and Halifax have all along desired to get control of the inspection of fish, and this recommendation seems to give them that control, and will deprive the merchants of the outlying districts of the privilege of having their fish inspected cheaply.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I confess I do not like this provision with reference to the owners of property inspecting it. It seems quite contrary to all our ideas of what is right that a person should exercise an official, or *quasi* judicial function where he has a personal interest, and I should think inspection under these circumstances would be perfectly valueless. It seems to me it would be better to have a provision inserted in the Bill that where a deputy inspector has an interest in the article inspected, he should not exercise his functions, but that the deputy inspector of some other district should, *pro hac vice*, inspect the article in question, and have jurisdiction in that particular district where the article was. It surely will be of no value to have an article branded practically in these words: "I own this property and I say that it is No. one or No. two, or whatever it may be. It is rather a curious, I think, and a somewhat improper provision to put on the Statute Book, and I should think that some better way might have been devised for getting over the undoubted difficulty arising from the fact that it is impossible to get suitable men who are not engaged, I presume, in the business themselves; and you cannot afford to pay a man enough to make him give up his business to devote his whole time to the inspection of fish.

Mr. KINNEY. I think the adoption of a clause with respect to the inspection of fish, and leaving it optional, will result in a great deal of benefit to the fishermen. Speaking from a great number of years' experience in the business, I know that the present inspection law is a great annoyance to fishermen, and not only an annoyance but an expense, not only an expense, but a double expense, because they are first forced to inspect their fish locally, and then to send them to Halifax or Montreal, perhaps, to have them inspected again, because the large dealer is not satisfied with the country inspection. Further, it is a common thing in Nova Scotia to ask permission to export fish without any inspection being made. I have known cases during a number of years where officers have allowed fish to be sent abroad and have received fees without seeing the fish, because the inspection was of no value abroad. There is no market in the United States for our fish where they care a jot for any inspection made in Canada; neither do they care for our inspection in the West Indies or Spanish America. Fish are sold on their own merits. The men who purchased fish from the fishermen brand the packages with their own name, and they prefer no local inspection whatever. If the arrangement proposed by the Bill is adopted, it will result not only in a large saving of inspection fees but of money expended in re-coopering. I consider it is in the interests of the fishermen to adopt this clause.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) has brought up a question as to which the Minister should furnish some information. The Minister takes power to appoint an inspector for each of the seven classes of articles. Suppose he appoints an inspector of hides and he should live in Montreal. If a dispute arises in my own city between a deputy inspector and a seller, is the chief inspector in Montreal going to travel there and hold an arbitration in order to decide the merits, and are the fees to be obtained from the deputy inspector or the party against whom the decision may be given? Moreover, the chief inspector may live in Halifax, and may be called upon to travel from there to Western Ontario and back. There is a great question involved here. I do not see how you can by fees pay the chief inspector, and every part of the country have fair play. I do not think, however, that one city or board of trade should be given preference by Act of Parliament in matters of trade; but this would bear directly in that direction. If payment is to be by fees, and the party is living in one of the large cities, the probability is that the articles will be sent to him to be inspected. One would hesitate, in case of having a dispute in Western Ontario, to incur the risk to having to pay the travelling expenses of the inspector to and from Halifax, or even Montreal, or to have articles sent to those points. I should like the Minister to give some explanation as to whether he thinks he can work out the system by fees, without giving undue preference to any city or town.

Mr. PAINT. I wish to correct a wrong impression which the member for Guysborough appears to hold in connection with chambers of commerce. The Halifax Chamber of Commerce desires a compulsory inspection Act. In regard to parties being selected to adjust disputes: If there is a sale and purchase made, it is very easy for the parties thereto to agree to have an inspection of the article, and if it sustains its character, the purchaser will pay the examination fees. If two parties have a dispute, they usually know how to seek redress—by going to the nearest lawyer, and I think this will continue to be done.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). There is some force in the objection taken by the member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), unless it is intended to authorise the appointment of chief inspectors for each Province. If there is to be only one chief inspector for each class of articles to be inspected, it may be necessary for the chief inspector to travel an unreasonable distance. But if there is one for each Province, for each class of article, the difficulty will be obviated, and I can see no objection to this, so long as the chief inspector is to be paid by fees. No doubt it would be practically inoperative if it were necessary for the chief inspector to travel from Halifax or Montreal to British Columbia, in order to inspect a package of salmon.

Mr. KIRK. I do not understand what further provision is intended to be made, although the Minister stated there was some further provision in regard to the inspection and packing of fish.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There is a change in the law.

Mr. BAIN. I think the question raised by the member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron), with respect to an owner inspecting his own goods, is deserving of consideration. It is contrary to all our ideas of business principles in the west, and I would suggest whether it would not be apt to lead to this difficulty, that there would be colorable transfers of the property of individuals for the purpose of obviating the necessity of attaching the word "owner" to the packages. I think, as a matter of practice, it will utterly vitiate all value of inspection by an inspector when it is found that the goods inspected were his own property. It is, moreover, unjust to the party himself, because it renders the inspection of no value. It is worthy of the Minister's consideration as to whether a change should not be made in that respect.

Mr. CASEY. One point has been overlooked in connection with allowing a deputy inspector to inspect his own goods. We have been discussing it merely under the idea that he might be tempted to grade his own goods too high. That is not the only point to be guarded against, although that is a serious one. There is the point of a colorable transfer. There is still another way in which the deputy inspector, who has an interest in the goods which are to be inspected, could

advance his own interest, and I wish to ask the particular attention of the Minister to this point. He could advance his own interest not only by grading his own goods too highly, but by grading the goods of his rival in trade lower than they ought to be graded. I would ask the special attention of the Mininister to this.

Mr. PAINT. A fisherman can grade his own fish under this Act, provided he brands it with the word "owner," and therefore there would not be that difficulty.

Mr. CASEY. I was directing the attention of the Minister to this point. I say that though he may grade his own goods with perfect fairness, he may grade the goods of his rivals in trade too low, and I think there is just as much chance of his doing an injustice in this way as in the other. But I do not think that the Minister has made any case for putting in this provision at all. The reason given for it was that in the inspection of fish, particularly, it was almost necessary to have some one to act as inspector who is in the business in order to have a fair inspection. That would apply to other lines of trade as well as to fish, but there is no reason why you could not get a deputy inspector who had been in the business before, and who knew it as thoroughly as if he were actively engaged in it at present, and thereby avoid any possibility of unfairness in grading the goods inspected.

Mr. STAIRS. As I believe the Halifax Chamber of Commercer made a request for this clause with reference to the inspection of fish, perhaps the committee will bear with me if I explain its effect. I think the criticism made by the last two speakers will not have the effect which they seem to think it has. With reference to the difficulty mentioned by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) as to an inspector branding the fish of others unfairly, even if he did not brand his own too high, I think unless you have a provision now which cannot be carried out, no man inspecting an article could deal in it at all.

Mr. CASEY. That is the provision now.

Mr. STAIRS. You could not enforce a law that an inspector should not deal in any article, because he might really own the goods and have them inspected under another man's name. You are liable to that difficulty, which the hon. gentleman knows would be as great under the present law as under the law when it is amended as proposed.

Mr. CASEY. The law now does not allow the owner to inspect his goods.

Mr. STAIRS. That is a provision which I say cannot practically be carried out, because it would be impossible to prevent an inspector dealing in goods; and one reason why this provision was asked for by the chamber of commerce was that in many fishing villages in Nova Scotia it would be impossible to get a person having a knowledge of the business to act as inspector who was not dealing in fish. In some of these places everybody is engaged in catching or handling fish, so that it would be impossible to get an inspector who is not connected with the trade. I am sure that in the case of fish this provision will not have a bad effect at all. If it is found that an inspector is branding his own fish unfairly, dealers who are taking the fish from him will soon find that out, and his brand will not be worth anything—it is an evil which will soon cure itself. We should always bear in mind, in this connection, that unless the men who catch and pack the fish do their duty properly, official inspection is, to a large extent, a farce. It is absolutely necessary that they should be inspected then, and that the greatest care should be exercised. The idea, when the inspection Act was put in force, was to induce fishermen to take this care, but I must say that it does not have that effect to as great an extent as was desirable. It is always known that the inspection in Nova Scotia generally which is worth anything is the inspection of the men who own the fish and put their names upon their goods. Take the case of a man fishing at Yarmouth or Halifax, or any other fishing town in Nova Scotia: if he puts up herrings or alewives or codfish, and is known to put them up thoroughly well, and if he puts his own brand upon them, they get a character, and their fish are sold upon that character. Now, I believe that is the best inspection you can have, and is, at any rate, a very important part of the inspection of fish. The same thing will occur when the owner is licensed as the inspector of fish, because practically that has been the case in Nova Scotia for years. A man must brand his goods honestly, else he will soon find that he will either be dismissed from his office or that the people will not employ him at all.

Mr. CASEY. I think after all the hon. gentleman and myself are at one on this question. He admits that the inspection made by a person who is also the owner of the article would have no value at all——

Mr. STAIRS. No; I deny that.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to finish the sentence, he will see what I mean.

Mr. STAIRS. Well, I allowed the hon. gentleman to interrupt me, and I think he should allow me to interrupt him. What I say is, that the inspection of the owner is the most important and the most valuable. I entirely disagree with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. gentleman had allowed me to finish the sentence he would have found that that was exactly what I would have said. I say that the inspection made by the inspector of an article which is his own property has no value at all, as an official guarantee of the quality of the thing; it has only the same value as the ordinary brand which the dealer would put on the goods himself. That is, if they are branded as "A" No. 1 herring or mackerel, it would have just the value which experience had shown it to deserve—the value of the brand would depend on the proven honesty of the dealers in the goods. Therefore the value of the brand would depend on the dealer's own personal reputation, and would have no value at all as an official brand, to settle definitely and impartially the value of the goods. It would be taken merely as the owner's own statement of what he considered the goods to be, and its value would depend on the amount of truth generally found to be contained in the dealer's statements. If deputy inspectors are to be allowed to inspect and brand their own goods with the owner's name attached, the whole thing is a farce, and might as well be abolished. Let everybody inspect his own goods and brand them according to his own opinion of what they ought to be, and let his reputation stand or fall by the correctness of that brand. In that way I think you would ultimately reach about as good a practice as you have now under the law. Of course, an official stamp would be of use to foreigners buying those goods, and it is for that reason that an official inspection is needed, to give the authority of the Government to the statement put on the package. For this purpose any brand put upon it by a deputy inspector who dealt in the goods would be utterly valueless. No stranger would trust the brand, once it was known that the inspector dealt in the same kind of goods. The hon. gentleman says that it has been found impossible to prevent the inspectors dealing in the goods they inspect. This is the reason, then, that this change has been made. It has been found impossible to carry out the law that already exists, and it has been determined to do away with it, so far as it prohibits an inspector from dealing in the goods he inspects. I think that is a very illogical position to take. The law ought to be carried out. No difficulty should stand in the way of

an energetic administration of the Act. If it is found that a difficulty of this kind cannot be got over, the true remedy is that suggested by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. Better give up the attempt to fix any official brand on packages of goods at all, and not allow the reputation of the country which authorises the official inspection to be degraded by permitting any man who deals in the same class of goods to inspect his own and his rival's goods, and mark them with the official brand of this Dominion.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Selkirk). I should like to ask the hon. Minister what is meant by the words "that the various grades of grain shall be better defined." It is interesting to Manitoba grain growers to know.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It is intended to provide for an extra classification of wheat for Manitoba and the North-West.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Is the standard to be raised or lowered?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Raised.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Higher than Minnesota?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will that operate against the grain trade of Manitoba? Manitoba hard wheat is brought into competition with Minnesota grain, and if the grade is to be made higher than that of the Minnesota wheat, we shall be at a disadvantage in the foreign market.

Mr. BOWELL. The higher the wheat is graded the better the quality; consequently it will sell better.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is what I say; we have to furnish a better article for the same money.

Mr. BOWELL. Not for the same money.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We find that we have a class of wheat in Manitoba superior to what is produced south of the line, and we wish to give Manitoba the full benefit of that.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That will be a special grade under a new name?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. I should like to ask the hon. Minister how many grades he intends to make for Manitoba wheat, and what are the standards.

Mr. COSTIGAN. We are now dealing with the resolution. When we reach the Bill I will give the hon. gentleman all the information I can.

Mr. WATSON. That is a question which I think might be answered at this stage. I would like to have the information, so that I may be prepared, when the Bill comes up, if necessary, to offer some amendments.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The resolution provides for the appointment of a board, as I understand, for the purpose of defining these different standards.

Mr. WATSON. I understood the Minister to say that he had adopted special grades for Manitoba. I would like to know how many different grades he has made for Manitoba, and what the standards are to be.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). What he said was, that he proposed to adopt.

Mr. BOWELL. It seems to me a very unusual course to pursue, to attempt to get from the Minister all the details of a Bill when the resolution on which it is to be founded is being considered. The object of the resolution, as I understand it, is to embody the principle on which a Bill is to be framed, and the question of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) would be quite proper when the Bill is before the House and the details are being discussed. If it is advisable, in the interest of the wheat trade and the farmers of Manitoba, that there should be a higher classification of Manitoba wheat, that is all that is affirmed in this resolution. The manner and mode of doing it, and the different grades which will be adopted, will come up when the details of the Bill are under discussion. If the hon. gentleman is of opinion that this board should be established for the purpose indicated, he should vote for the resolution. If, when the Bill comes down, the grades proposed should not meet his views, then it will be proper for him to oppose them.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman assumes that the present grading is wrong; and surely, when the hon. member for Marquette asks what grades you propose, this is the proper time to get an answer. You are now affirming, by this resolution, that it is desirable that the various grades of grain should be better defined. Surely the hon. member cannot be said to be out of order if he asks in what respect do you object to the existing grading, and in what respect do you propose anything better? The hon. member says he wants to know this, because if he disapproves of it, he may want to communicate with his friends before the Bill is considered. He has a right to know what the proposition is.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman puts words in my mouth which I did not use. I did not say the hon. member's question was out of order, but I said that it was an unusual course to pursue. If the hon. member for Marquette is of opinion that the present grading of wheat is quite sufficient, then he is quite correct in opposing this resolution.

Mr. WATSON. I am not opposing the resolution.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say that he was. What I said was, if the hon. gentleman is under the impression that the present grading is correct, and no improvement is necessary, it is quite legitimate and proper, from his standpoint, that he should oppose it. I do not say that he will oppose it. If he agrees with the different boards of trade and the representations that have been made, not only to the Government but in the press all over the country, that there should be a different standard for this superior class of wheat in Manitoba, it is quite proper to discuss that question, not only here now, but when the Bill is before the House, and the clause relating to this is under discussion. That is the better time and the proper time to discuss it. If we adopt the present course that hon. gentlemen opposite are laying down, every Minister, when he proposes a Bill founded on a resolution, should come here with the Bill in his hand and discuss every clause of it *seriatim*; for really that is the course pursued by the Opposition to-day, in dealing with the resolution proposed by my colleague, the Minister of Inland Revenue. To my mind the question is one of convenience rather than anything else, and I repeat again that if we admit the principle, that it is necessary to amend this Inspection Act, we affirm that by the resolution, and when the Bill comes down we can discuss it in detail.

Mr. DAVIES. We are not now discussing details at all. The hon. gentleman has said that certain representations have been made to the Minister, which induced him to determine, in his own mind, that a change should be made in the grading of wheat. He comes down and proposes the change, and when he proposes it he does not give to the House the data or the facts which induced him to make the proposition. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) has asked the very thing that we have asked with reference to fish, namely: What information have you, that induced you to propose to the House that a different grading of wheat should be adopted? We are perfectly in order in that.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). My hon. friend is trying to find arguments for the hon. member for Marquette, and in doing so he has given us two totally different versions of what that hon. gentleman said, and each of them differ from

what that hon. gentleman did say. In fact, he is altering his ground and making his argument to suit, by way of reply to what the hon. the Minister of Customs has said, and is quoting the hon. member for Marquette as having said what he never said at all. What the hon. member for Marquette said, was this: He asked my hon. friend, the Minister of Inland Revenue, to define the different standards of Manitoba wheat which he proposed to adopt. That certainly is not what the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) stated as what the hon. member for Marquette had asked.

Mr. DAVIES. I said he asked for better definitions than are contained in the resolution.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The first statement the hon. gentleman made, in quoting the hon. member for Marquette, was that he had asked the Minister to state what information the Government had upon which they proposed this alteration. That the hon. member for Marquette never asked, or anything like it; and that he gave in reply to what my hon. friend, the Minister of Customs, said. If my hon. friend will simply look at this resolution he will see the position taken by the Minister of Customs is correct, that what this resolution proposes is that the various grades of grain shall be better defined and that a board shall meet for the purpose of selecting the standards of grain for use by inspectors. All that is proposed by the resolution is the enunciation of the general principle that a different grading or different definitions of the grades of wheat for Manitoba wheat should be provided by law; and so far as the resolution indicates the intentions of the Government in the details of the Bill, it is that each different grade should be laid down by the board which should meet for that purpose. If that is the sole meaning of the resolution, it is quite premature now to ask the Government to state what the definition of grading in detail is to be, because it is not yet fixed. The resolution simply enunciates the general principle that a different grading should be established, and as the hon. the Minister of Customs said, if the member for Marquette is in favor of having a different grading, he ought to support the resolution, and if he is opposed to that he ought to oppose it; but, in any case, this is not the time nor the opportunity in which to go into the details. It is not fair or right to call upon the Minister of Inland Revenue to define what the details of the Bill will be, or at any rate to do more than say that the principle is all that is now sought to be adopted by the House, namely, that there should be different classes of grading; and I think the hon. member for Marquette is quite sufficiently intelligent and able, and sufficiently fluent, to state his own views and to support them ably and eloquently, when he thinks necessary, without the highly valued assistance of the member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies).

Mr. DAVIES. I might make the same remark to the Minister of Inland Revenue and the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WATSON. I have listened quietly to hon. gentlemen on both sides talking about fish and asking questions across the House about fish. That is a question in which I am not particularly interested, but I am interested in wheat. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue said he was going to have a clause in this Bill making some changes in the grading of wheat in Manitoba. He made that statement voluntarily, and I simply asked what were the changes he intended to make. This is a very important one for the people of Manitoba. Grain dealers from that Province have written to me, asking if I could find out what the proposed changes were, and on that account I asked the hon. Minister to let us know his intentions, so that I might communicate them to those parties. I am not thoroughly posted in the grain business, but I am in communication with people who are, and I do not think the question I put is at all an unfair one.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria).

Mr. COSTIGAN. I stated, in the first place, that from information we had, we felt justified in giving to Manitoba and the North-West a special grading of wheat; and I felt proud, and every Canadian ought to feel proud, that the wheat grown in that country is of so superior quality that it requires special grading. Having assured the hon. gentleman that the grading will be provided for in the Bill, I thought he would be satisfied to wait until the Bill came down, to enter into the details, unless the hon. gentleman does not want a new grading and is satisfied with the present grading.

Mr. WATSON. I am not.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I tell the hon. gentleman we are classifying the wheat higher in Manitoba, and surely, when we are legislating in the direction he desires, he ought to deal with me fairly.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. Minister misunderstands me. I would like to know the special grades to be introduced in the Bill, and the number of pounds to the bushel.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Having assured the hon. gentleman that the change will be in the direction to benefit his Province, he can, when the Bill comes before the House, deal with all these grades as they come up, and I do not see the utility of going into the discussion now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I take it that every member of Parliament, when he has a Bill before the House, has the responsibility of his position, as every member of the House, who really opposes or supports it, has his own responsibility. My hon. friend, in this case, has the responsibility of pressing this measure, and he asks this House to pass the resolution. On his own responsibility he states the facts which, as he thinks, entitles him to the support of the House in this resolution. Any hon. member who does not agree with what he says will continue to oppose it. My hon. friend has stated what he thinks should give him a right to claim the vote of this commitee on this resolution. As my hon. friend has made his statement, I advise him to rest satisfied with the statement that he has made on his responsibility, and to decline, positively decline, to be pressed in this matter, for purposes which are very unusual though perhaps parliamentary.

Mr. CASEY. It is a little too much that, in addition to the obstruction caused to the progress of this resolution through the committee by the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, his leader should now advise him to further obstruct its progress. We are accused, with utter injustice, of some vague sin, some vaguely objectionable course of conduct, which the right hon. Premier says is not usual in Parliament. If he refers to a desire to unduly protract this debate——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, will you please keep order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order, order.

Mr. CASEY. I say, if he refers to any desire to unduly prolong this debate, he is utterly in error. We have been trying to get such information from the Minister of Inland Revenue as will enable us to close this discussion, and we have been asking for perfectly legitimate information. The debate has been taken part in by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to as great an extent as by those on this side of the House, but the Premier happened, unfortunately, not to be in his place during a portion of that time, and so he accuses us of delay, which is due as much to them as to us. I am not blaming them. They were anxious to get information as we were anxious to get information, and in some cases they were given it when it was refused to us. The wording of this resolution is that it is desirable that the various grades of grain shall be "better defined." The hon.

member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) says the only principle involved is whether there shall be a change in the grading of wheat. It is not; it is whether there shall be a better definition of the grade of wheat. How can we pronounce whether the changes would be a better definition or not until we know what these changes are? How can we say——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order, order.

Mr. CASEY. There is obstruction for you. There is a deliberate attempt to delay the progress of this resolution through the House, and a successful attempt, for no one who has any respect for his voice will exert himself in trying to talk those noises down. Now that order is restored, I wish to emphasize again my statement that, before we can accept the wording of this resolution, we must know whether the definition intended to be introduced by the hon. Minister, in exchange for that now in force, will be a better definition or a worse definition. We have asked that question two or three times of the Minister, and he has refused to answer as to what are the special points of this new grade of Manitoba wheat. Everybody admits that there should be a new grade of Manitoba wheat. That is not the point at all. We want to know how he is going to define it, so that we may see whether it will be a better definition than the one now existing. If he has not settled what he intends to make it yet, he might say so at once, and there is an end of the question. If he says I cannot tell you now, but I will tell you when the Bill comes down, there is an end of it. But, if he says: I know, but I will not tell you, we shall have to continue the attempt to extract that information from him. I have wished for some time to call attention to two points in connection with the grading of grain, but have made way time and again for those who wished to discuss the fish question. I will finish my reference to these points now, and make way finally for those who wish to continue the discussion of the fish question. My first point is in regard to the authorities consulted by the hon. Minister when preparing his Bill. He told us he consulted the boards of trade in all the cities and towns. These are the official representatives of the trading and mercantile classes, the grain dealers and the merchants. Their opinion certainly should be taken, but there is an institution which is a sort of board of trade for the farmers of the country, which is representative of their views, so far as there is an official representative of their views at all in the country—I refer to the organisation known as the "Grange," composed of men who are more deeply interested in the classification of grain than the dealers in grain, men who are quite as well qualified, from experience in the handling of grain—

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). You ought to be ashamed of yourself.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I call your attention individually to the fact that the hon. member for East Hastings is interrupting the committee.

Mr. WHITE. I have a right to interrupt. We have no right to sit here all the time listening to your nonsense.

Mr. CASEY. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to call that hon. gentleman specially to order, and to rebuke him for the irregular language he has just used.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Selkirk). Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CASEY. I have not taken my seat yet.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I will not apologise to you; send the Sargeant-at-Arms.

Mr. CASEY. This is a point of order. Mr. Chairman, will you call the hon. member to order for those remarks which he made?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I cannot call the hon. member for East Hastings to order. If the hon. gentleman names an hon. member, he will have to state to me what the hon. gentleman said if he wants his words taken notice of. I know there has been a great deal of noise, and I think hon. gentlemen would expedite matters much more by keeping quiet; but, as to singling out any hon. member, I cannot do so.

Mr. CASEY. I understood the hon. member to say he would not sit here listening to such nonsense. If he considers it nonsense, it is all right, but he has no right to express that opinion in an interruption of my speech.

Mr. WHITE. I will leave it to a vote of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. If the hon. member for Hastings made use of such language, I think it was improper, but, not having heard it, I cannot call him to order.

Mr. WHITE. Yeas and nays.

Mr. CASEY. As that is settled, we two Irishmen can now be jolly, and I can go on.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock; go on.

Mr. CASEY. I wish to ask the Minister if he has consulted the Grange in regard to these changes; also, whether he has had under consideration the question of the inspection of beans. I see hon. members laughing, but beans are not a matter to be laughed at. The hon. Minister of Agriculture laughs at the idea of beans. He knows beans, I have no doubt, but he probably does not know that beans are the principal crop of many portions of the county of Kent, in Ontario, a large portion of which is attached to the riding I represent; that beans are the special crop of large districts in that county, and pay better than any other crop that can be raised. The value of these beans depends entirely on the care with which they are prepared for market, even more than in the case of wheat or barley. More depends upon the color of the beans and the careful picking out of the bad beans——

Mr. POPE. I suppose they pick the be-in's over and send the poorest here.

Mr. CASEY. I never knew before how the hon. gentleman came to get here. I say the value of beans depends more upon their grading than any other grain, and I hope the hon. Minister will give his attention to this point.

Mr. GILLMOR. When there is anything in a resolution proposed by the Government that I can approve of, it affords me great satisfaction. I think the change in reference to the inspection of fish is in the right direction. I remember that some years ago I divided the House on that question. I thought compulsory inspection was a great hardship, indeed, to the fishermen, and although I did not succeed in abolishing compulsory inspection, it was never afterwards enforced. Now, I think we could do very well without the inspection of fish at all; because the arguments of the hon. members for Yarmouth (Mr. Kinney) and Halifax (Mr. Stairs) prove that the value of fish in the market depends upon the character of those who take them to market; and I do not believe we need any such officers as fish inspectors at all. I think it would be well to leave inspectors out altogether; but if inspectors of fish are to be appointed, you must appoint men acquainted with the business.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). This discussion has been somewhat irregular, and I suppose I have been a little irregular myself; but there is a point the Minister has not explained yet. It does seem to me that we ought to have some little explanation as to whether the First Minister did just exactly what he would have done had he not been under a little excitement at the time he advised the Minister not to give any answer. I do not know, but I think if he had been

present when I put the question he would agree with me that I should have had an answer to it. I do not understand the resolutions before the House to give all the details and the information that might be better given at a later stage; but I do consider that, while the First Minister says he is responsible, he must know that the members of this House have a responsibility on them if they allow a resolution to pass and concur in it, and it is reported as with their concurrence Now, I do not know whether I agree in the resolutions or not, because I have not such information as I want with reference to the first part. The first question I asked was, if these inspectors, seven of whom might be appointed by the Government, if they saw fit, were to be salaried officers. If they were, the resolution is wrong, in not having a money clause introduced. He replies to me that they were not to be paid in that way, but would be paid by fees. The point I wanted to ascertain was in what way the fees are to be levied. The difficulty I saw was this: That in appointing an inspector, say, of hides and leathers——

The committee rose; and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

.Mr. PATERSON. When the committee rose at six o'clock, I was drawing the attention of the Minister back to the first clause of the resolution, which I had discussed for a little time, and had asked for information on a certain point, and the difficulty that I saw had also presented itself to the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron), and the discussion being led on to later clauses in the resolution, we were unable to ascertain what the views of the Minister were. I was remarking that the resolutions provide for the appointment of a chief inspector for each article—six or seven different articles; there is to be only one inspector chosen for each separate article. Now, we will suppose it is the article of hides and pelts. There is a chief inspector appointed, whose duty it shall be to settle disputes between inspectors and persons desiring to sell that article. Suppose that the chief inspector, whose duty it shall be to settle disputes, is resident in Halifax, and the dispute arises in the city in which I live, how are the parties to the dispute in my city to avail themselves of the services of this chief inspector? That question arises, because the Minister has told us that he does not propose to pay his inspectors a salary, but they are to be paid by fees. Therefore, I say, if the chief of that line is living, say, at Halifax, and the dispute arises in my own city, it will be a very serious matter for the person disputing to ask the chief inspector to travel from Halifax to that city in order to settle the dispute, when, if he is to be paid by fees, the fees must come out of the parties to the disputes, and, I suppose, out of the party against whom the dispute will be settled, either against the inspector or the party complaining; and it seems to me that in that way a difficulty will arise. Now, the reason I asked was, that being anxious to sanction this resolution—I do not find any particular fault with the appointment of chief inspectors—but we are bound, before we change the law, and before we acquiesce in this proposition, to understand something of the way in which it will work. I will read the law as it now stands, and the Minister will see just exactly where the change he proposes may operate to the disadvantage of certain parties, and give preference to others. The present Act specifies, with reference to any disputes that may arise :

"If any dispute arises between the inspector or deputy inspector, and the owner or possessor of any article by him inspected, with regard to the quality and condition thereof, or relating in any respect to the same, then, upon application by either of the parties to any justice of the peace for the place in which such inspector or deputy inspector acts, such justice of the peace shall issue a summons to three persons of skill and integrity, one to be named by the inspector or deputy inspector, another by the owner or possessor of the article in question, and the third by such justice of the peace (who, failing the attendance of either of the parties in difference, shall name for him), requiring such three persons forthwith to examine such article and report their opinion of the quality and condition thereof under oath (which oath the justice of the peace shall administer), and their determination, or that of the majority of them, made in writing, shall be final and conclusive, whether approving or disapproving the judgment of the inspector or deputy inspector, who shall immediately conform thereto, and brand or mark such article, or the package containing the same (as the case may be), or of the qualities or conditions directed by the determination aforesaid; and if the opinion of the inspector or deputy inspector be thereby confirmed, the reasonable cost or charges of re-examination (to be ascertained by the said justice of the peace) shall be paid by the said owner or possessor of the article in question, and, if otherwise, by the inspector or deputy inspector."

That is the clause of the Act now in force with respect to disputes arising where there are no boards of examiners, boards of trade or chambers of commerce. The next section provides how disputes shall be settled in cities where they have boards of examiners and chambers of commerce. It is as follows:—

"Provided always, that if any dispute arises between the inspector or deputy inspector for any of thesaid cities of Quebec, Montreal, Kingston, Toronto, Hamilton, London, Ottawa, St. John, N.B., or Halifax, N.S., and the proprietor or possessor of flour or meal, with regard to the quality or condition thereof, or relating in any respect to the same, such dispute shall not be decided in the manner hereinbefore provided, but upon application by either of the parties in difference to the secretary of the board of trade or the chamber of commerce for the city where the dispute has arisen, the said secretary shall forthwith summon a meeting of the board of examiners for the said city, who, or a majority of them, shall immediately examine such flour or meal and report their opinion of the quality and condition thereof; and their determination, or that of a majority of those present, made in writing, shall be final and conclusive, whether approving or disapproving the judgment of the inspector or deputy inspector, who shall immediately attend and conform himself thereto, and shall brand or paint, or cause to be branded or painted, on each and every barrel or half barrel, the quantity and condition directed by the determination aforesaid."

I need not read the next section, but a subsequent subsection goes on to say:

"And if the opinion of the inspector or deputy inspector be thereby confirmed, the reasonable costs and charges of re-examination, according to the rates allowed by the council of the board of trade or chamber of commerce for the city, shall be taxed by the said secretary and paid by the proprietor or possessor of such flour and meal; and if otherwise, by the inspector, with all damages."

The Minister will see that in case of disputes arising in the cities mentioned in the Act, where they have boards of examiners and boards of trade, the secretary of the board shall summon them and a decision shall be given on the point. If they decide that the inspector was right, the person with whom he had the dispute shall pay all reasonable costs assessed by the board of examiners. If, on the other hand, the inspector was wrong, the costs shall be paid by him. But there is provision made in the preceding section in regard to districts where they have no board of examiners or board of trade. When disputes arise in such districts, the remedy is to apply to a justice of the peace. The party shall hand in one name to the justice of the peace; the inspector shall submit another name, and the justice of the peace shall submit another name, and these three persons shall come to a decision on the merits of the case. The Minister of Inland Revenue, if I understand his resolution aright, proposes that, instead of this machinery, we shall have a chief inspector, say one for flour and meal, another for leather and hides, and so on, for the different articles enumerated, and when disputes arise they shall be determined by this official. The difficulty I see, and the point which I desire to emphasise is this: Will not the practical operation of having one man to determine these disputes give an advantage to the city where that officer lives? Will it not lead merchants to send their goods to such city, inasmuch as if the inspection does not please him, he can have another inspection made

at a trifling expense. But if the inspector resided 1,000 miles away, and the merchant had to incur the risk of paying his travelling expenses in addition to his fees, it would deter him from appealing against the inspection. I therefore desire to enquire if it is intended by this proposed new law to repeal sections 11 and 12 of the present Act, and substitute the appointment of a chief inspector, as I have mentioned. If that be the case, it seems to me, from what I at present know, that the clause in the Act is more in the public interest. It will not do to have inspectors located in cities, if the effect of that is to give undue commercial advantage to any one city or cities in the Dominion. I trust the Minister apprehends the point I am taking and will give me information in regard to it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I can only say to the hon. gentleman that I have afforded all the information I could afford in connection with these resolutions. With respect to Manitoba wheat I may say that I have endeavored in that respect to meet the wishes of the Province by giving it a higher grade. Another change is with respect to the inspection of fish, and on that point the member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) has recognised the advisability of the proposed change. With respect to the details of the Bill, I will give as full information as I possess in committee on the Bill. The change made, in the first place, is as regards voluntary inspection. That is admitted by both sides of the House. Another change is made, so as to give the wheat of Manitoba and the North-West a higher classification. I expected to be congratulated by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson) and others, upon having met the requirements of Manitoba. Does the hon. gentleman intend to state that the Province does not want that change? I do not think he will say so. If hon. gentlemen will allow us to go into committee on the Bill, I promise to give all the information I can as to its details.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I submit that I cannot have misunderstood the resolution so, far as not to obtain an answer on my point from the Minister. The member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) saw the point, and we cannot both be wrong. I have pointed out that in the present Act, if disputes arise in places where there are boards of examiners and chambers of commerce, it is provided that the board of examiners shall deal with the matter; and that in other districts application shall be made to a justice of the peace, and three arbitrators appointed, as I have before explained. But who is to pay the fees? In the cities the secretary of the board of trade calls them together, but as I understand the resolution, it proposes to appoint chief inspectors whose duties it shall be to decide those disputes. That must be to wipe out the machinery under the present Act, and leave these disputes to be dealt with by the chief inspectors, to be appointed; but there is this objection, that there are even different articles open to this inspection. Take, for instance, the article of leather and hides, and as there is only one inspector to be appointed, supposing he lives at Montreal and a dispute arises in Victoria, will the person in British Columbia have to avail himself of the services of the inspector living in Montreal, with the cognisance that if the dispute goes against him he will have to pay his travelling expenses and fees?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I would suggest that I will make provision to appoint one for each Province.

Mr. PATERSON. I think that would be much better than the present proposition, which I think is likely to be unworkable. There should be no law enacted to give one city a commercial advantage over another, and under the present law we can settle a dispute in Guelph or Brantford just as well as anywhere else. But if the inspector lives in Montreal or Halifax, we could not settle it without paying his travelling expenses, or else sending the article there. The Minister's suggestion will obviate that difficulty a good deal, though I reserve to myself the right, when the Bill comes down, to say whether or not the present plan, which allows disputes to be settled in each section, is not the best after all, and one which gives fairer play than even the system of appointing one chief inspector for each Province.

Mr DAVIES. The suggestion which the Minister has made is important, so far as it goes, but it only partially obviates the objection taken by the hon. member for Brant. But at any rate, I think before we rise the Minister should amend the resolution in the direction he has suggested. Under this suggestion, a chief inspector for Ontario may reside in Toronto; the dispute must still be settled by the chief inspector, and if he has to travel from a point in Ontario where he resides to the place where the dispute arises, the inherent defect of the scheme still exists.

Mr. WATSON. As the Minister mentioned my name in connection with the grading of wheat in Manitoba, I wish to say that I think he misunderstood me before recess, when he thought I was obstructing the Bill. I was not obstructing the Bill. But I was anxious to know in what particular direction the classification of wheat in Manitoba, which he proposed, was to go, how high the grades were to be and what standards were to be adopted. If I understand the Minister aright, it is his intention to make a grade of wheat comparing with the Minnesota hard wheat, or the same standard, No. 1 and 2 hard, and so on, and then there will be a Manitoba special No. 1 and 2. I wish to know from the hon. gentleman what standard he would apply to the No. 1 special—how many pounds to the bushel—also, the standard he is supposed to apply to the No. 1 hard.

Mr. COSTIGAN. As I told the hon. gentleman some time ago, the principle of the Bill declares that we should change the classification of wheat, and I am sure the hon. gentleman recognises that fact, and the reasons for it. But if he finds, when my proposition comes down, that it does not meet his requirements, he can object to it. I am not here laying down the grade, but simply affirming that the classification of wheat should be better defined. Does not the hon. gentleman agree that it should be better defined?

Mr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Very well; if my definition does not agree with his view when the Bill comes down, he can make any suggestion he likes.

Mr. WATSON. As I explained before recess, I would like to know the standard, as there are many people in that country who would like to be informed on that point.

Mr. COSTIGAN. You will know when you get the Bill.

Mr. WATSON. When the Bill comes down it will go through the House, so that we will not have a chance of discussing it.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Oh, no.

Mr. DAVIES. I suppose the hon. Minister will now submit the amendment he proposes, in order to obviate the fatal objection raised by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson).

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not necessary, as it may be done when the Bill is before the House, as the hon. gentleman knows very well. The case was very well put by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), and I would suggest, to meet his views, that the resolution be worded, in the second line, "to provide that for each Province a chief inspector" may be appointed. As I understand, it is not the intention of my hon. friend, or the object of the Bill, to do away with the present machinery. It is intended, as far as possible, to give the chief inspector in each Province the specific power mentioned in this resolution to decide disputes between inspectors and others, in

regard to articles for inspection. It is thought well to have an officer who will have an authoritative voice.

Mr. DAVIES. Do I understand the hon. Minister to say that there will be two tribunals who will have authority to decide a point in dispute.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I do not say that.

Mr. DAVIES. Under the present law a decision of the tribunal appointed by a justice of the peace is final. If another is appointed, will there be an appeal from one to the other, or will they both have equal power.

Sir JOHN A MACDONALD. No; a dispute may be left to either party. People may use this simple form or the other.

Mr. EDGAR. The Act provides that examiners appointed by the board of trade shall examine persons before they are appointed inspectors. Is it also intended that the chief inspector shall be examined?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The chief inspectors will be appointed by me from the inspectors, who are all qualified by that examination.

Mr. PATERSON. When this Act was framed, it was not thought proper that deputy inspectors should brand any article in which they dealt. The wording of the Act is:

"No deputy inspector shall have direct or indirect interest, by himself or by any other person whomsoever, in any article inspected by him. Every deputy inspector shall, before acting as such, take and subscribe before some justice of the peace, the following oath:—I, A.B., do solemnly swear that I will faithfully, truly and impartially, to the best of my judgment and skill and understanding, execute and perform the office of deputy inspector of—, and that I will not inspect, brand or certify to the quality of any article or thing in which I have any direct or indirect interest on my own account or upon the account of any other person whomsoever, while I continue to hold office as a deputy inspector. So help me God."

That was the provision of the Act of 1874, as strong as it could be, not only in the declaration of the statute, but in the wording of the oath of office; and the Minister announces, as the second proposition in his resolution, that that is to be entirely changed, and that a deputy inspector is to be at liberty to deal in any article he inspects, being required, if he does so, to brand it with the word "owner." I think it would not be asking too much to ask the Minister what has led him to make such a radical change in the law.

Mr. COSTIGAN. One of the things that has led me to make that change was the strong ground taken by hon. gentlemen opposite, last year, who complained that while we recognised the principle of compulsory inspection we excluded fishermen from the Act. It has since been generally admitted, and by the hon. gentleman's own friends, that it would be better to modify the Act and make the inspection voluntary. Under voluntary inspection the inspection is only valid so far as you can establish a character for it. This is the Act introduced by hon. gentlemen opposite. It was voluntary in all its elements, except as to leather and hides. The inspection of flour was voluntary; and flour has been inspected since then, and the inspection has beeome valid and of worth. With regard to the deputy inspector: Last year I could not admit that they could expect a fee, when you made it compulsory on fish dealers to go to them and have their fish inspected; but I am quite free this year to adopt the views of hon. gentlemen opposite, and say that they should be competent to inspect the fish, simply marking any article inspected by them, if they have a pecuniary interest, "inspector and owner." Large quantities of fish exported from this country are put up not only on the certificate of the inspectors but of the shippers themselves. Under this amendment, the inspector shall afford a guarantee to the fishermen of its worth. If the inspection is not good, they will not patronise it. The inspector will find it necessary to establish a character for his inspection. That means that, with regard to fish we are applying the principle of inspection to fish, which we now have with regard to flour—the voluntary principle.

Mr. PATERSON. The mind of the hon. member seems to be running in the direction of fish. But fish is only one of seven articles in the list, and the law on the Statute Book, and the amendment proposed here, apply not to one article but to all the articles. He has said that the inspection of fish was compulsory and he proposes to make it non-compulsory. I do not want to enter into that question, because I do not understand the merits of it; I leave it to those who are more especially interested in it. Probably the Minister and those who argue with him are right with regard to fish; but it was not compulsory to have an inspection of flour and the other articles mentioned—wheat and other grain, beef and pork, pot ashes, pearl ashes and butter. Yet, flour not being compulsory, the strong language of the statute I have read declared that no one who was a deputy inspector should deal in it; yet the Minister proposes that he shall have power to do it. He proposes that they shall have power to make a radical change, a direct change, which is not affected by the fish question. If it had been compulsory and were not changed and made voluntary, it might affect it, as far as fish is concerned, but this law is enacted as regards articles on which inspection was not compulsory, and being not compulsory they are in the same category. The Minister proposes the Inspector may deal on them while the statute declares they may not. I want to see how it is desirable to let the deputy inspector do the very reverse of that which he was forbidden to do in the statute, other circumstances not having changed in the least.

Mr. MILLS. I do not see how the Minister is going to give practical effect to this particular provision. It proposes that a party may inspect an article in which he deals, provided he marks the word "owner" on it, to indicate the inspector has an interest in the article. That may be done with some articles, but how can it be done with wheat?

Mr. COSTIGAN. It does not apply to wheat at all.

Committee rose and reported; and resolution concurred in.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 135), further to amend the General Inspection Act of 1874, and the Acts amending the same.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

AGRICULTURAL FERTILIZERS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the Order for second reading of Bill (No. 122) respecting agricultural fertilisers be transferred to Government Orders.

Motion agreed to.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE N. W.—TELEGRAMS FROM INDIANS AT FORT QU'APPELLE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to read, indeed I am instructed to read, a telegram received from some Indians at Fort Qu'Appelle, sent through the Indian agent:

"FORT QU'APPELLE, 22nd April, 1885.

"Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, Ottawa:

"Indians want this read in Parliament by you.

"ALLAN MACDONALD,
"*Agent.*

"Pasqua and Muskowpetung are speaking to you now through their counsellor, Charles Asham, of Fort Qu'Appelle reserve. We have good thoughts in our hearts. From the time Governor Morris made the treaty with us, have kept our promises. Surprised to see soldiers coming here. Don't know reason why. Only look to treaty obligations and

our work on reserves. Don't think anything disloyal of us; it hurts us. We depend upon promises made by Great Mother to us, because of our keeping faith; hope when trouble is ended that she will extend more help to us on our reserves to make better living than before, and hope that our agent will have more power to help us. Expect Great Mother will see to that. Two winters ago tobacco was sent to us. We did not listen. Now more tobacco is sent. We will not listen. Governor Dewdney told us no matter if war around our reserves, we should not fight; we would not be molested. We hold on to that. We would not be called to fight; we want peace. I try all I can to keep peace and explain everything. I want Great Mother to be kind and good to us.

"We witness:
"A. MACDONALD, Indian Agent,
"WILLIAM E. O'BRIEN, Lieut.-Colonel,
"GEORGE DREWER, Interpreter,
"T. W. JACKSON, Member North-West Council,
"PASQUA, Chief,
"MUSKOWPETUNG, Chief,
"CHARLES ASHAM, Head Councillor.

"Send answer."

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES IN ANIMALS.

Mr. POPE moved third reading of Bill (No. 44) respecting infectious or contagious diseases affecting animals.

Mr. FISHER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he has included in this Bill the amendment which he promised to make to it when in Committee of the Whole I mean the amendment to exempt horses from the operation of the Bill. The hon. gentleman agreed, on the suggestion of my hon. friend, the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), that horses should not be included, and I trust he has made this change, excluding them from the operation of the Bill.

Mr. POPE. I did not agree to the suggestion; I said I had no objection to the hon. member moving an amendment of that kind, and if the House will accept it I have no objection to it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). When I withdrew the amendment I submitted to a clause in this Bill in Committee, I did so at the hon. gentleman's own suggestion. I wish it to be understood that I do not oppose the principle of this measure, on the contrary, I feel that it is a very important Bill in the interests of farmers and shippers of cattle in this country, and it is very desirable the Bill should pass. But I did take exception, when in committee, to that part of clause 13 which provided the amount to be given for compensation to the owners of cattle or any animal that might improperly be destroyed, not having been affected by any contagious disease. That was the principal part of the Bill to which I objected, and I submit now whether it is not reasonable that if, through the instructions of the Government, or without their instructions, by the action of any officer of the Government, any animal should be destroyed that was not affected by infectious disease, the owner should not at least be fairly compensated for the value of that animal. That is the position I take, and I submit to the House and the Minister of Agriculture that it is a very fair proposition, one he should support and a change ought to be made in this clause to meet that proposition. I am perfectly willing to support that part of the Bill that allows a small compensation in the case of animals being destroyed which are affected with contagious disease. It is the owner's misfortune if anything of the sort should happen to his animal, and I do not see that he is entitled to any compensation whatever, nor would I be disposed to advocate any; but, in conversation with the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, I understood from him that, in this Bill, he did not expect to deal with horses.

Mr. POPE. No; I did not.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I pointed out at that time that, in the case of horses particularly, from the very low compensation which was allowed, the owner would seriously suffer, and I understood from him that he would be willing to exempt horses from the provisions of the Bill. I find that horses are not included in the Bill affecting contagious diseases in England. In the Province of Ontario we have a local Act under which I think horses can be dealt with more efficiently than they could under the provisons of this Act. The hon. the Minister of Agriculture knows very well that horses are not scheduled, as other cattle or animals are for importation or exportation. I do not suppose they ever have been, and I hope they never will be. The machinery afforded by the local Act appears to me to be more efficient for dealing with local cases, and in my opinion it would seem to be a matter of local jurisdiction. It is very questionable whether the hon. Minister himself would not think that, even if this Parliament had the right to deal with the matter, of which there is some doubt, it is one coming more properly under the jurisdiction of the Local Legislature. As there are Acts in Ontario, and I believe in other Provinces, affecting contagious diseases of horses, it would be very desirable to strike that out of this Bill altogether, and I think the Minister will see, after consideration, that it is not necessary for his purposes to have horses included in this Act. The hon. member for Renfrew took some exception the other night, when the Bill was under discussion, to have horses struck out, as he thought that, under the Ontario Act, no compensation was provided for. That Act deals with cases of this kind very differently from this one, and not in the same summary manner. At the same time, I think the provisions are such that there is no danger of this disease existing without some person putting the provisions of that Act in force. All that has to be done is for any person who may know of a horse being affected with a contagious disease, especially glanders or farcy to report to a veterinary surgeon or to any justice of the peace. Action must be taken at once, and the penalties are very severe for any neglect of any order that is given. There are other provisions which, I think, protect the owner of an animal, and it is very unlikely that any injustice will be done, as the matter has to be heard before some court of competent jurisdiction before any action can be taken to order the killing of the animal. In that case, I do not think there would be the same danger of any injustice being done to the owner of an animal under that Act as under the present Bill. I therefore move, as the hon. Minister suggested:

That the said Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of amending section 2, sub-section *b*, by striking out the word "horses," and adding at the end of the clause the words "except horses;"—also by adding the word "horses" after the word "cattle," in line 1 in sub-section *a*, of section 27, and the same word after "animals" in line 1 of section 39.

I think that would exclude them from the Act altogether. It would be in accordance with the English Act, and would give greater satisfaction to the farmers, and to the owners and shippers of horses generally, throughout the Dominion.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman has put this question very fairly, and it is a question that is undoubtedly open to discussion. I am not all sorry that he has moved this amendment, in order that the sense of the House may be taken upon it. I have no prejudice on this question. I would prefer that all the Provinces should have local laws by which they would manage entirely local affairs, excepting those in regard to cattle which are likely to be scheduled. It was under those circumstances that I spoke to the hon. gentleman the other night, but I find that some people in this House object to my striking this out, and for that reason I think it is better that he should move this motion. I will offer no impediment to it. I am not wedded to the provision at all. I am sure that, if all the Provinces would manage this matter, it would be better, but I believe there are only two Provinces which have Acts on this subjects—one Manitoba and the other Ontario. Up to this moment, so far as my Department is concerned, we have in no case interfered. I must confess that I have always had my doubts about the jurisdiction, excepting with regard to those animals that I

have before described. Still, it is necessary that there should be some means by which which disease of this kind, whether amongst horses or anything else, should be dealt with; it has always been on our Statute Book and in no case has there been any complaint. However, if the House thinks it better that this should be removed, I have no objection whatever. I have been very much pleased that the hon. gentleman has put it in the fair, manly way he has, before the House, and I am sure that his remarks will have their weight with the House.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I hope the amendment will not be carried by this House. It may be true, as urged by the mover of this amendment, that horses are not so liable to be scheduled in other countries to which they are exported from Canada as cattle and sheep, but it must be known that there is a very large exportation of horses from Canada. I believe a large number are exported from Montreal every week to the United States, and in that particular Canada does not stand in the same position as England. I think that the exportation of horses from Great Britain is very limited indeed, and not at all to be compared with the exportation of horses from this country; and although it may be true that up to the present time no steps have been taken by other countries in relation to diseased horses for export from Canada, yet the time may come when the spread of contagious diseases in this country will become such as to lead countries to which we export to schedule them, and to stop the export of an article which is, at the present time, very considerable, and the profit of which is of considerable consequence to the farmers of this country. If I understood the arguments of hon. gentlemen opposite correctly, in respect to the provisions of this Bill, their chief objection to it was that the compensation provided was not sufficient. Now, Sir, what is the case in regard to the Act upon the Statute Book of the Province of Ontario? There no provision is made for compensation for animals killed under the authority of that Act, whether they be diseased or not. In the first place, it provides that:

"Where it appears to any person that any horse or other animal is diseased, such person may notify any justice having jurisdiction in the municipality; and the justice, if in his opinion there is reasonable cause therefor, shall forthwith, by writing under his hand, direct a competent veterinarian to inspect the animal alleged to be diseased."

Well, Sir, I pointed out the other night and I think those who represent country constituencies will agree with me, that there is nothing more difficult than to induce one farmer to give information respecting diseased animals belonging to his neighbor; there seems to be a reluctance and an indisposition on the part of farmers to inform upon their neighbors; and it seems to me that, under the provisions of this Act, it would be wholly impossible to stamp out a disease, particularly the disease of glanders, which has prevailed to a great extent in the locality in which I live, at all events, and I dare say in other parts of the country. Then, Sir, as I pointed out, there is no compensation provided to the farmer for his animals should they be slaughtered under the provisions of this Act. There is a provision by which a court of justice may make an order upon the municipality in which cases occur for the costs that are incurred in determining whether those animals shall be slaughtered or not, and in view of that fact, in view of the difficulties of putting this Act into operation, I am disposed to think that very little good could be effected under the operations of the Act of the Province of Ontario. As regards the other Provinces, I know nothing respecting the laws that may be in operation therein; but I am satisfied that in the Province of Ontario it will be almost impossible to stamp out the disease to which I refer in horses under the operation of that Act, and therefore I I shall vote against the proposed amendment of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland).

Mr. POPE. If my hon. friend is going to put this motion, I would ask him to extend it. He will find it necessary to amend the 37th clause, letter A, by adding, after the word "cattle," in the first line, the word "horses." That is for the purpose of quarantining them, because you must have the power to quarantine.

Mr. DAVIES. If the hon. gentleman looks at the interpretation clause he will see it is unnecessary.

Mr. POPE. But he is going to strike that out. Then, in in the 39th section, after the word "cattle," in the first line, he must include horses. That is to prevent the introduction of horses if they are diseased.

Mr. WELDON. I suggest that we put "horses, cattle and other animals."

Mr. POPE. Very well.

Mr. WILSON. I feel that the amendment is a very important one, and in the right direction. As stated by the mover of the amendment, in Ontario they have an Act that has worked very satisfactorily so far.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). They only passed it last year.

Mr. WILSON. I know that; but we have found that the Act, as far as it has come into operation, has given general satisfaction. Now, Sir, we find that the Minister has included among diseases a very large number of those that are not included in the English Act, and in respect to which it is very questionable to-day whether they be or be not contagious, and therefore they ought not to be included in this Act. My hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. White) says that we have a very large exportation of horses from this country, and therefore it might seriously prejudice the interests of that exportation from Canada to the United States. Now I think, Mr. Speaker, that if he will consider the disease that he referred to, and which he has said was very prevalent in his neighborhood, he will find that that disease has been proved to exist a long time before it develops any contagious or infectious character; that it can be easily ascertained and readily detected, and, if detected, under the Act of the Province of Ontario, the animal can be slaughtered, without any risk or danger to the animals that may come into contact with it. And further, I have never heard, yet, any complaint of any danger or any risk in regard to the animals exported from Canada to the United States. We find that so far as horses are concerned it would be a very great injustice indeed if the Minister of Agriculture had it in his power to enter into stables where there are very valuable horses and, upon the mere suspicion that there was a contagious disease amongst them, cause the horses to be quarantined or destroyed, whereby the party owning those horses might lose very heavily indeed. If the Minister granted adequate compensation, there would be some reason for allowing this clause to remain as part of the Bill. We also know that at certain seasons of the year—though I am not a sporting character myself—I know that at certain seasons of they year the horses of those who are inclined to sporting, might be very seriously interfered with, and great injustice might be done to parties interested in having fast horses. Therefore, I think the owner of such horses ought to be protected from interferance by the Minister of Agriculture who, otherwise, might, through his inspector, prevent those horses from pursuing their ordinary circuit. Then, again, I think that if the Minister will consider the Ontario Act he will find that it will answer all the purposes he desires, and that he will have no difficulty whatever in suppressing any diseases that are likely to take place among horses. We know, and all those who have had any opportunity of becoming acquainted with the subject are well aware, that horses may have certain diseases which assimi-

late very closely to some of the diseases represented to be contagious diseases; and it is impossible for any veterinary surgeon to say definitely whether horses have consumption or merely the relics of disease of the lungs. That being the case, any person having valuable animals might at any time be liable to have an inspector come along and declare them to be suffering from consumption, when no such disease existed in the animals. I hope, therefore, the amendment moved by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) will be adopted, as I believe it will do no more than justice to the owners of horses.

Mr. FISHER. I desire to say one or two words in reply to the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White). He made what he considered to be a point in regard to the Ontario law, that there was no compensation provided for an animal that was slaughtered under that law. Under that law it is provided that an animal shall be slaughtered in accordance with a judicial decision that it is suffering from a contagious disease. Section 8 provides that on the evidence of one or more competent authorities that the animal is diseased the court shall make an order for the killing, burning or burying of such an animal within twenty-four hours. But it is only in consequence of the decision of the court that the animal shall be so slaughtered, and it is very evident that, under such circumstances, the owner has no fair claim for compensation. The reason why the suggestion was made to the Minister of Agriculture that in this Bill the clause relating to compensation inserted in the Ontario Act should not be adopted in this Act was, because animals were not destroyed on the order of a judicial tribunal but by order of an inspector or the Minister. It is in consequence of that fact that compensation is given, and as, in the case of horses, it is entirely inadequate, the Minister was requested to strike out horses from the Bill. That is the reason why the hon. member for Oxford desires that horses should be struck out. The clause of the Ontario Act goes on to show that the fact that the animal has disease must be proved. It is, therefore, evident that this has to be established not only to the court, but to the court on the evidence of competent witnesses. There is no reason, therefore, why compensation should be granted under those circumstances, because if, by any chance, under the Ontario law a farmer's horse should be slaughtered on a demand made by the inspector, and it could be established that the animal was not diseased, the party has recourse in the courts to a suit for damages. Under this Act there is no such recourse, and if, by order of the Minister, such an animal were slaughtered, the law would hold the Minister or the person carrying out his instructions entirely free from claims for damages. There is no recourse and no appeal from the decision under this Bill, and any person having an animal killed would not obtain compensation. The hon. gentleman has alluded to the fact that horses are sometimes affected with contagious diseases. I am well aware there are cases of glanders or farcy, which is the only disease to which horses are subject coming under this Bill. The other diseases do not come under it, and animals suffering from other diseases to which horses are liable will not be slaughtered under the provisions of this Bill. In the case of glanders or farcy the disease is very easily detected as a rule. I think I know enough about horses to know that this disease very seldom spreads, or that any large number of animals are affected by it in any particular neighborhood. The disease may spread in one particular stable, but it very seldom spreads to a large number of stables in one neighborhood. It is not within the knowledge of any member of this House that a district has been declared to be under the operation of the Contagious Diseases Act in consequence of the existence of glanders or farcy among horses. Horses have never, so far as I know, been scheduled in any country to which we export them. I am not aware that complaints have been made about Canada exporting diseased horses. Such a case would be almost impossible. The Minister of Agriculture stated the other night that he wished the Bill to go through in its present form because it dealt with quarantine and our trade in animals. I think on that ground the Minister would be safe in allowing horses to be expunged from the Bill, because it is not at all necessary to apply this Bill to horses, to save them from any dangerous disease or their being scheduled in any foreign country. I therefore think the objections taken by the member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) are entirely incorrect, and the House will be quite safe in passing this measure.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I think the observations just made are the strongest argument that can be adduced against the proposition to strike horses from this Bill. As has been pointed out, under the Ontario law certain things are required to be done in order to bring animals under the operation of that Act. In my opinion it will never be put into operation. For instance, it is provided that in case it appears by the evidence of one or more competent veterinarians that the animal in question is diseased, the court shall make an order. The interpretation of this Act defines "veterinarian" to mean veterinary surgeon, duly registered in the Ontario Veterinary Association, although in many parts of the country there are no veterinary surgeons. Then, Sir, we are told by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) who, I suppose, has some knowledge on this subject, that the disease of glanders is very easily detected. I am informed, however, by competent veterinary surgeons, that it is a very difficult matter to determine whether a horse affected by the symptoms of glanders is really glandered, or is simply suffering from some disease of a less serious character. It seems to me that it would be desirable that some means should be adopted by which these animals should be quarantined, or set apart from other animals in the different localities, so that the disease may not spread, to the great detriment of the farming community. I am confident that, under the operation of the Ontario Act, it would be wholly impossible to bring about that result, and I therefore feel that it will be my duty to divide the House on the amendment.

Mr. AUGER. I believe that horses ought to come under the operation of this law. I know that in my own county last winter there were several complaints of horses suffering from what was called glanders, and in the Province of Quebec we have no law applying to such cases; but if such a provision as is now suggested had been in force, they could have been brought under its operation. These horses were travelling about the country, sometimes in hotel sheds or barns, and put up in the same stalls with other horses, thus exposing them to catch the disease. For that reason I think horses ought to be included in the provisions of the Bill.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Sutherland (Oxford), p. 1321.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Dodd,	McIsaac,
Bain (Soulanges),	Dugas,	McLelan,
Bain (Wentworth),	Dundas,	McMullen,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Dupont,	McNeill,
Baker (Victoria),	Edgar,	Massue,
Beaty,	Farrow,	Mills,
Béchard,	Ferguson (Welland),	Mitchell,
Benoit,	Fisher,	Moffat,
Benson,	Fleming,	Mulock,
Bernier,	Forbes,	Paint,
Billy,	Gagné,	Paterson (Brant),
Blake,	Geoffrion,	Pinsonneault,

Blondeau,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Girouard,	Pope,
Bourbeau,	Grandbois,	Ray,
Bowell,	Guilbault,	Reid,
Burns,	Gunn,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Hackett,	Riopel,
Cameron (Huron),	Harley,	Robertson (Hastings),
Cameron (Inverness),	Hesson,	Scriver,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Hickey,	Small,
Cameron (Victoria),	Holton,	Smyth,
Carling,	Homer,	Somerville (Brant),
Caron,	Hurteau,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cartwright,	Innes,	Springer,
Casey,	Ives,	Stairs,
Casgrain,	Jackson,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Catudal,	Jamieson,	Sutherland (Selkirk),
Charlton,	Jenkins,	Tassé,
Cochrane,	Kilvert,	Taylor,
Cockburn,	King,	Temple,
Cook,	Kinney,	Thompson,
Costigan,	Kirk,	Trow,
Coughlin,	Kranz,	Vail,
Coursol,	Labrosse,	Valin,
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Wallace (York),
Cuthbert,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Watson,
Daly,	Laurier,	Weldon,
Daoust,	Livingstone,	Wells,
Davies,	Macdonald (King's),	White (Cardwell),
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wilson,
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	McCallum,	Wright,
Desaulniers (St. Maurice)	McCraney,	Yeo.—131.
Desjardins,	McIntyre,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Hall,	Pruyn,
Anger,	Hay,	Rykert,
Bell,	Irvine,	Townshend,
Bryson,	McCarthy,	Tupper,
Burnham,	McDougald (Pictou),	White (Renfrew).—16.
Foster,		

Amendment agreed to.

House again resolved itself into committee; amendment reported and concurred in.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. MULOCK. I am glad that the House appears to be so unanimous in its efforts to perfect this measure. When we had it in committee there was some difficulty, I think, on the part of some hon. gentlemen, in approaching its consideration in that calm spirit which is necessary in dealing with any measure so important. I, perhaps, may take the liberty of congratulating the Minister of Agriculture on the improvement in his manner in which he has submitted to the House the question which has just been disposed of, and I venture to say that I think if he had manifested a similar spirit at an earlier stage of this Bill, he would have made much more rapid progress than he has made with it. However, it is never too late to mend, and even at this late stage of the Bill it has been shown that it was capable of amendment in a most important respect, so it cannot be considered oo late to offer another suggestion, which I trust will meet with the approval of the Minister of Agriculture and of this House. When the House was in committee on the Bill I called the attention of the committee to the extraordinary provisions of the measure and to the inadequate scheme of compensation. When the Bill was introduced into the House, and when it was being considered in committee, it was found that it gave most extraordinary powers to the Minister of Agriculture—powers which, if exercised even by accident, unwisely, might result in great pecuniary loss to individuals. Accordingly, I at that time made certain suggestions which were not acquiesced in. I pointed out at that time, as was then the fact, that the most valuable animal might be destroyed when it should not be destroyed, and that the only amount of compensation was the sum of $20 in one case, and a sum not exceeding $40 in any other possible case. I pointed out then that that measure of compensation appeared wholly inadequate; and further, that in consideration of the extraordinary powers demanded by the Minister, it was desirable that a further compensation should be provided for. After considerable discussion on that point the Minister of Agriculture, on the advice of the First Minister, I think, saw that it was necessary to offer a further amount of compensation, and accordingly the Bill was amended in committee in one respect, namely, by providing that in the case of animals with a pedigree compensation might be allowed to the extent of two-thirds of their value, and not exceeding in all $150. That was an amendment in the right direction, but does not go far enough. Therefore, I wish to call the attention of the House to another point. The Bill gives absolute power to the Minister of Agriculture to destroy animals that are only suspected of being affected with infectious or contagious diseases. He is not obliged, under the Bill, to make enquiry as to whether such animals are or are not so affected; but he can destroy the most valuable animal, if, in the public interest, he thinks it necessary so to do. Of course, I know he will not intentionally destroy such an animal; but it is quite possible that such a mistake may be made. Now, I would invite his attention to the case of animals merely suspected of disease, but in fact free from disease. I do not propose to consider the case of animals of small value, which are now provided for by the Bill; but there are in the country, at present, a large number of thoroughbred cattle. According to the Minister's report of 1883, during that one year there were imported into Canada 2,132 pure-bred cattle, which fact, of itself, shows that there is a considerable quantity of valuable stock in the country. Now, the Bill as it stands at present, only provides compensation to the extent of $150. There is no doubt in my mind, nor can there be in the mind of any hon. gentleman, that there are thousands of cattle in this Dominion at present, each one of which is worth far more than $150. I presume that no bull or cow crosses the Atlantic to Canada that is not worth more than that, whilst we know that many of these animals range in value away up among the thousands. Now, it appears to me that the Bill should be amended, by providing for a quarantine of such animals as are simply suspected of being affected with infectious or contagious disease. If a man has a valuable animal, and the Minister or his officers suspects it of being affected, while it is not so in fact, it should not be destroyed; but we know that it is the province of doctors to differ, and it is possible for mistakes or errors of judgment to exist, even after the disease has developed; but more especially is that possible before the disease has developed. During that period, while the animal is only suspected, I think it would be wise to provide a scheme for its segregation, for such a reasonable length of time as will decide the case one way or the other. If the disease develops itself, I would leave the animal to be dealt with according to law, not dealing with the question of compensation at all. After the disease develops in the animal sufficiently to lead to its destruction, it ceases to be of value to the owner; but if it turns out to be not diseased, it ought to be returned to the owner. In that view I would respectfully submit the following amendment:—

That the Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House, with instructions to amend the same by adding to the 13th section, the following words:

Provided always, that in the case of any animal of the value, when in a state of health, of $200 or upwards, and which is only suspected, but not shown beyond reasonable doubt to be suffering from any infectious or contagious disease, the owner thereof may require the same to be segregated and confined within certain limits to be defined by the Minister of Agriculture, apart from other animals, instead of being slaughtered; and thereupon the same shall be so segregated and confined, and shall not be slaughtered until pronounced by experts to be so diseased; and if after such animal shall be so confined for a reasonable length of time, the same shall be pronounced by experts as free from any such disease, then it shall be returned to the owner.

I hope that will meet with the approval of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. POPE. I do not propose to discuss this question at any length, as it was discussed when the Bill was in committee. But it would be quite impossible to carry out this Act if it were amended in the direction the hon. gentleman proposes. If the farmers are to quarantine their own cattle, other cattle through the country would be exposed to contact with them and to catch the disease. The plan proposed is an impossible one. So far as valuable pedigree animals are concerned, there has never been any disease among them when introduced in this country. They are sent to quarantine, whether diseased or not, on their arrival, and must remain there for ninety days, so that any disease amongst this kind of cattle would be a disease that is in the country. There never has been the slightest difficulty in carrying out this Act nor the slightest word of complaint under it. The position of the hon. gentleman would endanger the health of the cattle all over the country, by allowing them to be quarantined all over the country, thus exposing other cattle to catch the disease, for these animals, quarantined in this way in everybody's field, would not be isolated in the manner this Act provides.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I regret very much the hon. the Minister of Agriculture has not seen fit to adopt this amendment. The hon. gentleman says it would be impossible to carry it out, but he does not tell us what are the difficulties in the way of carrying it out. He must remember that, under section 13 of this Bill, he takes to his officials and himself the extraordinary power of seizing and slaughtering cattle supposed to be diseased. He can, without giving any notice to the owner or having any communication with him, instruct the officials of the Department to slaughter animals, on the assumption that they are infected with contagious diseases, although, as a matter of fact, they may be wholly free from disease. What my hon. friend proposes is, that instead of the Minister having such extensive powers, the owner of the animal suspected of disease, if he desires that it should be quarantined, should have it quarantined in a place fixed by the Government; and if it turns out not to be diseased the animal will be restored to the owner; or, if it be diseased, it will be slaughtered. Surely that is not an unreasonable proposition. Why should the Minister of Agriculture take the extraordinary power of ordering the destruction of an animal without the consent or knowledge of the owner, and then put the owner off with the paltry compensation allowed by section 13? The hon. gentleman must recollect that the amendment of my hon. friend only applies to a certain class of animals—those worth $200 and over. If the owner thinks fit, the Department will quarantine these animals; and there can be no danger that in quarantine the disease will spread, because they will be kept in some place fixed by the Government, where there can be no reasonable chance of the disease spreading, and will be, no doubt, under the direction of some veterinary surgeon, who will ascertain whether they are really infected or not. In discussing the general principle covered by clause 13, the other night, we pointed out to the Minister of Agriculture the difficulties and hardships that would necessarily result because of the strict enforcement of this clause. Under the first portion of the compensation clause the hon. gentleman has power to destroy all infected animals. We do not object to that; it is quite right he should have the power promply, at once, where the animal is really infected, to destroy it, so as to prevent the spread of disease; but what we objected to particulary was the second portion of the compensation clause, which enables the hon. gentleman, on mere suspicion, without any well founded grounds for belief that the animal was diseased, to instruct the officers of his Department, or any body, else to slaughter it. What we complain of is that where the officers of the Department shall do so, and it turns out the animal was not infected, the hon. gentleman should only to pay two-thirds of the value of the animal, not to exceed $40 in the case of grade cattle and $150 in the case of thoroughbreds. What my hon. friend from West York wants to do by his amendment is to provide that the Government shall not, where the animal is not shown, beyond reasonable doubt, to be infected, slaughter the animal without giving the owner an opportunity of ascertaining whether or not, as a matter of fact, the animal is diseased; and the hon. gentleman refuses to assent to that proposition. I regret this, because it is a fair and reasonable proposition.

Mr. FLEMING. There is a view of this question that has been pressing itself upon my mind since the Bill has been under consideration, and which has not been referred to, and that is the power of this Parliament to pass the Bill. There are some of its provisions, it is true, that are clearly within the jurisdiction of this Parliament, those relating to the quarantining of cattle imported into the country; but, so far as the regulations for the examination and destruction of cattle throughout all the agricultural districts of the country are concerned, I do not see very clearly where the power of this Parliament exists to interfere so largely with the rights of property as this Bill claims to interfere. Property and civil rights are, by the British North America Act, within the sole jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislatures, and there is no greater interference, that I can imagine, than the attempted interference of this Bill with the rights of property and other civil rights of the owner of property to hold and dispose of it as he thinks fit. It is true this law has been upon the Statute Book, so far as the point I am now discussing is concerned, since 1879; but, on referring to the debate of that time, I observe that this question was mooted by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), though it was not pressed for discussion. I merely throw it out now for the purpose of drawing the Minister's attention to it, and I think that, under the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) this is the proper time to raise it; because, when the question of the destruction of a valuable animal is concerned, it is quite possible that the owner of such an animal, entertaining the view that this Parliament has no jurisdiction in the matter, may bring an action against the officer of this Government for destroying his valuable animal, and the question will then have to be decided by the courts. It is quite true that, in the British North America Act, section 95, this provision is contained:

"In each Province the Legislature may make laws in relation to agriculture in the Province, and to immigration into the Province, and it is hereby declared that the Parliament of Canada may, from time to time, make laws in relation to agriculture, in all or any of the Provinces, and to immigration into all or any of the Provinces and any law of the Legislature of the Province, relative to agriculture or to immigration, shall have effect in and for the Province as far only as it is not repugnant to any Act of the Parliament of Canada."

Now, it is possible that it may be contended that, under section 95, this Parliament has the right to enact this law as affecting agriculture; but you will observe that the words of section 95 are that this Parliament may make laws in relation to agriculture in all or any of the Provinces. Now, agriculture is a limited word, and I do not know that it includes stock-raising or dealing in cattle and other animals that are affected by this Bill. The word agriculture itself is derived from *ager*, a field, and *cultura*, cultivation. It is defined by Worcester, following the Latin root, to be the art or science of cultivating the earth, tillage or husbandry. It is so defined also by Richardson, and, in that definition and in its original meaning, it cannot possibly cover the subject that is now being legislated upon. It is important, of course, that some law upon the subject of this Bill should be in existence. It is important, in the interests of the cattle trade, the export trade, that our herds should be free from suspicion in the markets of the old country, but that could be effected by an inspection at the

port of export, and the same quarantine laws that are now in existence, relating to the import of cattle, would protect our own herds from the introduction of disease. I call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to this subject. I do not think it is necessary for me to argue further that this is an interference with property and civil rights. It is so clearly manifest on the face of the Bill that it will not be denied by anybody, and if it comes within section 95 it is not so clear as not to render this Bill, if it become law, subject to the suspicion that it is beyond the power of this Parliament, and therefore it will not secure such an obedience to it as the laws of this Parliament ought to receive from the people.

Mr. MILLS. I thoroughly agree in the views that have been expressed by my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Fleming). When a Bill on this subject was introduced in the Session of 1879, I raised the question of jurisdiction, as my hon. friend has now, and it seemed to me that those provisions of the Bill relating to the quarantine of cattle—not cattle that were brought into the country, but cattle that were raised upon the farms of the farmers of the country—could not be brought within the jurisdiction of this Parliament by any legislation here. It will be remembered that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), in an earlier part of the Session, introduced a Bill to amend the law relating to common carriers. I believe the hon. gentlemen from the Province of Quebec generally objected to that Bill. They held, and I think rightly, that it was an interference with local jurisdiction. Now, upon the grounds or arguments set out by those who were opposed to that measure, it would be extremely doubtful if this House has the right to regulate the quarantining of cattle that had been imported into the country or were in transit through the country. But, if there is any doubt in regard to that, and it may be a question of doubt, there could scarcely be any doubt that we would not have jurisdiction to interfere with the personal property of the farmers of Canada, because, after all, this is a police regulation of the conditions under which certain kinds of property may be held. The Province of Ontario has already legislated upon that subject. There is a law in force upon that subject, and the Minister, I suppose, has proceeded upon the assumption that this clause which my hon. friend has read, the 95th clause of the British North America Act, is one which gives this Parliament jurisdiction over the subject. That clause authorises the Local Legislatures and the Parliament of Canada to legislate concurrently upon the subject of immigration and upon the subject of agriculture, but it provides that the law of this Parliament, so far as it is inconsistent with the law of the Local Legislature, shall be paramount in that particular. I do not think, however, that the word agriculture would embrace the conditions upon which farming stock might be held. We use the expression ordinarily in a different sense. The regulation of agriculture relates to the regulation of fairs that are established, the importation of grain, and all those matters which are usually dealt with by a Government in seeking to improve the condition of agriculture, by the establishment of agricultural exhibitions of various sorts. I am not going to argue this question at length, but it does seem to me that in this respect this measure is *ultra vires*. Of course, if that view is correct, so much of the law as does interfere with the provincial authority would not have any effect. It would be held to be void, and the hon. member, if he were to act under its provisions, undertaking to destroy cattle under the authority given by this Bill, would do so on his own personal responsibility. The law would not afford him protection against prosecution for any such act.

Mr. TROW. I think that the amendment of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) is a reasonable proposition. It seems to me essential that some safeguard should be afforded to enterprising agriculturists and stock raisers who import to this country valuable herds of cattle. Compensation is only asked in the event of the officer of the Government slaughtering the cattle not affected, which may not take place once in many years. It is some security, at all events, to enterprising farmers, that in the event of the officer of the Government, in his discretion, slaughtering a valuable animal, the owner should receive a reasonable compensation for his loss. I do not think the Minister of Agriculture should hesitate for a moment to accept that amendment.

Mr. CASEY. I am sorry the Minister does not see fit to accept the amendment moved by the hon. member for North York; and I would suggest that he follow the same course he pursued in regard to the amendment of the hon. member for North Oxford, and leave it an open question. I do not see any reason why the Government should make this particular amendment a Government question. There is no principle involved, differing from the rest of the Bill. The quarantine on imported animals is, of course, for the purpose of ascertaining whether they are diseased, and if so, that the infection may not spread, and that the animals, if not slaughtered, may not be turned loose in the country. I do not see that there is anything at variance with the general principle of the Bill, in applying this same procedure to the case of animals within the country which are suspected of being diseased, or which have been exposed to infection, and therefore I do not see why he should not leave this an open question, as he did the last amendment. On the last occasion he found that nearly the whole House agreed with his own opinion on the matter; he may find it to be so on this occasion.

Mr. FISHER. I am a good deal disappointed at the action of the Minister on this amendment. I had hoped, from his acceptance of the amendment of my hon. friend for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) that he would accept such a reasonable amendment as this. The other day, when we were discussing this question in committee, there were several amendments brought forward on this matter. I think my hon. friend from North York has advanced such strong reasons for his amendment that there can be no possible objection to it. He carefully provides that this shall only take place in the case of animals worth more than $200; consequently, it will only take place where an animal which is thoroughbred or pure-bred, and of considerable intrinsic value, is concerned. He further goes on to show that it shall only take place when that animal has been slaughtered without being diseased. Now, surely these two provisions of this amendment make it reasonable. The Minister of Agriculture, when he said he could not accept such an amendment as this, gave as his reason that we would have a large number of places all through the country established to quarantine such animals; and then he went on to show that in our experience, since we have had thoroughbred stock in this country, it had on no occasion been affected by contagious diseases. Now, Sir, I think that the one argument kills the other, when coming from the lips of the Minister of Agriculture. I am glad to be able to confirm the statement that we never have had, among the thoroughbred stock in this country, any contagious disease, and I trust and hope that that will continue for a long time to come. But, Sir, just so long as it continues, the hon. Minister of Agriculture will run no risk of having these little quarantine stations, which he so much fears being established in the country. Moreover, when, by any chance, such a disease does occur, these little quarantine stations will be established immediately, and the disease will be stamped out; and it is much more likely that these animals will be placed under quarantine, if such a provision as this is made, than if the law stands as it is to-day. Those who have thoroughbred stock of large value in their hands would hesitate to draw the atten-

tion of the Minister and the inspectors to their stock, for fear they might be slaughtered—large herds, perhaps, might be slaughtered, without any adequate compensation to the owners. I know that farmers throughout the country, who have thoroughbred stock, take the utmost care to keep it healthy and preserve it from disease, and they would be inclined to trust to their own precautions to prevent a disease from spreading to the cattle of their neighbors. They would be more likely, if such a provision as this were put in the Act, to bring their stock under the operation of the law. If thoroughbred stock is the only stock which can thus be affected, I think it is but just that such a provision should be inserted. It is not right or fair to our best farmers, who have taken upon themselves the, by no means easy, task of raising the standard of the breeds of cattle in our country. They have undertaken an enterprise which not only redounds to their own credit and advantage, but it is also a great good to the neighborhood in which they live; and I consider that any assistance that can be given to them, to men of this public spirit and enterprise, should be given under this Act; and I think it would redound to the credit of the Minister if he would accept such a reasonable amendment as this, especially when I find that the reasons he gives for not accepting it are shown to be contradictory, the one to the other. When we were discussing this question the other day the Minister of Agriculture did increase the compensation to be given to farmers when thoroughbred stock was affected; but he did not increase it to such an extent as really to cover the value of a thoroughbred animal. He only made the increase from $40 to $150. Well, Sir, I was glad to see that concession, but I confess that I do not consider that the Minister of Agriculture has covered the whole ground yet. I find, in referring to the English Act, that compensation is not given to thoroughbred animals in particular, but is left the same for all animals, and is placed at £40, that is to say, in our own currency, about $200. I contend that in this country, where we have many fewer thoroughbred animals than there are in the old country, in proportion to the whole of our stock, we should give greater facilities and protection to the owners of thoroughbred stock than is extended to them in England. In England there are a great many owners of thoroughbred stock all through the country; and though in this country to-day there is not a very large amount of thoroughbred stock, still we are increasing it, we are importing constantly, and we ought to give every encouragement to our farmers to import it and increase their investments in this kind of stock, and give up keeping the ordinary grade cattle. This being the case, and in view of the fact that this is a reasonable amendment, one not by any means all that some members of this side of the House have asked, but an amendment carefully hedged round with restrictions and provisions, to the utmost extent possible, in order to meet the views of the Minister of Agriculture, I confess I am very much surprised and disappointed to find it has not been met in the fair way in which the Minister accepted the amendment of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), but has been refused.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Mulock, p. 1324.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fisher,	McIsaac,
Armstrong,	Fleming,	McMullen,
Auger,	Forbes,	Mills,
Bain (Wentworth),	Geoffrion,	Mulock,
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Patterson (Brant),
Blake,	Gunn,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Harley,	Ray,
Burpee,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Scriver,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Somerville (Brant),
Cartwright,	Jackson,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casey,	King,	Springer,
Casgrain,	Kirk,	Trow,
Catudal,	Laurier,	Vail,
Cockburn,	Lister,	Watson,
Cook,	Livingstone,	Weldon,
Davies,	McCraney,	Wilson,
Edgar,	McIntyre,	Yeo.—54.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Dickinson,	Macdonald (Sir John),
Baker (Missisquoi),	Dodd,	Mackintosh,
Baker (Victoria),	Dundas,	McCallum,
Beaty,	Dupont,	McDougald (Pictou),
Bell,	Ferguson (L'ds&Gren.),	McLelan,
Benoit,	Ferguson (Welland),	McNeill,
Bergeron,	Foster,	Massue,
Bergin,	Gagné,	Moffat,
Billy,	Girouard,	Paint,
Blondeau,	Gordon,	Pinsonneault,
Borbeau,	Grandbois,	Pope,
Bowell,	Guillet,	Prunn,
Bryson,	Hackett,	Reid,
Burnham,	Hall,	Riopel,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hay,	Robertson (Hastings),
Cameron (Victoria),	Hesson,	Rykert,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hickey,	Small,
Carling,	Homer,	Smyth,
Caron,	Hurteau,	Sproule,
Cochrane,	Ives,	Stairs,
Costigan,	Jamieson,	Tassé,
Coughlin,	Jenkins,	Taylor,
Coursol,	Kaulbach,	Temple,
Curran,	Kilvert,	Townshend,
Daly,	Kinney,	Tupper,
Daoust,	Kranz,	Wallace (York),
Dawson,	Landry (Montmagny),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Langevin,	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	Lesage,	Wood (Brockville),
Desjardins,	Macdonald (King's),	Wood(Westm'land)—90.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CATUDAL. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I cannot allow this Bill to pass its third reading without moving again the amendment which I moved the other day, when we were in committee on this measure. This amendment, Mr. Speaker, proposes to pay back to the owner of an animal slaughtered, without having been affected by contagious disease, the full value of such animal. It seems that many hon. members, and especially the hon. Minister of Agriculture, are of opinion that this amendment should not have been moved. But the Bill now before us is not a new one; it is only the consolidation of a law which now exists. Now several counties have already been put under the operation of this law, and in these counties many complaints have been made which are very grave and very serious. I know, from my own experience and from persons on whom we may depend, that crying abuses have been committed; that many animals have been slaughtered without any reason whatever. The hon. Minister of Agriculture said the other day that he did not know that complaints had been made in the county of Laprairie; but, Mr. Speaker, from one end of that county to the other, as in all neighboring counties, the people are unanimous to condemn the action of the Government inspectors under these circumstances. For these reasons I feel it my duty to move the following amendment:—

That the said Bill be recommitted to a Committe of the Whole, for the purpose of amending the same, by adding to section 13 the following words: Provided that whenever it is proved that the animal so slaughtered was not affected by any contagious disease, the owner thereof shall be entitled to receive the full value of such animal.

Mr. SCRIVER. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Napierville (Mr. Catudal) seems a reasonable one on its face. Certainly, if an animal is killed which is proved, on a careful examination, not to have been diseased, it seems a great hardship that the owner should suffer the loss of the animal. The hon. member has referred to a condition of things which prevailed in his own county and in the counties adjoining last year, when a large number of sheep were slaughtered under the pretence that they were diseased. It is possible that disease prevailed to a certain

extent, but subsequent examination proved beyond doubt that large numbers of sheep were slaughtered that were not diseased. In some cases that came within my own knowledge, farmers had from twenty to thirty sheep slaughtered, and the neighbors and others who were called on to examine into the facts were fully satisfied that the sheep were not diseased, and that the action on the part of the veterinary surgeon and of the inspector in condemning the animals in question was rather the result of alarm and panic, and was unjust to the farmers. Those farmers, instead of receiving, as they should have done, $5 or $6 for each sheep, received only $1. These were certainly cases of great hardship, and if they are likely to prevail in many instances, as I conceive to be probable, this seems to be a reasonable amendment to be inserted in the Bill.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Catudal, p. 1327.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fisher,	McMullen,
Armstrong,	Fleming,	Mills,
Auger,	Geoffrion,	Mulock,
Bain (Wentworth),	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Gunn,	Pinsonneault,
Blake,	Harley,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Holton,	Ray,
Burpee,	Innes,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Huron),	Irvine,	Scriver,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Jackson,	Sommerville (Brant),
Cartwright,	King,	Sommerville (Bruce),
Casey,	Kirk,	Springer,
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Trow,
Catudal,	Laurier,	Vail,
Cockburn,	Lister,	Watson,
Cook,	Livingstone,	Weldon,
Davies,	McCraney,	Wells,
Dupont,	McIntyre,	Wilson,
Edgar,	McIsaac,	Yeo.—58.
Fairbank,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	Macdonald (Sir John),
Baker (Missisquoi),	Desjardins,	Mackintosh,
Baker (Victoria),	Dickinson,	McCallum,
Beaty,	Dodd,	McCarthy,
Bell,	Dundas,	McDougald (Pictou),
Benoit,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.),	McLelan,
Benson,	Ferguson (Welland),	McNeill,
Bergeron,	Foster,	Massue,
Bergin,	Gagné,	Mitchell,
Billy,	Girouard,	Moffat,
Blondeau,	Gordon,	Paint,
Bourbeau,	Grandbois,	Pope,
Bowell,	Guilbault,	Pruyn,
Bryson,	Guillet,	Reid,
Burnham,	Hackett,	Riopel,
Burns,	Hall,	Robertson (Hastings),
Cameron (Inverness),	Hay,	Rykert,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hesson,	Small,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hickey,	Smyth,
Carling,	Homer,	Sproule,
Caron,	Hurteau,	Stairs,
Cochrane,	Jameison,	Tassé,
Costigan,	Jenkins,	Taylor,
Coughlin,	Kaulbach,	Temple,
Coursol,	Kilvert,	Wallace (York),
Curran,	Kranz,	White (Cardwell),
Daly,	Landry (Montmagny),	White (Hastings),
Daoust,	Langevin,	Wood (Brockville),
Dawson,	Lesage,	Wood (Westm'land)—89.
Desaulniers (Maski'ngé)	Macdonald (King's),	

Amendment negatived.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. CARON. Mr. Speaker, I may be permitted to read a telegram from Colonel Amyot; I believe hon. members will like to hear from our friends and colleagues who are now in the North-West. He says:

"Weather being unusually bad, we have been put into barracks; my men generally well. Authorities doing their best for us, and have been doing all the time. Do not believe contrary statements by hostile press. Waiting orders to go further. We are all cheerful."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Where is that from?

Mr. CARON. That is dated from Winnipeg, to-day, the 23rd.

Mr. COOK. Why ain't he further on?

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES IN ANIMALS.

On motion for third reading,

Mr. CASEY. We have tried to make several amendments in this Bill in the interest of the cattle breeders of Canada. In regard to one of these, the Minister of Agriculture showed himself ready to meet our wishes and to yield to the force of our arguments—he accepted the amendment and voted for it. I hope that by and by, when the hon. gentleman returns to his place, he will also consider favorably the amendment I am about to propose, which is:

That this Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend it by providing that the value of animals slaughtered under the provisions of this Bill, for which compensation is by this Bill payable to owners, shall be determined, if the owner so requests, by three arbitrators, of whom one shall be appointed by the owner, one by the Minister of Agriculture or his representative, and a third by these two.

The amendment of the member for North York (Mr. Mulock) proposed that the owner of cattle slaughtered as diseased should have the option of requiring them to be placed in quarantine instead of being summarily slaughtered. The amendment of the hon. member for Napierville (Mr. Catudal) proposed that when an animal was slaughtered and found not to be diseased the full value should be paid for that animal. Failing those two amendments, we can, in justice, ask that an owner shall have the value of the animal on which compensation is to be paid by the Act left to arbitrators to determine. I say that the least we could ask, in justice, is, that the value of the animal, of which a certain proportion is given by the Act to the owner, should be fairly determined. The hon. member for Bagot and other members have pointed out that in the cases in which this Act was put in operation there was a great deal of trouble as to the value of the animals slaughtered; that in one case a large number of sheep had been killed, under suspicion that they had been suffering from an infectious disease, and that only a small part of the real value was paid to the owner. Now, it appears that the House has decided what proportion of the real value shall be paid in any case to the owner, but I think it is just and reasonable that the value should be accurately determined. It is certain that a Government official who orders the slaughter of the animal is not the proper person to determine its value, for he is interested in not making the value appear too large, because it will then appear to his employers, the Government, that he has been wasteful of the public money in ordering the destruction of so valuable an animal without a certainty of its being diseased, and he will be inclined to value it as low as possible. Of course, the estimate of the owner is equally untrustworthy, and therefore, I think, as in other cases, where property is taken by public authority for public purposes, the value of that property should be determined by the long-established and approved system of arbitration. When the Government takes a piece of a man's land for railway purposes, or a municipality takes it for school purposes, or any other purpose of a public kind, the value is fixed by arbitration. When a Government kills an animal belonging to any person, for reasons of public policy, I think it is as fair that the value should be decided by arbitration, as that the proportion to be paid to the owner should be established by law. I, therefore, with confidence, ask the Minister and the House to consider this

amendment and treat it, not as a question of want of confidence in the Government, not as a motion brought forward with the purpose of embarrassing the Government, but as an attempt to contribute something to the perfection, of this Bill. I speak on this point with the utmost sincerity and in the interests of a large class of my constituents and of the constituents of every other member of the House, who are interested in the feeding of cattle, especially for the English market. These animals are intrinsically so valuable that when they have to be dealt with in this way every safeguard should be afforded to their owners. For instance, my next neighbor in the country generally feeds about 100 cattle for the English market for the last three years, for which he gets about $100 a head, so that in the spring of the year he generally has about $10,000 worth or thereabouts of these cattle—not coming within the class of thoroughbreds for which special provisions is made in the Act, but still very valuable animals. If a single case of disease were developed in his herd, as they are nearly all kept in stables communicating with each other, they would nearly all come within the provisions of this Bill, under the head of cattle suspected of disease by being exposed to possible infection. Now, if the inspector appointed by the Government should happen to hear of a single case of disease occurring in those stables, and was not satisfied that proper precautions had been taken to isolate the animal, he would probably order the slaughter of the entire herd. In fact, under the Act, he could hardly have any alternative; he must either leave them alone or order them to be slaughtered, for he cannot quarantine them. Now, that gentleman, having a herd of cattle worth about $10,000, would be in an awkward position if the valuation were left to the official who ordered them to be slaughtered. I put this as a striking, though perhaps an extreme case, though I think that whether the amount at issue be large or small the principle is one which is impregnable, and one which will commend itself to the sense of justice of every member of the House. I am sorry the Minister is not in his place, for I should expect that the sense of justice which induced him to yield to the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) would induce him to yield to this amendment, which is merely the application to this Bill of a principle universally recognised by the Government in its dealings with individuals.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It is quite manifest that it is utterly useless to discuss either the principle or the details of the Bill to-night. The Minister, who ought to be here attending to his duties and listening to the discussion on the principles and details of the Bill, has not for the last three hours paid the slightest possible attention to a single word which has been said in Parliament. And we are expected to discuss these Bills, and the Minister who has charge of a Bill of this kind is expected respectfully to listen to the suggestions which are made by the gentlemen on this side of the House, and if their views are fair and reasonable, he is expected to give weight to them. I think he stated, when we were in Committee of the Whole, that he was prepared to listen to suggestions and prepared to consider them, and the way he is listening to suggestions is, that when he is in the House he is carrying on an animated and interesting conversation with gentlemen beside him, and, when he is not in the House, then he is not listening to a single word said or a single thing done in the House, and that is what we call, here, legislating in the interests of the people of this country. If the hon. gentleman had been doing what the country pays him to do and expects him to do, and what he ought to do as Minister of Agriculture, he would be attending to his duties in this House. There are other Ministers who are always in their places and who listen to what is going on, and who, if the suggestions made commend themselves to ther consideration, adopt them. But I ask you, Mr. Speaker, and everybody else in this House, how we can expect that legislation will be properly carried on when the Minister who is chiefly responsible for that legislation is absent from his place in Parliament. We were told the other night that we ought not to devote so much time and attention to this Bill, because it has been on the Statute Book for seven or eight years. So it has; and when it was put on the Statute Book it received the same sort of consideration that it does now. On the 13th of February, 1879, the Bill was introduced; two months and two days afterwards, on the 15th of April, it was read the second time, and it passed through committee on the 17th of April. Very little discussion took place upon it, apart from a vigorous protest by the hon. member for Bothwell and the hon. member for East Lambton, against some portions of the Bill, and as to the power of this Parliament to deal with a Bill of that kind. This Bill is going through Parliament in the same way, without proper explanation by the Minister in charge of it, and without his being in his place in Parliament at all. Now, I am satisfied that if any Minister of the Crown other than the Minister of Agriculture had listened to the arguments advanced by the hon. member for West Elgin, he would have given due weight to them. I ask you, Sir, as a prominent lawyer, who has had a large practice both in the courts and out of the courts, did you ever know in your own experience of any legislation, outside of this statute, which contained this principle for taking the valuation of any article assumed or destroyed by the Government. The provision my hon. friend asks to be incorporated in this Bill is a fair and reasonable proposition, and one which any Minister who pays the slightest attention to his duty in carrying a Bill through Parliament would at once concede. The Minister's proposition is this: I take your cattle or your sheep; I instruct my officials to destroy them if they think they are affected with a contagious disease, and I am willing to pay you two-thirds of their value, if it does not exceed $40; but in order to fix the value, I will make the valuation myself; I do it behind your back; I neither give you notice nor consult you; I first kill your animal without your knowledge or consent, or I instruct my officers to do it, or some bailiff in the outlying districts, who is better able to judge of the value of whiskey than the value of a sheep, and I pay you what he decides the animal to be worth. I say there is no such principle incorporated in any of our legislation outside of this Bill. The true and honest rule is that, when you confiscate a man's property without his knowledge or consent, you ought to pay him its fair value. And how do you arrive at the fair value? The Minister proposes to arrive at it by a one-sided arbitration; he is witness, judge and jury; he disposes of the whole matter by his own mere motion, without consulting anybody; and that the Minister, if he was in his place, would say was fair play; but not being in his place, he does not know anything about it. The proposition of my hon. friend, I say, is a fair proposition. What my hon. friend proposes, if you take the animal of a farmer and destroy it, without the knowledge or permission of the owner, because you think it has a contagious disease, is that you should appoint an arbitrator, that the farmer should appoint another, and that if they cannot agree, they should call in a third man, whose decision should be final between the parties. Is that not a fair proposition, and one which a Minister imbued with a sense of his duties to Parliament and the public would at once assent to? But the Minister will come in, not having heard anything about the proposition, and he will apply the party whip and call upon his supporters to vote it down, although he knows nothing about it, or about the discussion which hes taken place upon it. I say that the whole course pursued by the hon. gentleman is not creditable to the Government, and

is highly discreditable to himself. I ask those Ministers who are here and who do pay some attention to public business whether this is not a fair and reasonable proposition. It will do no harm, and it will meet the views of the farmers in the country, who sometimes complain that their animals are slaughtered and that an arbitrary valuation is put on them by the Department of Agriculture. I am amased that hon. gentlemen opposite should offer the slightest opposition to this principle; and if the Minister were in his place, discharging the duties he ought to discharge, and he is paid for discharging, we might learn something about his views on the subject.

Mr. MILLS. I think this is a most unheard of mode of proceeding in matters of legislation. We have here a very important measure, affecting deeply the interests of the agricultural population of this country, and we have the extraordinary spectacle of the Minister in charge of the measure absenting himself from Parliament during the greater part of the discussion, and, while he is here, sitting with his back to the members who are discussing the Biil, and not paying the slightest attention to the observations made. The hon. gentleman seems to proceed on the assumption that it is an offensive thing for members of this House to discuss the measures which the Government submit. If we look at the practice in the English House of Commons we shall find that there nearly all the important measures of the Administration are introduced during the first two weeks of the Session, and in a Session lasting usually over six months the measures of the Government are generally three months under the consideration of Parliament. There is hardly a measure, and certainly there is no important measure submitted to the consideration of the Commons of the United Kingdom, that is not carefully considered and thoroughly discussed by the House—so much so, that it becomes the measure not of the Government but of the House. The members of the House become familiar with its provisions; they take it as a proposition submitted to them for their consideration, and they assume the responsibility of examining into its principles and details, and considering carefully their practical effect, in order that they may be able to defend their conduct and to give a reason for the course they have pursued. What has been the practice that has grown up in this House? Although we usually have a Session of three months, nearly every important measure is submitted to Parliament—when? During the first fortnight? Not at all; but during the last fortnight of the Session, and it is expected that the House will vote down every proposition for the serious and careful consideration of the measures submitted to it. Has the measure before us been considered by the House beyond its merits? Has there been any attempt to protract the discussion upon it? Has anybody shown a disposition to speak against time or to delay the proceedings of the House? Not at all. Every part of the measure has been carefully considered by this side of the House, but not by the Minister in charge of it or by the gentlemen supporting that Minister. It seems to me that this House should not proceed to the consideration of a measure of this sort unless the Minister who has it in charge, and is prepared to explain its provisions and to give rational arguments against the adoption of amendments proposed, is present. Where is the Minister of Agriculture? He is not in his place; he is not here to consider the propositions made from this side of the House or from the other side of the House. What is he doing? He is assuming, apparently, that while the measure is under the consideration of the House no proposition that can be made from this side will be adopted by the Administration. More than that, he is assuming that his friends have conspired against the proper deliberations of this House. I do not know any other expression to use.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

Mr. MILLS. I am calling your attention, Sir, and the attention of the House, to the fact that the Minister is not here who has charge of this measure.

Mr. HESSON. I rise to a point of order; the hon. gentleman has said we are here as conspirators.

Mr. MILLS. I did not say that.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would simply suggest to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that there is an amendment before the House, to which his attention should be directed; a full discussion of a Bill on its third reading, as I ruled last evening, cannot be allowed. I think I have allowed great latitude to hon. gentlemen, and I do not think the time of the House should be taken up with any discussion, beyond the discussion on the amendment before the House.

Mr. MILLS. I accept your ruling, Sir, as quite correct, but I am not aware that I was discussing the general merits of the Bill. I was simply pointing out the fact that the Minister who is in charge of this Bill is not here; it was to that particular point I was calling your attention, as an indignity to which the House was being subjected. I am not aware that was out of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No.

Mr. MILLS. That not being out of order, I submit that the observations I was making were pertinent observations, and I do not propose to violate the rule you have laid down by entering on a discussion into the merits of the Bill. I was discussing the unusual course which the Minister had taken in, not being in his place for the purpose of considering the amendments that were being submitted, and which, I contend, were reasonable and pertinent propositions. The proposition that is now before the House is reasonable and pertinent, and it was the duty of the Minister to be here, for the purpose of hearing what might be said in its defense. I was also calling your attention, Sir, to the fact that this practice is not that which prevails in the House of Commons in England, where full and complete consideration is had of every measure submitted to it. The proposition of my hon. friend which is now before the House, is a reasonable one, one which ought to be supported. Why should the Minister—and I use the word Minister as a matter of convenience—why should the public, for the purpose of protecting the property of the country generally, have the right to destroy the property of anyone constituent of the public? Why should a Minister be empowered by statute, when he thinks that contagious diseases are likely to spread among cattle, have the power to destroy, without given adequate compensation, the property of any agriculturist in Canada? I think he ought not to have that power. I think the public ought to assume the responsibility of compensation, and that the party whose property has been improperly destroyed ought to have fair compensation for the property so destroyed.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to make one remark, in reference to what has fallen from the hon. gentleman, with regard to the custom and practice in England. He has said a great deal, since I came into the Chamber, about the English practice in the consideration of important measures. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that it is very far from the English practice to introduce, on the third reading of a Bill, a number of amendments, one after the other, which have been already fully discussed in committee. If the hon. gentleman will show me any instance in which that has been done——

Mr. MILLS. Any number.

Mr. McNEILL. To the extent to which it has been done in this House during the last two evenings, I will be much

obliged to him. I know of no occasion in which it has been done to that extent, unless on occasions when it has been practised by a party who are known in the English House of Commons as the party of obstruction; and I think such conduct as that which has prevailed here of late would, in the English House of Commons, be looked upon as malignant obstruction.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would beg to state, in answer to the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. Mitchell), that the hon. the Minister of Agriculture himself invited the discussion and these amendments. When the Bill was up for its second reading, there were gentlemen on this side of the House, and probably on the other side, who had amendments to move; but, as the House seemed to be in a hurry to get through with the second reading, the hon. the Minister of Agriculture himself suggested that the amendments should be moved when the Bill came up for its third reading.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We ought to have an understanding in this matter. As I understand parliamentary practice, both here and in England, the usual custom when going into committee, is to consider all questions which do not, as one may say, involve the question of the principle of the Bill. You cannot, in committee, as every body here knows quite well, get the sense of the House, nor can you have the votes recorded. It has always been our practice, and a proper practice, too, that on a third reading any amendment which any member thinks of importance shall be put, and the vote recorded; and I think that anybody who chooses to examine the records of the English House of Commons will find that so far from that practice having been had recourse to, only by a particular fraction or party there, the gentlemen of all political parties are constantly in the habit of having recourse to it.

Mr. McNEILL. I simply wish to say that I did not at all mean to imply that it was not usual or common to introduce an amendment on the third reading of a Bill. What I did say, what I wished distinctly to state, was that it was most unusual to find a number of amendments introduced, one after the other, on the third reading of a Bill, as we have had on these occasions.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I wonder if it is an unusual or a usual thing in the British House of Commons to find a Minister who is in charge of a Bill, when the Bill is being discussed, and when important amendments are being proposed to it, deliberately walk out of the Chamber and remain out, not listening to the propositions or knowing what amendment is being put, but prepared, on the members being called in, to vote it down. Would it not be still more unusual in the British House of Commons if that Minister, in order to get his Bill through the committee, had stopped the discussion by stating that he would be ready to listen to the suggestions on the third reading of the Bill? The hon. member ought to consider that, when he talks about the proceedings in the British House of Commons. It is true that the hon. gentleman represents an agricultural constituency, but probably he has not, like the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Pinsonneault), had the property of his constituents taken and slaughtered under the arbitrary power which the amendment of the hon. member for West Huron is designed to remove; but it is possible that what occurred in the county of Laprairie, and constrained the member for that county, though usually a supporter of the Government, to oppose the Government to-night, might happen in his county, and he will not occupy a position which will be strongly defended by his constituents, if, under these circumstances, his vote should be recorded against a reasonable amendment like that of my hon. friend, much less when *Hansard's* pages are turned up, and it is seen that a member who, in a few appropriate remarks, introduced an amendment to provide that there should be arbitration when a party considers that he has been injured, is accused of malignant obstruction. They will judge whether it is malignant or otherwise. If the proposition is one which is unreasonable and should not have been introduced, then the Minister, or some of his able lieutenants or supporters over there, should have risen and pointed out where it is unjust, how the public interests would suffer, how it is an unreasonable thing which is demanded; but they have listened, and I have listened, and I have been unable to see that the remarks of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) were not founded upon strong common sense, and upon considerations of justice and fair play. It does seem, and it ought to seem to hon. gentlemen opposite, a fair and reasonable thing that, when the property of an individual is taken without his consent, and is sacrificed, when it was not infected, when his animals were not afflicted with any contagious disease, when it is taken and slaughtered by an act of arbitrary power, when the compensation to be given to him is to be given by the will of the person who has committed that act upon him, it is not unreasonable, it is not a proposition that can be termed obstructive, when an hon. member, in language quite within parliamentary limit, speaking to his proposition urges that that individual whose property has thus been taken from him should have the recourse of appealing to arbitration, having himself the right to nominate one arbitrator, the Government the other, and they two to select the third. That is the amendment, which is designed to obviate what seems to be rather a tyrannical clause in the Bill which is now proposed to be read the third time. I approve of the amendment, and I shall have pleasure in voting for it.

Mr. DAVIES. I cannot allow the remarks of the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) to pass unchallenged. He intimates that the course taken by some members on this side of the House to-night is an unusual one, and deserves condemnation at the hands of those who desire to see the English parliamentary procedure carried out. He is mistaken. Amendments which it was formerly the custom to move after the third reading are now moved in amendment to the motion that the Bill be read the third time. The hon. gentleman knows, or he ought to know, that if amendments are moved in committee and a division takes place and names are not recorded, and if you want to take the sense of the House in such a way as to have the names of those who vote for or against a motion placed on record, you must move the amendment either when the report of the committee is to be received or when the motion for the third reading is being made; and if he turns to any book of parliamentary procedure, he will find that the proper time to move amendments of this kind is on the motion for the third reading, and that it has been the constant practice. If I move an important amendment, and another gentleman has another amendment to move, I want the sense of the House taken on my amendment and he wants the sense of the House taken on his, the only way in which we can obtain that is by moving on the report of the committee being made or on the motion for the third reading. I will give you an authority. The Clerk of this House, in his book——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. DAVIES. It is the question. Not only our right to move, but the propriety of our moving amendments, has been challenged, and it has been more than intimated that a reasonable amendment, which was supported by arguments which as yet have not been answered, has been moved from improper motives. That is the charge, and the hon. gentleman characterised the motion as malignant obstruction. The Clerk says:

"Whenever it is proposed to make important amendments, it is usual to move to discharge the order for the third reading and to go back into committee for that purpose."

The hon. gentleman should not make a statement as to the English parliamentary practice without acquainting himself thoroughly with it, and he should not charge hon. members with malignant obstruction when they are simply moving amendments that may not commend themselves to his mind, but in regard to which he has not taken the opportunity to point out where the impropriety exists.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Casey, p. 1328.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fairbank,	McIntyre,
Armstrong,	Fisher,	McIsaac,
Auger,	Fleming,	McMullen,
Bain (Wentworth),	Forbes,	Mills,
Bernier,	Geoffrion,	Mulock,
Blake,	Cillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Gunn,	Platt,
Burpee,	Harley,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Huron),	Holton,	Scriver,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Innes,	Somerville (Brant),
Cartwright,	Irvine,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casey,	Jackson,	Springer,
Casgrain,	King,	Trow,
Catudal,	Kirk,	Vail,
Cockburn,	Laurier,	Watson,
Cook,	Lister,	Weldon,
Davies,	Livingstone,	Wilson,
Edgar,	McCraney,	Yeo.—54.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Dodd,	Massue,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Ferguson (L'ds. & Gren.)	Moffat,
Baker (Victoria),	Foster,	Montplaisir,
Beaty,	Gagné,	Paint,
Bell,	Girouard,	Pinsonneault,
Benoit,	Gordon,	Pope.
Benson,	Grandbois,	Pruyn,
Bergeron,	Guilbault,	Reid,
Bergin,	Guillet,	Riopel,
Billy,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hastings),
Blondeau,	Hall,	Ross,
Bourdeau,	Hay,	Royal,
Bowell,	Hesson,	Rykert,
Bryson,	Hickey,	Shakespeare,
Burnham,	Homer,	Small,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hurteau,	Smyth,
Campbell (Victoria),	Jamieson,	Sproule,
Carling,	Jenkins,	Stairs,
Caron,	Kaulbach,	Taschereau,
Cochrane,	Kilvert,	Tassé,
Colby,	Kranz,	Taylor,
Costigan,	Landry (Montmagny),	Temple,
Coughlin,	Langevin,	Townshend,
Coursol,	Macdonald (King's),	Tupper,
Curran,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Vanasse,
Daly,	Mackintosh,	Wallace (York),
Daoust,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Cardwell),
Dawson,	McCallum,	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (Maski'ngé)	McDougald (Pictou),	Wigle,
Desaulniers (St. Ma'rice),	McLelan,	Wood (Brockville),
Desjardins,	McNeill,	Wood (West'land).—94.
Dickinson,		

Amendment negatived.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When the Bill was before the House for the second reading, I stated that I had an amendment to propose to the 13th section. The hon. Minister asked me to defer it until the third reading of the Bill, promising that he would be prepared to consider it and discuss it. I now rise for that purpose. Allow me to draw the attention of the House to the 13th section. It provides that the Governor in Council may, from time to time, cause to be slaughtered animals suffering from infectious or contagious disease, and it also provides that, where animals of that description are slaughtered, the owner shall receive compensation at the rate of two-thirds of the value, provided the same does not exceed $20. I have no objection to offer to that provision. I think it is a fairly generous one to make, because the

owner, in all likelihood would lose the animal altogether, and the giving of the $20 seems to me to be a gratuity to which he has no claim in equity. But the section goes further than that. Not only diseased animals, but animals which are or have been in contact with, and not only in contact with, but in close proximity to, a diseased animal, or to an animal suspected of being affected, are also to be destroyed, and the compensation for them is to be two-thirds of their actual value, provided always that the sum does not exceed $40. Now, Sir, I wish again to draw the attention of the House to the fact that this is what may be called an arbitrary measure—perfectly justifiable, though, if it is done for the protection of the public and in the public interest. But I wish to point out that the conditions in both cases are not equal. I stated before, when the matter was under discussion, that we have one class of stock raisers in the country, for which the sum of $40 would be fair compensation for the cattle slaughtered; in many cases it would be actually two-thirds the value of the animal. But, Sir, we have many cases where it would be little more than a fraction of two-thirds of the value. I stated then, and I state again, that in my own constituency we have some of the most enterprising and most successful cattle breeders in the country, possessing animals whose values range from $200 up to $800 or $1,000. I want the House to mark this fact, that according to the provisions of the 13th section of this Bill, wherever an animal is suspected of disease, or of having been in close proximity to a diseased or suspected animal, if such a case was to happen in the herd of one of these gentlemen, the whole herd would have to be slaughtered, because they would all have been, under ordinary circumstances, in close proximity to the animal suspected. Now, we have gentlemen of enterprise who, instead of lending their money or investing it in securities, take the very large risk of investing it in thoroughbred stock, not solely for the purpose of their own profit, but to improve the breed of cattle in the country. Now, I ask, why should they be placed at a disadvantage in comparison with those who risk nothing for the improvement of the stock of the country? I ask, by this amendmend, that they shall be placed on precisely the same footing—in fact, that all who have the misfortune to lose stock in this way, shall be placed on exactly the same footing, and that all shall receive two-thirds of the fair cash value of the animals slaughtered by order of the Government. The 13th section reads:

"The Governor in Council may, when the owners are reported by the Minister of Agriculture not guilty of any negligence or offence against the provision of the preceding section of the Act, order a compensation to be paid to the owner of the animal slaughtered under the provision of this Act; and whenever the animal slaughtered was affected by an infectious or contagious disease, the compensation shall be one-third the value of the animal before it became so affected, but shall not in any such case exceed $20."

And here come the cause that I wish to amend:

"In every other case the compensation shall be two-thirds the value of the animal, but shall not in any case exceed $40."

As it stands now, it is only permissive, and I wish to make it imperative. And then I propose that the limit of $40 should be struck out. I move in amendment:

That the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the 13th section by striking out the word "may" in the first line, and inserting the word "shall" in lieu thereof; also, by striking out all after the word "animal" in the 11th line of said section, to the end of the word "dollars" in the 12th line of said section.'

Mr. WATSON. I look upon this as a very important amendment, especially to the Province of Manitoba. The limit that is made at present provides that only $40 shall be paid for animals slaughtered that have been proved not to have been affected by any contagious disease. Now, as this will hardly be two-thirds of the value of an animal of mature age in the Province of Manitoba, I think it is unfair, and that we ought to provide that two-thirds

shall be paid, without any limit to the amount. There are other provisions that I think ought to be conceded. I may say that in the Province of Manitoba we have an Act almost similar to this, but with different provisions as regards the value. In that Act the amount is two-thirds of the value of the animal, without any limit; and it is also provided in our provincial Act that in case an animal is suspected of any infectious disease, and if the owner of the animal does not think it is so effected, he shall notify a veterinary surgeon, and shall have the privilege of notifying a justice of the peace. The animal shall be placed in quarantine and kept there until the evidence of the veterinary surgeon is heard before the justice of the peace, who decides whether the animal shall be destroyed or not. I think that is a fair provision, and ought to be placed in the Bill now before the House. I hope the hon. Minister will see fit to adopt the amendment proposed by the member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong), and allow this word "$40" to be struck out, and give two-thirds the value of the animal destroyed that has not been affected with a contagious disease.

Mr. WELDON. I would call the attention of the Minister to the first portion of this amendment, inserting the word "shall" instead of "may." In committee I pointed out that that word is permissive, and the Minister said that he would see about the matter on the third reading, and decide whether they would change it or not.

Mr. POPE. No, I did not. I said I would consult the Minister of Justice, and I did, and he said it was a proper thing to do.

Mr. WELDON. He said: "I do not intend to make a change to-night, but I will enquire into the matter before the third reading." It seems to me that this matter should not be left in doubt. We know that the word "may" is a permissive word, and under it you may refuse to pay anything. I think that section should be cleared up, so that there will be no doubt. The amendment proposed will, if carried, leave no doubt on the subject, and will provide clearly that in case of an animal being destroyed the owner would be entitled to get whatever amount he was entitled to under the Act.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In regard to this clause, it would be well to consider that in many cases animals affected with the diseases mentioned in this Bill may possibly recover. Most of the diseases mentioned are amenable to proper treatment. The Minister, by this clause, takes away from the owners the privilege of endeavoring to have the animals cured. Under those circumstances, when the animals are slaughtered for the general good, they being affected with diseases from which they might recover, it would be but fair that the owners should be paid full value for them. This clause is asking too much. It may be said that it was in the Bill passed a few years ago. Now that we have that Bill before us, we are able to remedy any injustice and any objectionable features. It is desireable that the Minister and the House should consider the propriety of amending this clause, so that owners of animals affected with diseases mentioned in the Bill, capable of being cured, if slaughtered, in order to prevent the spread of infectious diseases, should be paid full value for them. It is a fair and reasonable proposition, and if it does not exist in the present Act an amendment should be made. It is too much to ask owners to have cattle slaughtered when affected with diseases which are curable, even though there may be a danger of the diseases spreading to other animals. I hope, in the interest of cattle owners, that an amendment will be adopted, providing that if such cattle are slaughtered their full value will be paid. It is well known that the treatement of animals has rapidly improved, and it is quite probable that nearly all the diseases are amenable to treatment, by proper isolation and other means, and it is improper to allow the Government or any authority to take away cattle from their owners and slaughtering them without an adequate return being made, even though it is done in the public interest.

Mr. FAIRBANK. In addition to the interest of the owners of animals, it is also in the interest of the Minister and the Department who have to carry out the law, that the amendment now under consideration should be accepted. If there are good and valid reasons why it should not be accepted, the Minister will certainly be able to state them. But why does he wish to debar himself from the possibility of doing justice under certain circumstances? As the Bill now stands, unless the animals are thoroughbreds a greater sum than $40 cannot be paid. An amendment, increasing the amount to $100, in case of stock with a pedigree, has been accepted. A person requires to know very little of animals to be aware that many animals without pedigree are worth much more than $40. Under the present law, no matter how hard the case may be, the Minister will be deterred from doing that justice which he would wish to do. It appears to me that it is quite as much in the interest of the Department so far as equity is concerned as of the animal owner that this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I am not particularly anxious to prolong this debate, and am not often guilty of addressing this House without sufficient reasons; but on this occasion I feel that this is a measure which affects very largely the interests of very many of my constituents. I agree with what has been said, that it would have been desirable in many ways if the adjustment of these matters could have been left under the control of the Local Legislatures, because I think that, so far as the internal economy of those matters is concerned, they would be best dealt with there. On the other hand, I would be sorry to see the control of the Dominion Government withdrawn entirely from connection with those matters, because it is of prime importance that all matters of infectious diseases affecting stock should be summarily, carefully, thoroughly and effectually dealt with in the interest of our large cattle trade. We in Ontario have a growing interest in that trade, and it is probable, from different circumstances, and the development of the North-West, that our interest in that trade will be greater in the future than in the past. The Minister has already made what may be considered a very fair and equitable concession in the interests of the proprietors of thoroughbred stock. We find that since the Bill was introduced this concession of $150 in value allowed for animals with pedigree has been granted. I find, on turning to the last official return for Ontario, that that clause of the Bill will affect about 9,000 farmers, who are proprietors of thoroughbred stock, and that the average value of that stock, as returned by the Ontario Bureau of Industries, is about $150, the total value being $1,700,000. Taking all things into account, it is perhaps as fair and equitable as we could expect, when we find that the clause covers two-thirds of the average value of the stock. But just in proportion as our farmers become interested in improved stock, the average value of the ordinary stock rises, and in that proportion the interest of the average farmer suffers by their values being confined to the limit fixed by this Bill. Outside of thoroughbred stock, in Ontario I find, according to the last return of the Bureau of Industries, to which I have access, that for 1883 there were one 1,500,000 of other stock scattered over the Province and held by farmers. While we take into account that the Minister has met what may be called a reasonably fair proposition with respect to the 9,000 farmers who had the better class of stock, I think the amendment is one that ought to receive fair consideration at the hands of this House, because it will be found that

the average of our stock is gradually rising, and should those difficulties enter the better farming districts of Ontario, it would be found that there was a serious loss imposed on those farmers who were obliged to submit to accepting only two-thirds of $60 as a fair average value for their stock. Sir, I think that in view of the growing interests involved, and from the fact that our farmers are being, from circumstances, drawn into that business more and more every year, and encouraged in developing that business by the market which has been opened for us in the mother country, and which I must say, in fairness and justness to the Minister of Agriculture, has been carefully attended to on his part, in avoiding the difficulty of being placed with those countries which are scheduled in reference to the old country market—I think, in the interests of the farmer, it is desirable that this amendment should pass. I think, if the Minister will carefully consider, while he is taking control and supervision of dealing with infectious diseases of this class he should accede to the amendment which is proposed, to make better provision for that rapidly growing class of farmers who are keeping high grade stock, almost equal to the pedigreed, though not classed in that particular section. I think this amendment is worthy of the consideration of the House.

House divivided on amendment of Mr. Armstrong, p. 1332.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fisher,	McMullen,
Armstrong,	Fleming,	Mills,
Auger,	Forbes,	Mulock,
Bain (Wentworth),	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Harley,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Holton,	Scriver,
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex)	Irvine,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cartwright,	Jackson,	Springer,
Casey,	King,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casgrain,	Kirk,	Trow,
Catudal,	Landerkin,	Watson,
Cook,	Laurier,	Weldon,
Davies,	Lister,	Wilson,
Edgar,	Livingstone,	Yeo.—50.
Fairbank,	McCraney,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Foster,	Massue,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Gagné,	Moffat,
Baker (Victoria),	Girouard,	Montplaisir,
Beaty,	Gordon,	Paint,
Bell,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Benoit,	Guilbault,	Pope,
Bergeron,	Guillet,	Pruyn,
Bergin,	Hackett,	Reid,
Billy	Hall,	Riopel,
Blondeau,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bourbeau,	Hickey,	Royal,
Bowell,	Homer,	Rykert,
Bryson,	Hurteau,	Shakespeare,
Burnham,	Jamieson,	Small,
Carling,	Jenkins,	Smyth,
Caron,	Kaulbach,	Sproule,
Cochrane,	Kilvert,	Stairs,
Colby,	Kinney,	Taschereau,
Costigan,	Kranz,	Taylor,
Coughlin,	Landry (Montmagny),	Temple,
Coursol,	Langevin,	Townsend,
Curran,	Macdonald (King's),	Tupper,
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Vanasse,
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Mackintosh,	Wallace (York),
Desaulniers(St. Maurice)	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Cardwell),
Desjardins,	McCallum,	White (Hastings),
Dickinson,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wigle,
Dodd,	McLelan,	Wood (Brockville),
Dundas,	McNeill,	Wood(Westm'lnd)—88.
Ferguson (Welland),		

Amendment negatived.

Mr. SCRIVER. At this somewhat advanced hour of the night, I shall not presume on the patience or good nature of my fellow members by prefacing the motion I propose to submit with any lengthened remarks. I shall merely say that I think the proposition that the men to whom shall be entrusted the serious and important duty of determining whether animals, very often of great value, are affected with contagious disease and so should be slaughtered, should be men not only of good character and sound judgment, but should also be men possessing some technical skill—I say, I think such a proposition as that is one which should commend itself to every one in this House; and as I regard it as a defect that the Bill now before the consideration of the House does not make it incumbent on the Minister of Agriculture to appoint men of this character to these positions, I propose to submit the following amendment:

That this Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of amending it by providing that no person shall be appointed an inspector under this Bill who is not a regularly licensed veterinary surgeon.

Amendment negatived on a division.

Mr. DAVIES. When the Bill was in committee I called the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the fact that the clause providing for the recovery of penalties was so inaccurately and inartistically drawn that, in recovering those penalties, they could not take advantage of the Summary Jurisdiction Act. I think the hon. gentleman said he would look into the matter, and I think he will find it necessary to add a clause, providing that the procedure under the Summary Jurisdiction Act should apply in these cases; otherwise, as these are new offences, he will find it almost impossible to proceed, because the justices will have to set out their jurisdiction in the information and in all the proceedings.

Mr. POPE. I may say that I have consulted the Minister of Justice, and he informed me that there was no such difficulty as the hon. gentleman suggests.

Mr. DAVIES. I have not the shadow of a doubt that I am right, and I have spoken to half a dozen lawyers, and they all agree with me. I am not going to ask the House to divide, but I wish to record my opinion on this question. I think my amendment is in the right direction, and is one calculated to make the Bill workable. I move:

That the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, for the purpose of amending the 46th section, by applying the procedure of the Summary Jurisdiction Act to the proceedings for the recovery of the penalties.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Davies.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fleming,	Mills,
Armstrong,	Forbes,	Mulock,
Auger,	Geoffrion,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain (Wentworth),	Gillmor,	Platt,
Bourassa,	Harley,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Holton,	Scriver,
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cartwright,	Jackson,	Springer,
Casey.	King,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casgrain,	Kirk,	Trow,
Catudal,	Landerkin,	Vail,
Cook,	Laurier,	Watson,
Davies,	Lister,	Weldon,
Edgar,	Livingstone,	Wilson,
Fairbank,	McCraney,	Yeo.—50.
Fisher,	McMullen,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bain (Soulanges),	Dodd,	McLelan,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Dundas,	Massue,
Baker (Victoria),	Ferguson(Leeds&Gren.)	Moffat,
Beaty,	Ferguson (Welland),	Paint,
Bell,	Foster,	Pinsonneault,
Benoit,	Gagné,	Pope,
Bergeron,	Gordon,	Pruyn,
Bergin,	Grandbois,	Reid,
Billy,	Guillet,	Riopel,

Blondeau,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bourbeau,	Hall,	Rykert,
Bowell,	Hesson,	Shakespeare,
Bryson,	Hickey,	Small,
Burnham,	Homer,	Smyth,
Carling,	Hurteau,	Sproule,
Caron,	Jameison,	Stairs,
Cochrane,	Jenkins,	Taschereau,
Colby,	Kaulbach,	Taylor,
Costigan,	Kilvert,	Temple,
Coughlin,	Kranz,	Townshend,
Coursol,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper,
Curran,	Langevin,	Vanasse,
Daly,	Macdonald (King's),	Wallace (Albert),
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (Maski'ngé)	Mackintosh,	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wigle,
Desjardins,	McCallum,	Wood (Brockville),
Dickinson,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wood (Westm'land)–84.

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

EXPLOSIVE SUBSTANCES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the third reading of Bill (No. 95) respecting explosive substances—(*from the Senate*).

Mr. DAVIES. There was a section of the Bill which I think the hon. gentleman intended to explain.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No. The 15th clause provides that the imprisonment may be for life or for any term of years. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) said he thought there ought to be a minimum. I find, however, that there is no minimum in our statutes, except for such cases as rapes and criminal assaults on women. In all other cases, where there is imprisonment for a term of years upon conviction, it is in the discretion of the judge. I therefore do not think the clause requires any amendment.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 1:20 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 24th April, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CRIMINAL LAW OF CANADA.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hastings) moved first reading of Bill (No. 136) to amend the Criminal Law of Canada. He said: I introduced a Bill a short time ago to amend the criminal law, by providing for the further punishment of burglars. I only placed one short clause in the Bill which provided that upon conviction of the crime of burglary, the burglar should be sent to penitentiary for life. I find that clause was rather too general in its application; in punishing the greater offence, it would be rather severe to mete out similar punishment to the minor offence, such as a woman breaking into a laundry and stealing a few articles of wearing apparel, or boys burglariously entering a store and stealing candies, etc.; therefore, I find it necessary to introduce this Bill which comprises half a dozen clauses. I may say, for the information of hon. gentlemen who have not had occasion to look at the Acts, that section 50 of cap. 21, 33 Victoria, Dominion Statutes, defines what shall constitute the crime of burglary, and section 51, which I propose to amend, is as follows:—

"Whosoever is convicted of the crime of burglary, shall be liable to be imprisoned in the penitentiary for life, or for any term not less than two years, or to be imprisoned in any other gaol or place of confinement for any term less than two years, with or without hard labor, and with or without solitary confinement."

I propose to amend that clause by adding the following words:—

"When it shall be found that such person, at the time of committing such offence, shall have in his possession any implement known as burglars tools, or any murderous weapon of any kind whatsoever, he shall, when convicted, be sentenced to imprisonment in a penitentiary for life."

That is for the first offence. Then as to the second offence, and we know that in a great many cases, probably five out of six, when persons are arrested for the crime of burglary, they have previously served a short term of imprisonment in the penitentiary, which does not seem to be any warning to them. I therefore purpose introducing a second clause in the Bill which provides that:

"Where any person is convicted of the crime of burglary who has already or previously been found guilty of or served a term of imprisonment for a similar offence, that he or she, upon such conviction thereof, shall be sentenced to imprisonment in the penitentiary for life"

Section 59 of the Act now in force now provides:

"Whosoever is found by night armed with any dangerous or offensive weapon or instrument whatever, with intent to break or enter into any dwelling house, or other building whatsoever, and commit any felony therein, or is found by night having in his possession, without lawful excuse (the proof of which excuse shall lie on such person), any picklock key, crow, jack, bit or other implement of house-breaking, or any match, or combustible or explosive substance, or is found by night having his face blackened or otherwise disguised with intent to commit felony, or is found by night in any dwelling house or other building whatsoever, with intent to commit any felony therein, is guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be liable to be imprisoned in the penitentiary, for any term not exceeding three years or not less than two years, or to be imprisoned in any other gaol or place of confinement for any term less than two years, with or without hard labor."

I propose by the Bill to amend that clause by striking out all the words after the word "penitentiary," in the twelfth line, so as to make it read as follows:—

"That he shall be liable to be imprisoned in the penitentiary for a period of seven years."

Clause 60 provides:

"Whosoever is convicted of any such misdemeanor, as in the last preceeding section mentioned, committed after a previous conviction, either for felony or such misdemeanor, shall on such consequent conviction, be liable to be imprisoned in the penitentiary for any term not exceeding ten and not less than two years, or to be imprisoned in any other gaol or place of confinement for any term less than two years, with or without hard labor."

I propose amending that clause by substituting for the latter part of it, commencing with the word "imprisoned," in the fourth line, the words "for a period of ten years." That is for the second offence. I would also introduce into the Bill a clause:

"That any person arrested and charged with the crime of burglary may be tried so summarily before the senior, junior or deputy judge of the county or united counties in which said arrest has been made, and their powers for trial and sentence of burglars shall be the same as that given to other judges under this Act."

I think that this Act should commend itself to the consideration of hon. members. I am aware that there is a diversity of opinion as to the punishment to be meted out to burglars. I believe my hon. and venerable friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Hay) goes so far as to suggest that, besides the punishment inflicted by this Act, the punishment of the lash should also be applied. I think it might be judiciously applied and I hope the hon. gentleman may have an opportunity, when we go into committee of suggesting a clause to that effect. As this is a very important Bill, both in the public interest and for the further security of our lives and property, I should like either to have it given precedence in the Order paper, or, if not, that the Government should assume it and press it through the House this Session. It was my intention to have incorporated in the Bill a clause which would facilitate the arrest of

persons who commit a crime in one county and proceed to another. The law as it stands provides that any policeman or constable shall, either by affirmation or oath, have the signature of the magistrate who issues the warrant proved and the name of the magistrate into whose county the criminal has fled is then placed upon the back of the warrant. That very often gives an opportunity to these offenders to escape, but I will make this the subject matter of another Bill at a subsequent stage.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That, for the remainder of the Session, Government measures shall have the precedence after routine on Mondays.

Mr. BLAKE. The suggestion was made the other day by my hon. friend from Huron, when this notice was given, that under any circumstances it ought to be modified by the substitution of "questions" for "routine," so as to allow questions to be put on Mondays. I think also, that under any circumstances, the Government ought to give an opportunity to clear the undebated motions before finally wiping out the Notice paper. A very large number of notices are on the paper, some of which have been since very early in March, and we have not had an opportunity of reaching them yet. A number of them would be entirely undebated. On one occasion, the hon. gentleman will remember, that the whole of the Monday was absorbed by business, which belonged to another day of the week,—the Temperance Act. Not more than an hour, probably not more than three quarters of an hour, would be occupied in going over the list of notices. I therefore make these two suggestions to the hon. gentleman.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly, I will accept both. Make the motion after "routine and questions."

Mr. SPEAKER. Private Bills come first on Monday. It had better be "after questions."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well, that will do, "after questions."

Mr. BLAKE. And as to undebated motions?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will take them up and call them over on the Monday.

Mr. BLAKE. It is well that that should be understood, so that hon. members should be here, because this will be the last opportunity they will have.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Unopposed motions, of course.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, unopposed and undebated motions.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. COOK. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to refer to an article which appeared in one of the rags of Ottawa, called a newspaper, which refers to myself, in connection with a question which I put to the Government last night, that was not designed to be replied to by the Minister of Militia. I would not refer to that article, because I think it is of no consequence whatever, and the paper itself is of no consequence whatever, and the staff connected with the paper, but for this:

"It is evident that Mr. Cook's remark was intended as an insult to Lieut.-Col. Amyot and his men."

At about 12 o'clock last night, the Minister of Militia read a telegram from Col. Amyot, dated on the 23rd April, which read:

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hastings).

"Weather unusually bad. We have been put into barracks. My men generally are well. The authorities are doing their best for us, and have been doing all the time. Do not believe contrary statements by the hostile press. We are awaiting orders to go further. We are all cheerful."

Well, by the same paper I see that the 9th Battalion of Quebec left last evening at 7 o'clock for Swift Current. It would have been very interesting to the members of the House to know that they had gone forward to the front, and the Minister, if he knew that, should have communicated it to the House. Of course that is within his own opinion, but, if there was an insult intended to be conveyed by myself to the gallant colonel and his men who are at Winnipeg at the present time, or who were there at that time, it must have been an insult to others as well, for the 7th Fusiliers of London also left Swift Current last evening, and the Toronto Body Guards shortly after for Qu'Appelle. I repudiate that part of the article, and say it was no offence whatever to the colonel or his men, who are gone forward. I put the question in a spirit of right. I thought it was very necessary that the troops should get forward to the front as rapidly as possible, because we are constantly hearing of depredations being committed by the rebels. It is necessary to protect the people of that country, it is necessary not only for the protection of the people of that country, but the rebellion must be put down. I see by this same report that some member cried "shame" when I put the question. Well, if a member on that side of the House is prepared to cry "shame" to us on this side when a question is put for the protection of the people of our country, I am willing he should cry "shame" or should cry whatever he likes. But, be that as it may, I am very glad to see the colonel has been ordered to the front, and probably he is now prepared to meet the enemy, and is no longer detained at Winnipeg fighting the hostile press.

THE ELECTORAL FRANCHISE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, the Bill which the right hon. gentleman has just moved that we should consider in Committee of the Whole, is so exceptional in its character that I crave the indulgence of the House to make a few remarks thereon, as no opportunity has yet been offered me to do so. As a usual thing, in respect to ordinary Bills, I allow the discussion to be carried on by the leading members of the House, and content myself by placing myself upon record on the division list. But this measure is one of such exceptional importance that I cannot content myself by giving a silent vote on any stage of its advancement. I presume you are convinced by this time that this Bill is not to receive the unanimous consent of the House; I presume, also, that you perceive there is some prospect that it will receive more or less opposition before it becomes law. The exceptional importance of this Bill, in my opinion, arises from the fact that it has more objectionable features in it than any other Bill which I have heard discussed since I became a member of this House. In the first place, I may say, that it has proved itself to be most unpopular with members generally supporting, and still supporting, the right hon. leader of the Government. It is also the most obnoxious measure, probably, to the Opposition in this House, that has been presented during the present Parliament. Moreover, from the discussion that has already taken place upon it, it has been proved that it is a Bill that the people have never asked for, that it is unnecessary in the interests of this country, and will greatly increase the burdens of the people, that it is a Bill which, I think, should not be pressed upon the consideration of the House or become

law, at least until the people of this country either have taken it out of our hands or have asked us to consider it. I have already stated that this Bill has been proved to be unpopular with members generally supporting the Government. The reason for this I find in the fact that there are still amongst hon. gentlemen opposite a large number of members who have a lingering regard for what we term provincial rights. I know that in every Province of this Dominion there are a large number of people who look upon any infringement of the rights granted by our constitution to the Provincial Legislatures as a very serious matter, and it is not to be wondered at. I suppose it would be well enough to leave the discussion of constitutional questions to the members of the legal fraternity who have seats in this House; still, even laymen have some knowledge of the causes which brought out present constitution into existence. We know that discontent and difficulties arose during the time we were under a legislative union, from the fact that the Provinces were composed of what we may call heterogeneous elements, differing in their institutions, especially in their educational and religious institutions, and in nationality, and these causes were a source of difficulty in conducting the affairs of the country in such a manner as to meet the wishes of all the people of the Provinces. Now, Sir, that same condition of things exists to-day which was taken into consideration by the framers of our constitution when they gave us the British North America Act; and I believe that their chief object in framing that constitution was so to divide the respective powers of the Federal and Local Legislatures, as to prevent those difficulties which had caused discontent in the past, by placing all local questions within the purview of the Local Legislatures. That, Sir, I may say, has been carried out in the constitution to the very letter; and even in the question regulating the franchise, I think the constitution bears upon its face this construction, that even the regulation of the franchise was to be left with the various Provinces until such time as they were nearer in accord as to what should constitute a Dominion franchise. We know that the civil, the religious, and especially the educational institutions of the various Provinces, have a great deal to do in moulding public opinion upon the various questions of the day, and that public opinion has been moulded in the past in accordance with the teachings of the various institutions in those Provinces, and those institutions are looked upon by the people of each Province as the very best for themselves, and, Sir, the teaching of those institutions are as dear to the people who have been taught by them as the institutions themselves. I may say that public opinion as to what should constitute a franchise for the election of members to this House, is the outgrowth of the teachings of those institutions; and I am not surprised that every Province in this Dominion should look with some degree of jealousy upon any attempt to override or interfere with the opinions that have been formed in consequence of those teachings. My hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Gigault), during this discussion has given what I consider a very sound and a very powerful argument in favor of leaving the regulation of the franchise in the hands of the Local Legislature. He has told us that the Province of Quebec, especially, wishing to guard her own institutions in this respect, wishing to respect their teachings, and to respect the opinion of her people as to what should constitute a proper franchise, looks with a great deal of misgiving upon this attempt to give the power of regulating the franchise to this Parliament, and the people of that Province fear that it may place them in a position to be overridden by other Provinces. While I believe that that argument is especially sound in regard to Quebec, it is capable of extension to the other Provinces of this Dominion. While the Province of Quebec may not wish to have thrust upon her against her will the decision of this or any other Parliament, that the franchise should be based upon universal suffrage, I may say that the same opinion exists in other Provinces. We know that opinions are not at all unanimous upon this subject. We see that even in the far west the people have thought that manhood suffrage is the proper rule for the franchise. Well, Sir, the institutions of the Province of Ontario and the teachings that the people have received, lead them, probably, to a more liberal view as to what should constitute the franchise, than is entertained by the people of Quebec. We see that evidenced by the recent proceedings in the Province of Ontario, which show that the people are in favor of a more liberal and extended franchise, and that nearly one-half of the people of Ontario in their Legislature have declared in favor of manhood suffrage. Now, if that be the result of the teachings of our institutions in Ontario, I claim that we stand in the same position as the Province of Quebec in regard to this matter. While that Province may not wish to have what they may term a too liberal franchise forced upon them by the other Provinces, I think the Province of Ontario has a just right to claim that she should be not hampered in her march of progress, if I may say so, towards a more liberal and extended franchise. If it be the almost universal opinion in the Province of Ontario that the franchise should be liberally extended, if it be a growing opinion in that Province that manhood suffrage should obtain, then I say she does not wish to be kept from realizing those aspirations by being bound down by a general franchise in common with the Province of Quebec, or with the other Provinces that may not hold such liberal views. And what is true as regards Quebec on the one hand, and Ontario on the other hand, is true with regard to every Province. Every Province has its opinion upon what the franchise should be, and so soon as we make a general franchise dependent upon this Parliament, then, Sir, upon the one hand we may force upon one Province what it dislikes, and, on the other, we may prevent another Province from obtaining that extension of the franchise which it desires. The teachings of our provincial institutions, held sacred by the people, should be just as constant and perpetual as the institutions themselves. There are other reasons which make this Bill unpopular with hon. gentlemen opposite. We know that a large number are opposed to one of the leading principles of the Bill, the extension of the franchise to women. Other persons hold different views on this franchise question. I do not know that, taking the view I do of this question, I should feel justified in discussing and passing on to the details, from this fact. As far as universal and manhood suffrage are concerned, I hold that if the people of Prince Edward Island believe such a suffrage to be desirable they have a right to have it. If the people of Quebec prefer a more limited suffrage and do not believe in enfranchising women, I think the people of that Province have a right to their opinion; and when the people of Ontario think that their welfare will be best served by extending the franchise to women or by having manhood suffrage, I believe they should exercise that power. I do not believe our constitution intends that this Parliament should take away from any Province the right to introduce and maintain just such a franchise as they think best for the welfare of the people. I suppose I am justified in saying that there are many hon. gentlemen opposite who feel there are many other objectionable clauses in the Bill. I suppose I am justified in saying that some members regard it as somewhat unfair; that some regard it as an attempt on the part of the majority to override the wishes and feelings of the minority. Whether that be so or not, we know that very strong arguments have been brought forward by hon. gentlemen who usually support the Government against not only the introduction but the carrying into law of the Bill. I have said this Bill is unnecessary.

I base that opinion upon the fact that so far as I am aware from the statements made on the floor of the House, this Bill was not expected to be pressed through the House. I have found a very general disposition to discredit the belief that the Government intended to pass this measure even this Session. I have found a very general impression to prevail that it was unwise that even the present Government although in the opinion of a great many they do acts which to a large number seem unwise, should proceed with this Bill and endeavor to place it on the statute book. Some may say, it has been said here, why is it necessary to ask for the voice of the people on our legislation? Do we adopt that course in regard to all measures that come before the House for its determination? We do not, nor is it expected that Parliament shall wait for the voice of the people demanding legislation on ordinary subjects. But this is an exceedingly important subject. It is a question, not so much affecting the members of this House, or their duties, as one affecting the people who are the creators of this Parliament. In dealing with a question of this kind we are dealing with the voice of the people who really brought into existence this Parliament. I contend it seems to be reversing the order of nature. It is making an effect act as a cause. Parliament is the creature of the electorate. Parliament is the result of exercised franchise. I contend that if there be any question regarding which the duty devolves upon us of consulting our constituents it is this question. The right to exercise the franchise properly belongs to the people, and when we see fit to legislate upon it we should do so under the direction, if not under the express command, of the people who heretofore have exercised that franchise. This Bill deals with the constitutional weapon of our citizens, which is placed in their hands as a means of defending themselves against what may some day or other be a tyrannical Parliament. The franchise is our defence, the defence of the electorate, and with it they can guard their civil and religious liberties. It is the cherished heritage of Canadians over which they watch with jealousy. To disturb this safeguard, to interfere with the economy of this fortress, to weaken the right arm of the people's safety would be to take dangerous and critical ground. I hold that in dealing with the franchise we are dealing with that which is so peculiarly the people's own, that nothing short of an unmistakable and expressed demand can justifiy such action. This Parliament, I take it, has no right of its own motion to silence a single voice that helped to call it into existence. If there is one question, I repeat, upon which we are in duty bound to ask for the advice of the people it is on this question of the franchise. Who among us would be bold enough to confront a people, many of whom he has robbed of the power which assisted in placing him here? And who among us would dare to confront some of those who voted against us at the last election, and say in a spirit of revenge: "We have fixed you, and you will have no vote at the next general election." This view of the question will bring it home to every voter in the country. Even to enlarge the franchise without conference with the people seems questionable. To enlarge the franchise is to reduce the power and influence of those who formerly exercised it. This measure is more objectionable to members of the Opposition than any other measure that has been brought before this Parliament. The arguments I have advanced tend strongly to show this. We were told during the discussion that if we expressed the honest sentiments of our hearts we would frankly admit that the clause in the proposed Bill having regard to the construction of the voters' list was the sum and substance of our complaining. I do not know where the hon. gentleman—I think it was the member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend)—got his information. I think the argument presented by hon. members on this side of the House show that we are just as strongly opposed to the attack on provincial rights as we are to that most objectionable feature of the Bill to which I have already referred. We oppose the Bill because it is objectionable and is unasked for; because it entails on this country a very large increase of expenditure, and increased trouble in connection with the preparation of the voters' lists. Do you think that if the people of this country were asked whether or not we should pass such a measure as this at the present time, after having all its provisions laid before them; if they were told that it would put them to a very large expense, that it was a measure which would give power to the Government to create some 400 or 500 salaried officials, that it was a measure which would increase our annual expenditure by $200,000 or $300,000—I have found it estimated at $350,000 by some, and at $250,000 by others—but at any rate it is such an enormous amount that, if the people come to consider that phase of the question alone, they would say, I think, to this Parliament: "Let well enough alone; we are satisfied with the manner in which our franchise is arranged by the Local Legislatures, and we have not asked the Parliament of Canada to interfere." Take the expenditure of $350,000 and capitalise it at 4 per cent and you increase the indebtedness of the Dominion by $8,750,000; and I ask, are we in a position at the present time, knowing the rate at which our annual expenditure has mounted up, knowing the enormous amount which our public debt has reached—are we in a position to pass a measure which is undemanded by the people of this country, which is not needed in the interests of this country—to carry into law a measure which will so enormously increase our public expenditure, and place such an amount of trouble upon the electorate in the preparation of their lists? If the people were told that these officials of the Government were to come into their counties and make up a temporary list by some sort of assessment, by some sort of means, that all parties interested in the welfare of the country, who wished to see the names of those on the list who had the right to vote had to go before these officers; that every man had to lay his claim before them as to his right to the franchise, a right which perhaps he has exercised without question for twenty years before; that by this law he is deprived of that right, and must of necessity make his appearance before that official, and after he does so very likely will fail to get his name upon the list—if the people of this country knew those facts—the amount of difficulty, the amount of trouble and expense which will be entailed upon them in the preparation of these lists, I think the unanimous voice of the electorate of the country would be: "Let well enough alone; we are satisfied with the franchise we have, and when we are dissatisfied with that franchise we will ask our own legislators of our own Provinces to arrange it for us." Well, Sir, the hon. member for Grey says that the question does not belong to the Local Legislatures; but whether or not it belongs to them, this I do say, that the argument which I adduced at the commencement of my remarks, that the framers of our constitution intended that the provincial authorities should have the regulation of the franchise, is proved by the fact that they have been allowed to regulate that franchise by right, for the last eighteen years; and whether they have that right by law or not, I think these eighteen years exercise of that function gives them some sort of right by possession. If it is wrong to-day to allow the Provincial Legislatures to regulate the franchise, it was equally wrong eighteen years ago.

Mr. RYKERT. Why did you change the Ontario franchise?

Mr. PLATT. We change the franchise in the various Provinces in accordance with the wishes of the people of

those Provinces, through their representatives in the Local Legislatures. Though there may be some hon. gentlemen that feel aggrieved with the general conduct of the Local Legislatures, who may consider anything they do as wrong and unconstitutional, the people of the country have heretofore submitted to the wise regulations of the various Provincial Legislatures, in so far as this subject is concerned, and the people themselves asked that a change should be made in that respect. Well, Sir, we have the Bill before us, and in some respects the Bill is peculiar. We find different members arguing from different standpoints, and a great many say that this Bill has only one principle, and that that principle is that of a uniform franchise for this Dominion, and they ring the changes on those beautiful words: "Uniform franchise for this Dominion." For my own part I do not see that these words contain a great deal of meaning. Others say that there are various other principles in the Bill, while the leader of the Government, who proposed the measure, contends that while uniformity of franchise is the chief principle of the Bill, states that there is another principle in the Bill, namely, the extension of the franchise to women. One hon. member—I think the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White)—stated to the House that there was only one principle in the Bill, and that was the principle having a franchise of our own—having a uniform franchise all over the Dominion, while the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Wright), states that this Bill is bristling with principles, and he proceeds to elaborate what he believes to be the chief principle of the Bill, namely, the extension of the franchise to women. I say, Sir, that I agree with the hon member for Ottawa County that this Bill bristles with principles, and that the principles are bristling in their character! Every hon. member who listened attentively to the debate must have noticed that, although we have during this Parliament had very many Bills of importance before us, many questions which hon. members on this side have seen fit to object to and oppose, those measures have seldom been carried without some strong arguments being adduced on the Government side in favor of their being carried; and I say that any hon. gentleman who has listened with attention to this debate cannot help remarking the weakness of the arguments which have been adduced in favor of this Bill. Those who have addressed the House in favor of the Bill have confined themselves almost entirely to the one cry to which I have already adverted, the cry of a uniform franchise. Now, Sir, I shall say no more with regard to the meaning of those words, except that to my mind they are nothing more nor less than a sentiment, pure and simple; and I repeat, Sir, that this is not the time, this is not the condition of the country, which demands that we should expend large sums of the people's money simply for the sake of carrying out what is nothing more than a sentiment. Well, Sir, hon. members on both sides of the House have sought to point out at various stages of the debate what are the real objects of the Government in bringing the Bill before the House. So far as the debate is concerned it has been proved conclusively that the arguments in favor of the ostensible object in bringing it forward, that of securing a uniform franchise, that of preventing the Local Legislatures from encroaching on our rights—those arguments have proved to be so weak as to be utterly futile and useless. Then, Sir, some hon. members have been casting about for some other reason for the introduction of this Bill. I shall not indulge in the strong language which some hon. gentlemen have indulged in, though the opinions which have been expressed even in that strong language, have been shared in by myself. We know that when the rulers of some nations are in deep trouble, or distress in one particular point in their national autonomy, they sometimes, in order to divert the attention of the populace from that particular subject, enter upon another subject which they consider of greater importance. Can it be that the Government of this country, feeling that the people are becoming anxious and excited from the difficulties which now hang over the Dominion from one end to another, have sought to distract their attention from those subjects by bringing up this Bill, which could not fail to produce a profound impression on the populace? Can it be that the Government have sought, by bringing before Parliament this measure at this particular time, to take the people's minds off the causes of the troubles which now exist? We know, Sir, that as a rule Governments look forward to the next general election no matter how distant it may be, and so guide their course of action that when they confront the people at the coming election they may have some defence for the policy which they have been carrying out. Can it be, Sir, that hon. gentlemen have so long before the approaching elections seen the seeds of discord already sown in their ranks? Do they see that from one end of this country to the other there is disappointment as to the effect of the policy which they promised would give the country universal and continuous prosperity? Can it be that they see that the people have failed to discover that they have carried out their promises, which were heard from every platform in the country? Do they see that the people are becoming aggrieved and discontented in consequence of the enormous expenditure which has been heaped upon them, and that unless they can do something to retrieve their errors in this covert way, they will likely be defeated at the next elections? One complaint made against the existing system, I think by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), was that it was an outrageous thing that this Parliament should allow the Local Legislatures to so change the entire complexion of the electorate that we should not at the next election be able to go back to the same constituencies that elected us at the last election. Well, Sir, that may be an objection; but I would like to ask that hon. gentleman if he was always so jealous of the complexion of the electorate? In 1882 when a Bill passed through this House to completely change the electorate in the Provinc of Ontario, was he then found defending the permanence of the electorate, or was he found supporting the change? And, Sir, have we any guarantee that these continued attempts to change the complexion of the electorate will not be repeated? Does not the present Bill completely change the complexion of the electorate in many Provinces? If this Bill passes can we go back to the same people who sent us here and give an account of our stewardship to them? Not only in the Province of Ontario, but in every Province in the Dominion, the electors who created this Parliament will not be those to whom we shall appeal when the next election comes around. I was somewhat amused at an attempt at argument that was made by the hon. member for King's, New Brunswick (Mr. Foster) when he contended in concert with the hon. member for Cardwell, that this Parliament should have the power to regulate its own franchise. That hon. gentleman made use of these words:—

"On this principle I am willing to take my stand, that a Parliament or Legislature should have an electorate of its own; that it should not be at the beck or the will, the wish or the whim, of any other body, be it higher or lower in the order of legislation."

Now, that sounds very well. It may be true in principle that each Legislature in this Dominion, no matter how small or how exalted its powers may be, should have the power to say what shall be its own electorate. But that hon. gentleman takes his stand on the ground that, whether higher or lower, every Legislature should have the right to construct its own franchise. I suppose we shall find him taking his stand on the principle that the Local Legislatures have no right to interfere with the franchises of municipal

institutions. Does he take the position that county councils, township councils, and boards of school trustees shall all have the right to construct their own franchises? If there is anything in his argument, he must follow it out to its logical conclusion, and we must have no Local or Federal Legislature interfering with the franchises of municipal bodies. Now, Sir, with regard to that very material and important part of this Bill, for extending the franchise, in part at any rate, to women, I quite agree with the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Wright) that it is the chief provision of the Bill, and it is one of the questions which I presume has very largely excited the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite. We hear various rumors as to the manner in which that proposal has been received by the supporters of the right hon. leader of the Government. Although the argument of the hon. member for Ottawa County was so strongly expressed as to convince them for a time, still I think there has been more or less of a revolt in the ranks on that subject. I am not going to discuss the question at this stage. Being one of the chief principles of the Bill I believe that now would be the proper time to discuss it; but having been left an open question, for the House to decide in committee, I think we may well wait until we are in committee before we decide whether that provision shall remain in the Bill or not. It seems to me very strange after the right hon. leader of the Government had explained this clause, which he held to be his own peculiar child, that he should have taken so little care to nourish and guard it until it should be placed on the statute book. He was perhaps right in claiming this as his own peculiar child; but all I have to say is that the child does not very strongly resemble the parent! It is not one of those provisions which we should naturally expect to come from the hon. gentleman. Looking through the Bill, I can find other provisions which look more like the product of his genius. The clause providing for the appointment of revising officers is one which I think may more justly claim the parentage of the hon. gentleman. If the provision extending the franchise to women was one which he fondly cherished as his own, how is it that instead of making provision for its culture and nourishment he should have, even before its birth, made arrangements for farming it out to a committee of this House? If that is the manner in which the chief provision of this Bill is to be brought before Parliament, the women of this country will have a long time to wait before they receive the blessing of enfranchisement at his nands. I suppose, however, that the hon. gentlemen has been forced to agree that he would not make that provision a material part of the Bill, but would leave it to the committee. I do not see why, in his declining years, his followers might not have realised the fact that, if this clause were not given effect now, he might not have an opportunity of bringing it into law. On the principle of the law of mutual concession which the hon. Secretary of State so beautifully elaborated, they might have yielded to his entreaties and allowed that provision to become law. The hon. Secretary of State said:

"We must all yield a little of our pretensions; we must all, Provinces as well as individuals, yield a little of our personal feelings on some things: we must all yield a little of our personal views on some subjects; we must even yield some of our own personal interests to try to arrive at a good medium measure satisfactory to all."

Upon this principle I presume that the hon. leader of the Government has yielded to the entreaties of his friends in regard to that provision of the Bill, and I hope he will be willing to yield as readily to the entreaties of this House, not only of members on his own side, but of members of this House generally, when the arguments advanced show that some of the other provisions of the Bill are not what they should be in the interests of the people. The section of the Bill which has been described by hon. gentlemen opposite as a most obnoxious section to hon. gentlemen on this side, I think, may justly be held to be obnoxious, not only to this side of the House, but to the people of this country. I refer specially to that clause to which I have already alluded, giving power to the Government to appoint irresponsible revising officers. I have already stated that this section of the Bill looks more like the legitimate offspring of the hon. the leader of the Government than any other section. We know that it has, I may say, some brothers and sisters already. The Gerrymandering Act, as it was termed, is now about three years old, and this clause of the Bill looks very much like the Gerrymandering Act; at any rate, I should characterise it as belonging to the same family. We know that in the appointment of returning officers, hon. gentlemen opposite have sought to take into their hands some such powers, as they appear desirous to take into their hands by the provisions of this clause. We have been told that this revising officers' clause cannot possibly do any harm, because the judges of the land may be appointed. Well, I wish that the judges will be appointed, if we are to have this measure at all. But what is there in this Bill that at all makes it imperative upon the Government to appoint them? Some years ago, when a change was made in the election law, giving the Government power to appoint sheriffs, registrars or other persons as returning officers, we were told that the sheriffs and registrars would be appointed. Were they appointed? Were they justified in calling upon the people to trust the Government in that respect? We know very well what was the character of the appointments then made. We know very well that in Ontario alone, at any rate in Ontario and Quebec, there were 75 returning officers appointed who were neither registrars nor sheriffs, and who were appointed, not because of the absence or illness or incapacity of the sheriffs and registrars, but because they suited the Government. When we look back to the elections then and consider the character and the behavior of many of the returning officers of that time, what right have we now, with that experience, to trust the Government when they say they intend appointing the judges of the land as revising officers? Is it not altogether probable that they will do the reverse, that they will do as they did before, and that it will be found that revising officers will be appointed on the recommendation of Government candidates because of their interest in the election of those Government candidates? Is it not altogether probable that the Government will appoint revising officers whose active sympathies will be altogether enlisted in favor of the Government candidates? Now we have been told that unfortunately we could not use the municipal machinery to a very great extent in carrying out the provisions of this Bill. Fortunately we have used the machinery of the municipalities in carrying out our electoral franchise heretofore, and I ask the House in all fairness why should we be called on now to make use of machinery which will be cumbrous and will not be assisted to any extent by the municipal machinery at present in use? Upon the whole, after looking carefully over this Bill, the franchise will be materially curtailed; there will be more people disfranchised by far, under it, than will be placed on the roll of electors by its provisions. I have already stated that in Ontario there is a clamor for the extension of the franchise. We know that the Conservative party in Ontario have made it a plank in their platform that manhood franchise should obtain. How then are hon. gentlemen in this House, supporters of the Opposition in the Ontario Legislature, going to meet their friends in that Province on the platform hereafter? Not only have those hon. gentlemen here failed to bring in a measure for manhood suffrage, but they declare, by compelling the Provinces that have manhood suffrage to reduce and curtail their franchise, that manhood suffrage is not proper or right. We have one set of Conservatives in this House who are not in favor of manhood suffrage and are in favor of having a Dominion suffrage which will prevent the

people of Ontario, in case they deem manhood suffrage to be right and necessary, from extending that suffrage in Ontario to the elections for this House. It may be that in this instance the principles of concession may come in again; it may be that the leader of the Opposition in Ontario will consult the leader of the Government here, and that they will come to an agreement as to which shall yield. We know very well that the leader of the Opposition in Ontario once yielded to the entreaties of the leader of this Government; probably on this occasion it will be the turn of the leader of this Government to yield. Now, I have expressed, if not tersely, as rapidly and as briefly as I can, my chief objections to the principle of the Bill. I object to this Bill and shall vote against the motion, because the principle involves the centralisation of a power which should be left with the several Provinces, and can be left there to the satisfaction of the people for whom we are legislating. I object to the measure because it is dealing with the electoral power which made this Parliament and dealing with it without the command, nay, without the consent of the people who sent us here. I hold that upon a question such as this common modesty, not to say decency, demands that we take our instructions direct from the people after the most definite propositions have been ennuciated from the public platform and replied to at the ballot box. I object to the measure because it is unnecessary, because it is unasked for, because it substitutes cumbrous, expensive, and untried machinery for that which is simple and within the experience of the people already. It proposes two systems for one—it doubles the trouble, trebles the expense—confuses the people—and satisfies nobody, save those officials whom it may feed at the people's expense. I am opposed to it because it contains provisions, monstrously unfair and un-British. It places power in the hands of an unpopular and tyrannical Administration to thwart the desires and intentions of the electorate by putting their franchise at the mercy of an unscrupulous and partisan official whose regard for his benefactors may overshadow his regard for the interests of the people with whose franchise he is dealing. I oppose the measure myself and I justify opposition of the most stubborn character to every stage of the Bill. Hon. gentlemen opposite may term it obstructive, or factious or what they like, it will make no difference. The gentlemen upon this side of the House, feel that the occasion demands our action and we feel that the country will sustain us in our uncompromising resistance to a measure which strikes at our liberties in an unfair and unmanly way.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. In accordance with my remarks of last evening on the Franchise Bill, I beg to give notice that before we go into committee I shall move an amendment proposing to strike out the clause proposing to extend the franchise to women.

Mr. WALLACE. I will explain to the House why I cannot agree in the remarks made by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member from Prince Edward County (Mr. Platt) declares, with a great deal of confidence, that the Conservative party are opposed to this measure; perhaps that hon. gentleman has greater means of knowing the views of the Conservative party than hon. gentlemen on this side. All I can say is that if he takes any consolation in the idea that the Conservative party will oppose that motion, he is greatly mistaken. We have seen that two members of the Conservative party have voted against this measure on the second reading of the Bill, but I apprehend they did so on the ground that it extends the franchise a great deal further than they care to go. That the franchise is too liberal a measure to suit their views, and therefore they oppose it. I favor the Bill now under discussion for several reasons. The hon. member for Prince Edward County (Mr. Platt) stated to this House a few moments ago that this Bill changed the electorate and restricted the number of votes in Ontario. I deny that *in toto*. I have here a number of voters' lists from various municipalities in the riding which I have the honor to represent, and I cannot find one name of all whom I know—and I am pretty familiar with the inhabitants of the riding—who were on the voters' lists in 1882 who will be struck off by this Franchise Bill. In fact, I find that this Bill not only increases the number of those by whom we were elected in 1882, but increases the number of votes given by the new Franchise Act of the Local Government passed at the last Session. I find that, in my constituency, there are more than 500 voters who had votes at the previous election who are disfranchised by Mr. Mowat's recent Act, and, in the name of those 500 voters, including some members on the other side of the House, I protest against the disfranchisement of such a large number of voters in any constituency in this country. In one township alone, the township of York, or rather only the west half of the township of York, 419 of those who had votes in 1882 will be disfranchised by Mr. Mowat's recent Act. I say such an outrageous Act has never been brought before the people of the country. By that measure, without letting the people know, giving six days' notice before the Act was finally passed, without letting the people know the scope of the Act, what would be the consequence of it, they have disfranchised a large portion of the voters of this county, and those voters are not the least intelligent of our constituents. They are gentlemen who have property in various places. I mention the name of William Howland, which appears here, who has property to the extent of $80,000 or $100,000 in the West Riding of York.

Mr. MILLS. He votes in Toronto.

Mr. WALLACE. He had a vote in West York in 1882' and he exercised his vote, and he exercised it in 1883 in the local election, and in 1884, if there had been an election, he would have had the power to exercise his vote, but, by the Bill introduced and passed by Mr. Mowat, Sir William Howland will be disfranchised. He will not have the privilege of voting on $100,000 worth of property he owns in the West Riding of York. We are told that he will have a vote somewhere else. We are not aware of that. He may not be assessed somewhere else. I am not aware of it. But he had a vote in West York, and he loses that. The people who are disfranchised are among the most intelligent. They are the large property owners of this country, and I will defy hon. gentlemen opposite to point out a Franchise Bill, of which the chief basis is voting on real estate, which disfranchises a large portion of those who own a great amount of property. We can understand that, under universal suffrage, or manhood suffrage, where property is not the basis of representation at all, a man holding property is registered in one place and has a vote only in that place, but those gentlemen cannot point out to me any Franchise Act, in any country where property is the basis of the qualification, and where, as in Mr. Mowat's Act, property is almost the sole basis of qualification, because the income franchise and the wage-earner franchise do not materially increase the number of voters on the list, by which large owners of property are disfranchised. Mr. Mowat disfranchises a large number of those property owners, the largest property owners in this country, and he is not courageous enough to go the step further required of him if he were consistent, and give universal suffrage. I vote for this Bill because it is going to be the fairest Franchise Act that this country, or the portion of it in which I reside, has ever had. My own experience is that, when you get a lot of Grit assessors in your riding, you cannot have confidence that a fair result is reached, and that those who are entitled to be on the assessment roll and on the voters' list are

placed there. Our experience in the West Riding of York, where we have had Grit assessors, is that we have each year to appeal against the assessment, and to get 40 or 50 names added to the voters' list which were left off by the assessors.

Mr. McCRANEY. What about Tory assessors?

Mr. WALLACE. If hon. gentleman opposite have no more confidence in the Tory assessors than I have in the Grit assessors, they will vote for this Bill and try to make it law. I consider that this Parliament should have the making of its own franchise. I think it would be just as reasonable to ask the Local Legislatures to define the boundaries of our constituencies, which I have no doubt they would very gladly do if they had the opportunity, I think it would be just as reasonable to ask them to conduct the whole machinery of the elections, as to give them the power of regulating and constructing the voters' lists. If they are to have that power, which hon. gentleman opposite think is so necessary in the interests of provincial rights, why not go further and give them the power of running the elections? The Dominion Government will say: We have dissolved the House, we must have an election, we call upon the Local Government of Ontario, to carry out the election of 92 members, and the Local Government of Quebec to elect 65 in Quebec, and so on in the other Provinces; we want you to return the members, to work up all the machinery, and send to us the members who are to be elected. If there is a principle involved in it, why not let the Local Governments do the whole of the work? Why not even go still further, and let the county councils manage the elections for the Local House? Why not say to the county of York, for instance, that the county council knows the people better than the Local Legislature knows them, and that it is desired to fix the local lists, to make a law, and to send three or four representatives, as the case might be, from the county of York; because, if the Local Legislature ought to work up all the machinery for the election of members to the Dominion Parliament, why should not the county councils be given the power to do the same for the local Parliament? Surely hon. gentlemen opposite have sufficient confidence in the people to allow them to do that. But while the hon. gentlemen expressed great faith and confidence in the people, they are in fact diametrically opposed to giving them additional power, as we find in the conduct of the Local Government of Ontario in restricting rights of the county council and centralising all the power in themselves that should belong to the county and township councils; and now they are bold enough to come to this Parliament and say: We want not only the powers that are given by the Confederation Act, we want not only our own powers, but we want the powers that are given, precisely and unequivocally, to the Dominion Government. I think, Mr. Speaker, that although this Bill may involve additional expense, and considerable trouble, the expense and the trouble will be amply repaid by our having a list that will reflect the true opinions of the people of this country. I shall, therefore, give my cordial and hearty support to this measure, which will prevent a large number of electors in each riding from being disfranchised, and will add to the list the name of every man who has a right to be there; which will give all the safeguards that the people require to allow them to put their names on the voters' list, which will give them an appeal,—which they have not now, from the county judges—in fact it will give them every thing they require, and will send to this House a set of representatives who will better reflect the opinions of the people of this country than could be returned under any other system that we have ever had.

Mr. JACKSON. The member for West York (Mr. Wallace) has attempted to deny that this Act excludes a certain proportion of the people from voting in the Province of Ontario; and he claims that the Mowat Act disqualifies certain persons from voting in the Province. I claim that he has not proved his case. I claim that every person whose name is on the voters' list, there has a right to vote.

Mr. SPROULE. What about non-residents?

Mr. JACKSON. Property owners in different counties, being non-residents, are supposed to have a right to vote where they reside. The hon. gentleman has referred to Toronto, and said that the Lieutenant Governor would be disqualified. Well, no doubt the city of Toronto is like other cities and towns throughout the country. Now, I can show the hon. gentleman how that would work in portions of the country in the vicinity of cities and towns. I can refer him to what has taken place in my own county which, I think, will disprove what he has said in that respect. In 1882, 178 appeals were made in the South Riding of Norfolk, and out of that number 161 names were erased from the voters' list. I will explain how this came about, to a large extent. A number of the citizens of the town of Simcoe owned land in the rural part of the county, and they had votes in the town of Simcoe and on this land in the county. They had divided the land up into 25 acre lots, and some lots of 200 acres returned as many as five names to be put upon the voters' list. Those names were appealed, and, as I have said, out of 178, there were 161 names erased from the list during that year. The Mowat Act is to this effect, that a man residing in the town can vote in that town, but he cannot go into the country and vote; he has one vote and not two; and therefore, by that Act, you get a representation of the people, whereas, under the old system, you got merely a representation of the people's wealth. If a man had property in two or three ridings he had that many votes; therefore, the members were not elected by the people individually, but by the people's wealth. Now, Sir, I think that clearly disproves anything the hon. gentleman has said in that respect. Now, in regard to the voters' lists in the municipalities. These lists are made by the municipal officer of the county. The Secretary of State the other evening said that the reason why they wanted this Bill was in order to enable them to control these officers. They wanted to centralise the power here; and we are trying to show the people that this Bill will take the power away from the municipal authorities and place it in the hands of this Parliament. I think that disposes of the argument the hon. member brought forward, but I will touch it again later on. In 1883, on the opening of this Parliament, the First Minister in speaking upon the Speech from the Throne, said that it was necessary to have a Dominion franchise to elect the members of this House, and he gave as a reason that one of the Provinces had then given notice of its intention to deal with the franchise; and he said he was afraid that at the end of this Parliament, when he again had to appeal to the electors, he would find a different set of voters altogether to deal with, and therefore it was necessary to have a Dominion franchise upon which to elect members for this House. Now, Sir, I think this Bill proves that the hon. gentleman was not afraid of the Provinces creating a franchise, but he was afraid again to appeal to the people on a fair and square basis; and by this Bill he proposes to have a franchise of his own, got up expressly for himself and his political friends. I propose to go into some little detail with respect to this Bill. The hon. gentleman, in moving the second reading, last Thursday week, said:

"It is of great importance that the same classes should be represented here, otherwise, the House can well understand, we are sowing the seeds of discontent. If, for instance, in the contiguous Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, on one side of the river here there is a class which has a right to vote, and the same class is excluded just across the river, discontent must prevail there."

I would like to ask, who is responsible for this discontent. If there is discontent throughout the Provinces, I claim that the hon. gentleman is responsible for it. He referred to the different franchises in the Provinces divided by the Ottawa River, but there has been a difference ever since these Provinces fixed their franchise qualifications; and there has been no discontent in either of those Provinces; but under this Bill there must be discontent, because the Province of Ontario has lately extended the franchise to the people, while this Bill will disquality tens of thousands of people in in that Province, and therefore it must sow the seeds of discontent. If there is one thing more than another that will create discontent among the people, it is to deprive them of something they have once enjoyed, and especially from the privilege of exercising their suffrage. You deprive a man of that privilege and you take away from him all his manly liberty, and in the Province of Ontario and several other Provinces this Bill will have that effect. Now, I want to show you some of the features of this Bill. In the first place, I will refer to the tenant clause. That clause reads as follows :—

"The tenant of real property within any such city or town or part of a city or town, at a monthly rental of at least two dollars, or at a quarterly rental of at least six dollars, or at a half-yearly rental of at least twelve dollars, or at an annual rental of at least twenty dollars, and has been in possession thereof as such tenant for at least one year next before the first day of November, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-six or in any subsequent year, and has really and *bonâ fide* paid one year's rent for such real property at not less than the rate aforesaid; provided that the year's rent so required to be paid to entitle such tenant to vote shall be the year's rent up to the last yearly, half-yearly, quarterly or monthly day of payment as the case may be, which shall have occurred next before the first day of November in each of the said years respectively; and provided also, that a change of tenancy during the year next before the first day of November in any such year shall not deprive the tenant of the right to vote in respect of such real property if such change is without any intermission of time, and the several tenancies are such as would entitle the tenant to vote had such tenant been in possession under either of them, as such tenant, for the year next before the said first day of November in any such year."

There is nothing in this clause to show the value of the property on which rent is being paid. I claim that in a clause providing that a tenant paying a certain rental is entitled him to vote for a member of Parliament, there should be something to show what the property is worth. I further claim that no tenant should have the right to vote on property of less value than that which would give the owner a vote. This clause will have the effect of giving thousands of people in towns and cities votes on property of less value than the value which would give the owner a vote—hovels and bits of buildings in cities and towns. I claim, therefore, that this Bill, if it becomes law, will have the effect of giving votes to a class of people who should not vote, if this Bill is based on property qualifications, because it gives to a certain class of people the right to vote without their possessing any property qualification. The clause does not say what the property shall be worth; but, if it passes, anyone paying rental will have the right to vote. If this Bill is framed on a property qualification, let us have a property qualification, and do not let us allow a tenant to vote on property on which the owner could not vote. With respect to the expense that will be involved in connection with carrying out the provisions of this Bill, several hon. gentlemen have placed the cost to the country at $200,000, others at $250,000, and others again as high as $350,000 per annum. I am satisfied that the expense will not be less than $500,000 a year, so that each Parliament of five years will cost the country $2,500,000. This expenditure is, moreover, unnecessary and uncalled for, and if any hon. member thinks I have placed the amount too high, I can prove by figures that the cost will be what I have stated. I am satisfied if this Bill should ever become law, the people will ascertain that the cost will be not be less than $2,500,000 for every Parliament of five years' duration. I claim it is uncalled for, and it is imposing cost on the people unnecessarily, and especially at this particular period. As to the Bill itself, I may say that no one franchise is suitable for all the Provinces of the Dominion. I hold that no one franchise can be framed to suit the different people of this country, whose occupations, productions and requirements are diverse. A franchise that suits Ontario, cannot suit Quebec; that was fully demonstrated years ago. The franchise of Quebec does not suit the people of Prince Edward Island. It is, therefore, impossible to frame a franchise that will satisfy all the Provinces. I claim, however, that each Province has a right to say what its own franchise shall be. Hon. gentlemen are elected by the people of the Provinces, and they are sent here to legislate respecting the interests of the Provinces. Is it right that hon. gentlemen who have been elected by the people as their representatives should come here and make a law which in effect states that we are going to elect ourselves, or that we have appointed men to elect us? Is there any justice in such action? No. I do not know what hon. gentlemen will be able to say when they return to their constituencies and meet the people who sent them here. They will be forced to say to them: We have made a law by which we have taken the power of electing representatives out of your hands; we have appointed men to do the work, and you will not exercise the power you exercised before. This is an outrage on the people of the whole Dominion. It comes right down to a business matter. Suppose a man sends a clerk out to do business for him, and that clerk transacts the business so that when he returns he is proprietor. In effect he has usurped the power which formerly rested in the proprietor, and he now orders the proprietor as to how he shall act in future. This is the case in regard to the present Bill. The electors of the different Provinces have sent representatives to this House, and if this Bill should become law, the representatives will usurp the powers of the electors, and they will go back to the people and dictate as to future elections. I claim that this is a power which could not be given to this Parliament. If there is any Act which will cast discredit on Parliament throughout the Dominion it is this. I now desire to refer to the woman suffrage clause. Following the example of some hon. members, I do not propose to give my opinion as to whether woman franchise is necessary or not. But the point as to which I wish to put myself on record plainly is this, that if the girls, the spinsters, have a vote, I think the married ladies should have a vote. By the Bill, girls who may have a little property left or given to them by their parents or others, are qualified to vote, though having no experience whatever, knowing little or nothing about human nature, and yet married ladies, ladies of intelligence, are not competent to give an intelligent vote. I say, Sir, that that is a very great wrong, and that it is an insult to the ladies of this country; and I hope that the married ladies throughout the Dominion will see that their rights are protected, and that when another election arrives, they will show that they have some influence, that the hon. gentleman has been treading on dangerous grounds. Now, Sir, a word as to the revising barristers. Section 11 of this Act says :

"A revising officer to be appointed under this Act may, in any Province except Quebec, be either a Judge or a junior judge of any county court in the Province in which he is to act, or a barrister of at least five years' standing at the bar of such Province, and in the Province of Quebec he may be either a judge of the Superior Court for Lower Canada, or an advocate of that Province of at least five years' standing: Provided always that the same revising officer may be appointed for, and be required to discharge the said duties in respect of more than one electoral district.

The Bill does not say that the revising officer shall be a judge, but that he may be a judge, or a barrister of at least five years standing. My experience teaches me that the duties of the judges throughout the Dominion are so onerous that they cannot possibly accept this office if it were tendered to them,

and in my opinion it was not intended to give it to the judges, or it would have said they shall be judges. I conclude, therefore, that this officer will be a barrister. Well, Sir, with all due respect to the profession, my experience teaches me that barristers work for money, and when they get a good fat client they will stick to him as long as he will stick to them, and when they have the Government for a client they will have a good fat client. This officer is appointed by the Government, he is paid by the Government and he is to hold office during good behavior, which means, in my opinion, just as long as he will do the work of the Government and no longer, and therefore he becomes a tool in the hands of the Government, a machine to make votes for the Government whereby they can keep themselves in power. Now, Sir, I claim that that is a usurpation of power which should not be. I claim that it is one man power. I claim that the right of the people to have their own voters' lists is a very important matter. Where would I have been to-day, Sir, had not there been an appeal from the voters' list in the County of Norfolk? There were 178 appeals in my riding, and out of that number 161 were struck off the voters' list in 1882, which shows that there was a plot formed in that riding, and that, no matter who the candidate was, he would have been defeated under those circumstances. Had we not had a judge to see that the rights of the people were carried out, those names would have been left on the voters' list. Now, where is the chance of appeal? This revising officer has entire control of the roll; he has the making up of the roll and the whole management of it, and as there is no appeal from it, how are the people of this country going to be represented? This Bill gives no representation to the people; it is a representation of this officer, and members coming here to this Parliament will not represent the voice of the people, but will represent this officer appointed by the Government. These are facts which are too plain to be contradicted. Sir, I claim that this Parliament has no right, that those members sent here from the different Provinces have no right, to pass a law of this kind, disqualifying a large portion of the people who sent them here. In the Province of Ontario, from which I come, I consider, from the best information I can obtain, that not less than 10,000 people will be disfranchised who are now eligible to vote for members of this Parliament. That is an outrage upon the people of that Province, and it cannot fail to cause discontent among the people. These are facts which cannot be disputed. Hon. gentlemen say that the Franchise Act of Ontario has disfranchised certain voters. Well, Sir, as I stated before, no man except a non-resident is disfranchised, and non-residents have a vote where they reside, and if they have no property where they reside they cannot have a vote. This disqualification is intended to keep men from voting twice—to give every man one vote who has property, but not to give him two or three votes. I claim, Sir, that in that way you get a representation of the people, you get what the people want; and when one man, because he has more wealth than another, because he has property in two or three counties, has that many votes, you do not get the voice of the people—you get the wealth of the people represented. Therefore I claim that one vote is all any man should have, and that vote should be given where he resides. With these few remarks I conclude by stating my intention to vote against the Bill.

Mr. JENKINS. Three objections raised by the hon. members of the Opposition against this measure are that it has been brought down too late in the Session, that the speech of the right hon. leader of the Government in introducing it occupied only eight minutes and a half, and that barristers are such a set of scoundrels that they cannot be trusted with the revision of the voters' lists of this Dominion. Now, this Bill has been a long time before the country, the members of the House have had a fair opportunity of fully discussing it, and public discussion has been invited upon it. It was brought down about the middle of March, and it has been in the hands of the members since that time; and when we consider that already no less than 243 columns of *Hansard* have been taken up with the discussions on this Bill, I cannot see that there has so far been any lack of discussion upon this important measure. The speech of the right hon. Premier on introducing the Bill was, I think, a very good speech; he just explained the principles of the Bill, and invited free discussion upon them. He said that he was willing to have the measure freely discussed in committee, and I have no doubt that when we go into committee upon it, certain modifications may be made in it which will render it more acceptable to the people of this Dominion. It has been said that there has been no public discussion on the measure. I can state that in Prince Edward Island, during the recent election in Queen's County, it was most fully discussed, and the people were satisfied that it was a liberal measure; but owing to the fact that that Province has already a still more liberal franchise, I believe the people there would feel that as the Bill tends towards increasing and enlarging the franchise, it would be against the spirit of the Bill to restrict the franchise in Prince Edward Island. As regards the revising barristers, I think barristers as a class are honorable men, and they have a legitimate ambition to attain at some future time a high station on the bench; and that ambition would be imperilled by any malpractice that they might be guilty of. I think that alone will be quite sufficient to keep them in their right place. I look upon it as a gross libel on the profession to stigmatise them as the creatures of the Government, as men who are prepared to sell themselves and their honor for a paltry office. For my part, I have perfect confidence that when it may be necessary to submit the voters' lists for revision to barristers, the work will be done properly and with credit to themselves. As the hon. First Minister has invited full and free discussion of the measure in committee, I shall take an early opportunity of introducing an amendment to the effect that Prince Edward Island may remain as it is in regard to the franchise. The hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Wright) has been kind enough to highly compliment Prince Edward Island and its representatives on the result of manhood suffrage; and I trust that he and other hon. members will assist in carrying such an amendment as will maintain that franchise to the people of Prince Edward Island. That Island is peculiarly situated. It is almost filled up with settlers, and there is no chance for a large influx of population. The present population is chiefly rural, and I think there will be no danger to this House or to the country in allowing that Province to retain its present franchise. Our young men have exercised the franchise for 40 years, and they have done it with credit to themselves; and I think to deprive them of that privilege would be contrary to the spirit of this Act, which is a liberal Act, and which tends to enlarge the franchise. Otherwise I look upon the measure as a very liberal one; and with the few modifications that may be made in it in committee. It will have my hearty support.

Mr. LISTER. When this question was before the House lately, the hon. member for Cardwell undertook to defend every provision of the Bill. He used this language:

"I think there is no doubt to anybody who looks at the matter fairly that we ought to have in this Parliament the right to determine our own franchise; and, admitting that right, that by no better means can it be carried out than by the Bill before us, which I shall have great pleasure in voting for."

The hon. member swallowed and defended every provision of the Bill. Sir, in 1874, in the gallery to my right, there was a reporter whose name was Thomas White, and who I believe was then the owner of the Montreal *Gazette*. I

have reason to believe that the Thomas White, the reporter of that day, is the hon. member for Cardwell, and that he is still the owner of the Montreal *Gazette*—rumor says so—and that paper is a strong supporter of the Government. Now, in turning over an old file of this remarkable paper, I find the strongest reason possible why the Bill before the House should not become law. On the 24th of April, 1874, when the Government of Mr. Mackenzie was about introducing a franchise Bill, giving to the Provinces of this country the right to regulate the Franchise for this Parliament, that Mr. White, the editor of the Montreal *Gazette*, caused an article to be placed in that paper headed, "The Election Law;" and in the article I find that he used these words:

"But no one will dispute that it would be better, if it could be had without any serious inconvenience or expense, that we should have a uniform franchise for the representation of the people in the House of Commons; but it is to all intents and purposes impracticable. It would require the appointment of local officers to make our voters' lists, and would in its results involve an amount of trouble and expense altogether beyond the advantages to be derived from it. The people as represented in the Provincial Legislature, have the same interest in a fair equitable representation in Parliament, as have the same people as represented in the Parliament of Canada, and they may fairly be entrusted with the duty of determining a franchise, based upon local peculiarities, and their municipal system. If they abuse that privilege it is at any time in the power of Parliament to assume the duty of framing the franchise for its own election. As to the second objection, namely that certain officers of the Local Governments are to be returning officers under this law, we have no hesitation in saying that it is one of the best features of the law.

He does not think that now——

"The returning officer is, *quoad* this particular duty, an officer of Parliament, subject to punishment if he is guilty of mal-administration of his office; and the advantage of the system is, that it reduces greatly the influence of the Government in all elections. Nothing is more important than this. Under the responsible system which prevails in Canada, it is of the highest importance that executive influence should be reduced to a minimum in the matter of parliamentary elections; and everything which tends to that end should be hailed with satisfaction by all who desire a free and untrammelled representation of the people in Parliament."

Sir, after hearing the speech of the hon. gentleman and reading this article, it is somewhat difficult to imagine that it is possible for the writer and the hon. gentleman who sits on the front benches opposite to be the same individual. How is it that the hon. gentleman, since 1874, has taken such a different view of this matter? How is it that in 1874 it was all-important that this matter should be referred to the Local Government and that the influence of the Central Government should be reduced to a minimum? How is all that? Is it due to political exigencies? Was it the political exigency of the case that made the hon. gentleman in 1874 denounce the system of this Parliament taking into its own hands the franchise? And is it the same exigency in 1885 that induces him to swallow the Bill introduced by the Government in all its deformity? The hon. gentleman who just preceded me (Mr. Jenkins), a supporter of the Government, intimated to the Government that at the proper time he would be prepared to move an amendment to this Bill, by which the Province of Prince Edward Island would be exempted from its effects. Is the leader of the Government prepared to accept that amendment? Is he prepared to accept any amendment that will destroy the uniformity of this measure? Because, remember, Sir, that the whole Act is based upon the principle of uniformity; and if you once destroy that principle, the Act has no value whatever, except to give the Government power and political influence. It was said during the discussion upon this question, and I repeat it, that hon. gentlemen opposite, when they find themselves in a hole, when they find themselves perpetrating something which they are unable to defend, always attempt to shelter themselves behind something that Mr. Mowat has done; and in this, as in other questions which come before the House, the hon. gentlemen opposite instance the Bill lately introduced by Mr. Mowat extending to certain women of the country the right of franchise. Hon. gentlemen opposite said that that Bill became law within three or four days before the prorogation of the Local Parliament, that the country had no notice whatever that such a Bill was to be introduced, or that such a Bill was to become law. I tell hon. gentlemen opposite that they have not studied the history of the female franchise in Ontario, or they would not have made a statement so far from the truth as this. As far back as 1875, the question of female franchise came before the Local House and was there discussed by both sides. A reference to the Journals of the House will convince any one who is inclined to doubt this statement of its truth. From that time to the present the question of female franchise in Ontario has been more or less discussed by the press and people; and we know that anterior to that date, women were admitted to the franchise, so far as school elections were concerned. That was found to work well; the women took an interest in those elections, and I believe that no dissatisfaction, no objection was manifested against the working of the Act which gave the women this right; and from that time to this the question of female franchise has been, to a certain extent, a live question in the Province of Ontario. As far back as 1875 it was before Parliament, debated and voted upon, and ever since there has been an agitation, greater or lesser, for the extension of franchise to women, at all events, as far as municipal matters are concerned; because we know in these matters taxation should be the basis of the franchise, and women having the right to hold property and being compelled by law to pay taxes, it is but fair they should have the right of raising their voices as to who should spend the money they have to pay. I say again that so far as the Act of 1874 is concerned, hon. gentlemen opposite have not stated the truth when they say that Mr. Mowat, during the expiring days of last Session of the Ontario Local Legislature, introduced an Act giving the franchise to women. That Act was introduced by Mr. Waters, the member for Middlesex, at the opening of the Session; and at the last moment, after it had been discussed and voted upon, and carried, Mr. Mowat consented to make it a part of his Bill, amending the Municipal Act. That measure, therefore, giving the franchise to women, was introduced by a private member early in the Session, received a full discussion of all the members present, and Mr. Mowat did what the hon. the leader of the Government often does, he put the measure on the Government Orders, and made it a portion of his amendment to the municipal law. I say that the article from which I have read a portion, and which was written by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), is the strongest arraignment of the Government that can be made upon this Bill now under discussion; I say that the arguments used throughout that article are the most powerful arguments, and really the only arguments that can be used against the passage of the measure; and how it is possible that the man whose hand penned that article should get up and make the speech on this Bill which he has made, is beyond my conception. Perchance, before the debate is ended, the hon. member for Cardwell will have an opportunity of explaining how it is that he has come to change the decided opinions he held in 1874, when the Liberal party was in power—opinions against the Act which is now sought to be forced through this House—while to-day he has spoken in favor of that same Act. I have said before, and I repeat it, that the Act before the House is pernicious in every section; there is not one section of it, from the beginning to the end, that is not objectionable. It is an effort on the part of the First Minister to seize the power of electing this Parliament; to take away from the people of this country the right to say who shall be their representatives; to, as it were, throttle the public; to trust upon the loyalty of his own friends, to submit to what ever may keep him in power. I say that it is an ungenerous act on the part of the First Minister; I say

more, it is a cowardly act on his part. Hon. gentlemen on this side are prepared to meet hon. gentlemen opposite in any conflict they may think proper to raise, but we hope that conflict will be waged in a fair and honorable manner, and I say that this Bill is one which is intended to put it out of the power of hon. gentlemen on this side to fight successfully hon. gentlemen opposite, should those hon. gentlemen choose to exercise the power this Act gives them. It is a centralising Act. We know, from the speeches of the right hon. the First Minister at the time of Confederation, as reported in the *Debates* of Confederation, that he openly stated that he was a legislative unionist. He was opposed to the principle of federation, he was opposed to the federal system entirely, and he announced openly that he was in favor of the legislative union. From that day to the present he has never hesitated to show his hostility to the federal system. He has shown it in the disallowance of Bills throughout the Provinces, by which he has sought to take away from sovereign Provinces the right to legislate upon matters entirely within the powers of those Provinces. He has sought to take away from the Provinces rights which they have. He opposed them in the escheat law, he sought to take away from them the right of licensing by his liquor Bill, which has been decided to be unconstitutional, and the last and greatest act of hostility that he can show has been the introduction of the measure which is now under the consideration of the House. This Act, as has been truly stated, disfranchises a large portion of the people of this Dominion. Hon. members are sitting about me here who have been elected by the votes of people in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, and British Columbia, and Ontario, and I say that, in all the Provinces, except Quebec and Ontario, electors by the thousands are disfranchised by this Bill who cast their votes for members now sitting in this House. I say it is contrary to the first principles, that a man who has once exercised the franchise shall be deprived of it, and yet those hon. gentlemen who are sitting here to-day as representatives from those Provinces, who have received the support of men who are to be disfranchised by this Bill, come here deliberately and support a measure which takes away from a large portion of their electorate the rights which have existed from Confederation up to the present time, namely, their right to vote under the local franchises of the different Provinces. I believe that giving this Parliament a right to regulate the franchise was a mistake. I am not here to argue that, in the strict technical sense of the word, this Parliament has not the right to say who shall be the electors to elect people to Parliament, but it is contrary to the spirit of that Act, on the system under which we live, to take into the hands of this Parliament the right to fix the franchise in the several Provinces. It is a blow at provincial rights. The Provinces of this country are best able to judge whom they will send to the Parliament of Canada. Some of the Provinces have adopted manhood suffrage; others have adopted a very low property qualification; others have perhaps a higher qualification; some of the Provinces are opposed to manhood suffrage; others are in favor of it, and it does not lie in the mouth of the Conservative Government and party to say they are not in favor of manhood suffrage, because, in the last Session of the Local Legislature Mr. Meredith, leader of the Opposition, proposed a manhood suffrage Bill, and every member of the Opposition supported it, so that my hon. friends the Conservatives from the Province of Quebec may understand that the Conservative party in the Province of Ontario had pledged itself to the principle of manhood suffrage. And so it has been in Nova Scotia. As I understand, hon. gentlemen, from the Province of Quebec are opposed to the principle of manhood suffrage. Then, by accepting this measure, they put it into the hands of a majority from other Provinces to force upon them an electorate which is distasteful to them and to their people. I ask them, before they consent to an Act of this kind, to consider the ultimate consequences of it. If we are to continue and are to be that great and glorious Confederation which we all hope for, we ought to be sticklers, we ought to be careful that no right the Provinces have ever enjoyed shall be taken away or impaired in the slighest extent. Then I say to hon. gentlemen from other Provinces who have a more liberal franchise than exists in Ontario, you are leaving yourselves open—it may never come to pass, but it may—to have an electorate created for your country that is distasteful to you and to your people. This principle of centralisation is to be deplored. It will result in the destruction of this Confederation, and I do not believe that a legislative union will be ever raised upon the ruins of Confederation. If you destroy Confederation as it is, it inevitably must follow that we will have independent Provinces. Each Province will be independent, and we will never again have the opportunity of raising up on this northern portion of this continent a grand and a glorious nation. It is small things like this that have the effect ultimately of undermining the constitution, of undermining our institutions. I therefore again take the liberty of warning hon. gentlemen from other Provinces that there is danger in the measure which the hon. gentleman has thought proper to bring forward. The Bill before the House is not a fair extension of the franchise. It does not give to the people as extensive a franchise as they have to-day in the Province of Ontario. We have had for years a farmers' sons franchise; we have had a low income franchise; we have had a low property qualification franchise, and to-day we have what is called the wage-earner's franchise. Every man who is earning $250 a year has a right to vote. This Bill does not go that far. This Bill is not in other respects as liberal a Bill as the Bill of Mr. Mowat. The hon. gentleman from West York (Mr. Wallace) took occasion to state that a large number of people have been disfranchised in his county, and the way in which they have been disfranchised is that they were not allowed to vote twice or three times. If that principle was to prevail, if the principle that property should be the qualification for voting were carried to its logical conclusion, a man owning two farms in one township ought to have two votes, a man owning, say, $10,000 worth of property, ought to have one vote, and if he owned $10,000 worth more he ought to have two votes, and so on. The object of that Act is to get a fair representation of the people, and it is not right that any one man, because he is rich, should have more power to say who shall be the member for the county than the man who is poor. I think there is another advantage in that Act which was introduced by Mr. Mowat. I think that first amongst all causes calculated to encourage bribery and other improper practices under the Election Act, stood the non-resident vote. What candidate is there throughout the country who does not go to work to secure the non-resident vote? He may be living in Montreal, he may be living in Kingston, but he will travel 300 or 400 miles to give his vote at the expense of the candidate. I believe that in the city of Winnipeg, at the recent election, the man who holds his seat there holds it by the votes of men who went from the city of Toronto—paid, I suppose, by the candidate himself. Now I say that is a pernicious system which encourages a class of bribery which it is difficult to get at. I think that there is no fairer system than a reasonable property qualification system; it is, in effect, manhood suffrage. That being the case, I say that property should not enter into the consideration of the subject at all, and that one man should have one vote and no more, in order that all might

have an equal voice in saying who shall be their representative. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) took occasion to say that he would not trust a Grit assessor——

Mr. RYKERT. He is right.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. member for Lincoln says he is right. Well, if all the stories are true, the hon. member for Lincoln and his assessors are not to be trusted. The rolls are pretty well fixed up in Lincoln.

Mr. RYKERT. I beat them, in spite of the Grit assessors.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Gerrymander helped you a little.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman may thank the Gerrymander for being here to-day. Sir, one of the most objectionable features of this Bill is the appointment of revising barristers. This has been touched upon by every speaker on this side of the House, and it has been supported by many hon. members on the other side. The hon. gentleman says that the decision of these revising officers will be so fair that they must necessarily give satisfaction to all parties. Now, Sir, if it was possible for the right hon. Minister to appoint revising officers who are perfection itself there could be no exception to the clause by which it is proposed to appoint them; but we know, as a fact, that he will appoint his own supporters; of course, we do no expect him to appoint any of us. He will appoint the gentleman who is recommended by some member who supports him in this House, and I suppose that the member will see to it that the person whom he appoints as revising officer will not be unfriendly or hostile to himself—that is not at all likely. I say that the effect of that must be the appointment of men who are partisan, the appointment of men on the recommendation of members of this House supporting the Government, and they must be more than human if they do not throw their influence on the side which has given them the appointment. As has been said by somebody who spoke here, they will stand so straight that they will lean back, and that leaning back will be in favor of the other side. But his Bill states here that, in the most important matter that can affect an individual, his right freely to exercise his franchise, there shall be no appeal. Sir, you cannot point out a single country in Christendom, as was stated by my hon. friend in front of me, where there is an Act in existence similar to this. The hon. Minister, in culling from the English Act, has omitted the provisions of that Act which are good, and he has put into it provisions which, I am sure, will not be satisfactory to the electorate of this country. To say that a man shall have the right to decide who shall vote and who shall not vote, to say that a man may disregard the voters' list and the assessment roll, and may put upon the list such names as he thinks proper, may fix the value of the property himself, is giving him a most extraordinary and unjustifiable power. We know how men will look at these things. He may say, and satisfy his own conscience, too, that property is worth $150 or $250, when it may not be worth half that sum, as a matter of fact. Men differ as to the value of property. He may say, in regard to a Reformer: I do not think this property is worth $200, and he may say it conscientiously and yet be wrong. I say that is a power which no man having a political leaning and bias should be allowed to exercise. Yet you give him that power; while the man who is wronged, the man who is to be deprived of his vote, will have no power to appeal. Is that fair? Is it right? Is there any court in this country, from the most inferior upwards, which does not give the right to appeal? Suitors in all cases of the slightest importance pending in the ordinary courts in the land, may appeal from any court in this country. And yet in this great question, involving the dearest rights of a free man, you say that there shall be no appeal from the decision of the official whom you appoint. I protest against that proposition, in the name of the people of this country, and I think upon your own side there will be thousands of people who will say that it is unfair, that it is not just. Since this Bill was introduced I have heard men here in Ottawa, outside this House, state that they could not believe that Sir John Macdonald would ever pass such an Act as this.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LISTER. Hon. gentlemen may say, Oh, oh, but they may find to their cost, notwithstanding all the efforts they are making to secure their election, that there is in this country a portion of the community who will condemn wrong, whether it comes from one side or the other. Sir, the very man who prepares this list may be a candidate at the election for which the list is prepared. There is no provision in this Act that a revising officer shall not be a candidate; and a few days before the election comes off he may resign his position of revising officer and become a candidate at the election. Is that a proper provision? Is it right that the man who prepares the list may himself be a candidate under that list? The hon. gentleman proposes to pass such a Bill as this; he says it must pass, and if he says so, I suppose it must, notwithstanding all we can do. Is it right, or is it fair, that in that Bill there should be no provision disqualifying a man who prepares the list? Yet, Sir, the Bill, as it is presented to us, does not disqualify the revising officer. In some respects the hon. gentleman appears to be very careful, because we find that when there is a class of people who can do no possible injury to his candidate he disqualified them, but the man who can injure, the man who can affect an election, he does not disqualfy. We find that he disqualifies every agent, every person,—

"Who, at any time, either during the election or before the election, is, or has been, employed at the same election, or in reference thereto, by any candidate, or by any person whomsoever, as counsel, agent, attorney, or clerk, at any polling place at any such election, or in any other capacity whatever."

It disqualifies agents who may be appointed by candidates to attend an election, but he does not disqualify, so far as the election is concerned, the man who prepares the voters' list. Now, Sir, I find that he qualifies officers in the Civil Service, postmasters of cities and towns, officers of the Inland Revenue service of this country, Customs officers and various other officers who are under the control of the Government for the time being. I say that this is not a proper provision. I say, as I said the other night in the discussion on the Civil Service, that these men should be placed outside the political ring, as it were, that they should be placed above and beyond all political influence. I say it is not fair to these men to give them the right to vote, because they may be influenced by the Government, whose servants for the time being they are. I think that the provision in the Ontario Act, with reference to civil servants, is a wise and prudent one, and that every man employed by the Government should not have the right to vote; they should not be under the suspicion of being political partisans, and in this respect the Act which we are discussing is very pernicious.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

RICHELIEU AND ONTARIO NAVIGATION COMPANY.

Mr. DESJARDINS moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 61) further to amend the Act incorporating the Richelieu Navigation Company, and the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On the preamble,

Mr. BLAKE. I understood the other day that the member in charge of the Bill would furnish some explanation.

Mr. DESJARDINS. The object of the Bill will be apparent when I present a few facts connected with it. As is mentioned in the preamble, the capital stock of the company is of the nominal value of $1,589,000. An inventory made, by direction of the board, showed that the assets of the company were only $1,215,000. In 1875 the directors then in charge thought it a convenient thing to allocate a certain amount of capital as a bonus, to the extent of $300,000. Some time afterwards they purchased certain boats, belonging to an opposition line, by issuing new stock to the amount of $89,000, so that the stock so watered was not represented in the actual value of the assets which belonged to the company. The result was that the stock of the company declined and a large number of shares went on the market and have remained there since, to the great detriment of *bonâ fide* investors who want to remain with the company, hold the stock as an investment, and try and work the company to the best advantage possible. When the board of directors found there was such a difference between the assets of the company and the nominal value of the stock they thought it would be to the advantage of the company to reduce it; and then they had to choose one of two methods, to provide simply for the reduction of the nominal value of the stock 25 per cent., or adopt the plan that is now suggested, and which they desire to carry out under the Bill now before the House. The effect of the operations under the Bill, if it is adopted, will be as follows: For the last three years the net income of the company has been over $100,000, out of which 6 per cent. on the capital stock, nominal value, has been paid, which entailed an outlay of $95,000, or nearly $96,000, leaving a balance of a few thousand dollars. If the plan proposed is adopted, the result will be this: The company would, under the operation of the law, issue bonds to the extent of $200,000 to redeem the $389,000 worth of shares which was available for sale on the market, at at at an average price of 55. So the first charge on the net income, if the bonds were issued at 6 per cent., would be $12,000 a year. By paying the same dividend to the shareholders, 6 per cent. on the full amount, the payment would only reach $72,000, so that instead of paying 96 it would be only 84, leaving a balance with which the bonds would be redeemed, without entailing any charge on the shareholders or on the stock of the company. The plan was submitted to a special meeting of shareholders called to consider it. Out of 16,000 shares 10,000 were represented. A resolution was proposed to adopt the plan, and it was carried unanimously. At the general annual meeting the same question was brought to the attention of the shareholders. They discussed it, and the directors, as authorised by previous resolution, reported they had already purchased at an average price of 55, an amount of stock equal to 2,000 or 2,600 shares. A balance sheet showing the purchase of the shares and the amount borrowed to meet the expenditure on the sale was submitted, and the whole was ratified by a unanimous vote of the shareholders. So far as the public are concerned, there is no possible objection to the transaction, because the company does not owe a cent to the public. So the whole matter is a domestic arrangement between the shareholders who are desirous of obtaining power to complete the transaction and those who have asked that the Bill be passed. That is the whole object of the Bill.

Mr. HALL. I have no desire to influence the opinion of any other member of the House, but this Bill involves a principle so objectionable that, though I do it reluctantly, I feel bound to oppose it. It is not an unusual circumstance for a company to find its capital impaired, and the relief which has hiterto been sought and invaribly given, when the circumstances appear to warrant it, is a reduction in the par value of its stock. I am not able to see any reason why that plan should not be adopted in the present case, and the very unusual and extraordinary method suggested in this case is open to very serious objection. It is a very improper power to give a board of directors, to allow it to mortgage the whole of the assests of the company in order to raise funds with which to purchase shares of the company. It involves the objectionable feature of the directors dealing in the shares of the company, and the still more objectionable feature of mortgaging the company's assets for that purpose. I see no reason, no reason was given in committee, why the usual method of the reduction of the par value should not be adopted, and from which no injustice could possibly arise. If we once adopt the principle embodied in this Bill, we shall open a door to a method of relief which will be liable to abuse hereafter. It will seriously affect the creditors to reduce the capital virtually at their expense, because the impaired assets will be charged with all the liabilities due to the creditors. In this particular case I do not mention that as a serious objection, because the assets are sufficient to meet the liabilities, but the principle involved is the same in all cases, and, if once adopted, we shall be very liable to impair the rights of creditors by allowing methods of this kind to be adopted. For these reasons I feel obliged to oppose the Bill, and the principle which it involves.

Mr. DAVIES. I hold the same position as the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I was a member of the sub-committee appointed by the Banking and Commerce Committee, and we were unanimously in favor of the application made by the company to be allowed to reduce the amount of their stock. The object stated by the hon. gentleman in promoting the Bill, was to enable them to pay dividends, and that object can be accomplished by reducing their stock in the ordinary way, which has always been permitted by the committee when a proper case has been made out. The only objections raised in the committee, and the objection raised in the House now, is not to the reduction of the stock, but to the manner in which it is proposed to be reduced, by taking bonds having a precedence over all other stock, and with the money realised by the sale of those bonds to buy up the stock. Anybody can see what a door that plan would open for possible fraud, and how it might be used to the detriment of ordinary shareholders, and it is a principle which, if introduced into our legislation now, would be one which it would be difficult to resist in future. When the Bill was before the Banking and Commerce Committee the solicitor who appeared on behalf of the company said that the company had already purchased, on the advice of their solicitor, a large quantity of this stock, and he contended that English authorities supported them in doing so. This statement took me somewhat by surprise, though I did not like to contradict it at the time, but I have examined the authorities since, and I find that the law of England is not at all as he stated, but that it shows, as we thought at the time, that it is absolutely illegal for a company to purchase its own stock, and that any such purchase could be set aside. Now, I think it is fair to say that while the statement made by the promoter of the Bill is correct, that the shareholders who had a meeting called supported this proposed scheme, some of them—one or two, I think—appeared before the Banking and Commerce Committee and opposed it. I think they represented some 300 shares.

Mr. DESJARDINS. One hundred and ninety shares.

Mr. DAVIES. At any rate, they protested very strongly against it. Those who had the handling of the money received from the sale of those bonds would have such an advantage that the ordinary shareholder could not compete with them at all, and I think myself that the principle we are asked to adopt is so vicious that I, for one, cannot assent to it.

Mr. BLAKE. I certainly think we should have had some reason given us by the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) as to the special circumstance of the case, and why this exceptional method of altering the position of the company should be adopted. The hon. gentleman has not given us any reason at all peculiar to the concerns of this company, nor can I conceive that there is anything which would make it an exception to the general rule. And the proposed legislation is unique; we are, for the first time, invited to legislate in this direction. After the statement of the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall), there is not much use of many words as to the obvious difficulties of acceding to legislation of this kind. I maintain that there is nothing we should guard more carefully than the action of directors in dealing with the stock of companies of which they are directors, particularly if they are appropriating the companies' funds to the purchase of those stocks. The hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) says there was a quantity of stock on the market. Well, in most companies there is almost always quantities of stock on the market, and if the company gets into difficulty there is generally a good deal. I should like to know how much of the stock of the Bank of Montreal is on the market, in the sense of being held for speculation and not for investment; and so with the stock of nearly all such companies. The hon. gentleman also told us that this operation had been in effect completed, so far as it could be completed lawfully, and we are called upon simply to ratify that action; that the directors had gone into the market and purchased a good deal of this stock, at, I suppose, the best prices that could be obtained, etc. Well, all the object which the hon. gentleman has in view, so far as I can see, can be accomplished, as my hon friends have said, by a reduction of the stock. The hon. gentleman says the stock is no longer worth par. That must be admitted; but if it is the fact that that is the case, and the circumstance that it is worth so much less than par embarrasses the operation of the company and disables it from paying dividends, it is a reasonable thing that it should be reduced to something approximating its actual value. We perform that operation every Session with one or more companies, and why then make this exceptional provision? If we do, next Session a bank which is embarrassed will come forward, asking that the bank should be authorised to issue obligations upon which it may buy a certain proportion of the stock. It seems to me a very complicated method of getting relief, and attended, as between the shareholders themselves, with extreme risk of advantage to one side and disadvantage to the other—attended also with added risk to the shareholders, even if there is no advantage, because those left in the position of common shareholders are no longer left in the position of common shareholders—proprietor of the assets of the company; they are common shareholders, proprietor of an equity of redemption in the assets of the company. A charge is created for the purchase of a portion of the shares, and therefore, in order that they may have what remains to them, their shares are really mortgaged and may be lost, in order to realise the obligation which has been created for the purchase of the stock which is bought in by the company itself. Then, as the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) has stated, there may arise a case in which the rights of the creditors would be seriously impaired. Those do not rise in this particular case, according to the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) because he says there are no creditors. But we are introducing—if we do introduce it—a new principle of relieving embarrassed companies whose capital is no longer equal in value to the nominal value of their shares; and I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite, who have a certain duty to discharge with reference to the principles of private Bill legislation, whether they are prepared to sanction the introduction of this novel principle into private Bill legislation, because we have no special reasons showing why this measure should be given to this company in particular, and therefore we are recognising the principle as one of general application, which will likely be invoked by embarrassed companies in future.

Mr. DESJARDINS. The leader of the Opposition has asked me the reasons why the proposed plan has been adopted by the directors of the company. I say this: That, as was fully established in the committee, the watering of the stock in 1875 has been an injury to the shareholders—to the real investors in the company—and that, since that time, they have had to meet within the company a body of shareholders who are not united in the company's interests. They were there only to secure such an amount of benefit as would be derived from the purchase and sale of the stock on the market, without caring in any way as to the prosperity of the company, or that its management should be such as to produce the best results. Well, in reducing the stock purely and simply, the same stock and the same number of shares would be left on the market. By this measure, those who want to keep the shares as an investment, and to make the company a paying concern, will be able to do so much better than with a certain number of outsiders, who are with them to-day, and will give up their interest to-morrow, and who are only interested in the company so far as they can secure some immediate profit from their daily transactions on the market. By this means the shareholders, not by themselves but by the company, will be enabled to contract the stock to such an amount as can easily be kept by themselves, and that is the main reason why they select this way of reducing the stock. Now the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) says that it is a new principle to introduce in legislation to give a company power to redeem its own stock. Well, there is nothing in the common law to prevent a company, especially a company of this kind, from purchasing its own stock. So much is that the case that the statute law prohibits it in the case of banks as an exceptional case. I shall quote the English law, which has been quoted as being against us. In "Buckley's Joint Stock Companies," it is stated:

"But it is not, of course, every alteration in respect of the capital of a company that is *ultra vires*. Thus, within certain limits and for certain purposes it may be that a company which has not, under its original constitution, power to take surrenders of shares, or to cancel shares, may under this section give itself such powers. And in the same case it was said that a company could give itself power to purchase its own shares. But *quære* this is withdrawn, at any rate as a general proposition. But since it has been held that a power in the original articles for the company to purchase its own shares may for some purpose be valid, it may be, and it has been held, that a power to purchase its own shares may be acquired by special resolution."

Further on it states:

"The decision of Fry, J., in Colville's case, which was cited in *re* Dronfield Co., but not noticed in the judgments, certainly goes a good deal further. It was there held that under a power to accept surrenders of shares on such terms as the directors may think fit, which was not in the original articles but was added by special resolution, a surrender was valid which was proposed by the shareholder and accepted by the company, and under which the Company paid the shareholder £300 for shares on which £1,600 had been paid."

In "Abbott's Digest of the Law of Corporations," the American law is stated as follows:—

"In the absence of any statute restriction, a corporation may purchase shares of their own stock, hold them unextinguished, and re-issue the same; and such re-issue may be in the form of issuing new stock upon a new subscription, without reference to the requirements of the charter as to the terms of original subscriptions."

These quotations show that this case is not exceptional, and that there is nothing repugnant to the common law in what this company is asking. It has been established that the company owe nothing to the public, and that all the shareholders, except one or two, who, representing 190 shares out of 16,000, asked by petition that this Bill should be passed. It is said that it might lead to abuse, but every precaution has been taken in the Bill, so that no abuse could arise. The value of the shares to be purchased is limited to $389,000, at a price not exceeding 60 per cent. of their nominal value, and the power of issuing debentures is limited to $200,000; and if we compare that amount with the value of the assets of the company, and with its earning powers, we shall see that it is impossible that these provisions could injure the financial position of the company. There is no possibility of speculation being indulged in by directors, or by any others who might be in the secrets of the company, when it is established that the stock of the company is worth 75, that it cannot be purchased by the company at a higher price than 60 per cent., and its earning powers are over 6 per cent. of its nominal capital; and as a further security, I have given notice of a provision that tenders shall be called from the shareholders, so that anyone who desires to sell his share will be permitted to do so *pro rata*. Therefore, I do not know to what principle enacted in this Bill exception can be taken as a bad principle, or as one that could be availed of by the directors or any interested parties to injure the rights of anybody, whether of the stockholders or of the public. I think the Bill ought to be accepted by the House.

Mr. COLBY. I understand that this matter was very carefully considered by a sub-committee of the Committee on Banking and Commerce, and that that sub-committee, after careful investigation of the statements of fact set forth in the preamble, came to the conclusion that the preamble was in all respects proven; that the application is a *bonâ fide* application; that the object the company has in view is a desirable object, and that it is in the interest of the shareholders that the capitalisation of the company should be reduced as the company asks, although the sub-committee did not, I believe, go to the length of making any recommendation as to the mode in which the capitalisation should be reduced. Of course, there are two methods by which that can be done. The one is the ordinary method of reduction, and the other is the one proposed by this Bill. Both would accomplish the same result, but the latter method seems to be the one preferred by the company. Now, if I understand the Bill, it is not a proposition of the directors of the company, by which they or any of their friends may, by the purchase of this stock, obtain any advantages; but the proposition is that of the stockholders themselves, affirmed at a special meeting, called for the particular purpose, and subsequently reaffirmed at another general meeting of the stockholders. It is the desire of the stockholders of the company that this particular mode should be adopted. It has been fully explained, and I believe the sub-committee found that to be the case, that this course would not be open to the objection that it would injure any creditor—that the outside public would not be injured, and that the stockholders would be benefited. Consequently no harm whatever could be done by pursuing this method which is desired by the stockholders of the company, either to the stockholders or the public at large. That, I think, we may assume. Now, the objection to this is that a precedent may be established of which other companies may seek to avail themselves. If we had to determine here as to the passing of a law which would permit companies, under all circumstances, to reduce their stock in that way, I would be disposed to oppose it, because I can conceive how that might, under certain circumstances, be abused by directors acting in their own interest or in other interests than those of the stockholders at large. I do not think it would be wise to enact such a law. But this Bill does not ask for the enactment of such a law, and we have parallel legislation to that asked by it. We do not permit railway companies to consolidate as they chose, one with another, or to make certain special arrangements as they desire, one with another; but if railway companies come before Parliament and make out a case, if they prove to our satisfaction that their proposition is advantageous to themselves and not injurious to the public, we try that as a special case. It is, as I understand, largely within the scope of Private Bill legislation to deal with these special cases. If we could deal with all cases under a general rule, all we would have to do would be to pass a general law, from which companies could not, under any circumstances, deviate. But that we cannot do; we can lay down certain rules which will be applicable, to a certain extent, but we must legislate specially for each case when applications are made for such legislation. If a company, which is a *bonâ fide* company, an honest company, comes here, for the purpose of putting itself on a permanent basis, with a certain proposition which has been carefully considered and maturely weighed by the stockholders of the company, and which has been repeatedly affirmed by the stockholders as being the best mode in the interests of that company, I think that we ought not, as a Parliament, to stand in the way of that being carried out, unless some considerable body of stockholders and the public at large will be injured by it. I think we should deal with these cases as they come, on their merits, and if in any other case it is proven, as it is proven in this, that no injury will be done to the stockholders or the public at large by the legislation asked for, we should not refuse it. Of course there are many of us who are not members of the Committee on Banking and Commerce, and have not the same opportunities that committee had of knowing all about this case; but the fact that it is recommended to this House by the Committee on Banking and Commerce, after the most careful consideration; the fact that that large and independent committee have passed favorably upon the application of these people, certainly commends it to my mind, and will doubtless commend it to the minds of many other hon. gentlemen who are not on that committee. We must yield somewhat to the authority of that committee, because it is a large committee, composed of commercial and legal men, quite competent to deal with questions of this kind; and when, after having being assisted by the sub-committee, and after most careful consideration of the whole matter, this large and influential committee, which usually leads the House in matters of this kind, have recommended the passage of the Bill through the House, I, for my part, seeing that no injustice can be done to the public at large, or to any of the stockholders; seeing that it is a laudable purpose which these people wish to accomplish; seeing that it has been, in part, accomplished; seeing that a very considerable portion of the stock has been purchased in good faith, upon the opinion of the solicitor of the company, that the company had a right to purchase it, I would not feel that I was doing right to this company if I would assent to placing them at a disadvantage, by compelling them to undo what they have done; and, in fact, it seems to me, it would be difficult for them to undo what they have done without some legislation. They have acted in good faith; the sub-committee gave them full credit for that, and I cannot see for a moment how they are going to relieve themselves from what they have done, in good faith, in the interest of all the stockholders, and upon the advice, rightly or wrongly given, of the solicitor of the company. I think Parliament may safely be entrusted or safely trust itself to deal with these cases, as they come up, as special cases, precisely as they deal with railway and other companies that want privileges we cannot allow them

under the general law, but we do allow them when a special case is made out. I can see that a special case is made out here, and I think, therefore, we should pass this Bill.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman is right in saying that this Bill has been passed by the Banking and Commerce Committee, and it is quite in his province to argue that the decision of that committee should have more or less weight with hon. gentlemen who have not had an opportunity of examining into the details of the question, but he is altogether incorrect in his statement that the principle involved in the Bill has received the approval of the sub-committee to which it was referred. So far from that being the case, the sub-committee reported adversely to that proposal, and they reported that the proposal was so vicious that they could not recommend its adoption into our legislation. All the sub-committee did was to find that the facts stated in the preamble were true, and they were prepared to recommend that the stock should be reduced in the ordinary way; but they distinctly reported the opposite to that which the hon. gentleman stated, as regards the principle which the House is now asked to endorse. The hon. gentleman has said that the object is a laudable one; perhaps it is, and he will see that we do not object to the object being carried out. That is not the question. The question is, whether the means by which the company seek to obtain that object is one the House will endorse. That is the question; we are willing the stock should be reduced, but we say, let it be reduced in the ordinary way. The hon. gentleman says: What are they going to do? They have acted in good faith; they purchased the stock on the advice of their solicitor, whether that advice was rightly or wrongly given, and they are in a box; and he asks: How are they going to get out of it? The hon. gentleman will see they have purchased the stock in the names of trustees, and they now hold it in the names of trustees. They purchased it at 55 and it is now worth, they say, 65. All, therefore, they have to do is to put the stock on the market and to sell it, and they will clear a profit of 10 per cent. and get rid of all the responsibility without any trouble. There can be no difficulty on that score; they have purchased the stock; the stock is now higher in the market, and by selling they will relieve themselves of it without any difficulty, because it stands in the names of trustees. Authorities have been quoted in support of the position of a company purchasing its own stock, but all these authorities are American authorities; the English authorities are directly the opposite. I quote from "Green's Brice's *Ultra Vires*," a work of considerable authority:

"There is a great difference between dealing in the shares of other companies and in its own. The former is only ordinary business, attended only with the usual risks of ordinary transactions, but the latter tends inevitably to breaches of their duty on the part of the directors, and defraud and rigging the market on the part of the corporation itself. Consequently, a corporation, to possess such a power, must have it conferred by the plainest and most explicit language in its constating instruments."

This is an important decision given in the case of the London, Hamburg and Continental Exchange Bank. Though some American authorities in the Western States lay down the law somewhat differently, their rulings would not hold here against the English law.

Mr. HESSON. As a member of the sub-committe, I may be allowed to say a few words. I can scarcely add anything to what has been so ably expressed by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby). The case presented to the sub-committe was made very clear indeed, by the officers of the company and the record kept in the books of the company; the matter was so thoroughly and satisfactorily explained that the committee considered the company ought to be relieved, if the principle involved were not, in the opinion of Parliament, one which could not be admitted in this case. The committee reported to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, stating the particulars of the case and finding that the preamble had been proven. So far as the general principles were involved, they referred that to the full committee. As a member of that committee, I have very strong opinions upon it myself, and I generally disapprove of such a course; I do not think it is wise or prudent. But the leader of the Opposition gave the instance of banks. It was hardly fair to compare the position or circumstances of this company with those of a bank coming here to obtain the privilege, not only of reducing its capital but of dealing with its stock. This company asks the power to purchase $400,000 worth of its own stock, for the purpose of cancelling it—not to allow it to remain in the market. For that purpose it asks permission to issue bonds to the extent of $200,000, to purchase that stock which is on the market for 50 cents or 55 cents on the dollar. It would be very different in the case of a bank. There is the question of depositors and there is the question of circulation, and there are various other questions which make that a matter of great importance. I think the company should get this Bill, but that it should not be made a precedent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As a member of the Committee on Banking and Commerce, I may say to my hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby) that there was, as he is aware, a great diversity of opinion in respect to this Bill, and I must say that it appears to me to combine in itself the most objectionable possible precedents that can be imagined. In the first place, it is perfectly clear that the directors have done an act of doubtful legality in purchasing their own stock; and, as I have taken occasion to mention elsewhere, it appears to me to be so very objectionable that I think the attention of the Government should be called to it, and that, if there be any doubt as to the law, and if the law is, as my hon. friend from Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) thinks it is, and not as my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies) thinks it is, the power should be taken away from them. There is nothing likely to lead to more mischief than a corporation of this kind being allowed, at the bidding of their directors, to purchase their own stock. If this Bill is passed it will remain on our Statute Book as a precedent, and will be made a precedent for similar concessions to a great number of other companies. I quite agree that it is right that these gentlemen should have the power of reducing their stock, and I cannot see for the life of me that any injury would be done them by depriving them of the power of going into the market, and, as this Bill apparently intends they should, of mortgaging the property of the other shareholders, who are not unanimous in regard to it, some of whom protested against it, for the purpose of purchasing their own stock. This, I think, however, is a question on which, the attention of the Government having been specially called to it, we have a right to know what their view is, especially as several of the members of the Government were members of the committee, and have no doubt reported to their colleagues in regard to it. It is one of those questions in which the Government should be expected to lead the House, and I shall confine myself to recording my own dissent from the proposition.

Mr. BLAKE. I really think that the several appeals which have been made to hon. gentlemen opposite, to say whether they are prepared to agree to the introductien of this principle into our legislation, should meet with some response. I understand that the Minister of Finance, whose absence we all must regret on this occasion, in addition to regretting the cause of it, was himself opposed to this principle of legislation in the Banking and Commerce Committee, and I think all the hon. gentlemen who are supporting its introduction at present have stated that they would be very much opposed to it in general and would be sorry

to have it drawn into a precedent. You cannot avoid that. If you do it now it must be regarded as a precedent. It is very easy to be virtuous in the general and vicious in the particular instance, but the vice in the particular instance will result in the reduction of your general scale of virtue, and what you do wrong now you will do again next Session.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understand that the Minister of Finance, who opposed the Bill in committee, was disposed to accept the amendment which the mover of this Bill gave notice of on Monday last. The Minister of Finance would not, I know, have accepted the Bill without that amendment, but I understand from the mover of the Bill that he intends to move this amendment at the proper time. Under these circumstances, though this is a new principle, I do not see that there would be such danger that we should not deal with this case as a special one. Every case that comes before the House should be taken on its own merits. If the measure is one that commends itself to Parliament, I do not see why we should not allow this company to adopt this mode of reducing its capital. Of course, the ordinary mode is to say: You have $1,000,000 of capital; we will reduce it by 20 or 25 per cent., and all the shares will be reduced by that amount; but in this case it is said that, instead of that, so many shares will disappear, by being bought out by $200,000, which is to be borrowed by the company on debentures or bonds. This would hardly be fair, if this amendment was not carried By this amendment, you give every shareholder who wishes to get rid of his shares, who does not want to accept this situation, the chance of taking advantage of this offer of $200,000, by having his stock purchased. He has only to conform to the mode which will be adopted by this resolution, which will be that, on a certain day, he will offer his stock to the company, at a certain rate, and if too many offer their shares, it will be in proportion to the number of shares, it will be reduced to the number of shares that the company can purchase with the $200,000. Under these circumstances I think the Bill might go.

On section 1,

Mr. DESJARDINS moved that the following be added:

Such purchase of balance of shares shall only be made after one month's notice, sent by mail to each shareholder and directed to his usual address, has been given to all the shareholders, of the intention to purchase (which notice shall be in the manner in which advices for general and special meetings of the shareholders are given), and each shareholder shall be invited, if he or she desires to dispose of any part of their stock, to offer the same, in writing, to the company, on a day and hour to be named in such notice, and in purchasing said stock preference shall be given to those offering it at the lowest price, and in case more stock than needed should offer at the same price, the same shall be divided amongst the persons so offering in *pro rata* to the amount so offered.

Mr. MULOCK. Will the hon. gentleman explain what notices are required to be given to the shareholders?

Mr. DESJARDINS. Notices are given to shareholders of each special or general meeting; the notice is sent by mail to each one of them, besides the advertisement in the *Canada Gazette* and the local papers—twelve days' notice.

Mr. MULOCK. It is important the notice required to be given to the shareholders inviting tenders should be an ample one. It may be the notice of special and general meetings may not be sufficiently provided for by this clause. My hon. friend who is moving this Bill is not clear as to what notice is to be given to shareholders through the public press. I think that the point should be made quite clear before we say that this amendment meets the case.

Mr. DESJARDINS. We have no objection to say that it shall be one month in the newspapers.

Mr. MULOCK. I think it ought to be a direct notice, by communication, sent to them through the ordinary channel, the post office.

Mr. DESJARDINS. We do so.

Mr. MULOCK. If it is quite clear that these are the requirements of the Act referred to in this amendment, well and good; but my hon. friend cannot say that.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I have no objection to make a special clause of it.

Mr. MULOCK. Say one month's notice, to be sent through the post office, by means of circulars.

Mr. DESJARDINS. Very well.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

HAMILTON PROVIDENT AND LOAN SOCIETY.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 114) to comprise in one Act a limitation of the share and loan capital of the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know how the Bill has been amended, but I think it is a very serious act for the House to accept the principle of special legislation with respect to one of this numerous class of very important financial corporations. I believe it to be injurious to the general body of the corporations and those interested in them that they should not be regulated by a general law. We had a general law, very carefully framed, and since that time we have adopted, as a rule, the view that if an alteration were required in the general interest of this class of corporations it would be made in the general law. I do not know of anything particularly objectionable in the proposals of the present Bill, but it is objectionable once more to create different and separate powers for one corporation which are not shared by all; and particularly is it objectionable if, as was the case in the Bill as originally framed, some special rights and interests are created which will not be subject to subsequent general legislation. I am informed at this moment that the Bill has been amended in this regard; but the objection still remains, that we begin by this Act—and we have a large number of corporations—special legislation for one, and we may be asked to consider the condition of each corporation under a separate Act, instead of having to deal with all as established under one code of law.

Mr. KILVERT. In the committee there was no objection to having the general law amended to the extent mentioned in this Bill; but, at this stage of the Session, it was thought impossible to have a Bill to amend the general law carried through.

Mr. BLAKE. There would be no more difficulty in carrying through a general Act than a Bill of this kind.

Bill reported, and read the third time on a division and passed.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

Mr. LISTER. When the House rose I was attempting to show the disastrous effect of the appointment of partisan revising officers. That, Sir, is not, however, the only difficulty connected with this Bill. I say that a grave objection to the Bill is the fact that it contemplates the appointment of a large number of officials throughout the country—the appointment of no less than three officials in each electoral districts, or 612 in all. I say, Sir, at this time, in view of the present condition of the country, that the enormous expenditure involved in this proposition is a matter for the serious consideration of the Government and the House, involving as it does at a very low estimate an added annual expenditure of something like $250,000. But there are other reasons why this Bill should not become law. There is the additional expense to the candidates and to all who take an interest in election matters. In Ontario to-day our

election lists are taken from the assessment rolls of the county and revised by the court of revision and afterwards by the judge of the county court. I need not say to hon. gentlemen who have had any experience in this matter that it is very troublesome indeed, involving considerable expense and loss of time; indeed, taking it altogether, it is something which most people would hesitate to undertake. But, Sir, while that system is simple, compared with the complex system proposed by this Bill, we have, if this Bill should become law, in addition to the preparation of the lists, a vast amount of expense incurred by private individuals. The revising officer has the power to issue subpœnas, he has all powers of a judge sitting in court, and the result will be a trial wherever the roll is questioned, which means great expense to those interested in the matter. Sir, it is impossible not to feel, in view of what has happened in the past, that the right hon. First Minister, in introducing this measure, is not actuated solely by a desire of making a uniform franchise throughout the country, as he stated to the House, but that he has some other object in view. I take this opportunity of recalling very briefly some of the incidents of the last few years. We find that, in 1872, the party led by the right hon. gentleman carried the country, and history has recorded, on undoubted evidence, the means resorted to to carry that election. We find that, in 1878, when the Government again went to the country, the hon. gentleman did not hesitate to make promises to the people of this country, which time has falsified. I say, Sir, it is fair to charge the hon. gentleman with having misrepresented what he would be able to do if he were returned to power, and with having carried the elections of 1878 by false pretenses. We find again that in 1882 the Government went to the country, and that they were afraid to go to the electors who elected them four years and some months before, and in order to make the election secure the right hon. gentleman found it necessary to gerrymander the Province of Ontario in a manner which I say casts discredit upon him, and had the effect of securing the election of many gentlemen to seats on the opposite benches, by depriving gentlemen on this side of seats to which they were entitled. We find him now preparing for another election, and I cannot conceal the feeling —I cannot make my mind believe anything else—than that the right hon. gentleman is pursuing the tactics of the past, and is seeking to shackle the electors of the country, so that he may again return his party to power. I say that this course reflects no credit on the right hon. gentleman and his followers, and I believe this last effort will be a futile one. I object to the passage of this Act, because, Sir, the country, or any section of the country, has not asked for its passage. I say that no necessity whatever exists for the passing of this Act. We have voters' lists throughout the country, prepared without expense to this Government. We have lists which have proved satisfactory in the past, and there have been no complaints, from one end of the country to the other, that a measure of this kind is necessary. Again, I object to the passage of this Act because it interferes with provincial rights, because it takes away from the people of the several Provinces the right to say who shall elect members to this House. We are under a federal system, and I say that although the law permitted this House to pass a Bill before, this Bill is not in accordance with the spirit of that law. This House has recognised the principle, by the Act of 1874, that the Provinces should fix those who are to elect members for this House, and I say, therefore, this is a direct interference with provincial rights. I say the Provinces of this Dominion are liable at any time, by an Act of this House, to have thrust upon them something which they do not want. I say it takes from the people of this country the right to make their own voters' lists. Heretofore the people of the several Provinces have had the right to make those lists. That duty has been entrusted to them; they have discharged it faithfully and well, and if their officials did not do so, redress would be taken by the people of the country; but nothing of the kind has taken place. and we are seizing this right which has been exercised by the people of this country ever since Confederation, and before. We are taking away from the people the right to prepare their own voters' lists, and we are placing that power in the hands of persons appointed by the Government. I say it is an arbitrary act; it is an act that cannot be justified by reason or even by expediency. For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I oppose this Bill, and when the proper time comes, I shall feel called upon to vote against it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would scarcely feel justified in opposing this by merely voting against it. I feel that it is my duty to speak against it as well as to vote against it, and, on this occasion, to give some of the reasons why I oppose it, and oppose it with all my might. This Bill has been introduced at a very late stage in the Session. It is almost impossible, at so late a stage of the Session, to have a discussion in which all parties in the House will take part. We have on the opposite side taciturn conduct displayed. Hon. gentlemen opposite scarcely speak upon this measure They think, because the right hon. Premier has introduced it, that that is quite sufficient for them, and that they should vote for it, without having its provisions discussed, or having all the facts that might be elicited from discussion brought before this House. I conceive that it is the duty of the members of this House to study and discuss the measures which come before them, so that they may thoroughly comprehend them, and be able to judge of the practical result likely to flow from them. Now, there have been many measures introduced into this House for reasons which have not appeared to me to be statesmanlike; they were introduced, in my opinion, under the motive of strengthening and advancing the interests of party. I believe this is one of that class of measures; but measures introduced into this House, for the purpose of advancing party interests, do not always carry out the diabolical intent of those measures. They frequently fail, and probably this will fail, as I hope it will. Now, Sir, I hear a gentleman talking who owes his seat very much to one of those infamous measures; I refer to the member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson). He owes his seat in this House to a most infamous measure.

Mr. HESSON. It is not true.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I believe that; I think that.

Mr. SPEAKER. Then, you ought not to say it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It will be a great humiliation for me to retract that; and if it were not for the respect I have for you, Mr. Speaker, or if it were in any other sphere, I would see you far enough before I would retract it. Now, this measure, in 1882——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair. Put him out.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes, you gerrymandered to try to keep me out, but you did not succeed.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. Address the Chair.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am addressing myself to the matter. If you allow these gentlemen to interrupt me, Mr. Speaker, you must allow me the courtesy of replying to them, because I do not like to have a gentleman speak to me without returning his kindness; I do not do it in any unkindly spirit, and I do not wish to violate the rules of the House. I do not desire to say anything offensive to any hon. gentleman in this House, but I desire to state, as

firmly and as forcibly as I believe the case warrants, everything connected with the question we have before us.

Mr. HESSON. Keep to the floor.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Why, the hon gentleman would not understand me if I discussed it in that spirit. He knows very little about the principles of decency or order, or he would behave himself. Now, I was saying that sometimes these measures are conceived in the interest of party, and that the party will prostitute political power for party purposes. Sometimes these measures succeed. It is true that the measure to which I refer, the Redistribution Act of 1882, did succeed. We have a number of gentlemen sitting in this House as the result of that measure. We know that is a fact. We know that the Government boasted of their policy, that they told us that theirs was the policy that had lifted this country up, and that gave a stimulus to trade. But they distrusted the people, because, when they went to the people, did they go on the strength of their policy. No, but by carving and cutting about sixty-five constituencies in Ontario, in order to snatch a verdict, not by their policy but by a political party measure, which was unworthy of any civilised Legislature in the world. They succeeded that time so well that they think they will carry the country by a measure of a more iniquitous character than that. I submit that that is a parliamentary phrase, and that only faintly describes the feeling I have towards the measure before the House. Now, they introduced the Gerrymander Act——

Mr. McCALLUM. I rise to a point of order. Is the Gerrymander Act before this House now?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman should confine himself to the principles involved in this measure, not those of any other measure.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The principles involved in this measure are involved in the measure I refer to, and it is impossible for me to discuss the one without referring to the other.

Mr. RYKERT. Sit down, then.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There is the hon. member for Lincoln, who was himself elected by reason of that former Act to which I have referred. The hon. gentleman would have stepped down and out of here if it had not been for the benefit of that Act; and I trust that that hon. gentleman will not interrupt me, and that those who came here by reason of that measure will not interrupt those who came here in opposition to these measures. Now, I say that the measure before us is one entirely in accord with that measure. That was a measure which struck a blow at the principles of liberty, which struck a blow at the principles of fair play and British practice. Consequently, that measure and this measure being so intimately blended together, it is impossible for me to discuss this measure without referring to the former. These men claimed to be bold and valiant men. They talked about the greatness of their National Policy. They told the people how it gave such high prices to the farmer for his grain and other provisions. They do not tell us anything about it now. They say that the National Policy cannot affect the price of grain. It did not bring the grain down from what it was, $1.50 a bushel, to what it is, 70 and 80 cents a bushel now; and that is the way these hon. gentlemen talk on this question. They introduced that measure and they succeeded; they now have the fruits of that measure; there are hon. gentlemen in this House supporting the Government who succeeded, by virtue of that measure, in gaining their seats in the House—is that Professor Cassandra that is singing there? or is it he that is playing on the harp again?—and these gentlemen think that when a measure so revolutionary in its character as the present one comes before the House, the right hon. gentleman, their leader, may introduce that measure in a short speech of eight and one-half minutes and that is quite long enough for them. They do not want any more discussion on it after that speech; but if they believe in that principle, I do not. I do not believe that gentlemen elected in a British community should tolerate such a principle. I believe a principle, of disposing in a very few words, a measure of this importance, is one that should be repugnant to every Briton. Hon. gentlemen opposite carried the National Policy, and they appealed to the country on the strength of the Gerrymandering Act; on their appeal to the country on the strength of that Act, they succeeded in gaining ten to fifteen seats.

Mr. SPEAKER. I ask the hon. gentleman not to refer to the Gerrymandering Bill, but to confine himself to the principle of the measure before the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. In deference to your feelings, Sir, I will call it the Redistribution Bill, and perhaps that will not be objectionable to you.

Mr. SPEAKER. If my authority is to be over-ruled, the House must over-rule it, and not the hon. gentleman; and I must again ask the hon. gentleman to confine himself to the principles of the Bill now under discussion.

Mr. RYKERT. He does not know them.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That measure interferes to a great extent with the liberties of the people; I say it strikes a deliberate blow at the liberties of the people; it carries away the old landmarks the people have had for the last twenty years, and is closely allied to the one to which I have referred; but as a reference to it, Mr. Speaker, seems to hurt your feelings, I will not speak of it again.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Hon. gentlemen opposite need not get excited. I will pass from that measure and go to another which was introduced for a similar purpose, and it is on the principle which is cognate to that of the one we are now discussing.

Mr. DAVIES. I think order must be kept on the other side if the hon. gentleman is to be allowed to keep to his subject. What with the cat-calls and other interruptions from hon. gentlemen opposite, it is difficult for an hon. gentleman speaking to keep as closely to the subject as he otherwise would.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must call on hon. gentlemen to keep order on the one side as well as the other.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This House has been in session almost three months, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to support the measure now before the House without any discussion, and after it has been introduced with an explanation lasting only eight and one-half minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). We can all read.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I do not know that you can; I would not like to swear to that. You do not act like reading people or you would want some further explanations on the question before the House. I think that a measure of so much importance as this deserves more notice at the hands of the Premier. I think that in introducing this measure he should have delivered a statesmanlike utterance on it; he should have explained the various provisions of the Bill; he should have told us what its effects would be upon the people, what effect it was going to have on the liberties of the people; he should have said something about the expense that was going to be incurred by reason of this Bill. The expense alone, if there were no other disagreeable features in it, is sufficient to condemn the measure, in the mind of every hon. gentle-

man in this House, considering the present state of our financia outlook. I stated that another Bill had been introduced for a similar purpose, the purpose of aggrandising power, of developing strength, of increasng the strength of the great party of which the Premier is the head, and I say it is a great party; I say there are a great many good men in that party.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The measure I refer to, that was introduced by the Premier, is in some respects akin to this, and it was introduced for the purpose I have stated, that of strengthening the party of hon. gentlemen opposite. I refer to the Liquor License Bill, which was introduced in 1883. The Premier himself introduced the Bill, but after he looked at it he thought there was something suspicious looking about it, and he did not like to have the paternity ascribed to him, so he cast his eyes around to see which of his supporters he would select for that honor; and there were two gentlemen in the House——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If you can read me any rule to show me that I am out of order, I will stop. The hon. the First Minister cast his eyes around to get some other person to share with him the paternity and also the maintenance of this bantling. At one time it was thought that the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster), who is tolerably well versed in classical lore, would share the paternity, but it was known that he was distinguished for temperance proclivities, and it would hardly be proper——

Mr. McCALLUM. I call the hon. gentleman to order; we are not discussing the Temperance Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have already asked the hon. gentle man to confine himself to the principles of this Bill, because that is the only matter on which he can direct his remarks, If he simply makes short reference to some other measure, so as to draw a parallel, I have no objection to that; but I object to his going into a lengthy statement of any other Bill. I am sure the hon. gentleman will adhere to the ruling I have given.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I quite agree with you, Sir, as to the propriety of that decision, and I will adhere closely to it. I was only drawing attention to the liquor license law, because I think it was introduced for the same object as that for which this Bill is introduced, and I was going to show that the Government do not always succeed in their purpose when they introduce measures for a purpose such as that for which this and the other measure I am referring to were introduced. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) who has given evidence so often of his classical skill and lore was passed over, and the Premier selected for the paternity of his measure the hon. member for West Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). The Bill, instead of being called the Macdonald Act, became known as the McCarthy Bill, for the Premier, it appears, did not want to be responsible either for the paternity of the Bill or for its maintenance. The consequence was, after giving the paternity to the hon. member for West Simcoe, he placed the burden of its maintenance on the hotel keepers. During the past year these people have paid something in the neighborhood of $125,000 for the maintenance of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. This has nothing to do with the measure now before the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am only referring to this to show what we are paying for this kind of Bill. This House has paid a large sum of money—I do not remember the figures, but I am safe in saying in the neighborhood of $50,000. That is the amount we are practically paying for that Bill. Well, only two days ago the Bill died in his arms. It was consigned to limbo by that tribunal known as the Supreme Court. It was said to be *ultra vires* after all this expenditure of money, this tax for a bogus license to the licensed victuallers of this country, amounting to $125,000 last year. That was the sum they paid for it; what this country has paid for it I do not know; but, at all events, according to the announcement of the Supreme Court, the Bill was *ultra vires*. Just to show the tendency of the legislation in this House, I have to refer to some other measures, and I will only just touch them as I go along, in order to show you that the tendency of our legislation is a violation of the federal principle, is a violation of the principles of Confederation, is in the direction of a legislative union, just as this Bill is a blow at federal union and in favor of legislative union. I will have to refer to other measures, because this is one feature of the question that I desire to bring out. I have told you what I believe to be the object of the introduction of the Liquor License Bill—that it was to strengthen the party that is in power, and that it has cost the licensed victuallers $125,000; and I do not know what it has cost the country, nor do I know what it will be. That was a blow aimed directly at provincial rights; that was a blow aimed at something that we were expected to have under the Confederation Act; that was something that the people in the Provinces held dear to them; but they said then: We want uniformity in the licensing system. They say the same thing now, in relation to the franchise. I believe the member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) would say I am out of order in speaking of this. The cases are as parallel as any two cases can possibly be, and I am told by these gentlemen that I am out of order in speaking of two measures which are parallel in their effects and which have the same results on the country—a direct blow against federal rights and in favor of centralisation and legislative union. They did not get the uniformity which they thought they would get by that. The Bill has been destroyed. It was found not to be in harmony with the habits, the customs and the traditions of the different Provinces in this Confederation. It is impossible to have a measure of that kind that will suit the views, and the conditions and the customs of British Columbia, where my distinguished friend comes from, and that will suit the Province of Quebec or the Province of Ontario. It is just as difficult—it is more difficult in the matter of the franchise—to have the franchise assimilated. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) spoke—I do not see him in his place in the House, and I do not like to speak of any gentleman who is not present, but he spoke the true theory of the franchise in 1874. He was then the editor-in-chief of the Montreal *Gazette*. He then favored the opposition to the very measure that he is upholding now. He laid down, in the editorial in that paper, the views that the distinguished leader of the Reform party enunciated here the other night. But he was not successful in his attempts at securing a seat in this House until, by the grace of the Premier, a constituency was opened for him in Ontario, and he, by the grace of the Premier, occupies a seat in this House as the member for Cardwell. I have heard that member taunt the member for West Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) whose seat was abolished by that Bill which I referred to a few moments ago. I heard that gentleman taunted because of his defeat, and if it had not been for that no reference would have been made by me to-night to that question. I think it came with a very bad grace from him to taunt that gentleman because his seat was wiped out by the Redistribution Bill, because he was once or twice defeated before the people. He knows how often he has been defeated—goodness knows how often; I do not, and I do not think anyone in the House has been able to trace up the number of his defeats. But, when he gets in the House, in that preserve which was opened in Cardwell by the Premier, he changes

his views entirely on the question of the franchise. Is this another instance of his views of political exigencies, which has led him to change his opinion in so short a time? He was then the editor of a paper; he is still the editor of a paper; he is still connected with a paper, and we know the amount that that paper costs this country, and here we have an evidence of the change of base of that hon. gentleman in a few years from a platform that was sound and solid to the present Bill, which is striking a blow at the liberties of the people. I believe that the franchises should be left to the different Provinces. I believe that is the common sense view of the situation. I believe that the member for Cardwell was right when he upheld that view, and I believe I am right now in upholding it, and I believe that this Bill is wrong in principle, in striking a blow at our home rule. It is just another blow at provincial rights, it is another blow aimed at the harmonious working of our great Confederation. There were other measures introduced into this House that were calculated in their character to stir up dissent. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Sutherland) two years ago told us that if there was an increase in the tariff it would be but a very short time before we heard of a rebellion in the North-West. The prophetic utterances of that member have been realised, and we see to-day the verification of the prophecy the hon. gentleman uttered at that time as a result of that increase in the tariff. The Government here, it appears, have endeavored, by their conduct, by their legislation and by their administration, to run the gauntlet with all the Provinces. They have endeavored to interfere with the harmony and the rights and the liberties and the home rule in the different Provinces. The Legislature of Ontario enacted a law in reference to maintaining for the use of the public those highways—the streams and rivers. The Government here in Ottawa disallowed the Bill; they gave reasons which they believed to be sound and constitutional for the disallowance. The Bill was re-enacted. It was again disallowed. The people of Ontario, through their representatives there, said: We will maintain the freedom to navigate the streams and rivers and to make them great arteries for the commerce of this country. The Government of this country said: No; we will disallow that Act and we will reserve the streams and rivers for the use of individuals instead of the great public. Well, what is the result? On one or two occasions a Bill that was carried through by the wishes of the people of Ontario was disallowed by this Government. The case was tried before the highest tribunal in the realm, and the contention of the Local Legislature was borne out, and the Government have refrained on this occasion from interfering with the wishes of that Province, and have not disallowed the Bill. One of the boons that was to be conferred upon the different Provinces by Confederation, as I understand it, was that the people should have the management of their own affairs. Several blows have been aimed at the privilege being continued to the Provinces by means of those measures that I have spoken of. Well, this effort of the Government in striving to take away the rights and liberties of the Provinces, striving to take away the privileges they enjoy under Confederation, striving to destroy their federal rights, striving to take away their home rule—in all these things, do you wonder, if home rule is taken away from the Provinces, that trouble should arise? If the North-West had been left under home rule do you suppose the trouble they have there to-day would exist now? I say it is a dangerous precedent, and is fatal to the peace and well-being of the people. They are very tenacious of those rights, and if you interfere with them you will create discord and dissension, and eventually bring about rebellion as the result. Well, this measure, as I said, is a violation of the federal system. This measure takes away rights from the Provinces which they have enjoyed ever since Confederation, and which they still continue to enjoy. More than that; you are endeavoring to bring about legislative union. The right hon. Premier is coming around to his first love. This legislative union was always his theory. I understand that he opposed Confederation until a very recent period before it was established. He desired to break down the safeguards that were held by the people under Confederation, and to bring about, as far as possible, all the elements of legislative union. Well, Sir, the measure before us is both a radical and a despotic measure. The Bill possesses both these extremes. In some clauses we find that it is conferring the franchise on Indians, on Chinese, on unmarried females and on widows. In that respect, so far as Chinese——

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). It does not say anything about Chinese.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I see that my hon. friend from Victoria has not seen the Bill yet.

Mr. BAKER I have heard enough about it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I will bring the Bill before the member and read the clause that I referred to in reference to those who are enfranchised. In the interpretation clause of this Bill, speaking of persons, the word means a male person, married or unmarried. Does that exclude Chinese?

Mr. BAKER It does not say Chinese.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It does not exclude an Indian,——

An hon. MEMBER. That refers to you.

Mr. LANDERKIN——or a female person, unmarried, or a widow; and the pronoun he, in its inflection, includes either sex. It includes Chinese who are naturalised subjects. Well, Sir, I find in another clause of this Bill, that it excludes any married woman whose husband is living. Now, I cannot understand why it is that the mothers of this country are to be so treated by the gallant knight who leads this Government. I would like to know why it is that he will give the franchise to an unmarried female, who may be a Chinese, or a squaw, or any other person naturalised, and deny it to the mothers of this country. There are many ladies not married, who deserve our consideration I admit. Many who are widows also deserve the consideration of this House. But I cannot understand how it is that the Premier should consider the claims of these classes to the franchise, while he denies it to the mothers of this country—they that are married and have raised the people of the country, and have had the troubles, difficulties and privations of this life. Why, it appears to be a ban placed upon matrimony. It would appear that the Premier does not desire to encourage, but he rather desires to disfranchise those mothers who deserve so much for having moulded the character and the sentiment of the people of this country. On behalf of the mothers of this country I protest against this measure, because it is striking a blow at the most deserving class of people that are found in the Dominion of Canada to-day. Then, Sir, in this measure we find that the expense is to be very great. The expense, perhaps, is not the worst feature of the measure, but it is a very bad feature of the measure, in the present condition of the country, with wheat at 70 cents—perhaps it has risen a little since the rumors of war, but still, very low; the farmers are hard up; all classes of people are in straitened circumstances; and here we are going to increase the expenditure by this innovation, by enacting a law that is not asked for, and that is not required by this country; and you are going to saddle this country with something in the neighborhood of about $800,000 a year. Now, Sir, in order that the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Ferguson) may have an idea of what it is going to cost this country, I have prepared an estimate, which I will sub-

mit for his consideration; and if he will give me his attention he will know more about this Bill than he did before. I have made an estimate of what the carrying into operation of this Bill will cost in South Grey, the riding I have the honor to represent, the riding to which, through the kindness of the First Minister, one township has been added since 1882. Some one thought the distinguished Premier had some objection to my returning here, and a township was taken from East Grey and added to South Grey. It was thought that township Artemesia would give a large majority against me; but I am much obliged to him for the addition. No less than 239 independent voters of that township, who believe in principles of fair play and British justice, voted for me on the last occasion, and I presume they would do so again. I have made an estimate on the basis of the six municipalities which make up South Grey. The cost for printing—and I make a low estimate—I place at $600. It might be done for less, but it will not be done for less. Clerks will cost $1,200. Bailiff, $600; it does not take a bailiff long to realise $600. Revising barrister—and he is the greatest luxury of the whole—$1,000. A barrister of five years' standing will not do a great deal of work for $1,000. The member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) will bear me out in the truth of that statement. These items make a total of $3,400. There are 211 constituencies in the Dominion, and taking the cost of each at the amount estimated for South Grey, the total is $717,400, or for a Parliament of five years, a gross sum of $3,587,000. What shall we get in return for that money? That is the question the people will ask, and in which they will be interested. But over and above that question, there is the vital principle of liberty, a deeper, higher and nobler principle at stake. If the other provisions were not unsatisfactory, this clause alone would be sufficient to condemn for ever this Bill, in my estimation. How do we find matters connected with voters' lists conducted at present in South Grey and other ridings. We find the voters' lists are prepared by the municipalities. They have to be provided every year. They are to be prepared to strike the rate of taxation. The consequence is, that an assessment is to be made every year, and if this Bill is carried through, another voters' list will have to be made every year. Here we have two sets, and who are going to pay for them? Do the people save payment because the Dominion Government by their officer will make up one list? By no manner of means. I suppose the First Minister will not try to lead the people to suppose that we get all our money from the Yankees, as he endeavored to do when he was waving the magic wand of the National Policy. The people have, however, discovered that they pay their own taxes, by means of duties imposed on all the goods we consume. Under this system there will be two lists, as I have stated, and the people will have to pay for them, and I have given an estimate as to what the cost will be. It may be below that; it may possibly go beyond that; it is very hard to estimate what the amount will be. Now, what do we get in return? We do not find that under the provisions of this Bill we get a great many blessings. We do not know, in fact, what blessings are to follow, but we know some of the curses. There is a principle in this Bill which it is dishonorable on the part of any hon. member to introduce. No matter how much respect I may have for the distinguished Premier, on account of his long services to the country, the very fact that he endeavors to barter away the rights and liberties of the people, as he endeavors to do by this clause of the Bill, is not to crown his years in the way I should like to see them crowned. Here is what the revising officer has power to do. It is a general provision of the Bill in regard to the registration of voters. It says:

"On the day, and at the time and place appointed, the revising officer shall publicly proceed to the preliminary revision of the list, basing such revision on the evidence and statements before him, and of the persons who may then be present to give information in support of or in opposition to the written objections, claims for addition, or other proposed amendments, and he shall then and there correct the list to the best of his judgment and ability, upon the evidence or information before him, attesting, with his initials, any addition to or erasure or change therein."

He shall do all this. It shall be left to him to do just as he likes about these lists. However worthy a gentleman he may be, however noble he may be, I will not consent, as the representative of a free people, to surrender one single right they possessed at the time I took upon myself the responsibility of representing them. If I did so, I would be a recreant to my duty. While I occupy a seat in this House, I shall protest, and protest strongly, against handing over a single right belonging to the people to any official, however good he may be. I am not going to say a word against the character of any revising officer. If he were a good man I would not hand over any of the people's rights to him; I would not want my own rights and privileges left to the judgment of any single man. Then, it is said, in clause 24:

"At the time and place named in the notice of the revising officer, he shall hold open court for the said final revision, and shall hear and dispose of any objection or complaint of which notice shall have been given as aforesaid, hearing the parties making the same if they appear, and any evidence that may be adduced before him in support of or in opposition thereto, and shall either affirm or amend the list accordingly, as to him seems right and proper."

Am I to hand over the rights of the people to this revising officer, who will do as he thinks right and proper, without those people having the right to appeal to the courts, which is a Briton's privilege, a right which belongs to British freemen? That is something which should not be asked for, and should not be resigned by the people; it is something which the House should not ask, and something which the people should not give up. Now, Sir, I will show you something more in connection with the revising officer. Clause 40 provides:

"The revising officer shall have power at any court or sitting held under this Act by him, to amend or give leave to amend, when he sees fit, any of the proceedings taken in reference to any voters' list, to direct notice to be given to other persons, or to dispense with any notices hereinbefore required to be given, and to adjourn any court or sittings, on the hearing of any claim or objection or proposed amendment, to a future day; and he shall not be bound by strict rules of evidence or forms of procedure, but shall hear and determine all matters coming before him as such revising officer in a summary manner, and so as in his judgment to do justice to all parties."

Now, I ask hon. gentlemen who sit behind the Government in this House, are they willing to give up their rights, and the rights and liberties of their electors, in their townships and ridings, to a revising officer, who is to deal with them in a summary manner, and as his judgment may deem to be correct. That is clearly a mistake; it is something which I believe, if this Bill is well dsicussed, and its features are brought before the House, it is impossible that any independent gentleman can support. It does not make any difference whether the revising officer is a judge or a barrister of five years' standing; why, Sir, even the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), whom I have known a long time, and in whom I have great confidence—I say I would not even trust him in my riding as revising officer, because I would not be true to the people who sent me here if I allowed the rights they have enjoyed to be handed over to any one man, I do not care who he may be. Then, there is something about the right of appeal which strikes a blow at the great charter of liberty which the people have enjoyed for many years. It is in keeping with the great charter of liberty that we shall have the right to appeal; that is the bulwork of British liberty and freedom which is taken away; the distinguished Premier has asked that we shall take this right away from the people, and give it to the Government or a revising officer:

"No such appeal shall be allowed or entertained against any decision of the revising officer upon any matter of fact, or the admission or rejection of evidence adduced or offered on any matter of fact, but the appeal shall be allowed only on some point or points of law, as before mentioned."

The right of appeal, as to matters of fact, has passed away from the people—has passed over to the control of this revising officer. Members of this House are supposed to hand over the liberties of the people in this manner. Is that what the members of a British House of Commons are going to do—take away the rights of the people and hand them over to an irresponsible officer, I do not care how good he is? Mr. Speaker, I hear some gerrymander notes over there. Now, I will read you some more out of this Bill, and I think speaking of villainy, there is a clause here that outrivals them all. When the revising officer makes a return there is no appeal to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and if any appeal is entered, and an election is ordered in the meantime, it shall take place on the list before the appeal is decided. I will read you the clause:

"Provided, however, that in the event of any such appeal, the said lists, after the publication of the last mentioned notice in the *Canada Gazette*, shall apply to and be final and conclusive as to every election for such electoral district, held before such appeal has been disposed of, or the result thereof communicated to the revising officer."

Now, are independent members who are supporting the Government in this House willing to see matters done in that way? Does the Government desire to snatch a verdict upon a Bill founded upon such principles as these? Has the Government begun to distrust the people? It is a well known fact that when a Government distrusts the people their rule must be a despotic one; it must be allied to absolutism, and the people who are distrusted never forget the bondage. It is a wonderful thing that in this day and age of the world a measure so iniquitous as this should be introduced into a British Parliament. There is another matter in connection with the expenses which I omitted. I am not in a hurry, until hon. gentlemen get through with their musical tones.

An hon. MEMBER. Why do you not dance to it?

Mr. LANDERKIN. In connection with the lists which are made up, at present the clerk of the municipality distributes a great many of the lists to different persons throughout each township. As I was observing, Mr. Speaker, these notes are very near to where the hon. member for Cardwell sits. That hon. member must have a good ear for music. I will say, Mr. Speaker, that you did seem very anxious to call me to order, but I do not think you seem quite so anxious to call those gentlemen to order as you were to call me.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. gentleman should make such a remark as that. I have tried to keep hon. gentlemen in order, and I have made several appeals to them to do so. I think hon. members on both sides will bear me out in that statement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear. Chair, chair.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think you did discharge your duty towards me, and now I am anxious that you should discharge your duty towards the gentlemen who are sitting behind the Government.

An hon. MEMBER. Speak now.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that under the present law, as you well know, in the Province of Ontario, the clerk of the municipality makes a certain number of extra lists, and an elector can get a copy of the list without expense. Under the present system, the electors get a copy of the voters' list without cost; but under this Bill, for printing the same, the revising barrister will charge at the rate of 6 cents for every ten names thereon, which is equivalent to a cost of 60 cents for a copy with one hundred names on it. Now, it is pretty hard to imagine the amount of expense that is going to be involved in procuring these lists.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have asked the hon. gentleman several times to cease making these unparliamentary noises. The debate will come to a conclusion much sooner if the noises are stopped.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If the gentlemen knew how much it rests me, I think they would just continue. I do not wish to have any further discussion with you, Mr. Speaker, about your duty or about mine; but I do not intend to proceed until there is order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I can hear the hon. gentleman very distinctly. There is not as much noise as there was.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am more anxious that the reporter shall hear me; that is what I am anxious about. Hon. gentlemen opposite are satisfied with the eight and a-half minutes of explanation of this Bill, so that there is no use of talking to them. I am not talking to them or for them. I am laying my views before this House in the best manner I can. I do not want to be offensive to any hon. gentleman and if they desire to be offensive or discourteous, I am not responsible for that. I presume that the Premier, who is responsible for the legislation in this House, is to some extent responsible for the conduct of those who support him here. I was showing how much expense the people would be put to by reason of this Bill. The revising officer will have to buy the assessment roll, and he will have to get a copy of it every year, as he cannot expect the township clerk to give him a copy. Therefore, there will be the cost of two lists. Now, I did expect, as I had drawn the attention of the Government to the case of a very important class of people in this country, that some provision would have been made for them; I refer to the alien Germans in the country. Under the present law the Germans, in becoming naturalised, are put to a great deal of expense and inconvenience. All of this could be obviated by the Government in a very easy and simple method; and I did think, when the Government was bringing down this measure, that, as we have a very large number of Germans in this country, and as there are no better class of settlers, that the Government would fully consider the necessity of enabling them to be naturalised, so as to exercise the rights of citizens in a manner much more expeditious, cheap and agreeable than they can under the present system. Some two years ago my hon. friend from East Bruce (Mr. Wells) introduced a Bill in reference to this subject, the provisions of which were such as to enable the Germans, or any other class of aliens who settled in this country, to take the oath of allegiance and citizenship when they offer to vote, after having their names recorded on the assessment roll or on the voters' list. That would obviate the difficulties and inconveniences they are now put to. They have now, as you are aware, to present their naturalisation papers at the quarter sessions, and if they are approved of there, they have to have them recorded with the clerk of the county court, so that you can easily see what a vast amount of expense that very large, respectable and industrious class of people are put to. When the hon. member for East Bruce and myself had pressed upon the Government the importance of this matter, and when we were asked by the Government to let that hon. gentleman's Bill stand, as they were considering the matter, I did think that there would have been in this Bill some redeeming feature like that, which I could support; but I regret that there has been no effort made to grasp, by the hand, these classes of people who come to settle in this country. In the United States we know citizenship is made very easy; and many immigrants settle there, by reason of the greater freedom of citizenship than prevails in this country. I did hope that the Government would engraft some provision in the Bill, whereby this class of settlers could obtain their rights as citizens, without going to all the expense and

trouble that they are put to under the existing law. Now, Sir, it would be impossible for me, in the course of one address, to go over this Bill and present to the House all the features of it that I take exception to. I have spoken of such clauses as I believe strike a death blow at the liberty of the people of this country. I believe that this Bill, which is introduced for the purpose of perpetuating power, is the prostitution of political power for party purposes. I believe it should not be endorsed by this House; and if there was to-day as much fair play in this country as there was a few years ago, I do not believe it would pass this House. I have that faith in some of those who sit behind the Government to believe that they will not vote for it; and if they do, I have reason to believe that there will be such changes in this Bill that it will not be so repugnant to the feelings of Briton-born subjects. I think that instead of contracting the liberty of the people, the liberty should be extended, consistent with the keeping of laws and order and the preservation of peace. I think the habit of abusing the prerogative of Government by curtailing the liberties of the people and handing them over to Government officers is a relic of the feudal ages, and not in keeping with the spirit of liberty and progress in the nineteenth century. Lord Mansfield, in speaking on a kindred subject, said :—"It is not fitting that the judging of information should be left to the discretion of an officer; Parliament should judge and give certain instructions to the officer." In this case, however, we do not judge, nor do we give instructions to the officer. We allow him to be the sole judge; we allow him to take away, at his own discretion, from a voter, the rights to vote, and we do not allow the man from whom that sacred right has been taken any appeal, except on a question of law. No appeal is allowed on a matter of fact, as to who shall or shall not vote; that alone is to be decided by the revising barrister. It may be possible, if you have a revising judge or revising barrister in your county, Mr. Speaker, who does not think you are properly qualified, that he may strike your name off the list, and you may go to law with him, but you will have no redress. You cannot tell the court what the facts are, on what ground the revising officer decided that you should not vote, but still you can go to law, and you know what expense that involves. Under the present system we have very little expense; every man who has the right to vote is put on the list by the council, and every man who has not the right will be struck off the list by the council. There is no expense at all. Every man who has been left off the list can go to the township council, when they hold their court of revision, and whether he has been struck off by a Grit or a Tory assessor, he can, if unjustly struck off, be put on again. The council will not object, because they are elected by and are responsible to the people. There you see the principle of the thing; it goes right down to the people, and we are and always were for the people. We do not doubt the people, and we oppose this Bill because it is an attack on the liberty of the people. In the riding I have represented off and on, for about thirteen or fourteen years, I have never gone to the court of revision, never looked after the voters' list; I have always had such confidence in the township councils and assessors and clerks that I never went near a court of revision. I know that a township council cannot act unjustly, because if they did they would be discharged from the township, whether Conservative or Reform. The people do not take the narrow view, but look at the question in the broad light as to whether it is right or wrong. In the county of Lincoln things may be done differently, that is an old-settled county, and they have had time to learn a few tricks there; but there are no such tricks known in our riding. The poorest man in South Grey can go to any township council, and if he has been unjustly left out of the list by the assessor, he can get his name put on, and it will not cost him a cent. But under the operation of this Bill, if the revising officer leaves a man out, that man has to go to law if he wants to have his right to vote. The revising officer may say: My judgment is that you have not the right to vote; I will strike you off the list, and you have no claim in law for redress, except on a point of law. It is monstrous to expect that a poor man is going to law, in a case of this kind, against the whole power of the Government. The thing is shameful and it should be strongly resented by every man who loves and prizes British freedom and fair play. The Bill I consider is a tyrannical Bill, an unjust Bill, introduced for the purpose of perpetuating the power of the Government and of a party who are too cowardly to run on their own merits. That is not British fair play, but a cowardly act on the part of the Government to keep themselves in power. If this measure were well considered by the people, I have not the slightest doubt that on it alone the Government would sustain a defeat before the country. Let this measure be thoroughly understood by the people, and I will not be afraid to go to the country and meet any member of the Government or of the Conservative party upon it. They are afraid to let the people judge of their fiscal policy, of their railway policy, and of their general policy of legislation. But I would be recreant, as I said, to the trust confided to me by the people of South Grey, if I did not speak as strongly as I can speak, and if I did not vote to oppose a measure like this becoming the law of the land, a measure that does away with the right of appeal on questions of fact, a measure that would place your liberties at the judgment of any one man, that would centralise power in the Government, that would abuse prerogative in every conceivable way. I would be recreant to the honest men who voted for me if I were to allow one jot or tittle of the liberty they hold now to pass away by any Bill for the purpose of perpetuating any party in power. It matters not whether the Government is Conservative or Reform. No matter what Government should introduce a Bill like this, I would oppose it. It would not make any difference to me if a measure like this was introduced by a Reform Government, I would oppose it as much as I have this. I am not so wedded to party that I would not oppose a measure, irrespective of the party that introduced it. Why, this is a measure that cannot be endorsed by any man that thinks; it is a measure that cannot be endorsed by people that think. We are recreant to the people if we delegate the rights the people gave to us to the Government or to any party in this country. It would make no difference if it were the other party; it would be all the same. We have no right to do it; we should not do it; it is a retrograde movement; it is going away back. Then, there is another feature about this Bill, another ground upon which I would oppose it. I think it is the member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend)—it is not the member for Cumberland that we used to know here—who told us the revising officer was "to fix the list." Well, the revising officer, after he has "fixed" the list, might resign the office and then become a candidate in that riding, and it is very probable that he might—I do not suppose any of the gentlemen over there, if they had the fixing of the lists, would fix them very badly for themselves—he might very probably become a candidate. Why, the thing is outrageous, to think that the Government would allow a Bill like that to be crystallised into law. The thing is perfectly ridiculous, to think that the revising officer may go and sit there, may hold his court where he pleases, and may fix that list; may strike off the Speaker of the House of Commons or of the Senate, or any other person, and you will have no right to appeal on the matter of fact of his judgment, but you can go to law; and, after he has done that, he has the privilege of resigning and becoming a candidate. Has justice fled from this country? Has justice fled from the counsels of the

Government of this country, that they would endeavor to bolster themselves up by any means such as these? It is a Bill that would do discredit to England a hundred years ago, when they were despotic, decidedly despotic. The principle is one of perfect despotism—that we are going to take away the rights and liberties we have enjoyed so long and give them over to any irresponsible officer. It is the most outrageous piece of despotism that has ever been attempted in this country. The revenues of this country are falling off. The expenditure of this country is increasing very rapidly. I think we have increased twelve millions in the last seven years. The people know, to some extent, the cost of having a Government such as we have to-day—twelve millions more to govern this country than it took seven years ago. I remember when the Minister of Customs had a seat over here, and you used to sit somewhere here beside him, Mr. Speaker, and he used to get up, occasionally, and I do not know but that you did yourself, occasionally, and you used to speak of the leader of the Government then, the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) as being incapable. You spoke of him as not having the capacity to rule and govern this country. I remember that the late member for Cumberland used to speak of his incapacity, and so did the present Premier. You all spoke of his extravagance, and yet he governed the country for $12,000,000 a year less than you do to-day. What did the member for East York find in this country when he accepted office? He found a rebellion going on in the North-West that had never been stilled; he found the seeds of rebellion in Quebec; he found disturbances in British Columbia. By his wise, moderate, statesmanlike course, he brought all these elements into peace and harmony, and when he left the Government of this country he had not increased the expenses of the country a whit, and he left peace and order prevailing in every Province of the Dominion. What is the result, after a few years of their return to power? After Confederation the present Premier entered upon the Government of this country, and in less than three years we had a rebellion in the North-West.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

M. LANDERKIN. Order! I am speaking of a historical fact; I am quite in order; I know when I am in order quite well. That is a matter of history; does any one deny it? The wise, careful, statesmanlike policy of the member for East York restored peace and harmony in the North-West, and, if the policy of that Government had been pursued and if home rule had been continued to the North-West, I venture to assert that we would not have in the North-West a rebellion to-day. Yes, I say that; I believe that; I believe that as firmly as I believe anything I have stated to-night. I believe that it is incapacity on the part of the Government that has brought about that state of things. The country finds out now, Sir, the advantages of that wise, liberal, careful and statesmanlike policy pursued in that *régime*; they find out now the advantages that did accrue, in that short period of four or five years, to this country. They find out now what it is going to cost to have an incapable Government in this country. There is a gentleman in this country, a political thinker, a political student, who has given a great deal of attention to the affairs of this country—I refer to the Hon. Wm. McDougall, who was appointed Lieutenant Governor of the North-West. What did that great organ of the Government, the Toronto *Mail*, say about him the other day? It said that the conduct of his administration, under the present Premier, was a worse act than the shooting of Thomas Scott. The bungling and mismanagement of the Government is felt to day.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must ask hon. gentlemen to keep quiet. I cannot be expected to call the hon. member to order if hon. members on the other side do not keep order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Now, Sir, the policy of home rule was inaugurated in 1867, in dealing with the North-West, that policy of home rule is neglected to-day, and it is the neglect of that same policy which is resulting to-day in the loss of the lives of so many of our noble people in the North-West, who have been shot down.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is digressing from the principle of the Bill under discussion, and I now ask him to confine himself to the Bill.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the principles of home rule and provincial rights are not included in this Bill, then I do not know anything about those principles.

Mr. SPEAKER. I rule that the hon. gentleman is digressing from the principles of the Bill, and I ask him to confine himself to the Bill.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Now, here is an evidence of what the revising officer will do. I have no appeal against the ruling of the Speaker, and the people will have no appeal against the ruling of the revising officer. Now you see the position which the people of this country will be placed in by this Bill. I, Sir, born in Canada, having always lived in Canada, desire the welfare of Canada, and I do not think that any man can be loyal to Canada that will sacrifice the liberties of the people to any party in the country. I do not believe that any man is loyal, I care not how much he boasts of his loyalty, that will give away one jot or tittle of the liberty and freedom that the people enjoy now. These men may boast on every stump of their loyalty, and we occasionally hear hon. gentlemen opposite boasting of their loyalty in the House. Oh, they are a loyal people! You will find that some of these gushing loyalists have good reasons for boasting of their loyalty. I declare, Sir, that any party, any member who gives away any right or any liberty that the people enjoy under our great charter of liberty, and hands it over to the Government, or an officer of the Government, is a rebel, in the truest sense of the word; and I designate that man, I care not who he is, whether he is high or low, who will assent to the principle of giving up the rights and liberties of the people and placing them in the hands of any officer, I do not care what his position may be, I do not care what his titles may be—I say I designate that man a rebel of the first water, a rebel against manhood, a rebel against liberty, British fair play and British freedom. I notice, whenever I speak of fair play, there is a noise made over there. Probably there may be some conscience, there may be some remorse, in the breasts of some of those gentlemen, and they would like me to talk upon some other branch of the subject. They are quite willing, it appears, to ignore all these weighty matters in this Bill, in which are to be found graver principles than in any other Bill that has been brought before this House since I have been in it. I say that it is a stigma, I say that it dims the lustre of the distinguished Premier of this country, that he has introduced such a Bill as this; I say that the future historian, when he is writing the history of that hon. gentleman's time—a man who has done a great many good things for his country, I admit—will look upon this Bill as one of the darkest stains on his political record, and will say that he wished to tyrannise over the people and to destroy the liberties and rights and privileges which they have enjoyed for so many years.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I offer no apology to the House for rising at this hour to address them. I shall not crave their indulgence, as I feel I am by no means constrained or obliged to do so. Nor do I agree with those

who have spoken of us having arrived at a very late period of the Session. We have arrived at what ought to be a very late period of the Session; but owing to the dilatoriness of the Government—if I use not the word, incapacity—we have not arrived anywhere near, I am obliged to believe, the end of the Session yet. I therefore feel myself under no obligation whatever to restrict myself to any time in discussing a measure so important in its nature as the one now before the House; but it may be a relief, perhaps, to hon. gentlemen opposite, to know that while I thus assert my rights and shall maintain them, I recognise the fact that there will not only be one more, or two more, but many more occasions upon which I can avail myself of the privilege of speaking on this Bill. I will, in deference to some of my own friends who are to follow me, and whom I do not wish to throw too late in the night, confine myself to speaking on just one or two of the more objectionable—nay, I should not say to one or two—of the objectionable clauses of this Bill. Now, I am not one of those who would say that if the Bill was amended in a certain direction, that if you were to substitute for your revising barristers the county judges, you would remove the great cause of complaint. I take no such ground, individually. The Bill is offensive, distasteful and hateful to me, for the principles it contains—for more than one of the principles it contains—and those objectionable principles cannot be modified to such an extent as to make it palatable to me. I am opposed to the Bill utterly and entirely. I do not want the Bill. I will not vote for the Bill. I should think hon. gentlemen opposite, if they would divest themselves of any feeling of self-interest that is to accrue to them through the operations of this Bill, and have regard to fair play, to the rights of the people, would agree with me, and reject this Bill as one unworthy to be produced before the Parliament of a free people. I shall have occasion to refer to that point more at length as I close my remarks. For I have noticed, by the ruling of Mr. Speaker to-night, that there will not be that amount of latitude given for the discussion of subjects which it seems to me are quite relevant to the question under consideration, and are necessary to illustrate one of the most hateful features of this Bill. And, therefore, I shall leave that to the last, in order that I may by that time be enabled at all events to say sufficient to indicate what my views are before hon. gentlemen oposite may object. Let me now take up first, if you will have it, the principle that is involved in this Bill, as distinguished from the principles upon which we have acted in the past. For eighteen years we have contented ourselved with having elections for this House take place on voters' lists prepared by the assessors of the different municipalities throughout the Dominion. It is now proposed, instead of that machinery, to provide machinery whereby irresponsible men, men not responsible to the people in any sense, shall have full control, not of the revising, but of making, and, after having made, of revising their own lists, with no appeal from the decisions at which they may arrive upon points of fact. But leaving that for the present, let me come down to one feature of the Bill, which I think hon. gentlemen opposite have taken good care not talk about, not to explain, but which it is necessary for them to take into consideration before they pass upon it. It is a feature of the Bill, a consequence of the Bill, that I venture to hope will be the means of causing many hon. gentlemen opposite to lose much of the advantage they hope to derive from its passage, when that one subject is rightly understood by the people. I therefore restrict my remarks at this time, which I have limited by my own motion, largely to a discussion on that point. And what is it? It is to ascertain the expenditure in connection with this Bill. What is our present condition, financially? That is the question we must ask ourselves; it is a question presented for discussion in connection with this Bill, because I shall presently go on to consider what extra expenditure is likely to be imposed on the people of Canada on account of this Bill being brought into operation. I ask, before we have inflicted on the country a large additional charge, what is the financial position of the Dominion of Canada to-day? Hon. gentlemen are not ignorant of the facts. The Finance Minister, in answering a direct question on this subject, said the public debt was about $200,000,000—and it may be more now. It is a well known fact that the Finance Minister has been borrowing money at the different banks in order to carry on the affairs of the Government. What does a debt of $200,000,000, and that is the net debt on the people, represent? It represents about $250 per family for every family in this Dominion. Think of it! Under the Bill you are proposing to enfranchise many of your fellow citizens, and you give a lower franchise on property than $250. There is not a man in Canada, with his $250 house and lot, which he fain believes is his own, and is free from mortgage, but is covered by this Government mortgage, placed upon it by the reckless extravagance—in a large measure by the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite—of public affairs. Hon. gentlemen opposite may object that there is no form of mortgage. It is true there is no written instrument, or mortgage filed in the registry office on the poor man's house and lot; but if there is a debt of $250 upon every family, then is a man's property his own? Does not the property belong to the creditors from whom this Government have borrowed the money, and for which they are responsible? Mark! The hon. Minister cannot answer that he will not have to pay that debt himself; that he will ever have to pay $250 to relieve the mortgage on each of these houses; for is it not a fact, nevertheless, that the mortgage is there? Must not the owner, day after day, month after month, and year after year, toil, sweat and work, in order to raise money to give to the Government to pay interest on that mortgage which they have put upon the property. Is it not equal to a perpetual mortgage? Can hon. gentlemen say it will not come so hard on those poor men, because more is contributed by men who occupy more prominent positions. There is here a fallacy, if we would accept it. How is the interest in respect to our public debt paid? How is the money raised? Is it raised on the income and wealth of the millionaires of this country? No. Under a system that has been inaugurated and carried on by hon. gentlemen opposite, the poor man, dwelling in a house and lot worth $250, may be forced to contribute as much to pay the interest on the public debt of the country as the man of wealth, who may be his neighbor. That is the position of hundreds and thousands of men who will be enfranchised under this Act, and under the Acts of the various Provinces. I say it is a serious question. I say that a Parliament which has not some regard to the happiness of the people is unworthy of confidence at their hands. So long as the system of collecting the revenue is as at present, by which Customs and Excise duties are drawn from the poor man, with his house and lot of the value of $250, in the same proportion as duties are drawn from a rich man, worth hundreds of thousands of dollars, and his property is as dear to him as is the castle of a lord in which he dwells. When that is the case, and I believe the expenditure this year will be in the neighborhood of $33,000,000 or $34,000,000; when you are forced to borrow money to carry on the ordinary affairs of the Government, taking from the banks the money which ought to be in their coffers, to aid the commerce of the country, and while you are in that position, while you have come down to the House and asked them for a vote of credit for $700,000—I fear but the first instalment of hundreds of thousands, if not millions of extra expenditure that are to follow in the great North-West, under the peculiar circumstances which exist there at this time—under this state of the finances, in this

condition of the country, with this weight upon the people, this patriotic Government comes forward and ask us to do—what? To pass an Act which will entail, as has been said by many hon. gentleman on this side of the House, an additional annual expenditure on the people of this country of half a million of dollars. There is where we are. That is one of the aspects of the question which is now before the House. I think there is a good plan of estimating questions of this kind—financial questions—which are pressed on our attention, which are pressing hard on the attention of the Government, and which are pressing, and ought to press, on the mind of every representative in this House who feels the responsibility of his position. Granting that the figures of half a million are accurate, as assumed by some hon. gentlemen in making their calculations, what does it involve? Sir, the way to look at it is, what amount will that half million of dollars, capitalised, represent as part of the debt of this Dominion, part of the mortgage that is already on every man's property who is in this country. Capitalise it at 4 per cent.—the rate at which you borrow your money—and it means that, if the Bill passes, the effect of it will be to add $12,500,000 to the debt of the country. That is what it means, because it is really added to the debt, and just as surely will the people have to pay interest on that $12,500,000 as if it were borrowed; for year by year they must, in the ordinary expenditure, raise this half million additional money that is to be required for the purpose of putting this Act in force. I have taken the trouble, Mr. Speaker, to draw up some figures which may serve as comparisons. When we speak about millions and tens of millions of dollars in this House, as we do, even members of this House have very little full knowledge of the amount of money which is represented by the figures we make use of, and still less have many of the people outside, busy with their own cares and only knowing that the burthen of taxation is great. Sir, I think it would be desirable, as the wage-earners of this country are a class that deserve attention at the hands of the members of this House, as they are a class which have to contribute to the revenue as much by Customs and Excise as wealthier men, I have instituted some comparisons between the earnings of these working men to show how long it would take them, if they paid their whole yearly salaries into a fund, to make up the twelve and a-half million dollars which we are about to vote upon them by way of public debt. I find, Sir, that if you take the city of Kingston, in Ontario, according to our census returns prepared by the Government, taking all the mechanics,all the artisans, all the factory employees who are in the city of Kingston, they would have to work thirty-three years, and all the money they earned in that time would be required to pay the twelve and a-half millions of dollars which by this Bill you propose to add to the burthens of the people. Take the city of Ottawa, in which we are, and every mechanic and artisan, every employé in every factory, including all the employees engaged in your saw mills, and they have would have to work twelve and three-quarter years and pay every cent of their earnings into the public treasury before they could wipe out the $12,500,000 which you propose to add to the burthens of the people if you pass this Bill. Take the city of London, and take all the classes I have mentioned, and they would have to work ten years in order to earn an amount of money sufficient to pay off that amount which you propose to add to the public debt of the country by the Bill now before the House. All the mechanics and artisans and employees in the factories of the city of Hamilton would have to work five and a-half years, and all their accumulated earnings during that period would be required in order to wipe out that debt. And even in the great city of Toronto, the largest in the Province of Ontario, the vast army of mechanics and artisans and factory employees in that city, numbering 12,708 men, or if you take that as representing three for each head of a family, it would give you nearly 40,000 people, and they would have to work for three and one-third years, and every dollar earned by that vast army would be required in order to wipe out the amount of the debt you propose to saddle on the workingmen, the wage-earners, the mechanics, the farmers, and the other classes of this country, by this Bill. Let us go to the other Provinces, and see how it would be with them. It would take seven and three-quarter years for the mechanics, artisans, and the factory employees of the ancient city of Quebec to wipe out that amount. It would take one year and five and a-half months of the vast army employed in the largest city in the Dominion, the city of Montreal, to wipe out that debt. It would take thirteen and three-quarter years for the men so employed in the city of Halifax to wipe out that debt. It would take seventeen years for all the mechanics, the artisans and factory employés in the city of St. John, N.B., before they could wipe out that debt. And yet we have that Bill staring us in the face, without any consideration on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, with scarcely so much as an allusion to it by hon. gentlemen opposite, with the speech of only eight minutes devoted to its introduction, with only one or two members on that side rising and feebly attempting to defend it, and when any one has risen on this side to protest against that Bill—iniquitous in every manner, shape and form, I was about to say—iniquitous in almost all its provisions, gentlemen who voted solemnly that there was lots of time in which to discuss this question have sought to stifle, by making noises, and drown the voices of those on this side who attempted to discuss it. This question will be discussed—mark you, I say that it will be discussed fully and thoroughly; that this Bill shall not become law, that this burthen shall not be placed on the people of this country to-day or to-morrow; not until the Opposition have been heard in reference to it shall it become law; not until the people of this country, through the utterances which go forth from this House, know the burthen which is being placed on them, shall that Bill have the sanction of the Governor General of this country. I have some more illustrations. I take the Province of Prince Edward Island, and we heard one of its representatives this afternoon endorsing this measure, but putting in a feeble plea that they might have a little better terms conceded by way of franchise to them—an impotent plea, for if the solitary argument of hon. gentlemen opposite of uniformity of franchise is worth anything, how can there be made any difference in the Province of Prince Edward Island from the other Provinces. What are the facts? Every artisan, every mechanic, every employé—and that includes all the employés of the ship yards in the whole Province of Prince Edward Island—would have to work fifteen and one-half years, and every dollar that they earned in that time taken and placed in the public treasury, before they could wipe out the debt you propose to add to the Dominion of Canada by the Bill now before the House, in order to take away from a large proportion of these very men the right that is theirs as free men, to vote for the men they send to represent them in this House. Yes, it is a nice dish prepared for the mechanics, artisans and factory employés of the Province of Prince Edward Island, to force them to shoulder their share of a debt that would take their united earnings for fifteen and one-half years to day for the benefit of having an Act passed that disfranchises a large proportion of them, perhaps, and take away from them rights that are theirs. Take the Province of British Columbia, and it would take all the classes I have enumerated thirteen and one-half years to wipe out the debt which the representatives of that Province are helping to put upon the people of this country, and which their own people must bear their share of, for the

inestimable privilege of having a large majority of these same men deprived of their right as free men to vote for the men they wish to represent them in this House. Take the Province of Nova Scotia, including the city of Halifax, and all the important towns and villages in that whole Province, and what would be the result? Every mechanic, artisan and factory employé in that whole Province would have to work three years, and pour all their earnings into the public coffers of this country, to wipe out the debt that this Bill proposes to add to the people of this country. Take the Province of New Brunswick, and the same thing is true. Take the Province of Manitoba, and for sixteen and a-half years every man of these classes in that Province would have to work and pour in his wages into the public treasury before this debt could be wiped out. Take the Territories, and those who are there would have to work 352 years before they could get their necks free from the yoke. Take the five Provinces—Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba and British Columbia—along with the Territories, and every mechanic, every artisan, every factory employé, every hand working in ship-yards, and every hand working in saw mills in all of these five Provinces and the Territories, would have to work one year and two months before their combined earnings would be sufficient to wipe out the debt you propose to place upon them by passing the Bill now before the House. Take the Province of Quebec, including the great cities of Montreal and Quebec, and the classes I have described throughout that whole Province would have to give eight months of their entire earnings in order to wipe it out. And in the great Province of Ontario, in which we are to-night, that vast army of mechanics, workingmen, artisans and employés in factories there would have to give all their combined earnings for five months in order to wipe out this debt. And yet, the measure is before the House; the Premier introduces it in a speech of eight and a-half minutes; one or two gentlemen on the other side rise to support it feebly, scarce touching on any of the provisions in the Bill, while the large number opposite content themselves with no effort to support the Bill, further than is required by working their feet and their hands, in order to drown the discussion which is being given to the Bill on this side of the House. Take another estimate, and it will enable us to understand the question a little better. The entire exports of the products of our mines—our British Columbia mines, our Nova Scotia mines and Cape Breton mines—our iron mines and coal mines—were $3,442,491 last year. For three years and seven months would every mining miner in this Dominion, from one end to the other, have to work at his daily toil before he would get out enough of the exports of that product to pay off the public debt which you propose to put upon the people of this country by the passage of the Bill now before the House. The entire export product of the fisheries of the Dominion for the year 1884 was $8,609,341. Every fisherman in the Dominion—in the waters of the Atlantic, in the waters of Hudson Bay, in the Pacific waters, in the rivers, streams and lakes throughout this vast Dominion—would have to contribute all the fish he caught for export during one year and five months to clear off the debt this Bill proposes to put upon the country. Take the constituencies of this Dominion, and you propose to add $59,241 of debt to every one of the 211 constituencies that comprise the Dominion of Canada. Sir, I give these figures to the House; I use them for purposes of illustration. As I said before, we talk glibly of millions here, and we do not feel so much the burden of taxation that is necessary to meet the millions and the tens of millions of public debt that has been added to the people of this country. I leave to the House and to the country to form, in the light of the comparisons I have given, some conception of the money interest alone which is involved in the Bill before the House. Sir, I touch upon but one other point in reference to this matter. I discuss, not at this time, the question of woman suffrage; I allude not to the interpretation clause, or to the different classes of people who are being brought in under or out off under the operation of this Bill. I pass to a consideration of the last principle contained in it—the proposition with reference to the revising barrister, and the machinery provided for carrying out that principle; and I agree with the language that has been used on this side of the House in reference to the provision made with regard to that officer. It matters not to me who your officer may be. I say you have no right, in a Parliament supposed to be composed of free men, representing a free people, to take the rights and liberties of the people out of their own possession and place them in the hands of any one man. I care not who he is; and that is what your Bill does. You take the right to say whether a man shall vote or shall not vote. The dearest right a man has you take from the charge of men who are responsible to the people—men, who, if they fail in their duty, can have their judgment and their action appealed against, reviewed and corrected, and you place it in the hands of one man, whose word shall be final and unalterable. I protest against it with such voice as I have, in the name of all that is right, and in the name of all that is decent. And I say, and I say it calmly, that I cannot understand how any member of this House, with a due sense of his responsibility upon him, can vote for an Act so contrary to what I understand to be the principle and the constitution of a free people. The question arises in my mind: Why the necessity of passing the Bill, if it involves such financial burden upon the people? If it is necessary to give such despotic powers to certain individuals, if it sets aside in a certain measure the Federal principle under which we have been working in this regard, is is not better that the Provinces should go on, as they have been, no complaints having been heard? It is claimed that it is constitutional to pass this Bill. Granted. Is it not equally constitutional to refrain from passing it? That is the question we have to ask ourselves. Eighteen years working under the old system affirms that it is as constitutional for us to reject this Bill as to affirm it. Where, then, is the necessity? Where the need? Who has asked for the passing of this Bill, involving this additional charge to the public debt of $12,500,000, if the figures be correct that hon. gentlemen have taken in reference to this matter, and a Bill that interferes with the liberties of the people. I am forced to the conviction, no answer being given from the other side, no reason being alleged, except the one principle of uniformity, which the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Jenkins) has given us to understand will be departed from, no reason being given why it should be done, I am forced to the conclusion, judging his Government and this act of his Government by previous acts of the same Government, in my own mind, that this Bill, as introduced, is endeavored to be put through this House, not in the interests of this country, not in the interests of the people of this country, but in order that the present party in power in this country may perpetuate the power which they see is fast slipping from them, unless some new means are derived whereby they can prevent the free expression of the will of the people. I would hesitate long before I would dare to utter that, even though it is pressed home upon my mind, had I any reason to suppose it would be something so foreign to them that it could not be contemplated. But I have asked myself when has ever that party gone to the people in a fair, square, manly fashion and fought their opponents on fair and equal grounds. If there is a period in the history of the country when they have done so, it seems to me it was when they were in such a position that they could not get any advantage to themselves

by acting otherwise. In 1872, when they had the power, what means did they adopt? We learn by the testimony which the Prime Minister gave himself before the commission charged with investigating into the conduct of the elections, that the Government had bargained with a great public trust to raise money for distributing among the constituencies, in order that the electors might be demoralised by bribery and prevented from giving expression to their views, and the hon. gentleman came to Parliament with his majority. Again, these hon. gentleman went to the country in 1882, boasting of the success of their policy and of their administrative ability, asserting that they were strong in the confidence of the people, but before they went they introduced that Bill, which they called the Redistribution Bill, the provisions of which had in them that element of cowardice which made the Bill obnoxious to any man who had the principles of fair play, of justice, and of right in his mind; and to-day it stands upon the Statute Book of Canada a blot and a stain, and stands there, in my judgment, to the shame of the members that voted for it. I hold that if the object of introducing this Bill now before the House is to give a party advantage to the party now in power, those who may vote for it for that purpose, ignoring all the principles that will be violated by its enactment, may live to see the day when they will rue, when they will repent and feel ashamed of doing that which they have not attempted to do in an open, manly way, or which strict principles could justify. I do not disguise from you, Sir, that under the operations of that Bill, which is to be passed, as I suppose it will be, the interests of the Reform party may seem to be weakened. It looks, upon the face of it, as if the party opposite, have the power and are determined to use it to accomplish their end; but I believe there is a power higher even than hon. gentlemen opposite. I believe that there is such a thing as men who design to dig a pit into which they think possibly others may fall, sometimes fall into it themselves. I can understand, that is if I could understand, men forgetting the principles of justice in the desire to get advantage to themselves personally and politically, voting for this measure, but while they may be interested in securing their seats, or their return to their seats in this House, the hundreds and the thousands of men who have to pass upon their conduct, and can exercise their votes at the polls, before these hon. gentlemen come into this House, will not have, perhaps, so strong a personal interest in seeing the principles of justice destroyed and the rights of the people invaded. No; I say here, that if what seems to me to be the evident design of that Bill be carried out, there may be, after all, as I believe there will, a revolution of feeling on the part of right thinking people in this country, and that the very electorate that they are seeking, as I read the Bill and view it, to capture by its operation, may be the very electorate that will say to them: "We entrusted you with the interests of the country; you have sacrificed them to the interests of party; with us country is before party; no longer shall you represent us in that House."

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, when the hon. First Minister introduced the Bill which is now before us, I thought that his intention was not to push it any further than the second reading. That is the reason why I did not think it my duty to address the House until the present moment; but, as he seems determined to push it through, I really believe that I would not be doing my duty, as one of the representatives of a Province which will be pretty seriously affected by this Bill, if I should refrain from saying what I think about this Bill. A Franchise Bill is always a Bill of great importance. Everybody knows that to grant the right of suffrage to any one is to grant the right of taking part in the administration of public affairs. Therefore, it is evident that, on the manner in which the right of suffrage is understood, on the manner in which it is determined, depends the good or bad administration of the affairs of the country. This has been very well understood in all countries, and especially in England, the country from which we take all our precedents and examples. It has come to this, that changes in the franchise are considered as real changes in the constitution, which involve great alterations in the policy of the country. And, Sir, it is not necessary to go back very far to find the proof of this fact. It is well known to everybody that immense changes have been wrought in England since the adoption of the Reform Bill of 1832. No doubt, that before this Bill, considerable changes had been made in the franchise in various parts of England; but it was only in 1832 that radical changes were made in the qualification of voters, such as it had existed up to that time. Well, what was the result of these changes? A new class of voters, a numerous class, were granted the right of voting. Those who voted before that time represented certain interests. They represented, above all, the ideas of a certain class of the community, those who were called property holders. Among certain classes of the population of England, Mr. Speaker, great complaints are made that that country is not animated with such a warlike spirit as it was in days gone by. Look at the class of electors who now say in which way they intend that the affairs should be managed. It is this class who pay the cost of war; it is the popular classes, the commercial classes who have been called upon to manage the affairs of England since 1832. It is those classes who know the cost of war. It is those classes who pay the cost both with their money and with their blood, and they reap no benefit therefrom, while the classes who, until then, had managed the policy of England were those to whom war never cost anything and who reaped the only benefits which can be reaped from war—fame, and promotion to the highest offices. Well, by these changes which have been introduced in the policy of England for a certain number of years back, one may see what has been the result of the changes which took place in the right of suffrage. In England the importance of a Franchise Bill is so well understood that no one has any thought of introducing a Franchise Bill as an ordinary Bill is introduced, without the Bill having been discussed among the public, without that Bill having been required, without an almost unanimous opinion of the population being formed on the necessity of that Bill. Never in England has any one dreamed of presenting a Franchise Bill which would be the result of a whim or fancy of a First Minister, which would be the result of a preconcerted plan, calculated to warp the expression of the opinion of the country. What was seen in England when the Bill of 1832 was passed? Did that Bill take the House of Commons by surprise? Was it introduced on behalf of a party representing a small majority of the electors of the country, and was it to be forced on the remainder of the population? Not at all. Public opinion had been formed in England for a long time. For years and years people had been unanimous in saying that the right of suffrage must be extended, and granted to a greater number of citizens who had previously been deprived of it. The opinion was not only unanimous in the country, but an immense majority in the House of Commons had already pronounced in favor of a Reform Bill. But it had been defeated in the House of Lords. Public opinion had pronounced so strongly on that point that a civil war was impending unless the Bill was passed by the House of Lords. That House, seeing that public opinion was so strong on the subject, thought it best to surrender. If that House had not adopted the Bill, the Premier had almost made up his mind to create new Lords in sufficient numbers to secure a majority in favor of the Bill. Let us go back, Mr. Speaker, to the time of the Reform Bill of 1868. Was that Bill introduced in favor of one party? Not at all.

Both parties perfectly agreed as to the extension of franchise. When Mr. Disraeli presented the Reform Bill which afterwards became law, a Reform Bill had been introduced by Lord John Russell. It is true they differed on certain particulars, which were immaterial, but the whole country was unanimous to say that the franchise in England must be extended and that a change must be made in the electoral law. We all know what took place when Mr. Disraeli (I mention this name with pleasure to our opponents, for they are constantly mentioning it to-day) who was then backed by a large majority, who, if he was not the leader of the Government, was the managing soul and spirit of Lord Derby's Administration, presented his Reform Bill. What did he do? Did he come forward and force this Bill through as a party Bill? Not at all; he came before the House of Commons and he introduced resolutions. So well did he feel that he required the moral unanimity of the House and country in favor of a Bill of that kind, that he introduced resolutions. He desired that the House of Commons should themselves lay the foundation on which the new franchise was to be established. The idea never entered his mind that he should himself propose a new franchise and force it on the country, through a majority and by means of the expedients at the disposal of the leader of a party, when such a leader wishes to use his majority in an arbitrary manner. Mr. Disraeli knew very well that such a course would have been contrary to all the ideas which have always prevailed in England. He might have reaped a momentary advantage from it, but he knew that such advantages are injurious, not only to the country, but very much also to the party who momentarily enjoys them. Mr. Disraeli declined to introduce a party Bill, and he preferred to bring it before the House, with resolutions whose object was that the whole House should agree in laying down the basis of a Bill which was to be adopted ultimately. This mode of proceeding was criticised; the leader of the Liberal Opposition, Mr. Gladstone, opposed it, and said, very rightly, I think, that the measure was of such great importance that although its absolute necessity was recognised by the whole country and by all parties, that measure should be presented under the responsibility of the Government, and I will not be contradicted when I say that both sides of the House agreed to say that a measure of that kind ought not to be introduced as a party measure, but as a measure which was imposed by public opinion. But it was contended, and with reason, by the Liberal side of the House—and I would uphold the same view, should circumstances require it—that the measure was too important to be initiated by a simple member of the House. When Mr. Disraeli presented this Bill—and by referring to the *Debates* of the Imperial Parliament, it will be seen that Mr. Disraeli never said a word which could, in any way, be construed as an evidence that he introduced that Bill as a party measure—his opponents did not deal with the question from a party standpoint. Both parties agreed to see in it a question which was above party interests. They saw that the general interests of the country were at stake; and Mr. Disraeli concluded his speech by saying: "Whether the present Administration is overthrown or maintained, that is immaterial, since we are introducing a Bill which is asked by the whole country; let the Bill be adopted and let the Government be overthrown it is perfectly immaterial to me; I shall suffer from it at the present moment, but my reputation will be better hereafter. Mr. Speaker, to come back to a much more recent period, this year, or rather last year, the Imperial Parliament passed, after a prolonged debate, another Bill, the Reform Bill, by virtue of which the number of the electors in England is increased by two millions. Again, on that occasion, was that Bill introduced by the Liberal party of England on behalf of a political party? Mr. Gladstone had at his disposal a majority as large and as solid as that of the present Government. Did he introduce this Bill as a party Bill? Not one single question of that kind has been discussed. The Bill had been discussed for the last two or three years. Both the parties had agreed on the great principles of the Bill, although they differed, as people will always differ, on minor details. But on the principles of the Bill they agreed, because for a long time the question had been agitated in the press and in public opinion. It was a measure which forced itself on the party in power, whether such party was Conservative or Liberal. There was a thing that neither of them could fail to do, and that was to introduce a Reform Bill. What took place is still fresh in our memory—these facts only took place yesterday, so to speak. It is well known that this Bill was so strongly urged by public opinion that the House of Lords, having tried to postpone its adoption by stating that they would pass it as soon as a Bill for the redistribution of seats or the readjustment of electoral districts would be introduced, they did not dare to expressly oppose it. It will not be pretended however that the House of Lords is Liberal. There is still a large Conservative majority in that House. Why did they not oppose it in a direct manner? It was because they felt that public opinion was in favor of it, and that their very existence was threatened if they did not pass it. Would they have been so threatened in their existence as a body if they had opposed a Bill which would have simply been presented as a party measure? Not at all. They were frightened and they finally gave way. And why? Because they felt that behind this Bill there was not only a party whose interest of the day might be favored, but every citizen of the country who had a right to take part in the administration of public affairs. Such is, Mr. Speaker, the way in which Bills of the nature of the Bill now before us are always understood. They have never been introduced and adopted until public opinion had declared them to be necessary, until public opinion had pronounced in such a way as to justify people in saying that they met with the unanimous assent of the country. Could we, Mr. Speaker, say that it is the case with the present Bill? Where are to be found these manifestations of public opinion? Has this question been agitated? There are only two mediums for the manifestation of public opinion—the elections and the press. Well, has the present Bill, in election time, ever been the object of a discussion between the candidates? I have taken an active part in a very large number of elections, to a certain extent on my own account, and a great deal also for other candidates, and that for several years past, and I have never heard a discussion on this Bill, neither in the Province of Quebec nor elsewhere. I may be mistaken as to the other Provinces, but in my Province, I can state, without fear of being contradicted, that no general election was ever made on this Bill. And even more, that no bye election was ever made on such a Bill as this. We had the general elections of 1878 and those of 1882, and from that time several bye elections took place in the Province of Quebec. Well, I appeal to the hon. members opposite, and ask them if ever a Bill of this kind was discussed. But it may be said that people did not think of it. Sir, it is a long while ago since this thing was spoken of. It was spoken of, by the way; but was it ever spoken of at election time? Never. Now, has the press ever had lengthy discussion on the subject of this Bill? Was there ever to be found in the press a general expression of public opinion, one of these unanimous expressions of public sentiment of which I spoke a while ago? Never. If anything is to be found it is an expression of dissent from this Bill. Whenever there was anything said about this Bill, or another Bill based on the same principle, not only the Opposition papers, but even the Ministerial papers, whenever they said anything about it (but they never spoke lengthily on this subject), these papers, I say, did not consider it as a measure which it was seriously intended to carry through; they have treated it as a measure which indicated a certain freak

of the First Minister, but never as a serious measure. If I remember well, last year, when this Bill was introduced, a Ministerial paper said:

"It is very evident that it is not the intention to push this Bill through, and so much the better."

One might quote a half dozen of Ministerial papers which spoke in the same way, and I do not think that a single Ministerial paper is to be found which is in favor of the Bill or in favor of the ideas which are sought to be carried out by means of this Bill. Now, Mr. Speaker, it cannot be said that this Bill is without importance. It touches upon three points of the highest importance as regards electoral franchise. Now, for instance, what might be called the local franchise system, which has been in operation for eighteen years, is laid aside. If it was absolutely necessary to have a uniform franchise for the whole country it might have been established when Confederation was established. What does the Act of British North America say? It will be remembered that that Act was not passed at a time when it could be pretended that people forgot to deal with that question. The Act of British North America was discussed for years and years. It was dealt with from 1864 to 1867. If it had been absolutely necessary to have a uniform electoral franchise for all the Provinces of the Dominion, there was plenty of time to think of it, and such a system of franchise might have been inserted in the Act, but no such thing was done. On the contrary, the proof that this matter was dealt with lies in the fact that the Act contains a clause which provides that, until the Dominion Parliament shall have otherwise decided, the law concerning the qualification of voters and the mode of making the electorial lists will be determined by the Provinces. That is what we find in the Act of 1867. Now, it will not be pretended that since 1867 it has been impossible to the present Government to pass a law of this kind because they have not been long enough in power. During the eighteen years which have elapsed since Confederation the present Government have been twelve years in power. Well, during these twelve years, have not the Government perceived the importance of changing the system which we have always followed? Neither will it be pretended that if the party now in power have not passed a law introducing a new electorial franchise it was because they did not have a sufficient majority. Without going back any further, Mr. Speaker, if one remembers what took place within the last few years, when a Government have been able to cause a majority to swallow down the Pacific contract and last year's loan, I think it will be admitted that a franchise Bill, no matter how hard to swallow, would have been swallowed just the same. Why has not such a Bill been passed? If it had been a Bill whose necessity would have forced itself upon the whole country would not the Government have caused it to be passed? It is evident that they would have done it a long time ago. An hon. member opposite, the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), said the other day, that the present Bill ought to be passed, because it was time we had a general citizenship, a general franchise for the whole Dominion. Well, Mr. Speaker, who ever dreamed of that? Where is the proof of the necessity of such a thing? Is it to be found in the experience of other countries having a constitution somewhat similar to ours? Look at the United States, for instance. It is not necessary for me to insist on that point, because it has already been dealt with by other speakers. We know that the United States are organised into a Confederation, and it will be admitted that that Confederation is pretty powerful; if there had been lacking essential elements in that organisation it would have been found out, for the people of that country are intelligent enough to know their own wants. Well, have the United States felt the necessity of that general franchise. Not at all. It has not been thought of until this day, for the law of suffrage in the United States is the local franchise. For the election of members of the House of Representatives, and even for the election of the President, the system in force is that of the local franchise. Still, Congress had undoubtedly the power to pass a franchise law for the election of representatives, but that never entered the idea of anybody. It was found that the local franchise worked perfectly well, and that no change was needed. But it may be said that we should not mind what takes place in the United States; let us see what takes place elsewhere. Take England, for instance. What do we see to-day? We see that there is one distinct franchise for England, another for Ireland, another for Scotland, and nobody has ever thought, even this year, when the Reform Bill, which has been adopted, was being discussed, nobody has ever thought of changing the system and of adopting this grand idea of the member for King's, who has pretended that it was absolutely necessary, in order to elevate the moral level of this country, to adopt a general franchise. In the United States people are satisfied with a local franchise, and so with England, Scotland and Ireland; why should we not be satisfied with it? Have the inconveniences of the present state of things been shown? It is true that very little was shown, because the Bill has not been discussed at all by hon. members opposite. They dare not discuss it, because they understand that they cannot discuss it. It is not defensible. There may have been reasons to introduce this Bill, but they seem to be incapable of giving the reasons why this Bill should be passed. If this Bill was worthy of being introduced in the House they ought to be able to give some reasons why they should support it. The First Minister, who is the promoter of this Bill, has given a few explanations, and I have here the report of his speech. Do you wish to know the space occupied by this speech, which is explaining a measure of such importance? Let us compare the length of the speech of the First Minister of Canada to that of the speech of the First Minister in England on the Reform Bill, and we will see whether or not he had good reasons to give in support of that Bill. The speech from the First Minister covers just two columns of the *Debates*. Now, if I read this speech, what reasons do I find in it? The hon. Premier says:

"The present condition of affairs, with reference to the Electoral Franchise, is altogether anomalous."

It is a peculiar anomaly, which has been going on for the last eighteen years, and he does not venture to say that any evil has resulted from it.

"And I do not think that that anomaly, in a country like this, owning British institutions and drawing its inspirations from those institutions, should any longer be continued."

I have just recalled a fact which is very well known, and which shows that it is not an anomaly. This state of things has always existed in England, and nobody speaks of doing away with it. I suppose that in England the representative institutions are understood as well as they are here, and as I said awhile ago, there is a franchise for England, one for Scotland and one for Ireland. There has even been more variety than that, for there has been a distinct franchise for each town, each borough and each county; in a moment we will see how that was done away with. What are the reasons given by the First Minister to do away with these anomalies? Once again, there is no anomaly; but if there was one, he does not point out any evil which has resulted from it:

"Since that time we have been going on using the voters' list, the system of representation which existed in the Province; but it is quite an anomaly, it is quite contrary to first principles."

Which are these first principles to which this system would be contrary? That is what he has failed to point out, and that is what he is unable to point out; these so-called first principles, which would be opposed to the system which we have now and which is followed in England, he

is unable to explain to us. Now, it is a reason of expediency; the First Minister has become *opportunist*.

"Sooner or later that principle must be affirmed."

The principle of uniform franchise—

"And I think, and the Government think no time more opportune to affirm that principle by practical legislation than the present moment. We have had an Act passed in the Legislature of Ontario; there is an Act now before the Legislature of Nova Scotia; there may be Acts passed in every Province in the Confederation, and these Acts may sweep away half the constituencies which centre here, or may enlarge the constituency much further than for Dominion purposes, on Dominion principles and with Dominion responsibilities, it ought to be extended."

Mr. Speaker, it is a question of expediency very badly brought. To read these remarks, one would think that there was never such an occasion as this to introduce a Reform Bill. But they forget that since the system which is considered as an anomaly and which the First Minister declares to be contrary to the first principles, is in operation, there has been readjustments of the electoral laws in the old Provinces, without saying a word of the Provinces which are unknown to me. I can speak of what took place in the Province of Quebec in 1875. We have remodelled our election laws. A new franchise was adopted. How is it that the First Minister did not see fit to propose a reform of the electoral law? It is true he was not then in power, but he took power since, in 1878. How is it that he did not say: Since the Quebec Legislature has completely changed the system of electoral law which has been in force in that Province, we must also change ours? The question was never raised. It is only this year that he deems it expedient to put an end to this state of things, which he considers as contrary to the first principles. Now, a little further on—I seek in vain the reason which might satisfy the least difficult to please as regards the introduction of this measure—he says:

"It is of great importance that the same classes should be represented here; otherwise, as the House can well understand, we are sowing the seeds of discontent."

There is a reason, Mr. Speaker; the same interests must be represented here from all classes of the Dominion, otherwise we are exposed to sow seeds of discontent. We have had this seed of discontent since 1867, and it has produced nothing up to the present time. The First Minister should have drawn attention to it, if there have been fruits of discontent since 1867. If this seed exists by law, it exists since 1867. Well, has the First Minister or any of his friends pointed out to us any of these fruits since 1867? Can it be pretended that it was this seed of discontent which caused the North-West disturbances? Nobody has ever thought of saying that the troubles of the North-West are due to the mode of suffrage which has been in operation since 1867. Now, the only principle on which the First Minister has thought fit to draw the attention of the House, is that of women suffrage, about which he says:

"There is one question, however, in this Bill in which, personally, I may be considered to be interested, and that is woman's franchise. I have always been and I am now strongly in favor of that franchise. I believe that is coming as certainly as came the gradual enfranchisement of woman from being the slave of man until she attained her present position, almost the equal of man. I believe that time is coming, though perhaps we are not, any more than the United States or England, quite educated up to it. I believe the time will come, and I shall be very proud and glad to see it, when the final step towards giving woman full enfranchisement is carried in Canada."

Then he quotes the opinion of Mr. Gladstone, of Sir Stafford Northcote, and of the Marquis of Salisbury, who, he says, have pronounced in favor of women suffrage. Well, the First Minister himself, in proposing women suffrage, is forced to admit that public opinion is not in his favor. Sir, a stronger condemnation could not be made against the Bill. He is forced to admit that the public is not prepared for the full enfranchisement of women; that the public is not prepared to free them from all the restrictions under which they have been kept until now. He says that he himself is prepared, but the public is not. And still he comes to us, and proposes that we should adopt a part of what he declares has not been accepted by public opinion. Is not such a proposition contrary to all principles of legislation, especially in electoral matters, to come and offer to us a legislation which not only is not asked by the public, but which the public does not want at all? That is his own declaration. Now, Mr. Speaker, the proposed system of establishing a uniform right of suffrage is contrary to the constitutional history of England. Will it be found that at all times in England there has been uniformity of suffrage? Not at all. It is perfectly known that from the beginning, and for a long time, there was no uniform law as to the right of suffrage; each locality could determine for itself who would be the members it would send to the House of Commons, and had the right to decide how they should be elected. Still, it was with that House of Commons composed in that manner, that the people of England obtained all the liberties we now enjoy. The principle contained in this Bill is not only at variance with the history of the British constitution under which we live, but it is a principle which is simply worthy of the French revolutionists of 1793. You know, Mr. Speaker, and all those who have studied the history of that time of disorder know, what these revolutionists were aiming at; it was what they called the one and indivisible Republic. They wanted to put an end to all local customs or common laws. They were *doctrinaires* and serious *doctrinaires*, who wished to push their doctrines to their last consequences, who wished to do away with all the old Provinces, with all local autonomies, and they did away with them. They have sub-divided, cut and recut France into a great many departments. Such has been the first step of a measure which is submitted to us by a Government who style themselves Conservatives. What has been the second step? After having cut and recut France, from a territorial point of view, these same revolutionists, these Radicals, have done away with all local customs; they found that they contained something which was contrary to the first principles, as the First Minister says, for it is remarkable that the First Minister uses the same expressions as the Radicals of 1793. They also thought that it was contrary to the first principles of a one and indivisible Republic that there should not be a uniform law for the whole country. There were a great number of local customs and a still greater number of subordinate customs. Well, all these were done away with, in order to have a uniform law. That is to say, these revolutionists thought that a constitution should not be framed for their country, but, that a constitution should be framed to suit the rhetoricians and *doctrinaires*. Well, Mr. Speaker, this appears to be the object that the present Bill has in view. The object is is to put the whole Dominion in the same mould; the object is to throw the Province of Quebec, a Province, the majority of whose people is of French descent, a Province where there are still to day a great number of French customs and whose ideas are not the same as those of other Provinces, in the same mould with British Columbia, who may be right from her own standpoint, but whose ideas and customs are not the same. It is evident that if the object is to put them under the same system, laws will be forced on British Columbia which will not suit that Province, which might ruin it, or else a system will be adopted which will suit British Columbia and which will be the ruin of the Province of Quebec. Such is the system which is sought to be established by that law. Now, Mr. Speaker, it has been stated that the Act of British North America has secured this power for the Parliament of Canada. Nobody, that I know of, on this side of the House, has ever denied the absolute power of Parliament to pass such a law as that which is submitted to us, but there are many other things which we have a right to do and which we ought not to do. This is no argument. The question is simply whether the law is good or bad, whether it is wise or unwise; but it is an utter impossibility,

as I said, to establish a uniform franchise which would suit everybody, and a moment of reflection will convince anyone of that fact. The franchise of every country depends more or less on the social state or the distribution of wealth, on the condition in which the individuals are placed; all of which differ in every Province. In the Province of Quebec the social condition is not the same as that of Manitoba or Prince Edward Island. There are great differences between all the Provinces, but there are still greater as regards the distribution of wealth, which plays such an important part in the electoral franchise. Private wealth is not distributed in the same manner in the different Provinces. Sir, it would be useless to undertake a long dissertation on the Bill now before us. From what I have just said it is impossible to establish an exactly uniform franchise. The Bill itself furnishes the proof of it. In that Bill is found a special franchise for fishermen. Well, there are no fisheries in Manitoba, and it is evident that this franchise is specially destined to those who form a numerous class of the population of the Maritime Provinces and part of the Province of Quebec. That uniform franchise for the whole Dominion would give rise to another inconvenience. It will be admitted that all the electors whose names should be put on the voters' list should know on what conditions they would have a right to vote. All the voters are not lawyers nor men who have time to study the conditions under which they have a right to vote. Well, the greater the number of different electoral laws each elector is obliged to study, the more certain we are that a great many electors will neglect to have their names put on the voters' list. In the Province of Quebec we have a franchise for municipal elections, which is distinct from that of the local and federal elections. We have the same franchise for both local and federal elections. As it is, we have great difficulty to make the electors understand these two franchises; it is very easy for a lawyer to understand them, but for a farmer, for a trader, for a business man, who does not make a habit of studying law, it is always pretty difficult to understand what is the qualification for the Dominion Parliament or for the Local Parliament or for municipal elections. If we come with a third franchise, distinct from the two others, it will be a third difficulty to be added to those which are already existing, and which already offer sufficient confusion. Now, Mr. Speaker, the present Bill introduces quite a new principle in our law; I do not say whether rightly or wrongly. We will see that in a moment. But it introduces in our constitution principles which are quite new, principles which are foreign to those on which the right of suffrage, such as originally established, and such as it now exists in England. The basis of the right of suffrage is the right of citizenship. An individual votes not as an individual, but as a citizen of a locality or as holder of property. Such has been the system followed in England, Scotland and Ireland, up to this day. I shall mention, in a moment, the changes which have been made. Well, in our country, under what title has a man been allowed to vote up to this day? He was allowed to vote simply as proprietor, lessee or occupant of real estate, at least in the Province of Quebec. That is to say, it is by reason of his relation with real estate that an individual has heretofore been admitted to the right of suffrage in our country. We have never admitted what in England has been called fancy franchise. I shall read to the House the opinion of a man who is certainly a high authority on all matters connected with the constitution; no less a person than the celebrated Edmund Burke. Here is what he said in the House of Commons:

"The virtue, spirit, and essence of a House of Commons consists in its being the express image of the feelings of the nation." It is in this sense, as the same great authority observes, in its quick and unfailing sympathy with the national sentiment, and not from its popular origin, that the House is truly representative. Whether the prevailing sentiments of the people be right or wrong, they ought to be made known to the Crown; and the utterance of the House of Commons in that expression of popular feeling which, and which only the Crown is bound to receive. "His Majesty," says Burke, "may receive the opinions and wishes of individuals under their signatures and of bodies corporate under seals as expressing their own particular sense, and he may grant such redress as the legal powers of the Crown enable the Crown to afford. This and the other House of Parliament may also receive the wishes of such corporations and individuals by petition. The collective sense of his peoples, His Majesty is to receive from His Commons in Parliament assembled."

So that it is not the individuals who are represented in the House of Commons, but it is the communities, the counties, the towns, the boroughs. Now, here is the interpretation given by a modern writer who has dealt with the British constitution. *Hearn, Government of England:*

"Whatever color the pecuniary qualification as introduced by statute derived from the uniform practice of so many years, no such argument can be urged in favor of the educational tests or the plurality of votes or other similar systems which late political discussions have brought into notice. All such projects——"

Including that which is now before us—

"are mere innovations. They have no root in antiquity. They are on the contrary, inconsistent with fundamental and well recognised principles of our law. Our constitution knows nothing of such fancy franchises."

Such is the opinion of these authors on the principles which are the basis of the right of suffrage, and which have been the basis of the right of suffrage in England. It may not be without interest to this House to know in what manner that question has been viewed in the Province of Quebec. I had the honor to be a member of the Quebec Legislature in 1875, when they passed an electoral law. Well, I had the audacity, as it was called, to move, in amendment to the Government Bill, the introduction of some of the franchises which are proposed to-day. Not the women suffrage, but something very less radical. Here is what I proposed:

"Mr. Langelier, seconded by Mr. Pelletier (Bellechasse), moved that the Bill be now re-committed to a Committee of the Whole House, to amend it again, by substituting in clause 8 of said Bill, the following sub-section to the third sub-section thereof:

"To be now and to have been without interruption during six months occupier as owner or lessee of a dwelling house or property——"

I was asking for the right of suffrage for all householders, either as owner or occupier——

"To be now and to have been without interruption, during six months, owner, lessee or occupier of real estate of a total value of $300 in the cities which have a right to send one or more members to the Legislative Assembly, and of $200 in the other minicipalities, the whole according to the valuation roll for municipal purposes, or

"To have been a resident in a municipality during six months, and to be a graduate from a university of the United Kingdom, or of the Province of Quebec, or to hold a diploma in the said Province as a lawyer, doctor, surveyor or school teacher."

It will thus be seen that the two new franchises which I had the honor to propose on that occasion were these: The right of suffrage for householders, which had been introduced in England and which had already been in operation for several years in that country. Apart from that, I proposed one of these franchises which in England were called fancy franchises, that is to say, the franchise of intelligence, in favor of the graduates of universities, or of holders of diplomas for the practice of liberal professions, or diplomas as school teachers. It will be admitted, I trust, that there was nothing in that which was very revolutionary. Do you now wish to know how that was accepted by the Quebec Legislature? I shall not read all the speeches, but only what I find in the report of *La Minerve*, of the 29th of January, 1875. Here is the speech delivered by Mr. Bellerose, who is now a Dominion Senator, and everybody knows that he is conservative enough. Here is what he said when he opposed my amendment:

"The amendments proposed by the member for Montmagny exist in England, but England is not in the same position as we are; there the real estate is in the hands of a few, while the great mass of the people hardly enjoy the light of the sun, but all heads of families have a right to vote under the law as it stands to-day. As to the lawyers and other professional people, they have already a right to vote; why should we give it to them twice?"

Now notice what follows:

"Besides, the adoption of these amendments would be a step in the way of these abuses which are now overturning Europe. With the emigration which is coming to us every year, there would be great danger in giving a right to vote to those who have resided for six months in the Province of Quebec."

These are the words of Mr. Bellerose. Here are now the words used by Solicitor-General Angers, who was upholding the Government measure before the House, and who was then one of the leaders of the Conservative party. It will be seen what were the principles of the Conservative party, according to him, with respect to a Franchise Bill:

"The amendment moved by the hon. gentleman would lead us to nothing short of universal suffrage, which gives a right to vote to every man who lives under a roof, without enquiring whether such a person pays taxes or not to the Province Now, Mr. Disraeli's law puts a certain restriction; it only gives a right to vote to those who, having a roof under which to live, could, besides, pay a certain amount of taxes to the country. It has been proposed to give a right to vote to persons having a deposit of $300 in a bank; it has been said that a man having thousands of dollars deposited in a bank should not have a right to vote."

It was not me who moved that amendment, but it was moved by others.

"I will say, with a great economist, that the man who owns no property is not a good citizen. That whoever has capital, if he wants to be useful to his country, must invest it in industry. It has been proposed to give the right to vote to graduates of the universities. I find, in the *Revue Catholique des institutions et de droit*, an article stating that the right of voting should be given to the father of a family in preference to the bachelor. The intelligent, learned man must not stop when he leaves college, a stimulant must be kept in reserve for him, to induce him to achieve a competency. This is what induces me to make all my efforts to maintain the present system."

Such were the remarks made in the House; of course, people who spoke thus put themselves under more restraint within the House than outside of the House. My amendment was qualified as revolutionary—neither more nor less. Here is what was said by *Le Canadien* on the 1st of February, the day after that on which this Bill was discussed. These commentaries apply to a great part of the Act now before us:

"The hon. member for Montmagny, as Mr. Angers said, wants to give the right of voting to everybody except to those who sleep in the street. This appreciation is correct. In fact, Mr. Langelier asked for univeral suffrage in cunning and disguised terms."

Will it be pretended that the universal suffrage is not asked, I will not say in cunning terms, but in disguised terms, and the Government is asking something more than I asked, and more than I would have dared to ask,

"Mr. Langelier will be called to account by his electors, but we hope that they will not allow him to come again in the House as the advocate of universal suffrage, for either one is a Catholic or one is not. If a man is a Catholic, even if he is a professor in one of the universities, he is bound to submit to the instructions of the Church. Now, Mr. Langelier knows very well that universal suffrage has been reneatedly denounced by Pius IX as one of the most abominable doctrines."

Such were, Mr. Speaker, the statements made by the Conservative speakers and the Conservative press in 1875, with regard to the somewhat inoffensive amendments which I had the honor to move, when I merely asked for the right of suffrage in favor of householders, of holders of diplomas from universities, of school teachers, of lawyers, of doctors and of members of the other liberal professions. It was stated that I wanted to submit the country to universal suffrage; the same thing was said of another amendment, which proposed to give the right of suffrage to those who had a certain amount deposited in a savings bank. These were revolutionary amendments, which were to lead to universal suffrage. Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask you, what would that Conservative paper have said if those who, like me, moved these amendments, had proposed women suffrage? Nothing less than the end of the world would have been predicted. This way of acting of the party which is now in power recalls to my mind the scene of the *Médecin malgré lui*. It will be remembered that the doctor in question being interviewed on the case of a patient who had been brought before him, was putting the heart in the right side and the liver in the left side. He was told that he was mistaken; that these organs were not generally placed in that way. His answer was: "We, doctors of a new kind, have changed all that." Well, the hon. gentlemen opposite seem to have changed all that. In 1875 universal suffrage was an abomination. To-day it is absolutely necessary. The first principle—according to the First Minister, and all his followers are ready to assert it, the Conservative principle—for with these gentlemen Conservative principles are the first principles—is not only the right of suffrage for the graduates of universities, for those who have received a certain education or who are holding a position as professional men, it is not only the right of voting for those who have a certain amount in the savings banks, but the right of suffrage for all those who have a certain income, whether they have property qualification or not Solicitor-General Angers told us that these men who had capital in savings banks should invest it in industry, and let the country have the benefit of such investment; that it would be contrary to the interest of their country and of their Province to qualify them simply on their capital. It was a revolutionary idea to propose the contrary; to-day this idea is absolutely Conservative. Sir, I ask, what has brought this change? Is it the principles which have changed colors, or is it the Conservative party whose ideas are being changed? Is it sufficient to be called Conservative in order to admit anything? Is it sufficient that things which have been called revolutionary, radical, un-Catholic, and all that is contrary to that which deserves respect, should be brought under the cover of a Government who style themselves Conservatives in order to become Conservative. In short, do these gentlemen pretend that the flag covers the merchandise and that the moment the merchandise goes under the blue flag, whatever may be that merchandise, no matter how radical it may be, there is nothing more to be said; it is a merchandise which every good Conservative not only must take, but must also declare to be good. Mr. Speaker, it has been stated that the present Bill would extend the franchise in the Province of Quebec. This is true, to a certain extent, but it will also limit it to a great extent. What is proposed by this Bill? It proposes, in the first place, a franchise based on real property, but discriminates between the towns and cities, and what is called counties. What is the real estate franchise proposed for cities and towns? It is a franchise based on real property of the venal value of $300 or of $20 of rental value. In other localities it consists of real property of a venal value of $150, or of a rental value of $20. Such is the proposed property qualification. In the Province of Quebec to-day we have no such distinction. We have no discrimitation between the towns and cities on the one part and the counties on the other part. It is a discrimination between the counties and towns which have a right to send representatives to Parliament. There are only two of these cities in the Province of Quebec—Montreal and Quebec. There are other towns, such as Sherbrooke and Three Rivers, each of which form part of an electoral division, but these electoral divisions contain other territory besides the towns in question. So that, in the Province of Quebec, we have only two cities to which this real estate of the venal value of $300 and $30 rental value apply. For the remainder of the Province the franchise consists in the possession of a property of a venal value of $200 or a rental value of $20. So that there will be no extension whatever as to the rental value, which is the basis of the right of suffrage in the whole Province of Quebec, outside of the cities of Quebec and Montreal. And will not the franchise be restricted in several towns of the Province to which the higher franchise provided for by the present Bill will apply? It will be the case with the towns of Lévis, Montmagny, Rimouski, Three Rivers, Sherbrooke, Berthier, Louiseville, Sorel,

Farnham, Beauharnois, Valleyfield, Joliette, Ste. Thérèse, Longueuil, Ste. Hyacinthe, St. John. Perhaps there are others still.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). (Translation.) Does the hon. gentleman pretend that if this Bill becomes law the number of voters in the town of Montmagny will be less than it was before?

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) There must be less, because at the present time every individual in that town who is the owner of a property valued at $200 has a right to vote, and according to this Bill he must have $300 worth of real property.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). (Translation.) What will the hon. member do with the farmers' sons and mechanics' sons?

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) There are none in towns.

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation.) Then the hon. member is not at all acquainted with the population of the town of Montmagny.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) What I say is not for that town in particular, but for every one of the towns I have just named. An individual who owns a property of the venal value of $200, or of a rental value of $20 a year, has a right to vote. If the Bill becomes law he must have a value of $300 in order to vote. But that is not all, and I specially call the attention of the members from the Province of Quebec on this, because this is very important to us. We must ask ourselves what will be the effect of the law if the Bill is adopted? At the present time, in our Province, the proprietor or occupier are qualified, either if the property has a real value of $200 or if it has an annual value of $20; that is to say, a proprietor in one of the towns to which I have just referred, who owns a property of a real value of $200, has a right to vote. If his property is only worth $150, but if its annual value is $20, he still has a right to vote. The same thing applies to the occupier. There is a difference only as regards the lessees, for whom both values must be combined—the real value of $200, and the rental of $20. But, for the owner or occupier, this is not necessary. Read the new Bill, and you will see that it provides that the proprietor can only be qualified on the venal value of his property. Thus, an individual who would own a property valued at $150, but rented at $20, can vote, according to the present law. He cannot vote under the Bill which is now proposed. Only the owner of a property rented at $20 or $25 will have a right to vote. Thus, we find that a very important class of electors will be deprived of the right of voting. This Bill will deprive from the right of voting as many persons, and even more than it will qualify. It will result in extending somewhat the right of suffrage in Quebec and Montreal; but these two localities are the only ones in which it will have such a result.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). (Translation.) Then, this Bill does not tend to establish universal suffrage.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) Now, this Bill admits some of the franchises to which I have referred in the Province of Quebec, and which will astonish a good many—franchises which are called fancy franchises in England. Thus, one of the new franchises is that of the farmers' sons. Well, this right of franchise will not benefit the Province of Quebec, and those who know that Province will admit that. I do not know what is the custom in the other Provinces. Still, I think that, in the Province of Ontario, when the farmers' sons reach a certain age, they continue to live with their father, even after they are married. That is the way in the English part of my county; but, as a rule, in the Province of Quebec, the farmer's son, as soon as he is married, takes a farm, which is separate from his father's farm. He would be qualified under the present law, but he will not be under the new law. I repeat it, only a very few will be qualified under this Bill. But not only does it introduce a new franchise; the promoters of the Bill started with an idea which they have not carried out to the end; they have shown themselves very inconsistent. If the right of suffrage is admitted in favor of an individual who is neither an owner of property nor a lessee, nor an occupier, simply because he is the son of a farmer—that is to say, the son of a proprietor—why should not the same favor be extended to all those who are under the same circumstances? Why should it not be extended to the son of a shoemaker or a blacksmith? Why is this Bill only in favor of the farmers' sons? And above all, why is not that favor extended to the daughter living with her parents? The right of suffrage in favor of unmarried women is admitted, but it is under a peculiar condition —these women must live in an independent manner. It sees to me that a daughter living with her parents would deserve the right of franchise much more than a daughter who lives away from her parents. Now, Mr. Speaker, another thing strikes me: Why is that particular franchise granted only in the counties? Why is it not granted to all sons of proprietors, whether the father is a farmer, a shoemaker, or a trader? Why not grant it to those who are living in the cities as well as to those who live in the counties? If it is thought that the son is sufficiently interested in real property because he lives with his father, this must be equally true in cities. The same rule should have been admitted for the farmers' sons and for the occupiers' sons. If the son of a proprietor is admitted to a vote by reason of the right which is possessed by his father, why not grant the same favor to the farmer's son. Sir, this Bill is full of contradictions; it is evident that the promoters of it did not start from any fixed principle. These new franchises admitted into this Bill seem to have been thrown into it at random, or rather according to the whim of whoever framed it. I see no principle, no general idea, with which this new franchise might be connected. The hon. member for Montmagny said, a moment ago, that this was not universal suffrage; but where will this lead? When I proposed, in 1875, that the right of suffrage should be granted to householders, it was said that it was universal suffrage. But when the right of suffrage to which I have referred is admitted, is it not in favor of every man of age? If the son of the farmer who owns property is admitted, why not admit the son of the tenant farmer; and if we admit these, why not admit the sons of those who have right to vote, and then this leads us simply to universal suffrage. I do not see what argument could be opposed to whoever would propose universal suffrage after this Bill has been adopted, because the answer will be this: You have admitted the principle of personal representation; well, every man who is of age must be a voter, and we must give him the right of suffrage.

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation.) The hon. member evidently forgets that he has just said that the present Bill will diminish the number of votes.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) It will diminish it in certain localities, but the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) seems to think that in order to introduce a Liberal Bill one must extend the franchise, while it must be restricted for a Conservative Bill. It is a peculiar idea. It is not the number of electors which determines the quality. A Bill may be introduced which would give the right to vote to a great number of electors, and which would be a very Conservative Bill. Suppose that to-day a Bill would be introduced in France asking that the right of suffrage be granted to communists only, it would be a Bill which would restrict suffrage, but which would nevertheless be a very

radical Bill. It is the principles which form the basis on which the qualification of voters is determined, which makes this Bill either good or bad. Now, this Bill also admits the principle of franchise based on income. Formerly it was a crime to propose the introduction of this new franchise, to-day it is an act worthy of credit. If the First Minister persists with his Bill what will become of all the Conservatives who have denounced this proposition in the Quebec House in 1875? The Bill also provides for woman suffrage. This opens out a question much broader than that of the mere right of suffrage. If the right of suffrage is granted to women how are we to prevent them from being elected? When, later on, they will come and claim the right of being admitted to all public offices, will we be in a position to refuse them? The right of voting implies the right of being elected and of occupying any official position. The right of suffrage is the right of taking part in the administration of public affairs. How are we to admit women within certain limits only? What greater inconvenience will there be to see a woman elected than to see her attending public meetings, taking part in the elections and in all the agitation to which they give rise. I will readily admit, Mr. Speaker that this is not the first time that woman suffrage is brought before the public. The question was raised in the United States. Wendell Philipps delivered some of his most eloquent speeches in favor of woman suffrage, but to-day in the most enlightened countries, nobody ever had the idea of proposing it as a practical idea, when once this principle was laid down theoretically. Thus in the English House of Commons, even this year, Mr. Gladstone gave it to understand that his personal opinion would not be adverse to woman suffrage; but he declared that he did not wish to introduce it in his Bill, because it was too important a question to make it accessory to a Franchise Bill. He was satisfied that to give the right of suffrage to women would be to open to them all public offices, and probably he was not prepared to go that far at one stroke. I am anxious to see, Mr. Speaker, how our friends, the Conservatives of the Province of Quebec, will come and ask woman suffrage for our Province. How they will come and prove that this is a Conservative measure; that that measure is required by the first principles, that these principles require that suffrage should be granted to women. Now, Sir, this Bill not only gives the right of suffrage to women, but it introduces it in a manner which seems absurd to me. The right of suffrage is restricted to unmarried women. If the right of suffrage is to be limited to one class of women, it seems to me that it ought to be in favor of married women, for the right of suffrage has always been considered—this was said by Mr. Angers—as a reward given to those to whom it is granted. Well, are we to reward women who do not marry or women who do marry? Sir, all the historians are loud in their praise of Augustus on account of his passing the celebrated Julia law. When Augustus first became Emperor, people were complaining that the empire was being depopulated. People declined to marry in order to avoid the burdens of marriage; the cost of living was high, people liked to live in comfort and they did not wish to bind themselves to the burdens of connubial life. What did Augustus do? He passed a law the wisdom of which is the object of the unceasing praise of the learned men. This law gave a pecuniary reward to those who married and had children, and punished, indirectly, those who did not marry. It was thus: Those who where not married and who were heirs to a legacy jointly with those who were married were deprived of their rights in favor of that latter class. The idea of rewarding those who did not marry never entered Augustus' mind, on the contrary the deep wisdom of that law was highly praised. Well, Mr. Speaker, the present law does just the contrary. If Augustus' law was wise, it is certainly not so with this one. It rewards by the right of suffrage, not the women who marry but those who do not marry. Still there is something more serious connected with the carrying out of that law. Not only is it contrary to all precedents, but it will be admitted that there is something strange in it. Who are the unmarried women who will take advantage of it? There is a respectable class of unmarried women, it is those who abstain from marriage by religious profession; but as to those who abstain from it in order to shun the burdens of it, I think they should not be rewarded. Who are the unmarried women who will take advantage of it? It is a class of women who are occupying in society a position such as to deter the respectable women from exercising their right, because they will not consent to exercise it at the same time as the women mentioned in the first place. Thus in Quebec, Montreal and other great cities of the Dominion, if the right of suffrage was given to all respectable women who form the great majority, then they might exercise it without having to blush for it. But, in the large cities, will we see the respectable unmarried women exercising that right? No, they will be ashamed to do it, because they would be obliged to exercise it side by side with women of loose character. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is what is implied by this right of suffrage granted to unmarried women by this Bill. Now this Bill consecrates another very important principle which has reference to the preparation of voters' lists. As I said a while ago, it is a principle which is altogether foreign, not only to the history of our election laws, but also to the practice which has been constantly followed in all the Provinces of Confederation. The principle which is sought to be established is to have these lists prepared by officers appointed by the Government. What has been the practice followed until to-day in the preparation of this list? In the Province of Quebec we have a mode of preparation which gives the greatest possible guarantee of honesty and fairness. There is such a great number of phases that it is nearly impossible for any persons who wish to give themselves a little trouble, to lose their right of suffrage. Thus, in the first place we have the valuation roll of all the real estate which is made every three years, and revised every year. This roll is prepared by proprietors residing in the municipality who are supposed to know perfectly well the value of property. Three sworn valuators are charged with the duty of valuating the property. Moreover, these gentlemen prepare the valuation roll with a view to municipal taxation on real property, and this takes away from them any idea of uselessly overrating or underrating the value of property, for if they overrated it the proprietors would be exposed to pay higher taxes than would be necessary, and in the opposite case they would expose the municipality to lose a certain amount of income. But that is not all, when the roll is prepared, it is filled and open for examination to all interested parties before the municipal council. All interested parties may attend and complain if the roll has not been prepared correctly. They are allowed to raise any objection in order to determine whether the valuation is too high or too low. The law goes still further. It was feared that the municipal council might be unjust, or that it might be deficient in knowledge as to the value of property. There is a guarantee in the appeal to the county council, it is even possible to sue for a writ of error before the Circuit Court if there are any illegalities in the form. So much as regards the valuation roll. Now this roll is used as a basis for the voters' list. No one in the Province of Quebec can have his name on the voters' list if it is not already on the valuation roll. Well, when all these precautions have been taken for the preparation of the roll, there is a certainty that everybody's property is entered at its real annual or rental value. The secretary-treasurer is charged with the duty of preparing the voters' list. He is appointed by the municipal council; that is to say he represents the whole municipality; he would be guilty of fraud or partiality should he commit

any irregularity. There is a man who not only is obliged to do his duty because he is pledged to it by his oath of office, but who is interested to do so on account of his reputation. Well, in spite of all these precautions, it was feared that that would not be sufficient to ensure the integrity and impartiality of the list; it may be revised before the council and an appeal may be lodged before a judge of the Superior Court. It will thus be seen, Mr. Speaker, through how many phases, in the Province of Quebec, the preparation of the voters' list has to pass, what are the guarantees the law gives of the integrity and impartiality of our voters' lists. Well it is proposed to do away with all this. This system costs nothing; the secretaries are not paid to do this work; neither are the assessors paid, only their expenses are paid. Everything is done gratis and things are extremely well done; they are so well done that the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) was pointing out the other day the small number of appeals which were lodged against the preparation of the voters' lists. The number of appeals lodged before the judges is so small because the secretary-treasurers and the municipal councils know that they have behind them a superior tribunal to revise their work; a tribunal free from political passion; a tribunal who only looks at law and justice, and it is for that reason that they are so careful in the preparation of the lists. There are hardly any appeals this year. I have heard of only one appeal lodged against the voters' list in the Quebec region. They are getting less and less frequent because the secretary-treasurers know that it would be useless for them to try to act dishonestly, even if they felt so inclined, because the unsound work which they would have been tempted to do could be destroyed. It is proposed to replace all this by officers appointed by the Government. Who will be these officers and what can we expect from them? Either competent lawyers must be appointed, and then they must be paid a high price, for a lawyer worthy of his position must be paid a very high price, and this will cost incredible sums of money. I know what time is required to prepare a voters' list, and I can assert, without fear of being contradicted, as regards the Province of Quebec at least, that in the average electoral division a lawyer who will be willing to do conscientiously that which the law requires of him will have to work, at least, during four or five months in a county. In a great number of municipalities with which I am acquainted a secretary-treasurer who is perfectly familiar with all the electors, who knows them personally, who has before him all the valuation rolls, takes eight days or a fortnight to prepare the voters' list in a locality which is not very large, and the valuators, who are perfectly informed, who know the value of every property, take a fortnight or three weeks, and sometimes a month of hard work, to make their valuation. Mr. Speaker, how much time will it take to a lawyer who will be sent from a city, or who, at all events, will not be taken in each municipality, to prepare this voters' list? This man will be obliged to do alone what is done by the valuators, by the municipal council, and by the secretary-treasurers; that is, to value the properties, to prepare the voters' list and to revise it. I repeat that a lawyer worthy of his position will not take less than five or six months to make the voters' lists for a whole county. Well, how much will we have to pay to a lawyer able to do this work? He must be paid a very high price. An estimate of $1,000 has been given for each of these revisers, and I am satisfied that is a very moderate figure. Now, if we take lawyers who are the rubbish of the profession, we may get them cheaper, but lists will be prepared which will be an insult to the public and to common sense. If things are to be done in a proper manner it will involve an enormous expenditure. Well, are we to expose ourselves to all these expenses? At the present time demands for money are coming in from all directions for great public works of a pressing necessity. This House has been deluged with petitions this year from the inhabitants of the north shore of the river, and a great part of the south shore, asking for the construction of a bridge at Quebec. To secure the building of this bridge it would be necessary that the Government should guarantee the interest during twenty years on the sum of $200,000. Thus, with the cost of the preparation of these lists, two bridges might be built at Quebec. If we were certain that we should always have annual surpluses of $8,000,000, we might be in a position to saddle the country with such an expenditure, but at a moment when the treasury is already strained, and when it is impossible to overtax it any more without putting our credit in jeopardy, how can the promoters of the Bill have this idea to overload the treasury with a burden so useless and so onerous as that of the payment of the preparation of the voters' lists? Mr. Speaker, there is something quite remarkable in the law which creates these revisers, they will have to value real estate, to revise their work themselves after having valued properties which they did not know in many cases, or which they knew very imperfectly. If people are not satisfied they can complain, but complain to whom? To the revisers. And if they are not satisfied, there is a new revision and before whom? Before a judge, not upon questions of fact but only upon questions of law, and only if the reviser is willing. So there will be three degrees of jurisdiction, but at each degree it will always be the same thing; it is just as if, in the Province of Quebec, it was the same judge who would decide in first instance, in revision, and in appeal. One must suppose a great deal of philosophy in a judge to think that he will thus contradict himself; it may happen but it will be very difficult to find a judge who will admit that he has committed a gross error. In England there is a second appeal from the revising barristers. These individuals make a real work of revision, not the original work, which is made by the overseers of the poor in the counties and the clerks of towns in the cities, and it is these lists prepared by these people which are revised by the barristers; they simply act the part of a judge. But our official reviser will be in the first place a simple ministerial officer to value the properties, and when his work is done he will at once transform himself into a judge to judge his own work. Now there is another thing and it is that there will be an appeal from the decision of that revising barrister only if he sees fit. The right of appeal before the Superior Court in the Province of Quebec can only be exercised with the permission of the reviser on a question of law, Well, any one who has any knowledge of human nature will hardly believe that this reviser will allow the appeal when he will be sure that his decision will be reversed; and it will be in his power to so arrange things that the appeal will only be allowed when he will be sure that his decision will be maintained. Therefore this appeal is not serious, it is a mere farce. The part which the revising barrister is going to play reminds me of the part of the promoter of this Bill in the Pacific question when a commission was appointed. A newspaper called *Grip* represented the First Minister playing four different parts. He was seen on the bench as a judge; he was seen in the dock as a prisoner and he appeared as prosecuting attorney and as a witness. Such is the part played by the revising barrister; it is a three-fold part and a contradictory part. This revising barrister or official reviser, as he is called in this Bill, will not only be a man charged with the duty of preparing the voters' list, he will be a man charged with the duty of creating voters. In France when they were to change the constitution after the *coup d'état* of Brumaire, the celebrated Seiyés had drafted a constitution under which an individual was to have the title of great elector; this official was to receive a high salary and to keep himself at such a

height that he could not be seen by anybody. Well, these revisers are the great electors of this country; it will be they who will make voters. The only difference between them and the great elector of Mr. Seiyés will be that they will probably not keep themselves in an elevated position above all party interests. If anybody came to-day and proposed a law whose effect would be that in each county one man would choose the member and send him to the House, there would be but one cry of indignation. Well that is just what is proposed to-day, only it is not done in a frank and honest manner. That object is sought to be attained by indirect means. Mr. Speaker, if Henry VIII was living to-day, I think that he could not help admiring at least this part of the law. It will be remembered that one day he wished to give force of law to his proclamations, but happily he did not succeed. But if he had lived in our time, and if he had had the imagination of the First Minister, I think he would have found a very simple means of securing this result; he might have created official revisers, and he would have been sure that these people would have sent to the House of Commons members who would have given the effect of laws to his proclamations. It is probably what is sought to be done to-day; it is intended to have people who will make electors or members who will only support the present Government. Sir, I will only detain the House a few moments more. I have not indicated in detail all the objections which can be raised against the Bill; to-day I will limit myself to three great principles which the Bill is intented to sanction in our legislation: 1st, a uniform franchise for all the Provinces in the Dominion; 2nd, purely personal franchise, a principle which has already been proposed amongst us and which was qualified as being revolutionnary in 1875; 3rd, preparation of the voters' list by officers of the Government, a principle which does not exist in England nor any where else. The First Minister has to-day shown himself very easy with his new franchises, I am satisfied that he would be willing enough to sacrifice the whole of them. He says he has great affection for woman suffrage. I believe that he would readily sacrifice his friendship for women to the last part of the Bill which deals with the revising barristers and which will not be the reflection of public opinion in the country but the reflection of the opinion of the party in power and of the leaders of that party. But, Mr. Speaker, I am without fear as regards the Province of Quebec. If I was to consider only the interest of my party this provision of the law would not at all disturb my peace of mind. Because if there were any of these officials who would dare to do what it is intended they should do under this Bill, there might be a repetition in the Province of Quebec of what happened at the time of the elections of 1867 when there was an attempt to disfranchise one half of a county. The county which I have the honor to represent contained three parishes which were almost wholly in favor of the Liberal candidate. What did the Conservatives do? They appointed returning officers who received instruction to prevent them from voting; only those who were in favor of the candidate, whose election was desired by the authorities, were allowed to vote and that was done in several places. In the county of Kamouraska—it will be remembered that the question was brought before the House—a returning officer tried to do that which will probably never be attempted under this law It happened that the election could not take place. The indignant electors went and took away the lists from the hands of the returning officer. Such scenes are much to be regretted, but if in the Province of Quebec an attempt is made to deprive the electors from their right of voting through such means as those which are provided in this Bill, the electors will not allow themselves to be robbed of their right of suffrage. The House blamed this officer for the disgraceful scenes which took place and it will be remembered that the life of this unfortunate returning officer was in danger. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the same thing would take place to-day if it was attempted to rob in such a dishonest manner, the electors of that Province of their right of voting. What I am afraid of is the carrying out of such a principle. Until now we have been accustomed to believe that the franchise was the property of the electors and not that of the Government. It is evident that this Bill is intended to be arranged in such a manner as to give a vote to only to such people as are wanted to vote, and to make them vote just as it is required that they should vote. This system, Mr. Speaker, will turn against those who are trying to establish it.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not desire to interrupt the course of the debate, but we have heard that a despatch of a very grave character has been received, and I would ask the Government whether that has been confirmed, or whether the Ministry has any information since that despatch, which, no doubt, they have seen.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; there has been nothing since. Of course, we may expect something very soon, but we have nothing now.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Before the question is put, I desire to offer a few words by way of protest, feeble though these may be against the disposition that is evidenced to press this question and to bring the discussion of this Bill to a close at this late hour in the Session. It has been urged, I am aware, that this Bill has been for a number of years before the country. It is true that a Bill of somewhat similar tenor was submitted by the First Minister as long ago as the year 1870. It is also true that reference was made in the Speech from the Throne to the disposition of the Government, in years that have gone by, to deal with the franchise question, and it is also true that, for the last two preceding Sessions of Parliament, Bills somewhat similar in character to the present have been submitted to the House; but the members of the House are well aware that, excepting the Bill of 1870, none reached beyond a first reading, and, in as many as something like four instances, the project never went beyond a reference in the Speech from the Throne. That being the case, I think it is dealing unfairly with this House and with the country; I think it is an outrage that honorable men, under all circumstances, should resent with all the force due to the position they occupy in this House, that a Bill affecting so immensely the interests which are involved in this Bill, embracing a variety of interests, embracing the immeasurable consequences involved in the proposition now before the House, should be submitted at a period of the Session far beyond the duration of many Sessions which have taken place since 1874, and at a period so late in this Session that, were it to receive the same consideration which has been afforded to Bills of much less importance, the Session must necessarily lengthen itself much beyond the period of any Session since Confederation. I have taken some little trouble to ascertain the length to which the Sessions have spun out since 1874. In that year the Session lasted from the 26th March to the 26th May, two months; in 1875 it lasted from the 4th February to the 8th April, two months and four days; in 1876 it lasted from the 10th February to the 12th April, two months and two days; in 1877, from the 8th February to the 28th April, two months and twenty days; in 1878, from the 7th February until the 10th May, three months and three days; in 1879, from the 13th February to the 15th May, three months and two days; in 1880, from the 12th February to the 7th May, two

months and twenty-six days; and, in the subsequent Sessions of 1882, 1883, and 1884, the Sessions lasted three months and eight days, three months and sixteen days, and three months and two days, respectively. Now, that being the case, it appears to me that a matter of the consequence of that now under discussion cannot by any means be considered within the time that is ordinarily apportioned to the Sessions of Parliament. It may be urged, and I have heard it urged during this discussion, by the few gentlemen on the other side who have attempted to defend the submission of the question at this hour in the Session, that it has been before the country since 1870. I have dealt with that matter already, but I may further say that the history of measures promised in the Speech from the Throne, and the history of measures submitted by the Government, led by the right hon. the present Premier, does not by any means lead the country to the expectation that these measures will be carried into law. If the number of measures that were promised in the different Speeches from the Throne, from 1870 to 1873, and from 1878 until the present, were to be submitted to the present House for disposition, I fancy that not only would the Session last much beyond the expectations of those who are least sanguine about its early close, but it would exhaust most of the year. If that is the case, we are perfectly justified in having acted on the presumption that, with a Bill introduced to its second reading so late in the Session, it was not the intention of the Government to proceed with this measure at the present time. This measure has been treated so cavalierly in the past by the right hon. the leader of the Government, and by many of those who support him, that there was ample reason for the expectation that it would not be proceeded with, and I am sure there was ample justification on the part of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in giving their attention to matters that must of necessity be discussed, and were more likely to be discussed than that now before the House. The right hon. the leader of the Government has treated this question, to my mind, as he has treated many others in the history of his political career. He has produced his jacks-in-the-box, exposed them to public view, left us in the position of "now you see them and now you don't," until, in the majority of cases, we have forgotten entirely that the measures were ever projected. If that is the case, I think it affords ample justification for the position taken on this side of the House, that a measure of this consequence cannot be discussed to the length that it should, and that its importance demands, without its extending the Session far beyond the duration of any Session that has previously been held. I am prepared to assume that responsibility, but I do not want hon. gentlemen opposite to forget the responsibility that lies on them, in having sanctioned, in having participated in a policy which has almost invariably resulted in the submission of the most important measures of the Session at a period approaching its close. We are only doing our duty on this side of the House in entering the strongest protest possible against a course which has militated against the public interest in many cases, which has been productive of more than one ill result and which has led to a re-enactment, to a re-arrangement, to an alteration in many of the statutes which are passed Session after Session, until those who are affected by those enactments scarcely know what they are. I need not bring to the attention of the House other instances of the same nature. We know that a Bill that occupied two whole sittings of this House very recently, the Civil Service Bill, was introduced in the year 1882, on the report of a commission appointed by the hon. gentlemen themselves, a report that ought to have contained what ordinarily would have been the basis of a measure of the kind; but yet, in the year 1883, the hon. gentleman submitted an amendment to that Bill, and in 1884 a second amendment was submitted, while, in the present Session, we have exhausted a material amount of time in fixing up a Bill originally submitted to us in 1882, and which has required revision every year since. Now, there is another case. Last year a Bill was submitted to us closely affecting the interests of the mercantile community—a Bill relating to the inspection of canned goods. We had no sooner, as a legislative body, given our consent to that Bill, and the mercantile community were preparing themselves to accept its provisions and to confine themselves to the legal limits thereof, than an Order in Council had to be issued, withdrawing the Bill from operation. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is another of the minor results that flows from the procrastinating policy that has been unfortunately exhibited in years past by the gentlemen comprising the Administration.

Some hon. MEMBERS. What about the Franchise Bill?

Mr. CAMERON. If hon. gentlemen really wish to know something about the Franchise Bill, and I really believe they do not know much about it, I will give them some information on that point. Mr. Speaker, if there is anything more to be regretted than another, it is the fact that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have, one after another, brought forward fresh propositions, requiring an answer from the Government side, yet since daylight closed upon us not one hon. gentleman opposite has ventured to make a reply to those propositions. I say that the country will mark its condemnation of such a course in reference to this important question. I say that under circumstances such as these, with a Bill of the immense importance of this Bill, involving propositions of a character that are involved in this Bill, it was due to the country, if not due to the House, that hon. gentlemen opposite should have given the reasons that prompted them to support the motion to go into committee on this Bill. Now, if that is the case, I think, there will be an excuse for my occupying the attention of the House for a short time, while I give some reason why I dissent from the proposition that this present measure shall become law. I regret to see the spectacle of a strong party apparently unable to give its reasons for supporting a measure of this kind. I submit to hon. gentlemen themselves whether eight minutes and a half was a sufficient time for the Premier to devote to the introduction of a measure of this kind.

An hon. MEMBER. Long enough.

Mr. CAMERON. Yes; long enough for gentlemen who are disposed to vote for any measure that is submitted to them from the Government side of the House. Mr. Speaker, if there is anything that would lead me to loose faith in the character of representative institutions, it is such a fact as I have mentioned just now; and it is particularly the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite receive a statement of that kind with derision instead of with shame. It was, Mr. Speaker, left to the hon. member for Ottawa county (Mr. Wright) to support the measure in a speech of slightly longer duration than that of the leader of the Government; it was left to him, I say, to deal with that Bill and to stand up in its defence in a speech marked by all the characteristic eloquence which has always marked his deliverances in this House; but I may say, for myself—and it may have struck many hon. gentlemen, possibly, on both sides of the House—that, much as we admired the character, much as we admired the eloquence of that speech, there were many characteristics about it that, in the present emergency, we particularly regretted. As a young member myself, I had been led to took upon the hon. member for Ottawa county—and I should have been glad if he were here at present, though there are more than I who are prepared to excuse his absence—I say I had been led to look upon the member for Ottawa county as one of those who, no matter what party question is involved, is

prepared to stand up for the rights and assert the privileges of this House on behalf of its humblest member. Not only did I form that estimate of his character, but I had also come to the conviction that, in a measure involving so many important considerations as this, the true bearing of the question would have been grasped by him with the ability that, I am prepared to say, he unquestionably possesses. Instead of that, we find that for some twenty minutes, or half an hour, he discussed the woman franchise question—a discussion which was entirely unnecessary and irrelevant, if we are to understand the import of the words of the First Minister in introducing the Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, order, order.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I think that, if not out of consideration for ourselves, at least consideration for the dignity of the House, hon. members ought to keep order. We are trying to discuss this matter as best we can, and the least they can do is to give an opportunity to some hon. members to express their own views, and those who do not like to hear them can go to bed.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope that hon. gentlemen will keep quiet. These noises are very undignified and unseemly.

Mr. CAMERON. If any gentlemen are indisposed to listen, I am sure we do not desire them to remain. They can exercise the same privilege that is open to any other gentleman on this side of the House, of retiring from the Chamber. At the same time, I consider that it is the right of every hon. gentleman here to discuss a measure of this kind as fully as he is disposed to do so. I am prepared to extend that right to hon. gentlemen opposite, and I am determined to claim it for myself.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has been speaking only a short time, and I think he should be heard.

Mr. CAMERON. I am prepared to insist on continuing my speech, so long as I address myself to the question before the House. It is true that the Minister of Public Works dealt with the question also in a speech which seemed to have been guided in its length by that of the hon. gentlemen who immediately preceded him; and if there was anything peculiarly characteristic in that speech it seemed to be the energy with which the party whip was lashed, in order to make it understood that this in all its essentials was a party question and that party lines must be tightly drawn. I suppose we are to accept that as a necessary alternative, and our intention is to express our opinion with regard to the many absurd provisions of the Bill, and to show the country that we, if not hon. gentlemen opposite, are prepared to maintain what we consider to be the rights of the people of the Dominion.

Mr. RYKERT. That is a good sentiment.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). If that is a good sentiment, I hope the hon. gentleman will be ready to act on it more frequently. It will then not be necessary to refer to such an Act as disgraced the Statute Book in 1882, by which, I think, the hon. gentleman sits here.

Mr. RYKERT. You show your ignorance of the matter.

Mr. CAMERON. I may show my ignorance as to some of the details. There are some hon. gentlemen who can ——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman must come to the question before the House.

Mr. CAMERON. I am willing to accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and I shall confine myself to the question before the House. If hon. members persist in interjecting remarks, I must reply. I desire to draw the attention of the House for a short time to the remarks of another hon. gentleman who was in his seat for a considerable portion of the sitting, and who, I regret, is not present at this particular hour—I refer to the hon. member for Ottawa city. That hon. gentleman was kind enough to inform us that he had participated in a great many elections, having lived in western Ontario since his early life, and he had taken some interest in visiting western constituencies and in seeing how voters' lists were prepared. I am aware the hon. gentleman has done a number of western constituencies that honor. He did a western constituency that honor in the latter part of 1883, at a time when there was a very active political contest, a double-barrelled fight for both the Local Legislature and Dominion Parliament. I make no protest against his visit at that time or any other time. He claims rightly that he is a Canadian citizen, and is a native of a section of the country in which the riding in question is situated. But I demur entirely to the statement that his visit was prompted by any such desire as that indicated in his speech. During that time a notable incident in election tactics occurred. A committeeman in the party in opposition to us was discovered with the sum of $100, which he said had been given him to use for illegal purposes in the contest in question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I have to do with the hon. member for Ottawa. I am dealing with the remarks of that hon. gentleman, and those remarks tended to show that he had participated in many elections.

Mr. McCALLUM. The hon. gentleman said nothing about $100.

Mr. CAMERON. I do not suppose the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) cares to hear about that $100. The hon. member for Ottawa told the House he took some interest in visiting western constituencies and seeing how voters' lists were prepared. I propose to show how voters' lists were prepared. A gentleman acting on the political side which the hon. member for Ottawa has supported since he took his seat in this House was discovered with $100 in his possession, which he admitted had been given him for illegal election purposes. The case afterwards came to trial. The gentleman who made the discovery made an affidavit to that effect. A counter affidavit was made by the party in whose possession the money was found. The party with whom the money was found was prosecuted before the magistrate, and charged with having made a solemn declaration which was not true. The case came first before a magistrate. That magistrate gave his decision in the court, a portion of which I shall read. The documents on which the prosecution was based had, in the meantime, been got out of the way.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman has no right to refer to a past debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. All through the stages of the debate, it is the same debate. But this question of trial has nothing to do with the principle of the franchise.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If I understood the hon. member rightly, he was speaking on a very important question that is in the Bill—that is, with respect to voters' lists. His remarks have led to that, and I think the House will apprehend the reason he has done so.

Mr. SPEAKER. This about a prosecution before a magistrate. It is too remote from the question.

Mr. CAMERON. Perhaps, if I am allowed to proceed, I shall be able to show its connection. I desire to show the connection.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member says that there is a connection between his remarks and the sub-

ject, I think the rule is that the Speaker should allow him to proceed, until he sees whether that connection is borne out or not.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman say there is a connection with the question before the House, I hope he will show, as soon as possible, what that connection is.

Mr. CAMERON. I will show the connection, Mr. Speaker. I think I have based my remarks on the speech made by the hon. member for Ottawa city (Mr. Mackintosh). I have endeavored to show that when he makes these references to the voters' list, his statement is open to a construction which this House did not apprehend, and I am endeavoring to show the construction that they are fairly open to. Now, if any hon. gentleman here said that he was in Montreal yesterday, and somebody else was prepared to dispute it, surely it becomes a question between the two gentlemen. I say the hon. member for Ottawa city, in making those references to western constituencies——

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I never mentioned western constituencies, and it will not be found in the report of my remarks. I do not know to what the hon. gentleman is referring, but I never mentioned western constituencies.

Mr. CAMERON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to read what he did say, from *Hansard*. I made a note of his remarks myself at the time, and I afterwards looked them up in *Hansard*, and this is what he said, as reported:

"Having lived in Ontario for a great many years, having participated in a great many elections, having lived in western Ontario all my early life, I took some interest in visiting western constituencies, in seeing how voters' lists were prepared."

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I was referring to the year 1871, when I ran in North Middlesex as a candidate, and when I found over 200 votes unjustly and illegally placed on the list. I had no reference to West Middlesex at all.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). You were there.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I was there, and, so far as I am concerned, I challenge any gentleman in this House, or outside of it, to show that on any occasion I was guilty of corruption in any election. The hon. gentleman mentioned something about $100, but I repeat that, so far as I am concerned, I challenge him or any gentleman in the House, or outside of it, to show that on any occasion I corrupted the electorate, or knew of $100 being given to any one corruptly.

Mr. MULOCK. The point seems to arise——

Mr. SPEAKER. Do you rise to the point of order?

Some hon. MEMBERS. There is no question of order.

Mr. MULOCK. Have I the right to speak on the point of order under discussion.

Mr. SPEAKER. No; there is no point of order under discussion.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I do not think any gentleman in this House, other than the hon. member for Ottawa, understood me as saying that he was the party charged with having made that expenditure of money. I was desirous of making that point clear, as I wish to be perfectly honest and fair in this matter. I do not desire to prejudice him in the slightest.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. You cannot do it; the people know that you cannot do it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must see that to go into the whole question about any hon. gentleman's real or supposed corruption, in some election, has really nothing to do with the question of the Franchise Bill. That is why I asked the hon. gentleman to endeavor to connect his remarks with the subject before the House.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. member for Ottawa has explained that his references were to the year 1882, or the year preceding that.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. No; I explained that my references were to the year 1871, when I ran as a candidate for North Middlesex.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). When you went out through the school house window.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. If that remark is any satisfaction to hon. gentlemen, or if it is any argument against the Franchise Bill, they can accept it as such. It is about all the argument I have heard, so far.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. gentleman has reflected on a remark made on this side, and surely he must allow some reference to his own remarks, and I question if anything he has said lately has had any strong bearing on the Franchise Bill. At the same time, I want to say this, that after having said 1882, when I meant 1872——

Mr. MACKINTOSH. No; 1871.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I have been endeavoring to show the fact that the hon. gentleman's acquaintance with voters' lists is not of that intimately public character, so far as the western constituencies go, that is intended to be conveyed by his remarks, and I think, certainly, I am in order. I will, however, bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and I am not disposed to proceed with that phase of the question any further. Now, I had determined also to deal, at some little length, with the question of costs. I have made some calculations of my own, based on some little experience of municipal matters in Ontario, and if the figures seem large the fault must be attributed, not to me, but to the peculiar character of the Bill under discussion. In Ontario my estimate is that a county having three representatives, a county having twenty-six municipalities, costs in the neighborhood of $4,500 a year for assessment, making $1,500 for each constituency. That, of course, leaves no estimate whatever for the cost of the printing of the lists, and for the other necessary expenses which are always contingent on that sort of work. Now, at the same rate for the 211 constituencies in the Dominion, the amount would be $316,500. That, Mr. Speaker, is independent altogether of the disbursements; of the many incidental expenses provided for under this Act. Now, let us proceed under the clauses of the Act, and follow out what the probable cost of the machinery provided under it would be. There are to be provided 211 revising barristers, and I have estimated the cost of those to be $1,000 each. I do not know that the sum is at all excessive; I do not think revising barristers, such as are contemplated, if we are to believe hon. gentlemen opposite—that is, barristers of five years standing, barristers such as the hon. member for Ottawa said would be men whose reputation would be a guarantee that they acted fairly towards all parties—I say if such men are to be appointed to do the work expected of them, they will not be found to do it, I think, for less than that—$1,000 each. That makes $211,000.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I was not referring to Grit lawyers.

Mr. CAMERON. No; I fancy not. There is no disposition to have Grit lawyers provided for in this Bill. Now, 211 clerks must necessarily be provided, and these, at $600 each, will cost a total of $126,600. Provision is also made in the Bill for appointment of a bailiff for each revising barrister, which means 211 bailiffs in the Dominion; and these, at the low estimate of $300 each, will cost $63,300. It is also provided by the Bill that the travelling expenses

of those officials shall be paid. Now, the travelling expenses allowed to civil servants when they are away from headquarters on Government business is fixed by Order in Council at $3.50 a day and railway fare. I have estimated the total expenses at say, $6 a day, so that if the revising officers, with their retinue, revise an average of 1,000 a month——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh!

Mr. CAMERON. Hon. gentlemen seem to doubt my estimate; but just let me draw their attention to the facts. It takes in Ontario, on the average, about two months to assess a municipality in which there are 1,000 names on the voters' list. That fact is within my personal knowledge. Now, if each of these officials is to be paid at the same rate for travelling expenses as civil servants, this item will amount to $2,700 for each constituency; and assuming that they will revise 1,000 a month, and that in each constituency there are 6,000 names on the average on the voters' list, that means $569,700 for the Dominion for travelling expenses alone. Now, that is possibly a large estimate, but I have given the basis on which I have made it, and hon. gentlemen may criticise it if they please. I have stated that two months is required to assess a municipality that has 1,000 voters; the average number of voters in an Ontario constituency is 6,000, and it must necessarily take six times that length of time to revise the whole of them. But if I reduce that estimate by 50 per cent.—and I do not think that a lawyer who is not particularly disposed to look after the interest of the Government will do the work much more quickly—that will reduce the estimate to $284,850; printing the voters' lists will amount to not less than $30,000, so that we get a total of $715,400 for the primary preparation of the voters' lists under this Act.

Mr. RYKERT. Is that all?

Mr. CAMERON. Possibly it is not as much as the hon. member for Lincoln would wish it. We know that he has had previous connection with Governments in matters that were of personal interest to himself, and if he is not very much belied, he has profited materially by it. I suppose he is quite prepared to look after the interests of those who will share in this $715,000 which the Canadian public will have to pay. Now, it must be remembered that that work which I estimate will cost $715,400 is now undertaken and completed without one dollar of expense to this Dominion. Besides, notwithstanding that the work may be undertaken by the Dominion under the provisions of this Bill, the municipalities will have to continue to their work equally as if this Bill had never passed. Does not that fact itself furnish a good reason why hon. gentlemen should stay their hands in passing this Bill, which is unnecessary, so far as the correct revision of the voters' lists is concerned, which is unnecessary, I believe, so far as any tinkering with the franchise is concerned, and which, to me, only seems necessary to those who expect to obtain positions under it. Now, the debate has indicated a very decided opinion on the part of some gentlemen as to the impropriety of departing from the present provincial franchises. I hold strongly to that opinion myself. I believe that the complete protection which is assured to every political party, no matter what its strength may be, by the present Voter's Lists Act in the Province of Ontario against any fraud or injustice, renders this Act absolutely unnecessary. In the first place, there must necessarily be an honest basis to it, because every man whose name appears on the list is personally interested to know that he is correctly assessed—why? Because his taxes follow that assessment. Does he not take care that he is not over-assessed, in order that he may not pay more than his proper share of taxes? Does it not necessarily follow that if there is any effort at all, it will be to lower his taxable rate. Consequently, the public is protected against any fraud being perpetrated. Have we not also the protection of the revision court, formed from the council of each municipality, which is directly amenable to the people; and that court punishes any injustice in the most summary manner. I am aware myself that in more that one instance the public have marked their disapprobation, independent of party inclinations, of any attempt to bolster up the voters' lists in the interest of any political party. But suppose that the community does not mark its disapprobation of the conduct of these men; suppose the municipal council is prepared to take advantage of its power; suppose its members are so much allied with a political party that they determine to sacrifice the position they occupy before the public as honest men, and to alter the lists for the advantage of some political party. There is still an appeal to the county judge, and the appointment of the county judge is practically under the control of this Parliament. If that is the case, is there not ample protection against any misconduct on the part of any local officials in the interest of any particular party? Now, the House is aware that the Ontario Legislature, within a very recent time, made very material alterations in the qualifications of voters. It has been claimed that the franchise proposed by this Bill is much more liberal than that existing in the majority of Provinces, and much more liberal than that existing in Ontario. Now, such is not the case. The present franchise in the Province of Ontario gives a vote to every one possessed of real property, in cities and towns, to the value of $200. If hon. gentlemen will turn up their copies of the Bill and are at all inclined to read them, if they have not done so already, and, judging from the interruptions of some of those hon. gentlemen, some of them have not, they will discover that the real property qualification in cities and towns required under this Bill is $400, or double the amount required by the Ontario Franchise Act. They will also find that the Franchise Act, in villages and towns in Ontario, is $100, whereas in this Bill it is $150; they will also find that the income franchise in this Bill is $400, whereas in Ontario it is but $250; in addition to that, in the Ontario Act there is a wage-earning franchise, which is not found in this Bill, by which every one who earns wages to the amount of $250 a year has the right to demand that his name be placed on the roll. That is really a workingman's franchise; it places the franchise under the control of the workingman; it gives him some leverage in the destiny of the country, a leverage this Bill absolutely denies him; yet hon. gentlemen opposite, when they have deigned to enter this discussion at all, have claimed that the franchise now proposed is much more liberal than that adopted in Ontario. The effect of this Bill practically will be to disfranchise a great many of those who will be on the voters' list for the Ontario Legislature. An hon. gentleman opposite admitted that would be its effect, and all hon. gentlemen must admit that will be the effect in the Provinces where manhood suffrage is the rule. It was admitted that was the effect in the Province of Prince Edward Island by an hon. gentleman opposite earlier in the debate, and it is generally admitted that will be the effect, as far as British Columbia is concerned. Let me examine for a moment what will be the principal consequences of this Bill, if passed, as regards Ontario. We have, in the first place, as I have mentioned, the fact that there is a difference of 100 per cent., as far as real property franchise goes. Now, that difference embraces a very large number of people in villages and towns. In townships, other than in localities that are immediately contiguous to cities and towns, it will not have a very material effect, because in very few instances, in the settled parts of Ontario, are there any farmers of any standing whatever who are assessed at less than $150; but in villages and in towns it will make a material difference indeed—a difference that I estimate, in a town having, say 1,000 voters, will amount

to 15 per cent. Not only is there that difference, but in addition there is the omission of the wage-earners' franchise, given by the Ontario Legislature, which must make a difference of between 5 and 10 per cent. besides, and in all these respects the franchise of Ontario is at least 20 per cent. lower and will embrace 20 per cent. more voters than the Bill now before the House. As between the two Houses, my contention is that the franchise for this House ought to be the lowest, because it is not by any means the man who is the wealthiest or the best off that necessarily pays the most money into the coffers of the Dominion, and I say it is a decided injustice that the franchise now under discussion should be, as it is, so much more restrictive than that of the Provinces. But I am firmly of the conviction, as I said, that each Province should control its own franchise. Many hon. gentlemen are now aware that in the Province of Ontario we have as many franchises as we can possibly ask the community to give their earnest consideration to at present. We have the school trustee franchise, in the first place, which is very liberal in its character; we have, in the next place, the franchise for municipal councilors, and we have the franchise for the Legislature of Ontario. Now, it will be noticed that these franchises in Ontario have been constantly becoming more assimilated. The franchise for the Provincial Legislature was very similar, until recently, to that for municipal councilors; that for municipal councilors is now highest, but it has this provision: that ladies having the same relations in life as those included in the Bill before the House, have votes for the election to municipal councils of Ontario, and consequently the direction of legislation in that Province must necessarily be to enfranchise them, as far as the Legislative Assembly is concerned. If that be the case, and it is a very reasonable deduction, from the action taken recently by that Legislature in lowering the franchise, that the next agitation will be to assimilate the Dominion franchise, if this Bill passes into law, to that enjoyed for provincial purposes by the most liberally enfranchised Provinces. To show that is the direction of Conservative thought in the Province of Ontario, I will take the trouble of reading to the House a few extracts from one of the most prominent Conservative journals in that Province, a journal that hon. gentlemen will concede is an authority, as far as the expression of Conservative thought goes, in the Province of Ontario. I refer to the London *Free Press*. That journal, in discussing the Franchise Bill, on the 21st of this month, said:

"One of the most important lines that it opens up is an extension of the franchise, so that in respect to the Dominion it approaches almost to manhood suffrage. The Conservative party is altogether in advance of the so-called Liberals on this and similar issues. It was Mr. Meredith, in the Ontario Legislature, who proposed to open the franchise to all who were not laboring under legal disability."

Again it says:

"But the Conservative Democratic party of the day is that which acts with the people, and it is never weary of doing them good in a hundred different ways"

We have decided reason, looking at the provisions of this Bill, to question that particular statement however. Again, the same paper says:

"And if the argument is good as respects the men, may it not be held to be so fully as regards the members of the other sex? And to have all the women voting as well as all the men would be to introduce a new, an emotional element, into human affairs, which the majority of the people are not at the present time prepared for. It would not be matter for surprise, therefore, if those clauses which propose to confer the privilege to vote at parliamentary elections on large numbers of ladies should not carry at this time."

Leaving the conviction uppermost in the mind of this journalist that it was only a question of time, and that woman suffrage was a necessary consequence of the extended franchise which he assumes to be one of the principles of this Bill. I think, however, that on the question of the relative liberality of the Ontario and the proposed Dominion franchise there is ample room, as I have shown, to differ with that journal. I have other objections to make to the Bill under discussion. In Ontario, and in some of the other Provinces, at least, the assessment rolls in the different municipalities are taken as the basis for the voters' lists. I have explained that this gives in itself a very decided assurance that justice will be done. There is no danger that a man will endeavor to secure a vote for the mere pleasure of having one. The danger is much less, at any rate, where he knows that that implies the payment of a rate to the municipality, than when it is simply the effort to secure his name on the list prepared by a revising barrister. Under this Act, the assessment roll is made no more the basis on which the voters' list is prepared than the mere verbal statement of any one to the revising barrister. I think that that in itself is a fatal defect in this Bill, and one that should certainly condemn it, and one that at least should induce hon. gentlemen opposite to insist on its consideration being delayed, until such time as its different provisions could be more carefully considered in all their details. I do not propose to deal with this matter at much greater length. I would not have said anything at all, but for the fact that I felt that, as far as my voice could go, I would exercise my right here in expressing my dissent from the Bill in all its provisions. I have stated a few of my reasons. I have stated that the different Provinces have ample facilities for the completion of perfectly safe voters' lists. These lists can be had, and are had, and are in use for Dominion purposes, without its costing this House one dollar. The Bill under discussion proposes that a large retinue of officials should be employed, that an immense amount of expense should be incurred, in order, as it is said, to assimilate the franchise. I believe that, with this country in its present condition, with the voice of discontent in many parts of it, it certainly should induce hon. gentlemen opposite to weigh carefully any movement in the direction that is proposed. I am not prepared to discuss the constitutionality of the question. I do not lay my reasoning on that ground at all, but I say, and most emphatically, most conscientiously believing the truth of what I do say, that this Dominion, being an aggregation of Provinces, each being supreme within its own domain, should move very carefully in the direction of assimilation. I believe that the safety of this Dominion is largely involved in the question as to how carefully and with how much consideration for the views and the feelings and the prejudices of those Provinces hon. gentlemen opposite, or whoever may be in charge of the Government, will move in the direction contemplated by this Bill. Realising the feeling of unrest that exists in many of the Provinces, such a Bill as the present is one of the most dangerous characteristics. One of the reasons that ought to deter hon. gentlemen opposite from moving in the matter, lies in the fact that our interests have not assimilated to that extent that will permit the Dominion with safety to withdraw the control of the franshise from the different Local Legislatures. There is another fact in connection with this matter. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not failed, and have not ceased to refer in glowing terms, in terms which are participated in to their full extent on this side of the House, to the alacrity with which our volunteers have turned out in defence of our common country. They have turned out with an alacrity that does them credit, that shows an interest in the country itself, in its future, in every thing that belongs to it, of which we ought in every way to be proud. That being the case, I say, with a knowledge of many of those who have gone, that several of these young men who have risked their lives in defence of the country which they must have loved so well are disfranchised under this Act. I say the test of the sincerity of the proceedings of hon. gentlemen opposite is in the

character of the measures they submit; and if, by the franchise that is submitted, a number of those volunteers, a number of those men who have given the very best pledge of their love for their country, are disfranchised, hon. gentlemen opposite are not true to the professions that they have made in this House. Could these men have given any better evidence than has been produced in the news that we have recently heard from the west. A celebrated English statesman, paraphrasing the classics, made reference, in years gone by, in the most fitting terms, to the troops of his country that were then opposed to a distant foe. In speaking of them, he adverted to the fact that the angel of death was abroad in the land, that we could almost hear the beating of his wings, that there was no one to sprinkle the lintels of the doorposts that he should spare and pass on. Mr. Speaker, it is similar in our case here. We know that since this House assembled this afternoon some who had gone forward in defence of the country have lost their lives in the cause to which they had consecrated themselves, and I say that that circumstance, above every other, appeals to us to do justice to those men, if there is any justice to be done.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not know whether it is proposed to prolong the debate any further to-night.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on; go on.

Mr. MULOCK. I am quite prepared to go on. I only made the suggestion, in case it might be the desire of the House to adjourn.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on; go on.

Mr. MULOCK. Very well; the responsibility of continuing the debate rests upon those who want me to go on. Mr. Speaker, when this Bill was up for the second reading, it was moved by the Premier and supported by the Secretary of State and other hon. gentlemen. The Secretary of State stated what he believed to be the purport of this Bill. I presume that when he made the statements as to the contents of this Bill, he spoke to the extent of his knowledge on the subject. When he stated, therefore, in regard to one very important provision of this Bill, that it provided for an appeal, I presume he stated what he believed to be a fact. But it must be clear to any person who has read this Bill that he was in error when he made that statement; it is clear that he was wholly ignorant of the most material portions of the measure. Thus we have it that the First Minister introduces to this House, and recommends to Parliament for its adoption as a Government measure, a measure presumably having the endorsement of his Cabinet, but which now turns out to be almost an unknown document to one, at least, of his Ministers. For these reasons, I think, we may fairly assume that if one, next to the Premier himself, did not know, on the 17th April, the effect of this measure, many others in this Dominion may be excused if they are equally ignorant. I do not think I would be justified in giving a silent vote on this question, or in assenting to the measure at this stage. It concerns intimately many whom I represent in this House, and whom it is going to disfranchise. I have not been authorised by them to consent to their disfranchisement. It also threatens to endanger the enfranchisement of many others whom I represent; I have not been authorised by them to consent to their rights or liberties being so endangered. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh), when addressing the House a couple of days ago on this question, stated that he had attended many public meetings within the last year or two, and that on no one occasion had he heard this question discussed on the hustings. He asked then, why it is that, if this measure is so obnoxious, that the House is not flooded with petitions against it. Why, his statement furnished the answer itself. He has been attending campaigns for bye elections during recess, and this question was never up for discussion. Why was it not up for discussion? It was not a live question; the people were not aware of what was contemplated; therefore it is unreasonable to ask why the people did not petition against a measure of which they have had no notice. Now, inasmuch as the Secretary of State has shown that he is not acquainted with the provisions of this Bill, I propose to show, in some detail, what its provisions are. I believe the First Minister rests his argument in favor of this measure on two grounds—one, that it is the abstract right of the Dominion Parliament to establish its own franchise; the other, that there should be a uniform franchise for Parliament, or, if not absolutely uniform, a franchise that is almost uniform. Now, with regard to his first argument, nobody will contend for a moment that Parliament has not the right to declare the franchise on which members shall be elected to this House. But the mere fact that this Parliament may possess that right does not dispose of the whole question. It may not be expedient for us to exercise that right, and before Parliament proceeds to assert that right it should be able to satisfy the country that the measure is a better one than the existing system. Parliament is not bound to exercise every right that it possesses. Parliament is here to legislate for the benefit of the people. If you can show that this measure is going to benefit the people more than the existing system, that, of course, furnishes a reason for Parliament considering this scheme. But unless it can be shown that the exercise of this abstract right will benefit the country, then I think Parliament is not called upon to pass such a measure, nor would it be justified in doing so. Thus, we have to compare the propositions contained in this Bill with the existing system. Now, this will involve a reference to the Bill itself; and apart from the abstract scheme set forth in this Bill, we have to see what the provisions are for carrying it out, for no measure can be recommended unless it can be brought into effect in a way that will be a benefit to the people. Now, there is no denying the fact that one of the very prominent features in the measure is a scheme whereby, no matter what the franchise is, that franchise shall be finally determined—I refer to that part of the Bill which contemplates the appointment of revising officers. Hon. gentlemen have spoken with more or less indefiniteness as to what this Bill declares to be the powers of returning officers, and to place the matter beyond controversy I shall take the liberty of reading some of the clauses of the Bill upon that subject. It is necessary in doing this to distinguish between the powers and duties of the revising officer. His powers are one thing, his duties another; we give certain powers to a man, and we assign duties to him as well; but, if we have no way by which we can adequately compel him to discharge those duties, we clearly have given him a power which we should not have given him. With regard to the powers proposed to be conferred on revising officers, I call attention to section 10. I shall read so much as refers to his powers:

"The Governor General in Council may, within three months after the coming into force of this Act, and from time to time thereafter, when the office is vacant, appoint a proper person to be called 'the revising officer,' for each or any of the electoral districts of Canada, who shall hold office during good behavior, but who shall be removable on an address by the House of Commons, and whose duties shall be to prepare, revise and complete, in the manner hereinafter provided, the lists of persons entitled to vote under the provisions of this Act in such electoral district."

The section goes on to provide that such officer, before entering on his duties, shall take an oath office. First, we find that section 10 authorises the Governor in Council to appoint one returning officer for each electoral district in Canada, or in all 211 returning officers. There is a provision in the Bill that a revising officer may have more than one electoral district to deal with. This clause declares that the revising officer shall have power to prepare rolls and

complete the voters' list. In other words, from the commencement to the end he shall have to do with the preparation, the correctness and the final completion of the list, and no one, as it appears by further reference to the Bill, who has not been finally placed on that list by that officer will be entitled to the franchise. It has been argued in this House, without reference to the language, that there is no reason for fear as to the character of the men likely to be called on to discharge those duties, because we are told that the revising office is to be a high dignitary, to be a man holding a judicial position, and if such a person cannot be found, to be a barrister of five years' standing. It is all very well to make those statements, but is there anything in this Bill which justifies them? Is there any guarantee to the public that the appointees are to be of the kind named? I point out to the House that my view of this section is that it is competent for the Governor in Council to appoint, under this Bill, if it should become law in its present terms, any British subject; in fact, I do not know that it limits appointees to British subjects living between the two oceans. What are the words?

"A revising officer to be appointed under this Act may, in any Province, except Quebec, be either a judge or a junior judge of any county court in the Province in which he is to act, or a barrister of at least five years' standing at the bar of such Province, and in the Province of Quebec he may be either a judge of the Superior Court for Lower Canada, or an advocate of that Province of at least five years' standing: Provided always, that the same revising officer may be appointed for, and be required to discharge the said duties in respect of more than one electoral district."

What guarantee is there whereby it can be said that when this Bill goes into law the Governor in Council is obliged to appoint a judge, barrister or any other man? The whole population of Canada can be chosen from; and if the Bill goes into force on the suggestion that one or other of those suggested responsible persons is to be appointed, the simple answer afterwards will be, that for certain reasons they were not appointed. Perhaps we may be told that they did not care to act, or that there were other public duties which the judges had to discharge, which prevented them from accepting office. Then, the Government will be obliged to choose other persons. Under this section, then, as worded, I think it cannot be argued fairly and honestly that the Government are bound even to offer the office to any particular person. My inference, drawn from a perusal of this Bill, is simply this: that its object is to enable certain appointees of this Government to prepare, revise and complete the list of voters; and whilst apparently there is machinery provided in this Bill for a revision and a correction, still all those provisions are absolutely illusory, and are simply there to deceive, and it is perfectly impossible for any person whose rights are not properly recognised by the returning officer to obtain the suffrage. I propose to read such sections of this Bill as I think sustain that statement.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. DAWSON. I understand that very important news has been received from the North-West, and as it would not perhaps interrupt the hon. gentleman very much, would it not be well that it should be read to the House, so that all may hear it.

Mr. SPEAKER—

"WINNIPEG, April 24.

"Later despatch announced fight began 9:15 a.m. Rebels advancing from coulee, near river, opened fire upon scouts led by Major Boulton; latter returning fire when rebels mounted and retired to place of ambush. From ambush they rose each time in firing. General Middleton at once deployed troops in skirmishing order. "A" Battery could not at first feel enemy with guns, so good were their shelter; eventually, however, battery got into better position, and rained raking fire among them. Two houses in which rebels reserves were secluded were demolished. Rebels next made dash and fought 90th at close quarters, but severe fire from left wing forced rebels to retire. Fight was Indian style on part of rebels who were always either concealed behind trees or in bluffs. Their fire was hot and very effective. Capt. Clark with sharpshooters first advanced in skirmishing order after scouts signalled danger, and closely following were Toronto School of Infantry, latter taking right flank. Conflict now became general and terribly severe. Indians were exceedingly combative and war-whoop yells could be heard distinctly some distance off. They rallied time and again, keeping up incessant fire for fully an hour. Subsequently fire slackened on part of enemy, but was again resumed shortly after noon. Prairie was set on fire as result of battle, but heavy rain which set in about noon quenched it. Following is a list of casualties reported at time of despatch, but is yet incomplete:—90th Battalion—Killed: Pte. Ferguson, No. 6; Sergeant Macklin, No. 6. Wounded: Capt. Clark, No. 6, slightly in arm; Corpl. Code, No. 6, both legs; Corpl. Lethbridge, No. 3, shot through breast; Corpl. Bowden, No. 4, slightly in head; Pte. Jarvis, No. 3, slightly; J. Canniff, slightly in neck; Pte. Hartop, No. 6, left arm; C. Kemp, No. 6, in groin; Pte. Clovett, No. 2, in shoulder; Pte. Mathews, No. 6, in arm; Pte. Slater, No. 6, in leg. "A" Battery—Killed: Gunner Damanilly. Wounded: Cook, Ainworth, Moiseau, seriously; Sergt.-Maj. Mawhinney, Langrell, Asselin, Imrie and Taylor, slightly. School of Infantry—None killed. Wounded: A. Watson, through body and fatal; E. Corries, through arm; R. Jones, shot in jaw; R McDonald, shot through arm. Party of rebels have been successfully driven from ambush, in ravine, by hard firing by volunteers. General Middleton had close call, being shot through hat. Capt. Wise, his A.D.C., had his horse shot under him. 10th Royals come up to relief from opposite of river, and are doubtless in conflict.

"BATTLE FIELD, N.W.T.

"Tremendous storm, rain and hail, accompanied by vivid lightning and loud thunder raging now, and may intercept telegraph communication."

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

Mr. MULOCK. In support of my contention, I will call your attention to some of the provisions of the Bill. First of all, I call your attention, Sir, to section 12. I shall not read it all; but any gentleman who thinks I omit any material part will correct me. Section 12 declares that the revising officer who prepares the first list of voters for any electoral district under this Act shall, as soon as possible after taking the oath of office, obtain a certified copy or certified copies (as the case may be) of the last revised assessment roll or rolls. And then it goes on to say, at the eleventh line, as follows:—

"And he shall proceed, as speedily as possible, with the aid thereof and of such other information as he can obtain, to ascertain and prepare a list of the persons who, according to the provisions of this Act, are entitled to be registered as voters, and to vote under this Act at any election for such electoral district."

And then this section, which is very lengthy, goes on to declare that this list which he prepares shall contain the various names and other information. Then we have, in section 12, the instructions to the revising officer in preparing the list which is to be the foundation of the voters' list; but you observe, Sir, that he is entirely at liberty to make up that list in the first instance from any possible source of information. The assessment roll is no binding guide of any kind—and he may entirely ignore it. This revising officer, who cannot have a personal knowledge of the persons throughout the whole electoral district, is entirely free to place on the list those whom he may choose. Now, what are the difficulties which are encountered ordinarily in this work? We find in Canada, or at all events, in Ontario, that there is an assessor for each municipality, and in some large municipalities there are more than one, and we know, from practical experience, that the assessment rolls are made up after careful personal examination, aided by personal knowledge on the part of the assessors. But in this case it is proposed to have this foundation list prepared by a person who may be an absolute stranger to the riding. Now, we will suppose that the Government do appoint a judge; how is a judge, on his own information, to know accurately, or with any reasonable degree of accuracy, who are the residents in a certain county, who are the persons who ought to be put on the list? It is wholly impossible for him to do justice to the case; or if you take an individual who is not a judge, take any man, who

we will say, fortunately lives in the most central part of the riding, the best place for the purpose of discharging his duties. Even he cannot reasonably be expected to discharge those duties so well as they could be discharged by several persons, each one taking a smaller district, and one with which he is better acquainted. Nevertheless, apart from the difficulties which may beset such an officer from the commencement, we find by section 12 that this officer, of his own motion, without assigning reasons, prepares a certain list, and it is to be borne in mind at this stage that that list is the list which is to govern in all cases, unless corrected by application on the part of some person, or unless the revising officer on his own motion, subsequently chooses to correct it. Now, I suppose, for illustration sake, that a certain elector we will say is the possessor of property to the extent of $150. This Bill declares that the owner of real estate of the value of $150 shall be entitled to a vote, if he is fortunate enough to be placed on the list. Now, we will suppose the case of a man not having his name placed upon the list in the first instance; let us see what course he has to pursue in order to get justice. Section 13 will then apply, and it reads as follows:—

"The revising officer shall then forthwith make or cause to be made a sufficient number of copies of the said list"

After directing the revising officer to publish the list in various ways, the section provides how a man may obtain a copy of the list in order to appeal from it.—

"Copies of the list may be procured by any person on application to the revising officer, as soon as he can furnish them, on paying therefor, if printed, a price proportionately sufficient to cover the price paid for printing the same, and if not printed, then at the rate of six cents for every ten names thereon."

Now, what does that mean? The revising officer is not obliged to keep on hand copies for the electors; he is only obliged to make copies for the electors when he is paid 6 cents for every ten words. Now, I do not think I am overestimating it when I say that the constituencies of Ontario will average at least 4,000 names upon the voters' lists. If the revising officer places anything like the full number of names upon the list, he will have a list of 4,000 names; and any elector, to procure a copy of that list, at the rate of 6 cents for every ten names, will have to pay the sum of $24. That is the first encroachment upon this unfortuante individual's property of $150 in value. Having got the list and finding that his name is not upon it, what does he do next? In section 15 provision is made for the revising officer holding a court for the preliminary revision of the list. Where is that court to be held? Wherever in the electoral district the revising officer chooses—not in each municipality, but at any place he chooses to select. The words of the section are as follows:—

"The revising officer shall hold a sitting for the preliminary revision of the list at such place in the electoral district as he shall deem most convenient for that purpose, on a day not less than four weeks nor more than five weeks after the publication of the list as aforesaid."

Now, we will fancy that he holds this court not merely at such a place as he may deem convenient, but at such a place as is absolutely the most convenient and central in the whole riding; would any hon. gentleman tell me where would be the most convenient place for holding such a court, say in the north riding of the county of Ontario. I believe that riding now extends in length over 100 miles, while its width, at places, is something less than eight or nine miles. If the revising officer holds the court evenly between the north and south limits of that riding, fifty miles from each extremity, then the propreitor of the $150 property, having paid $24 to get the list, to see if his name is upon it, is then accorded the privilege of travelling fifty miles to appear before this court on a certain, day in order to apply to have his name placed upon the roll. I leave it to hon. gentlemen to say what it will cost him to pursue his rights in that direction if he should desire to do so. I also leave it to hon. gentlemen to say what time he loses and what expense he is put to in going from his home and returning thither in order to rectify that error. Of course, hon. gentlemen may say that in selecting a constituency of those proportions I am not selecting an average constituency. I admit that——

Mr. KIRK. There are constituencies a great deal larger than that.

Mr. MULOCK. Still, there are few constituencies, I presume, in the Province of Ontario to-day, under the altered circumstances of recent times, but are very shapeless and not at all concentrated. Well, before this man starts out on his mission to get his name placed upon the list he must, at a certain time before the sitting of the court, have done something; What is that? I read from section 15:

"Any person objecting to any name on the list, or desiring to add any name thereto, or otherwise desiring to amend the same, shall, at least one week before the day fixed for such preliminary revision, deposit with or mail to the revising officer, by paid letter, at his office or place of address in the electoral district, a notice in the form provided for that purpose in the schedule to this Act."

He must have a copy of the statutes of Canada by him; he must be able to write a notice as required by this Act; he must take that notice to the post office or carry it by hand to wherever this revising officer may be; and he must do all this at least seven days before the sitting of the court, or else he has no right to appear before the court, and has lost all right to have this wrong remedied. Then the Bill goes on to say:

"And in the event of any such objection being that a name already on the list should be struck off, the person so objecting shall give a notice in writing to the person whose name is objected to, at the same time and in the same form as to the revising officer, by delivering such notice to such person or by mailing the same to his last known post office adress, and he shall also, at the same time, write opposite to the name objected to in the copy of the list posted up (if any) in the office of the clerk of the municipality or parish or other offices corresponding thereto, the words 'objected to,' and the name, address and occupation of the person so objecting."

Of course, the latter part of this section deals with the case, not of the elector seeking to add his name to the list, but of the elector seeking to have removed from the list a name that should not appear there. Now, you will see that, under section 15, a person may be wholly unable within seven days to point out the objections to the roll, and yet, if he does not point out those objections and go himself to where the list is posted, and with his own hand write upon that list, "objected to," a vote improperly entered in the roll can not afterwards be objected to. Was there ever a more monstrous proposition put in a Bill than this, that an appeal of this kind must take place within one week, or else, until another year rolls by, the wrong cannot be rectified; and in the meantime an election may take place? Well, suppose this elector has got his notice in, suppose that task has been accomplished successfully, the elector having retained a lawyer to enable him to draw the notice and see that everything is correct, the next provision is that there shall be a sitting of the court. What provisions are there in this Bill for giving public notice that the court is going to sit? For all that appears in section 16, that court may hold its sitting, complete its work, and adjourn, and the fact that it intended to sit need never have been known outside some printing office. The revising officer is to give notice as follows:—

"Notice that the said list and the time of holding of the said sitting have been published in manner aforesaid, shall also be given by the revising officer immediately after such publication, by at least one insertion thereof in the form contained in the schedule to this Act, in one or more newspapers, if any, published within the electoral district."

The revising officer publishes one little notice in one little newspaper, in some little insignificant newspaper, in one

corner of a riding, and that is supposed to be a notice to every elector in the riding, and he is bound by it, though, in fact, he has never seen it. There is no provision for sending notice to the person whose name is objected to; there is no such safeguard as that to warn him that his rights are to be adjudicated upon; there is only a sham notice provided here, a sham attempt to make it appear public. The whole thing is a farce, a colorable scheme, calculated to deceive. Well, we will suppose that our elector has succeeded in getting his voters' list; he has borrowed his $24 and has feed a lawyer to get the notice drawn; he has found his way down to the court; he has argued his case there and produced witnesses, and for some reason this arbitrary officer chooses to disallow the appeal. Then the Act provides that there shall be a second court of revision held by this same revising officer. I refer you then to section 21. That section enacts that after the completion of the preliminary list of votes and preparation of lists for polling districts, and so on, the officer shall publish the list a second time; and then it provides that any person aggrieved by that list shall have the right to appeal from it to this same court, and to go through the same form again, so that the voter has to commence again, under section 21, and buy a new copy of the list. Remember that the list he bought before, which cost him $24, is valueless. It was the copy of the first list; now he is compelled to buy a copy of the revised list—a supposed correct list. The first list is blotted out by the second, and he has to pay $24 more, or $48 altogether. Then he is obliged to prepare another notice. He has to go to his counsel again, and his counsel, who, I suppose, makes some charge for this, prepares this second notice, which is forwarded, and the same sham is gone through again. Then the revising officer holds another court, and the farce is gone over again. The same technicalities are provided in section 23, whereby the voter is again obliged to give notice within a week or his appeal is gone. He is obliged to go through all these technicalities literally, and if he is fortunate enough to get every thing done in such a way that the revising officer cannot possibly resist considering his appeal, at last he appears before the highest court in the land, namely, the same revising officer who overruled him before; and that brings us to section 24, and section 24 is so original that perhaps it will stand reading in its entirety. I am satisfied it is new reading to a number of hon. gentlemen here.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. MULOCK. If the Secretary of State were here, I could point to him, for—from his own lips, we heard it was new to him. He told us what he thought was in the Bill, and I have read the Bill and shown that he was entirely wrong, that it is a document unlike anything of the kind on earth, and thus have shown that we have here something new under the sun. It proceeds thus:

"At the time and place named in the notice of the revising officer, he shall hold open court for the said final revision"——

That is to be a very open court; there is nothing hidden about it.—.

"And shall hear and dispose of any objection or complaint of which notice shall have been given as aforesaid, hearing the parties making the same if they appear and any evidence that may be adduced before him in support of or in opposition thereto, and shall either affirm or amend the list accordingly, as to him seems right and proper, attesting with his initials any changes, additions or erasures in the list."

Now, if the appellant or elector, by any accident, does not happen to appear himself, if he sends in a number of witnesses to prove his case for him, the officer cannot entertain that appeal; he must disallow it. It can only be entertained in the actual presence of the appellant. What is the object of that provision? And, no matter what evidence is given, no matter what argument is advanced, the revising officer, after listening to everything, is permitted, under line 47, to confirm or amend the list as to him seems right and proper. Thus the matter is completed, and section 26 declares it to be the case. Section 26 declares that the lists so prepared are the lists on which elections are to be held, and I would draw your attention to this fact, that although later down in this Bill there is some nominal reference to appeals, still it is so ingeniously worded that the lists confirmed at this stage are the lists on which the elections are held. I will next call your attention to section 46, which is offered to us, I suppose, as a section that is calculated to afford complete, full and final justice to everybody. The humblest suitor in the land is to have the full benefit of the right to appeal from this revising officer. Under what conditions? I heard the hon. the Secretary of State declare positively that the elector had the right to appeal. He did not qualify that statement. Of course, he did not know what was in the Bill, but he stated that, and of course you believed him, you relied on his information, you did not read the Bill for yourselves, and so you voted for the second reading under a misapprehension. Let me read what section 46 says, and see whether it sustains his statement:

"Any person or persons who, under the foregoing sections, shall have made complaint according to the practice therein provided for in respect of the list of voters in any polling district, the final revision thereof, whether such list be the first or any subsequent voters' list for the polling district prepared under this Act, or any person or persons, with reference to whom such complaint was made, who shall be dissatisfied with the decision on any point of law of the revising officer in respect of such complaint, may give to the revising officer, on the day of such decision, and before the adjournment of the court on that day, notice in writing of his desire to appeal to a superior court from such decision, stating shortly in such notice the decision complained of and his reasons for appealing against it; and if the revising officer thinks it reasonable and proper to allow such appeal, he shall, as soon as he conveniently can do so, state, in the form of a special case, the facts established according to his opinion by the evidence, and necessary to be laid before the court above."

And the section goes on to deal with some other matters. Now, what rights are secured as a matter of law to the suitor in this case? Has he the right to appeal on everything? First of all, the appeal is limited under any possible circumstances to a matter of law? What is a matter of law in a case like this? Any hon. gentleman who has had to do with courts of revision knows what are the matters complained of, as a rule. Questions of value are the principal thing—what is this property worth? Am I in occupation? Am I a resident in this riding? and so on—pure questions of fact. It is a very rare thing indeed for any point of law to arise before a court of revision. Such point of law can only arise where it is a question as to the construction of some document, whether such a document creates such a title or not. It is a rare thing for a question of title to be put in dispute under such circumstances. In the greatest number of cases the question is simply one of fact, as I have indicated. But, supposing it is a question of law, what are the rights of the elector? First of all, before he has any rights at all, he must give to the revising officer, "on the day of such decision, and before the adjournment of the court on that day, notice in writing of his desire to appeal to a superior court from such decision, stating shortly in such notice the decision complained of and his reasons for appealing against it." Do you know any other case in any court in Canada where a suitor is obliged, the instant a judgment is given against him, and before the court has risen, to present in writing to the presiding judge notice of his intention to appeal from that decision, and not only that, but setting forth in that notice all the grounds on which he proposes to appeal? If any precedent can be found in any court under the British jurisdiction, then I make no more complaint under that section on that point, but there is no court, in which an appeal is allowed at all, where such conditions precedent to appeal are imposed. Those conditions attached to the right to appeal are inserted

there manifestly for but one object. Any person reading this section can draw but one conclusion from it. Nominally an opportunity is given to this man to appeal, but the opportunity is such that, in 99 cases out of 100 no man would ever be in a position to avail himself of it. Supposing that a decision is given at the end of the day. The court is over, the judge rises saying: "I am going to adjourn; I have no more business; there is nothing in the law to say that I am to continue the court while you prepare your notice of appeal." It would be an impossibility for the voter to present his notice, and not presenting his notice, his rights are gone. But, supposing he does present his notice, that does not secure to him the right of appeal, even on this point of law, because even then it depends upon the whim of the revising officer whether or not the appeal shall be had. The section says: "And, if the revising officer thinks it reasonable and proper to allow such appeal, he shall, as soon as he conveniently can do so, state, in the form of a special case, the facts established according to his opinion by the evidence, and necessary to be laid before the court above in order to determine the said point of law." You see from that that these words which I have read leave it entirely in the discretion of the officer against whose judgment the elector complains to refuse the appeal; and, if at last he does choose to allow the appeal, what evidence is handed to the court above on which to consider that appeal? Is there any record taken in the first instance of the evidence? Is there any machinery by which the evidence is to be taken down? None whatever. The revising officer draws his own conclusions from the evidence. He sends up to the court above just such an account of the transactions as to him seems meet. It is entirely in his hands to present to the court above such a view of the case as he may choose, because the report that comes before him is the only document, the only evidence, that the court above can look at in order to deal with the appeal. Now, Mr. Speaker, when we refer to section 40, to see how far this revising officer is bound by any rules of evidence, we find it declares that:

"The revising officer shall have power, at any court or sitting held under this Act by him, to amend, or give leave to amend, when he sees fit, any of the proceedings taken in reference to any voters' list, to direct the notice to be given to other persons, or to dispense with any notices hereinbefore required to be given."

Then it goes on to say:

"And he shall not be bound by strict rules of evidence, or form of procedure, but shall hear and determine all matters coming before him, as such revising officer, in a summary manner, and so as in his judgment to do justice to all parties."

Under section 40 the revising officer may disallow any evidence, he may refuse to receive evidence, he may wholly discredit evidence, and his action in this matter is absolutely final. Why, the only instrument upon which the case would rest he might refuse to receive, and there would be no foundation for any appeal. Then, Mr. Speaker, suppose we read section 47. That section reads as follows:—

"No such appeal shall be allowed"——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman had better not go into the clause in detail on this motion. He can discuss the principles of the Bill, not the clauses.

Mr. MULOCK. I am nearly through with them, and I think——

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I think, with all due deference to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot discuss the principles of a Bill without knowing what is in a clause, and you cannot know what is in a clause without reading a clause; and therefore I think the hon. gentleman is in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think I have authority for it here:

"On the motion for the Speaker to leave the Chair, a member is at liberty to discuss the main provisions, but not to proceed in detail through the clauses, nor to discuss the amendments to the Bill."

Mr. CAMERON. Yet he is at liberty to discuss the principles——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CAMERON. I am in perfect order. I am speaking to a question of order, and I submit that a speaker has a right on this motion to discuss the principles of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. Certainly.

Mr. CAMERON. He cannot discuss the principle of a Bill without knowing what is in it, and he cannot know what is in the Bill without reading it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think I interrupted the hon. gentleman until after he had gone through several clauses, one after another.

Mr. CAMERON. There are several principles.

Mr. MULOCK. I will try strictly to recognise your ruling. There are only six sections that I intend to refer to, and I shall refer to them very briefly. If you will allow me to read section 47. Let me call attention to section 47.

Mr. RYKERT. You have decided a point of order, and I think it ought to be sustained.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. gentleman is ashamed of section 47, and would like to keep it from the eyes of the public. It reads:

"No such appeal shall be allowed or entertained against any decision of the revising officer upon any matter of fact, or the admission or rejection of evidence adduced or offered on any matter of fact, but the appeal shall be allowed only on some point or points of law as before mentioned."

Now, Mr. Speaker, under that section you will see that no appeal lies under any circumstances upon any question of fact, and my justification for reading that to the House is that it should receive the utmost publicity. Now, suppose that this suitor, unfortunately for himself, is allowed to appeal. Having wasted most of his substance he is at last allowed to go to the court. To what court is he allowed to appeal? The only court in Ontario to which he is allowed to appeal is the High Court of Justice. Now, we all know that the High Court of Justice only sits in the city of Toronto, to which court our unfortunate elector must appeal or be disfranchised. Then, in what form? Under section 50 he can appeal to the High Court of Justice, commencing his proceedings as anyone else would commence an action at law. That is the next step, in order to get matters rectified, and one of the most extraordinary provisions that I ever saw is that he cannot appear in person.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman will see that he is not discussing the principle of the Bill. That is one of the things which may be amended in committee, and that is the reason of this ruling, that the clauses in detail cannot be discussed.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not going to read any more clauses.

Mr. SPEAKER. I thought the hon. gentleman was going to read.

Mr. MULOCK. I am only going to give the number of the section You will remember that when I began my argument I took this ground, and it is too late now, I think, to overrule me; I took the ground that this Bill nominally provided a list for voters, but in all its details it was calculated to defeat the making of a correct list. I was only going to give the number of the section about barristers. Section 48 says that if the party gets in his appeal all right he may appear at the next sitting of the court by any barrister. He cannot appear in person; he can hire counsel, and having hired counsel the case goes on.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is one of the details for discussion in committee.

Mr. MULOCK. I think there is an accumulation of evidence which goes to the principle of the Bill, that the objects of the details must be looked at, so as to see if they go to defeat not to accomplish the end aimed at. As a last warning to the suitor not to venture to appeal, it is decided that the court may award costs against him as in any ordinary case. These provisions lead to but one conclusion and one inference, namely, that this is a Bill, not for the purpose of extending the franchise, not for the purpose of enabling electors to be placed on the roll, but for the purpose of enabling a man who may be badly disposed to prepare a roll, regardless of what is right. The last point in the Bill to which I intend to refer is section 55. It says: "It shall be the duty of the returning officer on any revision, of his own mere motion, to strike out names;" and now I give the exact words," and generally to correct such lists, so far as any information in his possession will enable him to do so, in order to carry out the intention of this Act." It is no wonder that with such a Bill before this House, the member for Montreal East, one of the Government supporters, declared this Bill contained some most extraordinary provisions, and that the powers contemplated to be given to returning officers were most extraordinary powers. No wonder the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault), and other conscientious Government supporters, refused to support it. No wonder that hon. members on this side of the House stand up here, out of a sense of duty, and raise their voices against this measure. I will not refer to the expense to be cast upon constituencies by this meaure. That has been sufficiently amplified by other speakers. It is sufficient to say, by way of summary, that under this measure the Governor in Council, which means of course the Government of the day, have power to appoint 633 officers to carry out the provisions of this Bill. I leave the House to judge whether it is wise to fasten such a staff or even a much smaller staff of officials on the country for the purpose of giving effect to such a measure, unless it is going to benefit the country. Has it been shown that the country would be benefited by such an expenditure, or that the country has asked for a change in the existing system? Do hon. gentlemen opposite pretend to say that they did not, when they were elected, represent public opinion? Do they say that had the lists been otherwise, had there been a Dominion franchise, the Government would have been in different hands? If so, I can understand there has been some abuse. But they state that they accepted the verdict of the people, and so it does not lie in their mouths to say that they did not when elected represent public opinion, and that if the lists had been different the reins of Government would have been in different hands. In my opinion this Bill is subversive of every principle of justice. We, as a House of Commons, are called upon not to barter away the rights of the people, but to guard the rights of the people. This is not a Bill that applies to party at all. It is a Bill that is destructive of party. It is a Bill that is revolutionary in its character. It is a Bill that contemplates taking away from the people every power they should possess respecting Parliament. The Government appoint revising officers. Those officers may, if they choose to abuse their power, prepare such lists as will bring about one result, the election of those whom it was intended to elect. Then the only appeal against any wrong by the returning officer is such as to be of no practical use. How are the people going to get back their power? They cannot get it back, and those men who assent to this measure are doing an injustice to the country, are betraying the constituencies that sent them here, and are acting in a way that, in my opinion, is treasonable, towards their country. I say the men who take up arms and with violence assail their country do less grievous harm than those who make this assault on the constitution. In the one case the men do it openly and without pretence of doing right, they endeavoring to enforce their opinions by violence. In this case, if we proceed and pass this measure, depriving the people of their rights and liberties, we are, under the pretence of doing good by constitutional means, doing a great wrong. History furnishes warnings against the danger arising from the people losing control. If the Government feel, as the hon. member for Ottawa did, that it was right for them to use this power in order to secure the Conservatives in power—for I think he went so far as to admit that——

Mr. MACKINTOSH. To whom is the hon. gentleman alluding?

Mr. MULOCK. I was alluding to the hon. member who was playing the kazoo behind you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MACKINTOSH. I may inform the hon. gentleman that I was not playing a kazoo. But to whom is the hon. gentleman referring?

Mr. MULOCK. I was about to say that this measure is justified by one hon. gentleman on this ground: That it will enable the Conservative party to accomplish a certain purpose, to save this country from falling into the hands of the Grits. That is about his argument. That is just about as good a reason as Cromwell had when he marched his soldiers into the Long Parliament, and because it had not been doing its duty he turned Parliament out, took the keys, locked up the Parliament buildings and robbed the people of all system of representation. It is true the people got the keys at last; and they will get the keys in this case also. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to be gifted with so much patience as they should be; but in a case like this, where under the pretence of endeavoring to further secure the rights of the people, they propose to adopt a system whereby power will pass from the conscientious elector, be he Conservative, Liberal or otherwise, for if he dares to criticise the acts of those whom he may have assisted to put in possession of power, they will, through their agent, the revising officer, strike his name off the voters' list. Then, if this measure passes, when too late we will find that we will have entrusted the guardianship of the freedom of the people to a Government which, being beyond the people's control, will become as tyrannical as it will be irresponsible. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I enter my protest against this measure. I shall give my vote against it, and I trust it will never become law as long as you or any of us are spared to have any voice in the affairs of Parliament.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I do not wish to detain the House for any length of time. I have only a few words to say, and I desire that the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government should be in his place at the present moment. At the same time I can speak for some length of time if he does not come in, but if he comes in we may afterwards go into committee.

Mr. BOWELL. Do I understand you will go into committee if we send for him?

Mr. CASGRAIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will send for him; I think it would be better.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must confine himself to the principles of the Bill.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I should have preferred the First Minister being here, because if he is not I am going to say behind his back what I would rather say in his presence. It is true he wants to wear us out in order——

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). Order, order.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Perhaps the hon. member for Montmagny will be quiet, or perhaps, Mr. Speaker, you will keep him quiet.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Am I to understand that the hon. gentleman is speaking for his side of the House, or does he wish me to understand that the intention is to allow the House to go into Committee of the Whole?

Mr. CASGRAIN. I am not the leader of the Opposition, but at the same time I may say——

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. May I ask the Minister of Public Works to repeat what he said. What did the hon. gentleman suggest. I was not listening at the moment.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was not suggesting anything, but the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) wanted the First Minister here, and of course he is not here just now. I understood that he meant that we were to go into Committee of the Whole, and I wanted to know if he was speaking on behalf of that side of the House—whether it was the intention of hon. gentlemen to allow us to go into committee. If that is so I will ask the First Minister to come, so that he may go on with his measure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think what the hon. gentleman proposes appears to be reasonable. I do not suppose he intends to keep us long.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The First Minister is in charge of the measure, and perhaps he will be able to say.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps you had better send for him.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). You are out of order; you spoke before.

Mr. SPEAKER. I decide that the hon. gentleman is in Order.

Mr. LANDRY. It is the first time he has been in Order.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I do not want to be vexed, and I do not think the hon. gentleman will interfere with my remarks. The matter before us is one of extreme importance—I suppose it is the most important that has been before the House during the present Session. I think that perfect latitude, perfect freedom should be given to the members of the Opposition, and to members on the other side, to offer as much discussion as they may desire, or as may be necessary, upon this question. Now, I like to hear the pleasant voice of *le Chevalier de Montmagny*. He seems, by his interruptions, to be as much of a nuisance to his own friends as to hon. members on this side of the House, though he does not seem to have the sense to perceive it. Now, it appears to me contrary to the principle of fair play, that a measure of this kind should be brought down at so late a period in the Session. Before closing my remarks I desire to express myself to the right hon. Prime Minister of this Dominion. I desire to congratulate him on the way in which he is pleased to conduct the affairs of this Parliament. I desire to compliment him on the slight notice he takes whilst we are debating the business of the House. Whilst the children of our soil are fighting in the North-West, he has not even the pluck nor the courage to stand at his place and fight his battles in this Parliament. I wish to state, because he is here now, that he should have the manly courage to be at his place, and not do what he has been doing, taking a quiet sleep whilst he tries to tire us out——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order. Stick to the principles of the Bill.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I say that the hon. gentleman tried to stifle discussion and——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. CASGRAIN. If I am out of Order, I will withdraw what I have said.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have to rule, as I have ruled all night, that hon. gentlemen, in speaking, must confine themselves to the principle of the Bill.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Well, I regret that we have not had the opportunity of fairly discussing the principle of the Bill.

An hon. MEMBER. Go on.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I am not going on, but I maintain what I said.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I may say to the First Minister that there are several gentlemen who wanted to discuss this question, but if the object is merely to take this stage, I think we may be able to do so, if that course is preferred.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps, then, we had better go into committee and take the first clause.

Motion agreed to, on a division; and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may say that I intend to move an amendment to the second clause, to insert the words, "excluding a Chinaman," in the paragraph defining a person, and I know that an hon. gentleman has prepared a resolution to strike out the words "a female person unmarried, or a widow."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What! going to give the ladies up altogether?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have been informed, and I know that an hon. gentleman in the House is going to move the omission of those words, in order to bring up the question of the female vote. I shall, therefore, move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again; and if the House permit, we shall again go into committee on the Bill on Monday, and continue *de die in diem* during next week, until the Bill gets through committee.

Motion agreed to, and Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 4:35 a. m., Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 27th April, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

Mr. SPEAKER announced that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery certificate of the election and return of Pierre Malcolm Guay, Esq., to represent the electoral district of the County of Lévis.

Mr. P. M. GUAY, having taken the oath, and subscribed the roll containing the same, was introduced by Mr. Langelier and Mr. Blake, and took his seat in the House.

INCOMPLETE RETURN.

Mr. BLONDEAU. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, some time ago I had the honor to make a motion with regard to a return concerning the Agricultural Insurance Company of Canada. That motion was agreed to; a part of the return has been laid on the Table, but the most essential part has not been brought down. I would like to know whether the Government will take the necessary steps, in order to have the full and complete return brought down, such as recommended.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. member will be good enough to give me a note of what he has just said, and the Government will certainly see that it is done.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. EDGAR. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I should like to ask the hon. the Minister of Militia a question. While the whole country has been interested in all things concerning the troops under Major-General Middleton, I think all Canadians have been filled with admiration at the extraordinary and brilliant march made by Colonel Otter, from the Saskatchewan to Battleford; and all the country are interested in knowing how the troops have stood the extraordinary strain. As direct telegraphic communication exists with Battleford, I have no doubt the Government have informed themselves of the state of that column, and would like to know what is the report they have received.

Mr. CARON. It gives me very great pleasure indeed, in answer to the question of the hon. gentleman, to say that he has qualified the march of Lieutenant-Colonel Otter as it should have been qualified. It is considered by those who are authorities in such matters—and I do not presume to express my own opinion—that it is a march deserving of all the encomium that could be given to a feat of that kind. We always knew Colonel Otter to be one of the best men we had in the Canadian service; the opportunity has been afforded him of showing his very great value, and he has not shown himself wanting. I am happy to say, from the telegram I have received from Battleford, that the troops are in the very best possible health and spirits. They have stood that wonderful march—for it is really a wonderful march—in a manner that really nobody could have expected from them. I may also state that I received yesterday a cipher telegram from the Major-General in command, who speaks in the highest possible terms of the behavior of the troops in their first engagement. He confirms the news that has appeared in the press of this morning, and gives details as to the battle or the engagement that has taken place which appeared in the press of this morning. He mentions, of course, the names of our brave volunteers who have fallen on the field, and I am sure that I am merely expressing the opinion of the whole country in saying that we all deeply regret the loss we have suffered, but they have died the death of soldiers, and I am sure the country must be proud of the manner in which they have done their duty.

DOMINION DRAINAGE COMPANY.

Mr. DICKINSON (for Mr. HAGGART) moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the Dominion Drainage Company.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think my hon. friend had better move it, as Mr. Haggart is absent. A constitutional question is involved.

Mr. ABBOTT. I understand that he is going to move that the constitutional question be got rid of by making it apply only to the North-West Territories.

Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The constitutional question seems to amount to absolutely nothing. The provisions of the Bill do nothing more than incorporate an ordinary trading corporation, with functions to operate all over the Dominion. I do not think the point is debateable, but I understand the promoters of the Bill are willing to obviate anything of that kind by limiting it, if necessary, to the North-West Territories, though I think it is wholly unnecessary to do so.

Mr. IVES. With reference to the motion of the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Dickinson), I was exceedingly anxious that in the disposition of this matter a precedent might be established that would be a guide for the committee over which I have the honor to preside. I should regret very much if the compromise proposed should be made, and the question remain open as it is now. I would rather, if the hon. member for Russell would not object, that the matter should stand for a day or two longer, even, with a view of having it looked into by the law officers of the Crown, as I think it is desirable that it should not be passed in this way. It may be referred to hereafter as a precedent against legislation of a similar character, and for my own part I am inclined to agree with the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron).

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would ask my hon. friend to allow it to stand over.

THE FREDERICTON AND ST. MARY'S RAILWAY BRIDGE COMPANY.

Mr. TEMPLE moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 50) to incorporate the Fredericton and St. Mary's Railway Bridge Company, be read the first time.

Mr. WELDON. The principal amendment is one requiring that at least one-half the stock should be represented at any general meeting authorising the issue of bonds.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not rise to oppose the Bill at all, because I believe it to be a very proper Bill, but I would call attention to a very remarkable circumstance that occurred last year, when we waived the rules in relation to Bills coming in from the Senate. That circumstance had a very remarkable effect, and caused a great deal of commotion in this House and in the country; and the hon. member for West Durham called attention to the fact that it was of the greatest importance that the rule should be adhered to. My right hon. friend, also, has had some trouble in connection with the passing of these amendments from the Senate without carefully looking into them. I believe the rule requires that where there are changes otherwise than verbal which affect the Bill, they should stand upon the Notice Paper two days. I do not oppose the Bill, but I simply call attention to the necessity of following the rule strictly in order to avoid the recurrence of such a remarkable circumstance as occurred last year in connection with the Grand Trunk Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. This Bill, that is on the paper now, came down from the Senate last week. It has been put upon the Paper in accordance with the rules.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad of it.

Motion agreed to, and amendments read and concurred in.

HURON AND ONTARIO SHIP CANAL COMPANY.

Mr. RYKERT (for Mr. TYRWHITT) moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 69) respecting the Huron and Ontario Ship Canal Company, be read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER. This amendment is limiting the operation of the Act to five years instead of ten.

Mr. BLAKE. I believe the promoters of this Bill were perfectly right. It is a pity such an important enterprise should be thwarted in this way by the Senate.

Motion agreed to, and amendments read and concurred in

BROSSEAU & LISABELLE, CUSTOM HOUSE BROKERS, MONTREAL.

Mr. LANGELIER asked, Whether it is true that the Government suffers a loss of from $25,000 to $30,000 in consequence of the frauds committed by Brosseau and Lisabelle, Custom house brokers at Montreal?

Mr. BOWELL. The Government may lose by the frauds committed by Messrs. Brosseau and Lisabelle, Customs brokers, Montreal; but it is impossible to say what the amount may be until the investigation now going on is closed.

Mr. LANGELIER asked, Whether the Government have taken steps to enforce payment of the surplus of the entries made in the name of merchants implicated in the frauds committed by Brosseau and Lisabelle, Customs brokers, Montreal?

Mr. BOWELL. Steps have been taken to enforce the payment of all deficiencies covered by this invoice. I am not aware of any merchants who are implicated. If there are any, they will be treated otherwise than by merely requiring a payment of dues from them.

Mr. LANGELIER asked, Whether the Government have been informed that certain merchants in Montreal shared in the profits of the frauds committed by Brosseau and Lisabelle, Customs brokers, Montreal, by means of a system under which they paid entry duties of some thirty to forty dollars, when they ought to have paid from one hundred and twenty-five to one hundred and fifty?

Mr. BOWELL. Certain information has been conveyed to the Department as to parties other than brokers being implicated; but whether it is true or not I am not prepared to say.

Mr. LANGELIER asked, Whether the Government have taken energetic steps to prevent a renewal of the frauds committed by Brosseau and Lisabelle, and if so, what such measures are?

Mr. BOWELL. Government have taken all the steps possible to prevent frauds of this kind occurring again by instructing their officers to be more careful in the investigation of invoices presented, particularly by brokers.

Mr. LANGELIER asked, Whether the Customs Department has been informed that seizures have been effected as against merchants of Montreal indirectly implicated in the frauds committed by Brosseau and Lisabelle; what is the total amount of such seizures, and do the Government intend to maintain the same?

Mr. BOWELL. I only repeat the answer I gave to the former question. We have no positive knowledge of any merchants being implicated in these frauds, and it is impossible to state what amount may be lost, or the amount of the seizures, until the investigation to which I have referred is completed.

Mr. BLAKE. The question is, whether seizures have been effected.

Mr. BOWELL. The seizures have not been effected, but the merchants have been called upon to make amended entries.

SEIZURES BY THE CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT AT MONTREAL.

Mr. LANGELIER asked, Whether the Customs Department has been informed that the Collector at Montreal often intervened to arrest seizures made by the officers under his control, in cases of manifest fraud, and that such intervention resulted in benefit to the Customs brokers?

Mr. BOWELL. The Department has no such information.

Mr. LANGELIER asked, Whether the Customs Department has been informed that the Collector, or other superior officers of Customs at Montreal, took it upon themselves to cancel seizures made by subordinate officers, and to restore the goods seized, without submitting the case to the Department and without even notifying the officer by whom the seizure was made?

Mr. BOWELL. The Department has not received any information of that character.

WOOD FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS, OTTAWA.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth) asked, The number of tenders received for the supply of wood to the Public Buildings in Ottawa? Name of the contractor for the next three years? Price per cord for the three qualities of wood supplied?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Seven tenders were received. The lowest was that of J. M. Quinn, I think, of Ottawa, at the following rates: Hard and rock maple, $4.95 per cord, mixed, $4.75, kindling $3.75. The contract has not yet been signed, but it will most likely be signed to-morrow.

TREATY NEGOTIATIONS BY SIR AMBROSE SHEA.

Mr. DAVIES asked, Have the Government received any information of the successful negotiation by Sir Ambrose Shea of any arrangement with regard to the trade relations between Newfoundland and the United States? If so, will they now state the nature of the information?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Sir Ambrose Shea was in town on Saturday, and informed me that he had been at Washington. He had had no official duties to perform there; he was not appointed by the Government of Newfoundland, but he was asked to go to Washington by the Board of Trade of St. John. He had had some communication with Secretary of State Bayard, and with Mr. Wells, but there had been no conclusions come to. He informed me generally what he did, but I am not authorised to state what he communicated.

TRADE RELATIONS BETWEEN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. DAVIES asked, Have the Government taken any steps for the negotiation of freer trade relations between Canada and the United States, and if so, will they now state what those steps are?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government have had some communication on this subject; but the matter is not in such a state that it would be of advantage in the public interest to state particulars. And the same remark

applies to the next question. [Mr. Davies—Have the Government taken any steps for the negotiation of any treaty or arrangement respecting the use by American fishermen of the waters of the Dominion of Canada after the expiry of the fishery articles of the Treaty of Washington? If so, will they now state what those steps are?]

THE ELECTORAL FRANCHISE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the second interpretation clause, in the paragraph relating to "person," I move that after the words "an Indian" the words "and excluding Chinamen" be inserted.

Mr. MILLS. There are many other points in this interpretation clause before that one, and it would be well to know precisely the way in which the hon. gentleman proposes to proceed.

Mr. BLAKE. I think that we will have great confusion unless the hon. gentleman takes each clause by itself in the order in which they occur in the Bill. There are many important points preceding this one which may elicit much discussion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps so. The suggestion thrown out by the leader of the Opposition is a good one, and I shall adopt it. Say we take the first clause.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I move, in amendment to the first clause, that all after the word "owner," in the 16th line, to the words "in the said Province," in the 20th line, be struck out. If this amendment is adopted it will have the effect of striking out woman suffrage.

Mr. BLAKE. Before that motion is put I would say there are some suggestions to be made with reference to points still earlier in the clause than that, and I think it would be well to take them up in order. My hon. friends near me have suggestions with reference to earlier portions of this clause, and if we go backward and forward, we will get into confusion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend has moved this amendment in order to test the question of female suffrage, and I think it is very important to test it now as, if female suffrage is denied, it will cause a change in very many portions of the Bill, and it would be well to settle the question as early as possible. As that question affects most other clauses of the Bill, it should be settled first. There can be no objection, of course, to any other amendment being moved to any of the phrases before it.

Mr. BLAKE. Very well. On that understanding it is all right.

Mr. LANGELIER. Is this amendment intended to do away with woman suffrage only for the Province of Quebec? As I understand the amendment it is confined to the Province of Quebec, because the portion of the clause which it is proposed to strike out only refers to that Province.

Mr. GIROUARD. But it involves the question of woman suffrage.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is true that portion of the clause refers specially to woman suffrage in the Province of Quebec, but the Government does not propose, or the Bill does not propose, and I am sure my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Townshend) does not propose in his amendment, that the ladies of Quebec only should be excluded. My hon. friend takes the earliest opportunity of testing the question as to the female franchise, by moving to amend that portion of this clause which presupports that female suffrage is to be carried in the Bill. Well, Mr. Chairman, with respect to female suffrage, I can only say that, personally, I am strongly convinced, and every year, for many years, I have become more strongly convinced, of the justice of giving women otherwise qualified the suffrage. I am strongly of that opinion, and have been for a good many years, and I had hoped that Canada would have the honor of first placing women in the position that she is certain eventually, after centuries of oppression, to obtain. It is merely a question of time all over the civilised world. In England the question has made marvellous progress, as we all know who have paid any attention to that subject. By slow degrees women have become owners of their own property; they are protected as much as if they were unmarried—protected in all their rights, not only against all the world, but against their own husbands. They have obtained a *quasi* political position on school boards, in vestries, and in municipal elections, I believe, to a certain extent; and in every position in which they have made an advance towards equality with men, they have proved themselves so efficient that there has not been the slightest attempt to retroactive legislation to deprive them of any privileges or advantages that, after centuries of denial, they have at last obtained. I had hoped that we in Canada would have had the great honor of leading in the cause of securing the complete emancipation of women, of completely establishing her equality as a human being and a member of society with man. I say it is a mere matter of time. It is known—at least, it is believed, though I cannot speak positively on that point—but it is generally understood that the present Premier of England is in favor of female franchise. He did not allow female franchise to be imported into his late Franchise or Representation Bill, for fear it might harm the Bill as a whole. He stated that the question was to be judged on its own merits as a separate question; and upon his statement the motion for the extension of the franchise to women was defeated by a large majority. But it was a majority obtained in consequence of that statement made by the Premier, who, as head of the Government and as leader of the House of Commons, was carrying through the Franchise Bill; and when there was a separate motion, standing by itself, moved by Mr. Mason, it was defeated in the House of Commons by a majority of only sixteen votes. I need not enlarge upon this subject, because I am fighting *contra spem*. I believe a majority of this House is opposed to female suffrage.

Some hon. MEMBERS, No, no.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then I am not fighting *contra spem;* but I think I am better informed on this point than are those hon. gentlemen who say "no, no." The Government are exceedingly anxious, and are resolved so far as it lies in their power, to persuade the House to give effect to their resolution to have this Bill become law during the present Session, and, therefore wish that this question, which is a very important one, but not the all important one, should be settled as early as possible on this motion. And after this is disposed of, we shall be better able to judge of the remainder of the measure, especially of the qualification and disqualification of voters. I have nothing more to say, only I hope that my anticipation will not be realised, and that this House will adopt the clause by which unmarried women and widows will have the franchise. The argument has been used with some speciousness in the discussions on this measure that it is illogical, that we must

give the vote to every woman if we give it to any. This matter of the franchise is not a matter of logic, but of expediency; and it does not at all follow that because we go a certain length we have to go the whole length. The argument was pressed so far in this House the other night that it was said: If you grant the privilege of electing, you must grant the privilege and right of being elected. That does not at all follow. We have at this moment various qualifications of electors here who could not themselves be elected. Government contractors and civil servants can all vote, but cannot be elected. Persons receiving money from the public treasury can all vote, but cannot be elected. In the same way in England Church of England clergymen are all voters, but they are ineligible for election to Parliament. So that the logical argument that if you grant one thing, you must go still further, I do not think amounts to much. Then with respect to the argument that because the Bill gives the right to vote to unmarried women and widows, who are unmarried women, you are doing an injustice to married women. If it be a matter of justice and injustice, you are committing an injustice by omitting all women, and if you admit a certain portion you do not do a greater injustice than prevailed when ladies, married and unmarried, were all omitted. I am, however, in favor of giving ladies, married and unmarried, the franchise. But I am candid enough, as one who has to look at the whole subject, to admit that they do not stand on exactly the same footing. A woman who has no husband, and who is compelled to pay taxes on her property, and assume most of the responsibilities of men, she should have the right to vote for laws, and the most important of which, in any country, are for the protection of property. It seems very hard to argue that a lady who has a large property should not have a vote when her servants may have votes. A lady of large wealth and property said to me when I was in England a short time ago: I have no vote. My butler has a vote, my steward has a vote, my coachman has a vote and at least fifty of my servants have votes; but I have no vote. She thought it was rather an injustice to her that she had not a vote when so many who derived their means of living from her had votes, and were her superiors in that regard. Then I must admit that married women stand in a different position on the family ground, which I do not think ought to prevail, but which certainly separates the question of unmarried women from that with respect to those who are wives. They are supposed to have great community of interest with their husbands. Some people are apprehensive that if the wife holds one political view and the husband a different political view there might be family discord. It is an argument that has very great weight with society, and I believe it is the chief argument that is used against giving married women votes. I do not believe in its force. If married women have a right to own property, to invest their money, to spend their money whether the husband is pleased or displeased, and if that law which allows women to have separate property has not produced such social discord as to evoke a suggestion that the right should be taken away from women, I do not think that the fear of domestic discord on account of exercising the franchise ought to prevail. That, however, I must say, is the chief argument used against married women having votes, and I may say in my opinion it is the sole argument having weight. It has some weight certainly, but, as I have already said, when we see women having the management of their own property, when we see that husbands and wives have different political and different religious opinions, and we know that religious opinions are the strongest of all opinions, and they are those which promise most of accord and most of discord in society, and yet we see they can live happily together, one being a Catholic and the other a Protestant, and in England frequently one being a Christian and the other a Jew—when you see that all those variances in thought and opinion, and in action—consequent upon difference of opinion—does not produce family discord, does not in any way or to any extent produce such family disturbance, such domestic disturbances as to cause these difficulties, I must say that I personally am of opinion that married women ought to have votes. However, I am of the opinion of O'Connell that you should never refuse a step in advance, and I am strongly in favor of first conferring the franchise upon unmarried women and widows, and—speaking for myself personally—I would be quite satisfied to see the experiment tried, and tried for a very considerable period, of giving votes to unmarried women, who are free from domestic shackles, all domestic engagements, all supposed influence or preponderance from the opinions of husbands—to see that experiment tried for a considerable length of time, and allow the question of a further extension of the franchise to married women to depend on the success of this initiatory step. If it were found that the granting of the franchise to unmarried women were a failure, then it would be a decided block, a decided impediment, of course, to extending it at all. At all events, at present, the Bill does not in any way ask for the extension of the franchise to married women. The Committee is asked to consider now, whether it is not safe, whether it is not right, whether it is not just and equitable to allow unmarried women who have property, who have the responsibilities consequent on having property, to have the right of protecting that property by giving them votes. I have heard it stated that women do not sit on juries, that they do not do military service, and that that would be a reason why they should not vote, that they have not the same responsibilities as men. But why not, then, take away the vote of clergymen who do not go to battle? or the votes of Quakers, Mennonnites, and Tunkers, who have conscientious scruples against going to war? If the matter depends upon logic you must be logical, and you must exclude all persons from having votes who are not obliged to assume all the responsibilities that the mass of the voters do assume. No, Sir, I hope that the amendment will fail.

Mr. COURSOL. No doubt we shall hear many different opinions concerning the question of woman suffrage. I have no idea at the present moment what is the sentiment of this House on that subject, but I do know that the measure was fully known to the country at large for a year past, and that it has been discussed in every newspaper. I believe that the question of woman suffrage has already been discussed, especially in the Province of Quebec, and I have no hesitation in saying that the well expressed desire of the people of that Province is against woman suffrage, and I believe they will be pleased to hear that provision has been struck from the Bill. Many arguments have been advanced, and no doubt many arguments will be advanced in favor of woman suffrage. I have no doubt a great many of them are correct; but at the same time there is in the Province of Quebec a principle involved in the question, and that principle is that woman suffrage should be abolished altogether—whether they are married women or widows, or whether or not they are women who are proprietors possessing real estate—those questions have all been discussed, and the principle is that no woman should vote, and, therefore, in deference to that portion of the Province of Quebec which I represent, and knowing the feeling of my constituents on that subject, I have seconded this motion. This motion has been moved by my hon. friend and seconded by myself with a view of obtaining a test vote on this question, and the moment it is decided we shall proceed with the other provisions of the Bill. This clause in the Bill may be received with a certain amount of

favor in some of the other Provinces, but the time has not yet come, and is not likely to come for a long time, when it will be acceptable to the Province of Quebec.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is not often, Sir, that I have the pleasure of agreeing with the right hon. gentleman, even to a limited extend, as I do to-day. Of course, I do not agree with the right hon. gentleman that it is expedient for this House to adopt any measure whatever with regard to the electoral franchise. I believe we are taking a step which is uncalled for, a step which is not in the interest of the country, but I do believe that if this step is taken, if this House assumes the right, as it certainly has the power to regulate the franchise, then I do agree with the right hon. gentleman, to some extent, as to the question of female suffrage. I believe, Sir, that the enfranchisement of the females of the Dominion of Canada would not be detrimental to the interests of the country. I believe it would create a large vote which would be on the side of moral, social, and religious reform. I believe, Sir, if the women of this country, had had a vote, that the Bill which I have promoted two or three Sessions would not have met with the ignominious fate which it met with, from a House which was exclusively a congress of males; I believe that the rights of the females themselves would in that case have received some recognition. I believe, Sir, that in the case where female suffrage has been tried the experiment has proved a success. It has been tried in the Territory of Wyoming, and, when this Bill was introduced a year or two ago, I sent and obtained a work on the practical operation of female suffrage in that territory. I expected to find that the opinions of those who were intimately conversant with its working would be unfavorable, but I was surprised to find that the result of the operation of female suffrage in that territory was eminently satisfactory to all parties. But the kind of suffrage the hon. gentleman proposes is not the kind of suffrage which was granted to the females of Wyoming. Then, there is no unjust discrimination in favor of one class and against another,—the class discriminated against in this Bill being those most eminently entitled to the suffrage, for married females as well as unmarried have the suffrage in Wyoming. And not only do they enjoy the suffrage but they sit on juries, discharging the duties of citizenship in that respect, and with eminent satisfaction to the citizens of the territory and benefit to law and order. The hon. gentleman tells us that he did hope to see Canada lead the van of this reform among the British colonies. Well, Sir, I must say that it strikes me that the conduct of the right hon. gentleman with regard to this matter is not such as we would have expected from an hon. gentleman who is really and thoroughly in earnest in the matter of promoting this movement. I think the hon. gentleman has surrendered, or shows signs of being willing to surrender, tamely and without a struggle, this great principle which is so dear to his heart. He tells us Mr. Gladstone is in favor of this Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not quite say that. I said that that was the general impression,—the rumor—but that he did not state so in so many words.

Mr. CHARLTON. At all events, we have the explicit declaration of the hon. gentleman in favor of this principle, and, if he is in favor of it, I call on him to stand up manfully for it. We know the great power he possesses with the party opposite; we know that his nod is law, and we are perfectly well aware that if he is in earnest in regard to this matter, if he says to his followers that this provision has got to be carried, it will be carried. If the principle of woman's franchise is not adopted by this House I charge it directly on the right hon. gentleman who professes such an affection for the measure; I charge him with proving false to this principle, with having failed to stand up as he should for a principle which he professes to favor. He tells us with regard to the partial application of this principle that it is not expedient to grant it to all. Well, Sir, the question of mere expediency should not govern us in this matter; the question is what is right? The hon. gentleman says, it is better to do partial justice than not to do justice at all. Sir, I scout the idea. When our duty lies plain and palpable before us it is our duty to discharge our whole duty. He tells us, too, that if we were to enfranchise married women there might be discord in the family. So there might; and I know families in which there has been discord in consequence of some of the male members voting on one side and one on the other. I know farmers' families, in which if one son did not follow the principles of his father, there was discord. But what has that to do with the question? It is the right of every elector in Canada to judge for himself or, if we adopt this principle, for herself, and it is no argument to say that if the exercise by a woman of the functions that pertains to her should breed discord in the family, she ought not to have that privilege. I hold that if we are to act in accordance with the principles of justice, and if we hold in any degree that female suffrage is advisable, the hon. gentleman should not hesitate to go the whole length and grant this great boon to the women of Canada without regard to their being married or single; and if any discrimination is made, let the hon. gentleman exclude the widows and the spinsters and give the suffrage to married women, who are better entitled to it than any other class of women in Canada. Believing the enfranchisement of women would be in the interest and for the welfare of Canada, believing that it would introduce into the electorate a body of electors who would exercise their functions with a greater degree of conscientiousness than those who now form the electorate, believing that it would impart to our politics a higher degree of moral purity, and would give us a class of electors who would act religiously and from principle, I think we should be taking a step which is beneath the dignity of this House, and should be acting in a way that is most invidious and unfair, if we adopted only a partial recognition of this principle and granted the franchise to one class of women to the exclusion of another. Let it be to all alike, impartially.

Mr. ROYAL. If an argument were necessary to convince me that I am right in opposing female suffrage, it would be that expressed by my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) on the other side of the House. I regretted very much to hear for the first time such logic from the right hon. Premier as he used in this case. Evidently he was not in his sphere; he was evidently for the time not a Conservative Premier. I think we have enough democracy in this Bill to last for 20 years without touching female suffrage. The hon. gentleman speaks of woman suffrage in vestries, and in municipal and school elections. To vote in a vestry meeting a woman does not require a new education; she is given a religious education when she is young, but she is not taught politics. I do not suppose a woman, if she is a widow and has children, requires any special teaching to qualify her to vote in school elections or in municipal elections. But to give women a vote at parliamentary elections means the addition of a new element in the education of females. The programme that prevails at present in our educational institutions for females is large enough and perhaps too large for the young females who attend them, without encumbering it with political economy. I believe rather in domestic economy than in political economy for females. That is their domain, and they have enough to attend to there without being given those other important duties, which they are not fitted either by nature or education to fulfil, of voting at the polls, and assisting men to guide the affairs of state. Woman has been created for another kingdom; her kingdom is

powerful enough; and if we emancipate woman and allow her to enter the electoral arena, I believe the next move will be to emancipate man. I do not believe in this cry for the enfranchisement of woman. It has been mooted in the press of the United States and in England, and very slightly on the continent of Europe, by some single ladies whose unexpended treasury of affection they desired, I suppose, to be divided between their cats and political questions. Well, Sir, I do not believe in that sort of thing. I believe the dominion of women over men is wide enough at present; they are supreme in almost everything; and if you admit them to the the political arena, we shall have to concede our places to them. I believe our right hon. Premier, through misplaced gallantry, has crossed the floor and shaken hands with the hon. member who has just spoken, the author of the Seduction Bill, and so many other Bills of deep interest to the ladies. I believe, Sir, in the principle of the Bill. There are principles which are thoroughly conservative in it, but I believe this principle sacrifices too much to the other side of the House. I believe, we Conservatives, must stick to the principle that manhood suffrage is the right suffrage, and that womanhood suffrage should not prevail in this country. It is all very well in England, where a lady of property and rank may object that her butler has a vote while she has not; but that is due to the fact that the lady is a woman and the butler is a man, that is all; the reason is very plain. Certainly it may be said that there have been very illustrious women, who have made their mark in history; but I should like to see any honorable member of this committee stand up and say that he would wish to be the husband of one of those illustrious women. If he were, he would be known as the husband of that illustrious lady, and nothing else; he would be called the husband of Mrs. So-and-so, which I believe is against the established order of things which has prevailed for centuries. It would perhaps be a great honor for this Legislature to pay such a high tribute to women, but there are many other ways in which hon. gentlemen, whether young or old, can pay tribute to the fair sex, and I am sure no one here stands remiss in his duty in that respect. However, I do not believe it is a want of gallantry on the part of any hon. gentleman to vote against female suffrage, but quite the other way, and I am sure the majority of Canadian women are more proud to be known as good mothers of families than as good voters. Let us not bring disorder into the established state of things. I believe woman suffrage must be limited to her own fire-side where she reigns and ought to reign supreme, and that she should not be brought into the political arena. She has not received the education for that purpose; she has received no political education, and if she is to be an independent voter, she must be educated for that *role*. Our educational institutions tend to make woman what she is and what she ought to be, a lady who is the more respected the less she appears in a public capacity. I will certainly vote in favor of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend) and I hope that this Canadian Parliament will never sanction the theory of woman suffrage, a theory which I regard as most radical and which I dare to affirm it will be the duty of every well meaning Conservative to vote down.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I regret very much that there should be any opposition to the giving the franchise to the women of our land. In giving them the franchise, we would be simply carrying out what is already in force in our municipal institutions. Women in our municipal institutions have a right to vote, who have property, in the same way as this Bill provides. They have the right to vote for the election of school trustees in some parts of the Dominion; and why there should be any objection to giving them the privilege of voting for members of Parliament, I fail to understand. I think it would be a great boon for Canada to allow the women to vote at the election for members of Parliament; I think it would be a step in the right direction; I think there would be less disgraceful scenes if the women were allowed to have the franchise; I think there would be fewer bribery cases if they were allowed to vote. Women you will always find on the side of right, and whether we decide to-day in favor of women having the franchise or not, the day is not far distant when they will have that right; and we may as well take a step in that direction to-day and give what the Bill calls for, although as far as I am concerned, I am prepared to vote to give every woman the franchise whether married or single. I think we shall commit a very grave error if we refuse to give the franchise to women. Why, women are filling some of the most important positions in the world to-day. I have been surprised to hear hon. gentlemen in this House speak of what a scene it would be to see these women on the public platform. Why would that be a disgraceful scene? If those hon. gentlemen have not travelled beyond their own door or their own fireside, they know nothing at all as to what is doing in the world; let them go to the Old World and there they will find that not a week passes during which there are not public meetings and gatherings addressed by women of ability who would put some members of this House to shame. The same can be seen in the United States. In the adjoining territory to which I live, the Legislature has given the franchise to women. I have heard some hon. gentlemen speak of them as sitting on grand juries; well, in Washington Territory they sit on grand juries, and the effect is that the decisions given are more satisfactory than they were before and are rendered more quickly. It is well known that when women take hold of a matter, they do so with the intention of dealing with it thoroughly and intelligently, and you may depend upon it that matters in the Dominion of Canada, if women are given the right of suffrage, will take a different shape and a more satisfactory turn than they are at present. I sincerely trust that this amendment will be voted down, and that the women will be given the right to vote.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman, the First Minister, is no doubt capable of carrying this amendment if he thinks proper; but he might go very much further than he has done by the provisions of the Bill with regard to woman suffrage. It is true this is not a question that was discussed at the last general election. I do not remember that on any platform there were any discussions as to the adoption of a Dominion suffrage contradistinguished from that of the Provinces, or that there was any proposition that the electoral franchise should be extended to single women and to widows in this country. It is very obvious, from the observations that have been made on this question, that there are very different views entertained upon this question as to what will be the effect of the conferring the right of an elective franchise upon women in the different Provinces. It is clear from the observations made by the hon. gentleman who represents one of the Montreal divisions that the views in his constituency, at all events, and, I believe, generally in the Province of Quebec, are not the views entertained by a very large portion of the community in the other Provinces. This only goes to show that our social notions in the different Provinces differ so widely from each other that what might be regarded as the proper course on the question of an elective franchise in one portion of the Dominion might seriously affect the views and prejudices, if we chose so to speak, of the electors and people in another portion of the Dominion. The observations which are being made upon this question go very strongly to show the impropriety of undertaking to establish a uniform franchise throughout the entire Dominion. It goes to show that there are differences of opinion, differences in our social as

well as our political views, all of which ought, it seems to me, to be respected. The hon. the First Minister says this is not a question so much of necessity as of expendiency, and he proposes, because it is a question of expendiency, to go only a very small distance in the way of introducing the female suffrage. It did not seem to me that the hon. gentleman was successful in defending the position he had taken. His argument pointed to the propriety of going much farther than the Bill proposed to do. It seems like an extraordinary position to be taken in this House that, if you confer an elective franchise upon a single woman because she has a certain amount of property, you should disqualify her the moment she marries, that, in fact, the punishment which in England is inflicted for bribery or corruption at an election should be inflicted in this country simply because of marriage. That is imposing a ban upon marriage which this House ought not to impose. The line of expediency which the hon. gentleman adopted is not applicable to the case as it now stands. If women were not allowed to hold their separate estates, if the moment they married their rights of property merged into the rights of the husband, there would be some propriety in taking the ground which the hon. gentleman has taken; but women have, under the law, I believe, of all the Provinces of this Dominion, the right to retain their separate estates and to control their own property in their own way. That being the case, if you give them the franchise because of their holding a certain amount of property, it is a most inconsistent and I should think a most inexpedient proceeding to say you will take from them that right the moment they get married, though they have the same control over their property as they had before, the same interest in their property, the same interest in the Government of the country, and in the maintenance of law and order. If, then, they once are possessed of the elective franchise, they ought to exercise that right after marriage as well as before. The hon. gentleman has said that no one has the right to the elective franchise, it is a mere matter of expediency. I think there is a great deal of force in the observation made a few years ago by the present Prime Minister of England that the burden of proof in our day is upon those who whould deny the elective franchise to any portion of the community, and, if that is the case, it is clear, if the hon. gentleman admits that it is a proper thing to confer the franchise upon women at all, he is bound to show that very serious evils would arise from conferring it upon married women before placing upon them disabilities which he does not impose upon single women. The hon. gentleman has said that, in the matter of material, social. and legal progress, we never go back. He has pointed to the change in the condition of women, to their improved social position, to their increased right to exercise dominion over their own property, and he gives that as an instance to show that, if we confer the elective franchise upon them, there is no danger of those upon whom it is conferred losing it, but it will become the starting point from which similar privileges will be conferred upon those who are not embraced within the number upon whom the franchise is conferred by this Bill. The hon. gentleman himself has caused very many exceptions to be made to the rule he has laid down. On this very question of the elective franchise, my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) went to the country in 1874. He referred the question to the people of this country; they pronounced an opinion upon it; Parliament has legislated upon the subject; and, although it has done so, the hon. gentleman, without consulting the electors again, has seen proper to take up this question, and to undertake to undo what was then done and to depart seriously from the policy which was then enunciated. The hon. gentleman has said that there are domestic reasons why married women should not have the franchise which does not apply to unmarried women. I think the hon. gentleman was well answered in that particular by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). There are differences of opinion between father and son with regard to the elective franchise; the father exercises a certain influence and control over the son, and, in some cases, may undertake to control his vote; serious differences may arise between them in consequence of a difference of political opinion, and yet, by the provisions of this Bill, it is clear that the hon. gentleman does not think that is sufficient reason for disfranchising the son while he remains with the father. Neither the farmers' sons nor the sons of other property holders are to be disfranchised under this Bill, but, on the contrary, they are to continue to exercise the franchise at they have before. If that may be done in regard to the son, it may be done in regard to the wife as much as in regard to the daughter. If we are to introduce this subject at all, we ought to go further, and it does cast a very great degree of suspicion upon the earnestness of the hon. gentleman's support of this measure to find that he is so anxious to furnish facilities to those who wish to oppose it. I trust that hon. gentlemen in this House on both sides will not be disposed to vote against this principle in committee, will not be disposed to support the views expressed by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend). This is a most important question, deserving the earnest consideration of the House, one that ought to be very carefully considered, and we are called upon to assume the responsibility of acting without having had any expression of opinion in the country. It is therefore all the more necessary that we should carefully enquire into the merits of the hon. gentleman's proposition, and, if we are to reject the proposition, that we should reject it in such a way that the country will know precisely the views entertained by every hon. gentleman in the House on this question. I say then that the proposition of the hon. gentleman is one that ought not to be so cavalierly dealt with as is proposed by several of his friends. I say it is entitled to the serious, the earnest consideration of this House. It is true that there are many important questions involved in the proposition which the hon. gentleman has submitted to us—what will be the effect on the relations between the men and women of this country, how far it will draw the men up into a purer atmosphere or draw the women down from that exalted position which they occupy, and weaken the important æsthetic and moral influences they now exercise, must be considered. These are important questions, questions deserving the fullest consideration on the part of members of this House, and it seems to me that it is treating the subject far too lightly to propose to deal with it in committee, without giving members of the House who may not favor the proposition the opportunity of formally recording their votes on the subject. This question was last year under the consideration of one of the most numerous and respectable and influential religious bodies of the country, the Methodist Conference of Canada, and I believe that Conference almost unanimously pronounced in favor of woman suffrage. I say that the views that were entertained by the clergymen of that highly respectable, highly intelligent, and highly cultured body, are entitled to the most careful consideration of this House. I have no doubt, Sir, that these gentlemen did not express simply their own views: they expressed the views of a very large number of people with whom they are brought into contact, with whom they have an oppotunity of discussing this question; and that being the case, I think it is due to them, as forming a very large and important section of the community, that this question should be fully and carefully considered by the House. I regret as every one on this side of the House, and, I suppose, on that side of the House, must regret, that this Bill is brought before us at so late a period in the Session; but much as we may regret the late period of the

Session, and anxious as we may be to bring it to a close, it is highly desirable that this, and some other provisions of this Bill should be carefully considered by the House in order that we may reach a conclusion in some degree, at all events, consistent with the views that are entertained by the people of this country. Sir, I do not admit that as a representative in this House, I am called upon to maintain my own views in the abstract. I believe it is the duty of members to see that this House, so far as it can be made to do so, fairly represents the public opinion of the country, and that being the case, it is our duty not to proceed, whatever may be our individual views upon important public questions, in a direction contrary to the views of the country at large. If I had had an opportunity of discussing this question before the country, I would have done so, and if my views did not meet with the approbation of my constituents, they would have had an opportunity of electing a member of a different way of thinking. That opportunity has not been given them: that opportunity has not been given to the constituents of any hon. gentleman on either side of the House. There is no doubt that the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government, and who is responsible for submitting this Bill, and these propositions in the Bill, to the consideration of Parliament, has concealed his opinions upon this and other questions at the elections. If I remember rightly, before the election of 1882, no such views as those which he has enunciated since the election, were enunciated by him upon the hustings, or upon the floor of Parliament. He took an entirely different line. He concealed those opinions which, he says, he has so long entertained upon this question. It is true he knows the disabilities under which the women in this country labor in this particular; they were known to him ever since he has been in public life, and although they may have pressed heavily upon the women, and although he had reached a conclusion after careful and exhaustive consideration of the subject, he was equally careful not to express those opinions, either on the hustings or in Parliament, until after the election took place. I say that being the case, and the House being at sea, as far as public guidance is concerned, upon this question, it is of the utmost consequence that the question should receive the careful and candid consideration of every hon. gentleman in this House. The right hon. gentleman, I think, spoke of the equality of women; he spoke of their competency and of their ability to exercise the franchise intelligently. Well, Sir, I have no doubt that every one of of them are highly competent; they are quite as well qualified, as far as their knowledge of public affairs go, as men are, to exercise the electoral franchise. But, Sir, they do not lose that ability by getting married; they are not less competent after marriage than they were before. If they had a knowledge of political matters, if they took an interest in reading about the public questions of the day, and if they formed opinions upon those questions, they are not less competent to exercise the franchise, they are not less qualified, their convictions are not weakened by any change in their social condition. That being the case, it does seem to me that the House ought to support the retention of this proposition in committee, so as to give to members the opportunity of recording their views formally upon this subject. If the majority of the House then come to the conclusion that this proposition ought to be retained, then, Sir, it seems to me they out to go further and declare that the same property qualifications that will give to men, whether married or unmarried, a vote, ought to give the same right to women, whether married or unmarried. It is true that the women of this country have not, as yet, in any very large number, asked for the electoral franchise, but that has not prevented the hon. gentleman bringing it forward; and the hon. gentleman, having seen proper, under the circumstances, without consulting the country, to submit this whole question to Parliament, Parliament ought to deal with the subject upon its merits. That being the case, I shall vote against the amendment in committee, however I may vote when the question is formally before the House, in order that we may have a full and careful consideration of this whole proposition.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I confess I am quite unable to understand the consistency of the declarations that the hon. gentleman has made. He has made a speech in favor of female suffrage, and he winds up by saying that he shall vote otherwise.

Mr. MILLS. Not at all. I did not say that; I said I should vote for the retention of this proposition in the Bill, and against the amendment.

Mr. RYKERT. He will vote both ways.

Mr. CAMERON. He certainly was very careful to leave the House in such great doubt that there is evidently quite a difference of opinion amongst hon. gentlemen as to what he meant and which way he intended to vote. He has also made an attack upon the right hon. Premier, and endeavored to make a political question out of this question of female suffrage which, it seems to me, is not a political question at all. If hon. gentleman opposite are a unit, as a party, upon this question, I should suppose we should have had some declarations on the subject from that side of the House. I am not aware that they are ony more united upon this question than we are on the Ministerial side of the House. I do not think we will see unanimous vote on that side upon this question, any more than upon this side of the House. When my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) taunted the right hon. Premier with want of sincerity, I think the taunt was whooly understood, and that it was just one of those questions upon which the leader of the Government cannot, any more than the leader of the Opposition, dictate to his followers in which way they shall vote. It is not in any sense a question of party politics; it is a great social question, if I may so term it, upon which the members of the House may have each his own opinion. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) seems to complain that this amendment was made in Committee; but surely it is the proper and place in which to move an amendment of that kind.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was the only place.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). It was the only place in which this subject could be dealt with. If my hon. friend wants to take the sense of the House upon this question, he knows the parliamentary practise too well for me to remind him that it is open to him to move, when the Speaker is in the chair, a motion to the effect, and the yeas and nays will then be taken upon it, and he will have an opportunity of making a much more lengthy speech than he has made now upon the subject, and of recording his vote, and of requiring that every other member of the House shall record his vote, in favor of or against the proposition. For my part I wish to say a few words as to the reason for the vote which I propose to give upon this motion. I have great doubts in my own mind as to the way I should vote upon it. In theory, no doubt, the idea of female suffrage is perfectly correct; but under what I may term the enfranchised state of woman in the Province of Ontario, more particularly, the reasons which formerly existed against female suffrage do not any longer exist, but I doubt very much whether the question has yet reached that point of public discussion and public consideration, in which it is judicious to act. I think it is one which should be ventilated not only in this House but before the country, and hereafter when the public mind is better prepared for it, and when public dis-

cussions have shown there is a concensus of opinion in favor of giving females the suffrage which men now possess, perhaps more of us may feel justified in voting for such a proposition and our doubts on the subject may be removed. I think, however, it is impossible logically to give the right to unmarried women or widows and not give it to married women. For that reason, and in consequence of what seems to be the illogical character of the provisions of the Bill and the want of logical sequence, which the hon. gentleman has acknowledged and which he feels in his own mind, and also because on looking at the Bill I see that this clause is limited to the Province of Quebec, and because I am aware from the discussion that members of that Province are almost unanimously a unit against female suffrage, I do not feel prepared to support this particular clause of the Bill, and must therefore vote in favor of the motion of hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend), although I do not wish to be considered as altogether opposed to female suffrage, which I favor so far as the matter of abstract reasoning goes, but the expediency of granting which at the present moment I very much doubt.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I regret very much that the First Minister, when he moved the second reading of the Bill, did not make a longer and a more particular statement with regard to some of the principles of the Bill, as he has made on this occasion. The hon. gentleman contented himself with speaking on the whole Bill, containing some 60 clauses and 50 sub-sections, for a period of eight and a half minutes. On three lines and a half, which the hon. member for Cumberland wants to strike out, the First Minister has entertained us with a speech covering nearly half an hour. I regret that the First Minister did not make that speech when he moved the second reading. It might very likely have affected the action of some hon. gentlemen. It will be remembered that I ventured to make a few observations on the motion for the second reading of the Bill. I gave my opinion not very strongly, but I gave my opinion all the same, as to the propriety of the propositions which the hon. gentleman submitted to enfranchise a certain portion of the females, the spinsters and widows. I pointed out that I thought there had been no very strong reasons adduced in the House and none out of it, so far as I was aware, in favor of giving the right to vote to spinsters and widows. I pointed out that there had been no petitions to the House in favor of the course which the hon. gentleman was taking. I pointed out that there was no strong opinion outside of Parliament in favor of his position. But the hon. gentleman told the House he was thoroughly sincere in the course he was pursuing. He repeated that statement to-day, and he argued strongly in favor of female suffrage; logically and with the hon. gentleman's usual ability and power he pointed out the reasons why, in his judgment, ladies should have the right to vote. He pointed out that the strong current of public sentiment was running in that direction both here and elsewhere. He said that some of the first minds in England were in favor of female franchise, that Mr. Gladstone was supposed to be in favor of it; at all events, some of the ablest minds on the other side of the water were in favor of it, and that the First Minister of this great Dominion was very strongly in favor of female franchise. The hon. gentleman's argument was a good argument; it was, I daresay, a sound argument; it was delivered with his usual skill and force, and no doubt it had considerable effect. In fact, I may say, so far as I am personally concerned, that the hon. gentleman's speech and argument almost persuaded me to be in favor of giving the franchise to the ladies. If the hon. gentleman had delivered this speech on the second reading, perhaps I would have taken a different course from that I am about to pursue, and the same may be said of other hon. members. The hon. gentleman, I say, therefore should, in fairness to the House and in fairness above all to the ladies, have delivered this speech on the motion for the second reading. The hon. gentleman, as I have stated, pointed out that there was a strong current of public opinion running in favor of enfranchising the ladies. That may be; it is very likely so. But if it is so, and as the hon. gentleman is so strongly in favor of it, why does the hon. gentleman offer every facility for, and encourage the defeat of, this important clause of the Bill? It covers one of the principles of the Bill. The hon. gentleman has introduced the Bill as First Minister of this Dominion. It is a Government Bill. It is introduced on the responsibility of the Government, and yet as regards an essential principle, the hon. gentleman affords every opportunity and facility to kill this principle in his own Bill. Why, he has encouraged the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend); he turned round in order to give the hon. gentleman an opportunity of moving the amendment before any one else could move to strike out any clause, and he gave this opportunity to the hon. member to strike out a clause which the hon. gentleman considers of the greatest possible importance to the Bill, a clause which the hon. gentleman himself approves, and spoke strongly in favor of. Every opportunity is afforded to defeat this clause in the Bill. I do not mean to say that the First Minister, when he introduced the Bill, was not in favor of enfranchising the ladies, I do not say the hon. gentleman was not perfectly sincere in making that proposition; but what will the ladies outside of Parliament say to the hon. gentleman? He introduces a Bill and on the second reading he never opens his mouth in favor of female franchise. When the Bill is in committee the hon. gentleman discusses it at some length. But he tells the ladies, what? I make this an open question; I have the greatest respect for you; I am willing to give you the franchise, young and old, spinsters, widows, and married ladies; but I make it an open question. I leave my followers to do as they please. I do not treat it as a Government measure; I leave it an open question. We know, of course the hon. gentleman's sincerity on all occasions; we of course never mistrust him; but I am afraid the ladies outside this House will have a different opinion. They will say to the hon. gentleman: You had an opportunity of carrying this Bill through Parliament; you had a majority of seventy at your back; we have not elected you by our votes, but we have used our personal influence to give you that majority, and we know perfecty well that when the First Minister or Minister of Public Works cracks the ministerial whip there is no difficulty in carrying through any measure. If you are in favor of that principle and desire to enfranchise us, why did you not do it on this occasion when you had such a large majority at your back? The hon. gentleman has not done so, but he has left the ladies to the tender mercy of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) and other hon. gentlemen, and so far the hon. gentleman has only had to back him the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Wright), the King of the Gatineau, and the hon. member from the Pacific slope Mr. Shakespeare; but of the Ministerial supporters in the House there is not a ladies' man amongst them, except the two hon. gentlemen I have named. The hon. gentleman has but to say the word to carry the Bill, he has only to give the nod, he has but to turn around to his followers with his usual pleasant smile, and the thing is done to a charm; it is done at once. He has but to wave that magic wand of his and you know how quickly and simply the thing is done. Now, what I am afraid of is that the ladies will not think so much of the hon. gentleman who is such a gallant in the House and outside of it. They will think that the hon. gentleman in his old age is getting weak-kneed, that he is getting weak in the back; that he is after all only trifling with the females of this great Dominion of ours. Now, Sir, I do not want that impression to go abroad amongst the ladies of this country.

I am satisfied if the hon. gentleman does not carry through the principle of his Bill in this respect, the ladies of this country will not entertain a very high opinion of the hon. gentleman's steadfastness towards them, or of his faithfulness to them, knowing as they do perfectly well that if he only makes the attempt, and makes it in earnest it will be successful, and that this proposition of the hon. gentleman—perhaps against my vote—will be carried through this Parliament. And, Sir, what will they think of my hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Cameron): they will think that he is neither cold nor hot, and what will they do to him? The hon. gentleman knows what becomes of those who are neither cold nor hot, who are neither one thing nor the other. The hon. gentleman, if I understood him, is in favor of enfranchising all the ladies, and yet he is going to vote against them, and why? Because the hon. gentleman has spoken to two or three people from another Province, or knows of two or three from another Province, who are opposed to the ladies getting the franchise; and for this reason the hon. gentleman proposes to sacrifice the interest of every lady in this country, of every lady in his own Province. Well, Sir, I never knew a Cameron who was not a gallant man, and yet I must say that the hon. member for Victoria appears to be an exception to the rule, for though he says he is favorable to the ladies still he proposes to vote against them. He is following in the footsteps of the First Minister. The First Minister does not go so far; he will vote for them himself, but he will get everybody behind him to vote against them, and therefore——

Mr. MITCHELL. No, not everybody.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). No, there is another gallant man, the hon. member for Northumberland. Now, Sir, I have always thought, since 1877, that there is no proposition the hon. gentleman could submit to this Parliament that he cannot carry, and I am perfectly satisfied that if he is earnestly and sincerely desirous that this principle shall be incorporated in our legislation he can carry it; and if he does not carry it in this Parliament I say the ladies of this country will owe him nothing. He will not get their support, knowing as they do know, and as we all know, that if he was desirous of carrying this proposition he might do so. We shall see what we shall see in a moment or two; we shall see how many of the hon. gentleman's steadfast friends from the Province of Ontario, will vote with him in favor of this proposition, will support him in his desire to gratify and please the ladies in giving them what the hon. gentleman tells us they ought to have. We shall see how many of his friends will support him in this question, and how many of them are prepared to yield their desire to benefit the ladies to the exigencies of a particular moment. I am afraid, Sir, however, that the exigencies of the moment will to some extent, sway and influence some hon. gentleman in this House. We shall see, however, when the vote is taken how many of his friends will stand by him on this question. For my own part I will be perfectly willing if the hon. gentleman's proposition were followed to its legitimate conclusion, to give it my support. If the hon. gentleman enfranchised all the ladies, and made no discrimination between spinsters and widows and married women I would be disposed to support that proposition, but limited as it is, I expressed my opinions on the subject when I had the honor of addressing this House on the second reading, and I will not repeat them again.

Mr. CASGRAIN. This question is a very important one, and I desire to express my views upon it. I have never believed, and do not believe now, in the enfranchisement of women. My reasons for holding those views have been formed from what I have been able to gather from all classes of society and in every page of history that I have been able to cast my eyes upon. I do not see any necessity whatever at the present moment, for our making an exception of the women of Canada to all the civilised women of the world. Their education is not so far above those of European nations; on the contrary, they have less facilities for acquiring those qualifications which belong to women in similar ranks of society in some other countries, and they are not therefore so capable as the women of some of the European nations, of exercising the rights of the franchise, if they were conferred upon them. And when we look at the matter from another point of view, as to her status in the family and in society, I am entirely of the opinions expressed by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal), that the place for woman is in her domestic circle, and that the less she takes part in the conflicts of the world, the better for herself and family. I believe that if she does take any part in politics it will be to the detriment of her family and her household. There are certain peculiar circumstances under which certain rights of suffrage might be granted to women, but in those cases her maternal instincts will guide her and not political sentiment. I do not see much objection to women having votes on the vestry or school board; I would not deprive them of votes there, because, as these matters pertain to the education of the family, her maternal instincts would be a sufficient guide. But beyond that I am steadfastly opposed to any right of suffrage that might be proposed in favor of women. I may say that, though I have always entertained very liberal views, I think this measure is an extreme measure. It is true that, to a certain extent, female suffrage is now advocated in England, but I do not believe that, if the experiment of the enfranchisement of women is tried there, it will last very long. It is one of those things which may be tried, but which, in the long run, when it is put to the test, will not be maintained. I will therefore vote in favor of the amendment.

The Committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

Mr. McMULLEN. When the House rose we were discussing the question of woman suffrage. I consider it a very important question, and one that deserves the attention of every member in this House. This is about the first time that this question has been presented to Parliament, although I believe the hon. leader of the Government has included it in every Franchise Bill he has introduced for a number of years past. I do not know why he should have continued that clause so long, and now, at this particular period should show a disposition to countenance its being wiped out. I think the ladies are entitled to fair consideration in this matter, and I hope that before the debate is closed we shall have an open and candid expression of opinion from every member of the House, so that the country will learn the views of the people's representatives with regard to this important question. I am satisfied from my own experience that the ladies generally study politics. I believe there is hardly a man in this House who would venture to say that his wife does not take some interest at least in the political issues of the country from year to year. I have met ladies who were as capable of judging and of discussing questions connected with the political issues of the country as anv men I have ever met—ladies who were quite able to "corner" politicians of considerable experience. In point of aptitude and intelligence they are quite capable or taking upon themselves the duty of recording their votes as to who should represent them in this House. I think it will be generally admitted that the ladies are heavy tax-payers. I do not think any class of people pay more taxes than they do. Men as a rule do not pay

so much duty on the things they wear as the ladies do. The goods that ladies buy and wear are the very articles which are subjected to the heaviest taxes; and if we believe that taxation and representation should go hand in hand, we must believe that a person who is called upon to pay a heavy sum annually in the way of taxes, should be clothed with the power of voting for or against those who impose those taxes, and of expressing their opinion on the policy that so seriously affects them; the one naturally follows the other. I must say I am rather disappointed that at this stage a motion should be made to strike out the clause for giving votes to the ladies. I think it would have been better to have left the question until we reached the clause referring to it, and to have them discussed the whole question. It is quite evident that there is a considerable feeling of opposition in the House to this measure; still, if the discussion had been left until we had reached the clause, we might have been able to discuss it more intelligently, and more members might have been ready to enter into the discussion and give reasons why they are in favor of or opposed to this provision. Now, woman franchise properly understood, in my opinion, means giving a vote to them for those who represent them both municipally and as members of Parliament; and I do not see why the ladies should be deprived of this privilege. It may be said that they are represented in the persons of their husbands. I do not think that is fair. So long as our law allows ladies to hold property independent of their husbands, it should give them the right to vote on that property. When a lady gets married, her husband cannot deprive her of her property without her own consent, and she should be permitted to represent that property; I think the one thing naturally follows the other, and it is unfair to say simply because she is married that she should not be permitted to represent the property she owns. If she had remained single she would have been allowed to represent her property according to the first intention of the Bill; but I am sorry to find that the hon. gentleman who prepared the Bill did not put in a clause to enfranchise married ladies as well as single ladies and widows. I cannot understand why married ladies should have been left out. Of all classes I think they should have been included. If any class of ladies should be enfranchised, I think the married ladies should. Another class who have been overlooked are those who remain at home with their parents and help in the housework. If the Bill should pass the House in its present shape, a lady teacher earning an income will be allowed to vote, but her sister, who remains on the farm and does the necessary work which is to be done there, and endures all the hardships that accompany her lot, is not entitled to record her vote. I think she should be granted the privilege if she is 21 years of age, as well as her sister who is away from home. There are many farmers who have two or three daughters and no sons; and if you give a farmer's son a vote simply because he stays at home and does the work on the farm, I think on the same argument you should extend the franchise to a farmer's daughter who remains at home and does her share of the work. Among the poorer classes of farmers I have seen girls obliged to turn out into the fields and do harvest work. Any one acquainted with Canadian farm life must have often noticed the daughters of farmers working in the harvest fields, and almost doing the work of men. Now I think that when they undergo the amount of labor in this way, perhaps in the absence of sons, it is nothing but right they should be allowed the privilege of exercising their franchise and voting for those they want to elect. I believe, if the ladies were enfranchised, it would have a decided influence. Some people say that when they went to record their votes, they might be disgusted with the quarrelings and wranglings around the polling booth; but since we have the ballot in force, I do not see any necessity whatever for their being mixed up in anything of the kind. In the town in which I live, we have had, this year, the first experience of ladies having the right to exercise the franchise. In our town there were, this year, some 54 widows and unmarried ladies who had the right to vote for municipal councillors, and I know that every single one of those ladies went to the poll and recorded her vote. They were handed their ballots in the ordinary way, went into the place assigned for marking the ballots, marked their ballots, gave them to the returning officer, and withdrew. There was no trouble at all about it. I can quite easily conceive, in the case of open voting, where ladies are required to come up to the polling booth and give the name of the candidate for whom they intend to vote, it might be unpleasant for them to do so; but where they are permitted to use the ballot, I cannot see that any very great inconvenience or unpleasantness need occur. It was also stated, I think by the hon. the First Minister, that, if the ladies were enfranchised, serious troubles might arise between husband and wife on the question as to whom the wife should vote for. Well, those who are married, and know the cunning and cuteness of the ladies, will admit that there are more men in the world who are fooled by the ladies than there are ladies fooled by the men; and I am confident if you give the ladies the opportunity of recording their votes, they know enough to lead their husbands quietly to suppose they are going to vote for Thomas Jones when they have made up their minds to vote for Jim Brown, and they have the opportunity of doing that simply because it will be a ballot vote, nobody need know anything about it. they may possibly tell the secret afterwards, but I think, as long as by telling the secret they might run the risk of creating a quarrel between themselves and their husbands, they will quietly keep that thing to themselves. I think it is well it should be this way; I think it is proper that the ladies, if enfranchised, should have all the privileges of the ballot, and while the ballot is in force I do not think there is any risk to be run. I believe they would take the opportunity of recording their votes and regard it as a duty. I believe this would have a very beneficial influence from the fact that they would closely scan the characters of the men who present themselves to seek the franchise of the people, and that men would require to walk very straightly and very squarely, or else they would have no chance of success, for there is no class of the community that would come down on them more determinedly and unitedly than the ladies. It would be the means very often of preventing candidates entering the field who were perhaps altogether not of the cleanest and brightest character; I believe it would prevent men from being guilty sometimes of some things that men are inclined to be guilty of, because if the ladies got to know it, they would unanimously give their vote and influence against any such candidate. In England the operation of the Act has had a very beneficial influence. In some cases in England where men came before the electors seeking certain positions in which the ladies had the right to exercise the franchise, the feeling was so strong against those men that they had to withdraw from the contest. I believe this would be the case also in Canada, and in this way the woman suffrage would have a very beneficial influence. I was disappointed when the hon. the First Minister decided to leave this question an open one. I must say I would rather he would commit himself practically and definitely to the carrying out of this measure, which, I believe, would redowned to his glory and praise; I believe he would get thousands of ladies throughout this Dominion to give him their support in this, but now, if after holding out to the ladies the prospect of having the franchise, the prospect of having the right to record their votes and the privileges that carries with it—if now he should permit that

clause of the Bill to be wiped out, I am afraid they will become so mortified, so disgusted, that they will feel to a certain extent they have been insulted. I do not think we should permit this clause to be wiped ont. I am sorry the hon. gentleman has said to his friends: You vote or not for the clause just as you please, but, as far as I am concerned, I am going to vote for it. We have seen Bills introduced in the House that have been treated in that way, and very often they have been defeated and I should be exceedingly sorry this Bill should be defeated. With regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) I was rather amused with the course he appeared to take. He said that out of deference to his friends from the Province of Quebec, seeing there was such a very strong feeling by that section in opposition of the Bill, be was disposed to forego his own personal views and to vote in accord with the views of his friends from Quebec. Well, I can go back to a period in the history of this Parliament when that hon. gentlemen was not willing to take the same course. It appears quite convenient for that hon. gentlemen to take one course at one time and another at another time; but if there is anything in the world to be appreciated in public men it is consistency, and I do like to see a man stand up and follow a consistent course of action. We remember when the Orange Bill was before the House, and I think it was the hon. gentleman introduced it, although he knew his friends in Quebec were strongly opposed to that Bill he did not then sink his own opinion in deference to theirs. No, he felt that in that matter there was a necessity for doing something; he felt there was a very strong feeling in this country in regard to that question; he felt there was a strong desire to keep these people in line, and simply because that desire existed, he would not forego his views in deference to his friends from Quebec. He had to keep these people in line for the coming election, and I believe he succeeded in pulling the wool over their eyes very effectually; I believe they no doubt will turn out and vote for the hon. gentleman and his friends, but it is amusing to note how hon. gentlemen on one occasion can adopt one course and on another occasion adopt another.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). While the hon. gentleman is refreshing his recollection by his votes, I will correct a misstatement he has made as to my position in the matter. I expressly stated one of the reason for the vote I intended to give was that this particular clause in the Bill is limited in its operation to the Province of Quebec. For that reason, I will vote, as I announced that I intended to vote, for this particular clause; I guarded myself from any general enunciation of opinion as to woman suffrage. The Orange Bill to which the hon. gentleman referred was one Bill applicable to the whole Dominion. That in itself marks a point of distinction between the position I then took and that which I now take, and relieves me from the charge of inconsistency which the hon. gentleman has brought against me.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman making this explanation, but I think in the main the statement I have made is correct; I think, on reference to the remarks which the hon. gentleman made in the earlier stage of this debate, it will be found that my statement is correct with regard to the question as to how far this matter has been discussed. In England we find that there has been a very extended discussion on it; we find that it has attracted the attention of both Houses of Parliament in England, as far back as 1866. The question was then introduced, and from period to period since it has received considerable attention at the hand of the English-speaking people. In that country, also, the press has taken the question up, and has very largely advocated the rights of the ladies to enfranchisement, and I am glad to say that the press in this country also has discussed the question at considerable length, and that a very large majority of our journalists advocate the enfranchisement of the ladies. Looking at the question from all these points of view, and taking all these things into consideration, I think the question deserves at our hands more consideration and more investigation than, perhaps, it is likely to get at this very late period of the Session, and with the hurry in which members generally are to get to their homes. I regret that this question was sprung upon the House at a late period. It involves very important questions as well as the lady question, but I should like this point to receive careful and extended discussion before it is finally disposed of. If it does, I think that, if it is not made part of the Bill, the day is not far distant when it will be made part of the Bill. Wherever the ladies have had the opportunity to record their votes, I believe they have done it intelligently, and have shown by the course they have taken at elections that they are deserving of being enfranchised. In some States in the United States they have exercised a very beneficial influence. I know that, in connection with the temperance movement over there, ladies associations have taken a very prominent part. When I visited the State of Maine some time ago, I heard some of the most forcible addresses by lady platform speakers that I ever heard in my life. I will not say that I would go so far as to advocate that ladies should be representatives in this House, though, if we enfranchise them, the probabilities are that one step will lead to another, and that eventually they may be honored by being sent here as representatives of constituencies. I do not know but that, even in that case, it would have a beneficial effect. I have seen scenes in this House, when we have been called upon to sit late at night or in the morning, and I think that, if a number of ladies were here, for very shame, if for nothing else, we would not have the sitting to such an hour in the morning. I believe their presence would be the means of securing adjournments at an early hour, and that they would exercise an influence in that particular that would be beneficial, so I should like to see a number of them here. Another thing to be remembered is that we are living under a Queen, one of the noblest Queens who have ever occupied the throne of Great Britain. We all admire her. We all love our Queen. When we are ruled over by a Queen, is it not right that the ladies, the sex to which that Queen belongs, should have a right to have a say in the lesser affairs of the State. When we live so peaceably, so happily, so loyally under a Queen as the great head of this empire, it is nothing but right that we should consider the claims of the other portion of the female sex. I was referring to the manner in which the question had been introduced in England. In 1876 there was a petition presented to the House of Commons in England, signed by 356,000, in favor of enfranchising the ladies. In 1875, the year before, petitions to the same effect were presented, with the signatures of 415,000. I find that no less than fifteen professors, nine Fellows of Trinity College, and in all thirty-two Fellows of different colleges in England signed those petitions. I think, when that question received the endorsement of men occupying the high and prominent position that these men do in England, when men who have had experience, men who have had the opportunities of judging, have come to the conclusion that it was wise and prudent that the franchise should be extended to ladies in England, we should not give this question a mere passing discussion and reject it and throw it out in that way, so that possibly it may not come up again for years. When we are introducing a Dominion franchise it is a very appropriate and convenient moment to introduce this question, and I am afraid that, if this Bill

is amended by striking out the franchise to women, it may be a very long time before we have the opportunity of amending the Bill and inserting the right and the privilege of ladies to exercise the franchise. I believe it would be found very beneficial, and I hope and trust that hon. gentlemen opposite will give the question their serious consideration. One or two of them have already spoken upon the subject. I should like to see every gentleman speak. I think it is a question upon which every one of them should express his views. Whether this is adopted or not, I think those gentlemen will find, when they go back to their constituencies, that they will not perhaps receive that kind and cordial attention which they might otherwise receive if they had given this question their consideration. The ladies occupy a very important place in elections. I know, in my own experience, that there are a number of gentlemen in my constituency whom it would be an utter impossibility for me to get to the polls to record their votes if I did not, through the influence of their wives, get them to get dressed and turned out. I know that in many cases the ladies have exercised a very beneficial influence. There are dozens of votes that would never be polled but for them. I know where men have been sent and have coaxed the owner to come to the polls, but until such time as they could get the wife to exercise her influence in the direction of getting the husband to go to the poll, there was no possibility of getting him out. I have experienced that, and I dare say a great many others have experienced the same thing. You will find a more general vote if the ladies are enfranchised. I believe they will generally turn out and exercise their franchise. As I said before, in the place were I live every single vote last January was recorded by those ladies who had votes, and I am satisfied that, if they get the privilege of voting, they will go out and exercise it; and not only so, but they will bring their husbands along with them; and it would have another good effect, because, instead of leaving their husbands at the polls and allowing them to get into quarrels and fights, which, I am sorry to say, often occurs now, they will take them home with them, and so prevent their getting into these disputes, and perhaps into law suits, which cost them money. I do not wish to prolong the discussion of this question. I have offered these few arguments, in favor of women being enfranchiseed, conscientiously; I believe it would be a benefit to the country generally if we granted the ladies the franchise, and I believe that, as a people, we shall not regret having done so, but that, before ten years come around, we shall have positive evidence before us of the beneficial results which will flow from the adoption of this proposition. I hope the question will not be permitted to fall through. I sympathise to some extent with our friends from the Province of Quebec; I would rather see them disposed to allow the question to take its course, even if only those are enfranchised that the First Minister proposes to enfranchise by this Bill. I should prefer to see all the ladies enfranchised, but if we only get the portion proposed by the First Minister, the balance will in all probability follow before long. The First Minister suggested that we should first enfranchise the unmarried ladies and widows, and, after several years of that experiment, if we found it to work well, we might then enfranchise the married ladies. I do not think it would be fair to leave the question of the enfranchisement of the married ladies to the experience of the unmarried ladies and widows. I believe that every class should be judged from its own standpoint, because if, after a few years' experience, we found that the unmarried ladies had not availed themselves of the privilege, or had not discharged the duty as well as we expected, that ought to be no reason for withholding the franchise from the married women. I think it would be better to encourage those who, as I have already stated, remain at home with their parents, and do the hard work which falls to the lot of farmers' wives and daughters, rather than those who leave home and qualify themselves as school teachers, or for other avocations. It is certainly a slur upon those who remain at home to refuse them the right to vote while we give it to those who leave home. I think we should encourage home industry, and encourage it in such a way as to induce women to remain at home with their parents. I hope that some of our Quebec friends will see their way clear to accepting the Bill, even in its imperfect form. I hope they will consent to allow the extension of the franchise to widows and unmarried ladies, because the probability is that if they insist upon wiping out that clause of the Bill we shall soon have a strong agitation throughout the country in favor of the enfranchisement of all the women, and we may be forced to take up the whole question, and perhaps place them all on the list. It is better for our Quebec friends, in the meantime, to accept this partial enfranchisement, than run the risk of being called upon before long to accept the enfranchisement of all. I should regret very much if this clause of the Bill was rejected by the House.

Mr. ALLISON. In compliance with the suggestion of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), I would like to make a few remarks on the question before the committee. I consider that this question is as fairly debatable, pro and con, as any which has come, or is likely to come, before this Parliament. I recollect reading, some time ago, an article, I think, by George William Curtis, in favor of female suffrage, which he illustrated something in this way: If the air in a certain building became impure and vitiated, you would not attempt to purify it by any internal chemical process, but you would throw wide open the doors and windows and allow the free air of heaven to come in and flood it with light and freshness. Well, that is very good from his standpoint, and in this respect I should be disposed to favor the enfranchisement of women and allow them to come in and purify the political atmosphere, if there were no countervailing objections. But, Mr. Chairman, my own opinion, derived from observation and from some reading on the subject, is that if the entire female population were enfranchised, that very class whose franchise it would be most desirable to obtain would be those least likely to exercise it. I was somewhat amused with the speech of the hon. member for North Wellington, when, in one breath—or in a good many breaths—he paid the ladies a very high compliment, and yet inadvertently, no doubt, in another breath, he gave them a terrible slap in the face. He said, with regard to female suffrage making a disturbance in families by the wives voting against the husbands and the husbands against the wives, in the event of married women being enfranchised, that it would be the men and not the women who would be deceived, and that in the majority of cases it was the women who deceived the men, and not the men who deceived the women. Well, Sir, though he has expressed this opinion of the sexes, relatively, in regard to female suffrage, strangely enough he wished to enfranchise the women and thus place a greater opportunity before them for practising deception. I think there was a great deal of force in the remarks made by the leader of the Opposition the other day, if female suffrage were admitted at all, that should not stop with unmarried ladies and widows who are possessed of the necessary property qualification, but that it should be extended to all having that qualification. Well, there is a good deal to be said for that view. The hon. member for North Wellington has referred to this as a property qualification. He said he could see no reason why unmarried ladies and widows possessed of that qualification should not be allowed to vote. But it must be remembered that this is not strictly and entirely a property qualification; and, if the principle be admitted, to be consistent the

woman must also have an income and rental qualification. For, if it be decided that female suffrage is right, I can see no reason why any lady who, by her pen, or her pencil, or her needle, or by any product of her hand or brain, can earn an income equal to that which qualifies a man to vote, I cannot see, I say, why she should not also be entitled to vote. Now, Sir, this is a many-sided question. As I have already said, I am very doubtful whether the class whose suffrage it is most desirable to obtain would avail themselves of the privilege if they had it. But, there is another consideration which should guide us in coming to a decision, and that is whether it would be really advantageous to the women to be enfranchised; and this is one of the most important considerations with which we have to deal. On this point I may be allowed to follow the example of the hon. leader of the Opposition, and read a few lines from a popular poet, which expresses a view similar to that quoted by the hon. leader of the Opposition. The lines are not by the great English poet, Tennyson, but by an American poet, the late J. G. Holland; and with all deference to the authority from whom the leader of the Opposition quoted, are, I believe, not inferior to those of the great English poet:

'Black turns to brown and blue to blight,
Beneath the blemish of the sun;
And e'en the spotless robe of white,
Worn overlong, grows dim and dun
Through the strange alchemy of light;

"Nor wives nor maidens, weak or brave,
Can stand and face the public stare,
And win the plaudits that they crave,
And stem the hisses that they dare,
And modest truth and beauty save.

"No woman, in her soul, is she
Who longs to poise above the roar
Of motley multitudes, and be
The idol at whose feet they pour
The wine of their idolatry.

"Coarse labor makes its doer coarse;
Great burdens harden softest hands;
A gentle voice grows harsh and hoarse
That warns and threatens and commands
Beyond the measure of its force.

"Oh, sweet to feel, beyond all speech,
That most and best of human kind
Have leave to live beyond the reach
Of toil that tarnishes, and find
No tongue but envy's to impeach.

"Oh, sweet, that most unnoticed deeds
Give play to fine, heroic blood—
That hid from light, and shut from weeds,
The rose is fairer in its bud
Than in the blossom that succeeds.

"He is the helpless slave who must;
And she enfranchised who may sit
Unblamed above the din and dust,
Where stronger hands and coarser wit
Strive equally for crown and crust."

"She matches meekness with his might
And patience with his power to act—
His judgment with her quicker sight;
And wins by subtlety and tact
The battles he can only fight.

"And she who strives to take the van
In conflict, or the common way,
Does outrage to the heavenly plan,
And outrage to the finer clay
That makes her beautiful to man."

For these reasons, I shall support the motion of the hon. member for Cumberland.

Mr. EDGAR. At this late period of a somewhat tedious Session it is somewhat refreshing to politicians to come upon an oasis in party warfare like this. In the very centre of a Bill, which, so far as I can learn, possesses some of the elements of party strife, we are invited by the Prime Minister to deal with this great social question in a purely non-partisan spirit, and therefore I think it is a treat which the House will not readily give up. I think when we are loosened from the bonds of party we should take advantage of it, and try and give this question some of that very serious and attentive consideration and discussion which it deserves. Of course, the very position of the hon. gentleman who has introduced this subject to the House would demand for it from the House, especially when it is a non-party question, the most serious attention and consideration. We are all in favor of extending the privileges, rights and liberties of womankind, only we want to try and find out what is best for women. There are two sides to this question, and I am very much, indeed, impressed by the arguments on both sides. Partly for my own edification and perhaps a little for the edification of my fellow members, I will briefly draw attention to some of the arguments that occurred to me on both sides of the question. Why ladies should not be politicians I cannot say, especially when we know that a lady occupies the highest political position in the British realm. No man who ever sat on the throne of England exercised so intelligent a sway, so constitutional and beneficent a sway, as does the lady who now occupies the throne of England; and, therefore, no loyal subject of the Queen can, for one moment, logically say that a woman is not capable of being an excellent politician. We know very well, we are perfecly sure, that if women were enfranchised and had the right to vote they would support at the polls, and compel the candidates whom they elected, to support the right side on all social and moral questions. I think there is one question that is looming up before this country, which has been before the people of the United States a great deal, upon which I think the influence of women, when it comes to be considered, cannot but be a very beneficial one. I mean the sacredness of the marriage tie, the question of divorce, which is, in the United States, one of the most dangerous questions to the social fabric and to the whole community. And I am very sure if women had votes in this country they would take the right side on that question and keep Canada from going too far in the direction of loosening the marriage tie. What was it that was the distinctive mark of the age of chivalry? Why, it was nothing else but the respect which man paid to woman, the worship which he then began to pay her. After the years when woman was little better than man's slave, suddenly an awakening came upon the land, and the highest honor that a man could pay to a woman was considered to fit him most for all high positions in society and chivalry. That feeling of chivalry which began simply and solely in the increased respect which man paid to woman has been the basis of our civilisation since that day, and in countries where civilisation is highest man pays the highest respect, to women. Why are not women fit to exercise the suffrage? They are intelligent we know, and now-a-days they are becoming educated, educated not only in their own pursuits, but educated in those pursuits which men have appropriated to themselves for many years. At the universities, at Oxford and Cambridge, at universities in this country, they are found taking the examination, and I know at the university of Toronto, some of the most promising students in the faculty of arts are young women; and we know they are being admitted to medical degrees throughout the country. The standard of intelligence of women is equally as high as that of man. We are inclined to blame women, when they have nothing else to do, for gossipping a little too much, perhaps. How can they help doing so when we do not give them the privilege of talking politics? If we let them take a practical interest in politics and have a voice in the affairs of State, they would give up that little feminine weakness which I fear some of them still

possess. There is a feature in this Bill, however, with which I find much fault, so far as I am in favor of giving the suffrage to women at all, because it contains a provision that married women not only shall not vote, but worse than that, that the husband shall vote on property which he holds for his wife. That is adding insult to injury; not only are we preventing the wife from voting on her own property, but we are giving a vote to a good-for-nothing husband on property which she possesses. So I think that is a very inconsistent provision in a Bill which proposes to deal with female suffrage. These are some of the considerations on one side of this question that occur to me. On the other, it is only fair to say there are some pretty strong arguments. One, I think, is: Have women themselves asked for this privilege; have they knocked at the door of Parliament and made a demand for it? Most of the women we hear talking on this subject are themselves not in favor of having female suffrage. So I think it is almost a pity to force it upon them—to force the duties and responsibilities of the suffrage upon a class of the community who do not ask for it. Then, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that so very important a question as this, which is practically a social revolution, ought to be laid before the people at the polls, and when I say the people, I do not mean only the male voters, but I mean the class who are proposed to be enfranchised—I mean the spinsters and the widows. It is not only right that we should do that, but it is a privilege that candidates should have, to lay that question before meetings of merry maidens, which it may be necessary to call to discuss this question, and conventions of widows, who must decide upon the matter. We cannot go and appeal to the men only, upon a question which is practically a proposal to disfranchise them, in so far as it kills off a number of their votes by proposing to take in another class of voters with equal powers. This is a strong argument—I do not say a convincing one, but it is a strong argument for not taking action at the present time in this direction. Some people say that if we were to give women the franchise and bring them into the turmoil of election contests—which are bad enough, goodness knows, for the men engaged in them—it would unsex the women; it would take away their charms, and modesty and purity—that it would, in fact, make them Amazons. If there is anything in that I think we should pause before incurring such a responsibility. It has been said, too, that the women are sufficiently represented, without their having votes, by their fathers, and husbands and brothers, and even by the bachelors here who may occupy a more tender and delicate relation to the ladies. There is something in that, Mr. Chairman. Is it not possible that by giving a lady a vote we would only be giving two votes to her nearest relation or friend, perhaps to her favorite clergyman, whose advice she might take in this matter, as she does in spiritual matters. After all, is not there a great deal to be said in favor of the family being the sphere of women, where she can do most good, where she ought to have her chief occupation, and where she does more good to the world than she possibly could do at the polls or in Parliament? Why, the next thing the ladies will want, of course, will naturally be to be elected to this House. Now, just fancy the confusion which would be occasioned by ladies occupying seats in this Chamber. No doubt it would have a soothing, calming, and beneficent influence in some directions, but what an undue influence might be exercised by them. Just imagine, Mr. Chairman, yourself, with your well known delicacy, having to call a lady to order; how painful it would be to a gentleman of your instincts to call a lady to order, and insist on her sitting down instead of standing up yourself, in her presence.

An hon. MEMBER. The Chairman might be a lady.

Mr. EDGAR. She might, but that would be still more embarrassing to those who would have to address the Chair. Imagine a bashful member trying to catch the lady Speakers eye! A part of the duty of citizens of the State, as we unfortunately know to our cost in Canada, is to take up arms to defend the State, and unless the ladies become Amazons they could not do that. We would not like to see them do it, and surely the defence of the State should go with having a voice in the Government of the State. There is another strong point, which I will leave to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to put me right in, if I am wrong. I have seen it stated, and I think it is the case, that there is nothing to be found in the Bible in favor of female suffrage. I do not believe there is, and I know that is an argument which goes a good way with a great many good people, and I recommend it to the serious consideration of many members of this House. In the Province of Ontario the Provincial Parliament is composed exclusively of male legislators, male monsters, who sit there and legislate in connection with women as well as men. Sir, those monsters stood up in the Ontario Legislature for the enfranchisement of married women, so far as concerns their rights of property, and under the law in that Province a married woman can receive, and hold, and deal with her separate property as amply as if she were a single woman, or a man, and that concession was given her by the male legislators of Ontario. Then she has also been allowed by those same wretches to make her contracts, as if she were a man. Even if she is married, she is allowed to do that, in connection with her separate estate. Again, those male legislators of Ontario have actually given her the right to vote at elections of school trustees, and more recently in municipal elections, so it may be said with some degree of logic that it is not necessary, in the Province of Ontario, at least, to give women suffrage in order that they may have their rights. Another evil which might be pointed out would be this: If we gave women the right to vote to-morrow and put their names on the voters' list, it would be found—as it has been found in England, and wherever female suffrage has been granted, to a greater or less extent—that a very large majority of the female voters whose names were upon the list, and who have the right to vote, would not exercise the franchise at all. And surely, Sir, it is an undoubted evil to have the uncertainty of a large mass of non-voting electors upon the list. We know that in order to get over the evil of having a great many non-voting electors on the lists, as they stand at present, as a great many abstain from voting, it has been proposed to make voting compulsory. Surely nobody would like to put the names of women on the list, and afterwards come down with the proposition to make voting compulsory; and still I am afraid it would be necessary to do so, if you wanted to get them to come out and vote. The other day I came across a very interesting report in the Boston *Daily Advertiser*, of the 10th of March, of a meeting on women suffrage held in that intellectual centre of the United States, and there were arguments pro and con. There was an interesting shorter catechism propounded by a gentleman there. There were only a few questions and a few answers, and they were these:

"Q. Do the men always ignore the women's rights?—A. Yes.
"Q. Have these men wives?—A. Some of them.
"Q. Sisters?—A. Sometimes.
"Q. Mothers?—A. Usually.
"Q. And they always vote to injure their wives, sisters and mothers?—A. Yes; always."

There was a gentleman present who was called upon to address the meeting. He had come from England, and he had had some opportunity of seeing the results of the female franchise there, and I think it will be very interesting to the House for me to read an extract from what he said,

because it is so exceedingly appropriate, and so much better than anything I can say on the subject myself. You will soon see which side he took on the question :

"The chairman called upon the Rev. Brooke Herford to speak on the results of the female suffrage experiment in England. He said he was too recent a citizen of this country to like to take part in its discussions of public policy. On this question he felt no hesitation. He had never been able to regard this as wholly a woman's question. If woman suffered the whole Commonwealth suffered. He was heartily in sympathy with the general movement for woman's progress. Human nature separated in two directions—the fighter, the hunter, the worker, on one side, and the mother on the other. Women cannot, said Mr. Herford, leave home to do the rougher work. The solemn fact of nature—motherhood—would settle the difference between the sexes. The really strong woman is not the most masculine. She is womanly still. Though home is woman's special sphere, it is not her exclusive sphere. Many of them want to go alone, and it is their right. There is a neutral ground between man's special work and woman's. My first reason against woman suffrage is that it would be a great change, in a place where change is practically irrevocable. Admitting women to college and university affects only a few; admitting her to the suffrage affects the whole community. It is a question whether you will impose upon the whole of womanhood a new duty and responsibility. It would be more of a change than to let a few women specially fitted for it to sit in the Legislature. It is not an individual thing, but would affect the whole life of woman. The question is, whether a new conscription of political duty shall be put upon all women. One of two things should be shown —either that the change is very urgently asked for, or that the higher reasons for it are very strong. I have been struck by the very small number from which the real urging comes. It sounds to me like the efforts of a few people at a concert to force an encore for a piece that has not interested the audience as a whole. There is a great deal of clapping, but you feel that it is not the spontaneous expression of all. The opinion of thoughtful women is entirely divided upon it. So far as I have been able to make out, the experiments have not advanced the cause. The results in newly settled territories are not a safe guide. By the time Wyoming becomes a settled State they may be very sorry they began it. The result of the experiment in England is not brilliant. There is an almost utter failure of the suffrage to interest the women. A mere handful vote, and the great body show no interest in the use of the electoral franchise. The harm of it is the existence on the register of a large number who do not habitually exercise their vote, but can be brought out by the pressure of special interests or temporary stampedes of prejudice. In Manchester, England, the only time when female suffrage has shown its influence it has been a disastrous influence. It resulted in turning out a respected and experienced member of the city council and substituting a disreputable, unfit man because he promised to vote for a further extension of the suffrage to women. The women who voted were mainly of a very low class.

"My reasons for opposing this extension of suffrage are, briefly stated, these :—

"First—I believe that the general custom of the world, which has allotted the functions and duties of government as part of man's special work, is not a blunder or a tyranny, but the real dictate of nature

"Second—That though there are some women entirely fit for such functions and duties, it would be a mistake to alter the whole character of woman's life to the scale of what those few are fit for.

"Third—That such an alteration, namely, the imposition of the political suffrage upon women, would be an experiment in a field in which experiments are practically dangerous (because practically irrevocable) and therefore ought only to be made on clearest and most urgent necessity.

"Fourth—That there is no real necessity or urgency for it; the great majority of thoughful, educated women distinctly are not asking for it, and many of them earnestly protesting against it.

"Lastly—That these arguments are strongly confirmed by the fact that where the experiment has been tried its results are certainly doubtful, and, in the opinion of many thoughtful observers, unsatisfactory and mischievous.

"For these reasons, I regard any further extension of the suffrage to women as unadvisable ; and though I should have preferred to take no public part in the discussion of the question, I would not refuse the request of the many thoughtful and earnest women known to me, who believe that woman suffrage would be not merely unadvisable but a serious and subtle calamity."

Now, you will see how very embarrassing it is, when there are so many good arguments on both sides of this question. Individually, I would have been pleased to avoid having to cast my vote on a question on which my own mind is still unsettled, but I should be very sorry to shirk the responsibility of voting; and, by the time this debate is over, I hope to be able to come to a conclusion that will be satisfactory to my own mind.

Mr. CASEY. I confess that I have some little difficulty in getting at the exact position of my hon. friend who has preceded me. I am afraid that the contradictory arguments which he has quoted, and which he says are so puzzling, have left him really in a state of woeful indecision as to what ought to be our course on this question, and it is only a type of the condition in which the House is, generally, on the present occasion. We are wandering without a guide; we are sheep without a shepherd——

Mr. RYKERT. Speak for yourself.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for Lincoln tells me to speak for myself, but I speak more particularly for him. The shepherd who is to some extent the leader of the House is more particularly the shepherd of that hon. gentleman and the other lambs who sit around him; and, Sir, those innocent creatures are, on this occasion, left without that guardian care which used to lead them by the green pastures and the still waters, find them provender in due season and tell them how to vote on every question. To-night they are emphatically a flock without a shepherd, and the speeches which they have given us show into what a state of indecision this peculiar condition of affairs has brought them. It is rather pleasant occasionally to have a tilt at a question which is purely and entirely an open question, and which we can treat without the slightest tinge of party feeling; and to that extent I must confess that the discussion of the present question is pleasant to us. But, on the other hand, I do not think it is parliamentary to treat a question in this way. It may be very pleasant; it may be very amusing, but it is not politics or statesmanship, to treat a question in the way in which this question has been treated. The leader of the House has brought down to us a Bill supposed to contain the policy of the Government with regard to the whole question of the franchise. It is to be a national Bill, so thoroughly national that it is to wipe out of existence all local franchises and substitute a uniform Dominion franchise. It contains a great many revolutionary provisions, amongst them this proposal, which is one of the most revolutionary of all, that one-half of the community, who hitherto have been excluded from the franchise, should be admitted to the exercise of that right. Perhaps I am not justified in saying one-half of the community, because the franchise is to be limited to a certain section of our women. But this Bill, at all events, recognises, for the first time, the right of a certain part of one-half of the community, who have hitherto been excluded from the franchise, to exercise that power. What is the course of the Government with regard to this revolutionary proposal, perhaps the most revolutionary of all the radical proposals contained in this Bill ? What is the course of the Government on this proposal, which has been laid before the House as an important and remarkable part of their well-matured policy. In introducing and defining it, the right hon. gentleman, the father of the Bill, says: I will leave it an open question; I am willing to stand or fall on everything else in the Bill, but on this particular part you may vote as you please! That strikes me as a very peculiar method of conducting public business. It is usual for a Government, when they have brought down a Bill containing their matured policy, either to stand by it as a whole or intimate to the House that they have dropped certain provisions, and leave to private members the option of introducing them if they choose. That is the constitutional practice; the Government either stand by a Bill as a whole or drop the parts that they do not wish to hold to as a matter of life or death; or, on the other hand, leave the whole Bill an open question. The latter is a course to some extent sanctioned by the usage of this House, although I do not think it is a desirable mode of dealing with a measure of such importance that the Government have thought fit to take it in charge. We have, however, precedents for that, but we have no precedent, as far as I know, of a Government leaving part of a Government Bill an open question and declaring that they will stand or fall by the rest of the measure. Governments have sometimes taken

up measures which were introduced by private members, such as the Insolvent Act, for instance, and put them on the Orders as Government measures, on the understanding that the Government do not consider them as vital portions of their policy; but here we are told that three-fourths of the Bill are vital to the existence of the Government, and the other portions are not. Why has the hon. gentleman refused to stake the existence of the Government on this particular clause? For the reason that he generally refuses to stake his existence on anything he thinks this House is not likely to carry. This is, he says, his own particular and special invention, this granting the suffrage to certain sections of women; but he will not stake the existence of his Government on it, because he believes the House is not likely to adopt it. He wishes to obtain the credit of introducing this proposal, offering the women that franchise which some of them have been asking very loudly, without taking the least risk or responsibility of carrying it through the House. As has been pointed out already, this is a course by no means complimentary or respectful to the women of this country. It is almost an insult to them, to let the opinion spread that the right hon. gentleman thinks he can capture their sympathy and their influence, to be used with their brothers and husbands and sweethearts throughout the country, by means of the proffer of something which he has not the moral courage to really try to give them. He is trying to take credit, without risk or responsibility, and without displaying that courage which the leader of a Government should display, in reguard to an important question of this kind. It is remarkable what poor success the right hon. gentleman sometimes has with policies of his own peculiar invention. This is one of these; it is the only original policy which he has brought down for some time, and for which he has claimed credit for himself, and yet it does not seem to be very successful. He has had it before the House for a couple of years, and the result of the arguments he has brought to bear on his supporters, the result of the discussion of the question itself, has been such that this peculiarly happy policy of his own cannot find acceptance at the hands of his own supporters, and the hon. gentleman is not willing to stake the existence of the Government upon it. It is of his own supporters he is afraid and not of hon. gentlemen on this side, because we have not votes enough to carry anything in opposition to the hon. gentleman's party. If he is afraid to risk his existence on this policy, it is because of his own supporters. Certainly he does not seem to have the same good luck with policies of his own invention which he has had with the National Policy and such other policies as he has borrowed from others. I think the hon. gentleman's followers treat him very ill. It is by no means complimentary or creditable to the hon. gentleman that his supporters should on almost every occasion, when they are allowed to take the bit in their teeth and do as they like, vote against the hon. gentleman who is supposed to be their leader. Time and again we have seen him in a small minority of his own followers, and it would appear, from the speeches we have heard this evening, that he will be found in a small minority of them on this occasion, too. Why is it that, when hon. gentlemen opposite are free to act as they please, most of them vote against their leader, while on the other hand, when the party whip is cracked, they are always ready to support him? That does not do much credit to the practical statesmanship of the hon. gentleman, of which we hear so much. If his statesmanship were of that character, if it were so free from all suspicion of theoretical tinkering with the constitution, why should his followers, on this occasion, when the hon. gentleman has condescended to introduce a new and somewhat theoretical change in the constitution, be found voting against him? Let them do him and themselves, on this occasion, credit, by supporting, for the first and last time this Session on which they have the opportunity of doing so, a policy of the right hon. gentleman's own invention. It is very unfortunate, considering he has told us this is his own child, and what great store he sets by it, and what affection he bears for it—when he has exerted himself to the utmost in offering arguments in favor of woman suffrage, that so many of his followers should get up and say the whole thing is moonshine and theoretical nonsense. I leave to him and to them the consideration of what seems to me to be a very unpleasant state of affairs. I must say, however, that if the leader of this side of the House brought down to Parliament a policy which he stated was peculiarly his own, and exerted himself particularly to argue in favor of that policy, and if we opposed his policy in the same manner in which the supporters of the right hon. gentleman are opposing his pet policy, it might justly be said that we had lost that confidence in the practical character of our leader's statesmanship which we professed to have. I think that may be said of hon. gentlemen opposite, that they have lost all confidence in their leader's practical statesmanship, and believe that in this matter he has been carried away by an illusory theory, or by some desire to curry favor with a large portion of the community, irrespective of the equity of the case. They have not done themselves justice either, because it follows from this exhibition of independence to-night, either that their usual firm and uniform allegiance to their leader is induced by some other cause than conviction, that it does not arise from the arguments adduced by that leader, that it is not the result of a positive certainty that he is in the right, but is the result of a party feeling, or expediency, or something of that sort; or else that on the present occasion they have found the arguments of that leader infinitely less convincing than usual. I think his speech this aft rnoon was more convincing than usual. I think that he made a better speech than he usually makes on a question of this sort, and if his followers fail to be convinced by that, and fail to follow him with the steadiness they ordinarily do, it looks very much to me, and it will look very much to the country, as if they were enjoying their freedom from party restraint on this occasion, very much like a lot of school boys, who have a temporary holiday, as if they were revenging themselves for the compulsion put upon them as to the rest of this Bill, by having every fling they possibly can at the pet policy of their leader—woman suffrage. I say the action of the Government in dealing so with this particular question is scarcely in accordance with constitutional usage. It is, moreover, very disturbing to the public mind, and for that reason is unwise and injudicious. When the leader of a powerful Government, with an overwhelming majority, tells the country a year beforehand, two years beforehand: "I am going to give the suffrage to the unmarried women and widows of this country," they believe he means what he says. They know that he has the power to carry out his promise, and now, after having led them to expect that for a year or two, he comes down to the House and says: "My followers may do what they like on this question." We know what that means. We know he would not say that unless he knew that his followers were going to oppose it, and that he could not control them and make them support it. We know that it means the defeat of this clause in the Bill. When he says: "I give it up; I surrender the fort; I will give up all effort to try to secure for the women of the country that franchise which I have been trying to secure for them for a year or two back," does it not disturb the mind of the country? We know what effect it will produce upon the ladies, who expected to get the franchise, and we know what effect is produced upon the male portion of the community when the ladies' minds are disturbed in reference to such a matter! When they are discontented about anything, it is not a very pleasant

thing for the other half of the community. Therefore, not only in the name of the ladies of the country, but in the name of those gentlemen who are at the mercy of particular members of the female persuasion, I protest against the way in which the right hon. gentleman has excited the expectations of the ladies and the cowardly manner in which he now withdraws from championing their cause. It is an experiment, of course. The right hon. gentleman is fond of trying experiments. He has brought it down to see how it will take, and it does not seem to have taken very well. He has brought it down to try the feeling of the country upon it, and I say that Governments should not experiment on questions like this. They should know their own mind, and they should know the mind of their supporters, before they come down with matters of this kind. It is all very well to experiment, but this is not a laboratory, it is not a debating school, or it should not be.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. Hon. gentlemen applaud that sentiment. I hope they will remove from this House any suspicion of its being a debating school, by taking a much more frequent and a much more argumentive share in the debates of the House than they have been doing of late. The share that some of these gentlemen—I will not say all of them—have taken in debates latterly is more of the character that one meets in a debating school than in a deliberative assembly. Their arguments have proceeded rather from their feet than from their heads, but in this debate, upon a purely open question, a question so attractive to men of their gallant disposition, I hope they will redeem themselves from this reproach of only sharing with their heels in the debates we have been carrying on, and will show us their ability either to champion the cause of the women of Canada or to combat the arguments advanced in their favor. After this reference to the manner in which this case has been presented to the House, I want to say a few words on the case itself. First, I want to notice the *primâ facie* argument in favor of giving the suffrage to women. We all know that the arguments used in favor of any extension of the suffrage, in favor of giving it to any classes not now represented, are well expressed in the phrase I read this evening, which was uttered in the English House of Commons, that, ever since the Reform Bill, it had been recognised as the principle of representation that every person who paid taxes and had a stake in the country was entitled to the exercise of the franchise. I think that is the primary conception of what are the rights of franchise, and the question is whether this rule should be carried out and applied to all classes of the community or whether it should only be applied to the male portion of the community. I fancy that the House will receive with great pleasure the arguments that I hear proceeding from Old King Cole, or somebody else of that musical disposition on the other side. They are a very humdrum sort of arguments, but they are pleasing, notwithstanding; to many in the House they must be so, or they would not be so frequently repeated. A gentleman to my left says it is only the baby, but, if the baby keeps on making such disturbances—this is a point of order Mr. Chairman—he must have some soothing syrup and must be sent away in his nurse's arms to some place where he will not disturb those who have such serious business in hand.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order, order.

Mr. CASEY. I say the *primâ facie* case is in favor of extending the franchise to woman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order, order.

Mr. CASEY. I think you will see who the hon. member is, Mr. Chairman, if you look in that direction, and you had better call him to order at once. The *primâ facie* case is in favor of extending the franchise to woman, and it is for those who think she should not have it to show why it should not be extended to her. Those reasons have not been given to-night. The case is, therefore, in favor of the extension of the suffrage, so far as the argument has gone. I do not say that woman has an abstract right to the franchise, because I do not admit that it is a question of abstract right at all; it is a question of expediency, and of political and public convenience. If we come to look at it in that light, we see many reasons why it would be expedient, why it would be a political convenience, why it would add to the public interest, to give the franchise to woman. We know that she has a great many qualities which qualify her more than most men, more perhaps than any man, to judge of the character, of the moral character, and the mental ability even, of mankind. It is not at all necessary to contend that women have the capacity, either mental or physical, to grasp great questions of public policy, to sit here as members of this House till four or five o'clock in the morning, listening to delightful music, and taxing their brains with great questions of State; it is not necessary to argue that she has that capacity in order to prove that she is qualified to exercise the power of voting. What the elector has to do in any case is not, necessarily, to work out in detail, and to decide upon, great questions of public policy, but it is to choose a representative who, in the opinion of the elector, is qualified to act on behalf of the electors. The elector's business is the selection of a representative; the representative's business is the discussion of public questions—not, necessarily, as the mere mouth-piece of the elector, but as his agent, appointed with full confidence that he will act in the matter for the best interests of that elector and his fellows. Now, Sir, it cannot be contended for a moment that woman has any less capacity for choosing a capable representative of a constituency in this House than the average male elector; if it can be contended, it has not been contended here to-night. I have seen elsewhere arguments tending in that direction, and I have seen able answers to those arguments; and I may say that in the British House of Commons scarcely a Session passes without this question being discussed at great length, usually occupying a night or two of the sittings of that important Assembly. I have before me a report of the debate that took place in 1878, on the Bill introduced by Mr. Courtney, to remove the disabilities of women in England. The argument had been used that women were ignorant, that they were prejudiced, that they were too apt to be influenced by their priests or other clergymen. We know that the religious and moral nature of women is very strong, that they do repose great confidence in their clergymen or priests, and it was urged by some that this confidence was so great, and the converse influence was so great, that it was not safe to entrust women with the right to vote. Mr. Courtney thus replied to those arguments:

"It may be said that women are ignorant. It may be said that they are prejudiced; that they are led away by their sentiment; that they are uninformed; and that they are controlled by priests, or by some other persons exercising considerable influence over their feelings and opinions. Cannot every one of these things be said of men also? Who are the opponents of women who come and say they are ignorant? Who are the opponents of women who come and say they are prejudiced? You meet prejudice by prejudice, and then you proclaim your intellectual superiority by declaring that the other sex are affected with this disability of intellect. In respect of this, as it appears to me, ludicrous criticism, knowing how indissolubly connected men and women are, how little we can escape from the reins of their intellect, how very feeble we are to cut ourselves adrift from the influence of their thoughts and feelings, I have often thought of a couplet of Mr. Pope, who was very severe upon women and said many harsh things of them; and whose relations, indeed, with the sex, were not always happy, but he said one thing which I always thought to be a conclusive reply to all these objections. Hon. members will remember one of the royal princesses who had a dog, upon the collar of which was engraved the couplet Mr. Pope wrote:

'I am her highness' dog at Kew,
Pray tell me, Sir, whose dog are you.'

"When men charge women with prejudice and ignorance, and with being controlled by priests, I am tempted to turn upon them in reply—'Pray tell me, Sir, whose dog are you?' If women follow priests, what priest do you follow! Is it the editor of the daily paper? I am afraid we have in this House some experience of dependence on priests of that kind, who differ only from the more recognised order of priesthood in this respect—that their principles are not quite so fixed, and that they are not ready to proclaim to-day what they are equally ready to denounce to-morrow."

Sir, I think that the remarks of that gentlman are very true; that nothing can be said of the prejudice, the ignorance, or the subjection to control, of the average woman, which cannot be said with equal truth of the average male elector of the country. Indeed, I will go farther, and say that when a question of political morals is up, when a question of character in the representative is before a constituency, the instinct of woman, no matter under what control she may be, no matter how prejudiced or how ignorant of political questions, would be rather to be trusted than the instinct of the average male elector, no matter how well informed he might be upon the political questions of the day—especially if the question is much mixed up with the political issues of the day, I think that his instinct is less to be trusted as that of the average woman. We know how party bonds and prejudices, how party connections of all sorts, interfere with even our own views on the questions of the day—and I cannot put it more strongly than that. I think that each one of us will admit that he has some little personal bias in considering the questions of the day, some bias arising from his connection with one or the other party, and if we admit that in our own case, how much more readily will we admit it in the case of our opponents! I think everybody will admit, on this side of the House, that those gentlemen who sit opposite are affected by party prejudice in their dealings with political questions, and I am sure our friends opposite will freely make the same admission in regard to us. On the question of mental inferiority, I do not think I need enlarge much. It is the fashion to argue that women are mentally inferior to men. No one will contend that woman's mind is of the same sort as the mind of man; that the bent of her faculties is the same; that she can, with advantage, go into the depths of exactly the same questions; but I think no one who has known a sensible woman and conversed with her on political questions will dare to assert that the ordinary Canadian woman is inferior, even in political intelligence, to the ordinary Canadian male voter. It would be extremely out of place, Sir, if anybody in political life in this country ventured to make such an assertion. The right hon. leader of the Government has admitted, by this provision in this Bill, by his speech in the House, by his whole attitude towards this subject, that he believes the average Canadian woman is quite as well qualified to exercise the franchise as the average Canadian man. Possibly the opinion he has of average Canadian womanhood may be drawn from those specimens, or that specimen, with which he has most acquaintance. Sir, it does honor to those ladies, or to that lady, from whom he is most apt to form his impressions of Canadian womanhood—it does honor to that lady or those ladies, that he entertains the opinion he does. I am sure that no one on this side of the House could form a different opinion from the same premises. No one of us who has known, say, an elderly mother, say an elder sister, say an independent and sensible woman, living by her own resources—none of us who have known such a woman would venture to assert that the average woman of the country has not a mind capable of pronouncing a sound judgment upon political questions. Then there is the question of physical weakness and difference of sex. Of course, these are arguable points. But

when we think of what is really involved in the exercise of the franchise by women, how little physical exertion it really involves, how little the difference of sex would interfere with the exercise of that franchise, I think the arguments against female suffrage based on these differences fall entirely to the ground. It is not, as I have said before, pretended that the average woman is physically competent to act as a member of this House, to take the Chair of the Speaker, or even to fulfil the duties of Deputy Speaker, especially during the passage of long and elaborately discussed Bills, such as this promises to be. But, on the other hand, there are many male voters physically incapable of exercising those functions. Thousands of male voters are physically unable to bear the strain that is involved in being a member of this House, and fully performing all the duties of such member. More than that, all the physical exertion that would be required of a woman who had a right to the franchise would be to cast her ballot. Is it pretended that the women of the country are physically unable to cast ballots? The contention would be absurd. Is it contended that the mere casting of the ballot would interfere in the slightest degree with a woman's home duties? I think that contention is equally absurd. It has been said that if women had the franchise they would waste much time in acquiring political knowledge and in attending political meetings, and so on. I do not know that the time so spent, if they did so spend it, would be much more wasted than is a great deal of time now spent by them. I do not know that attendance at political meetings would be any worse use of a woman's time than attendance at a Scott Act meeting. That is a political agitation, in its essence. Yet women have been going out in thousands to attend those meetings for years, because they have been encouraged by their spiritual directors, and even by their husbands, brothers and relatives, to attend those meetings and cast in their influence with what they considered was the moral and right side in that agitation. Would it do women any more harm to listen to a discussion, say on the Franchise Bill, than to a discussion on the Scott Act? Would it be wasting time any more in one case than in the other? Would it be involving any more neglect of household duties? No. But there are other ways in which time is spent. There are many tea meetings held in the fall and during the winter. Rinks are open in the winter, and roller skating rinks in the summer, at which our wives and daughters spend a good deal of time. Will hon. gentlemen say that that is a more wholesome use of time than it would be to attend at political meetings? Yet I am willing, if they like, to grant that attendance at political meetings is not the very best thing for our women. But I say it is not necessary. Our women are very fond of reading, and they can find in the daily newspapers, taking both sides, a much better discussion generally of public questions than they will obtain by attending at election meetings; and by spending one or two hours every evening in consulting the newspapers, they will, in a very short time, obtain much more knowledge of public questions than a great many of the male voters who now control the destinies of the country. On the other hand, it is contended that there are sentimental objections. I have been talking of the physical objections, chiefly, to the exercise of the suffrage by women. But we have heard some beautiful poetry recited to-night about women. I don't remember it all exactly now; it is all, however, about the same sort of thing—that women should not mix in that which might contaminate the lily-white purity of their minds, and might make coarse the moral and intellectual fibre of their being—I think that is about the sort of figure generally used. It is that it would make women coarser to mix in political matters, and it would degrade women; that they should live in luxury, and in order to save their complexions they should wear large hats when they go out.

That is the sort of idea we find in all poetry written about the degradation of women by mixing in politics. Although mankind are, as a rule, very particular about not degrading the moral and intellectual fibre of womankind by letting them mix in politics, they are not so particular about it in other directions. If it is degrading to women to go quietly to the polling booths and deposit their ballots, say once in every five years, is it degrading to spend day after day at the washtub, until they are bent in body and weakened in mind, and have acquired the seeds of disease, from which they will never recover, owing to exertions made to support, perhaps, a lazy and drunken husband, or a family? Is that degrading to woman?

An hon MEMBER. No.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member is quite right. If it is necessary to do this, the act enobles the woman. But if women are to be mere Watteau shepherdesses, to be put on the mantlepiece and only to be touched with kid gloves, we should take measures to free them from this sort of heavy labor. This is not only the case with washerwomen. How many of our young girls have to earn their living in factories? Is it pretended that the moral atmosphere of the ordinary factory is better for a woman during many hours of every day of the year than the air of a polling booth for a few minutes once in every five years? If the work does not degrade women in the factories, is this visit to the polling booths going to do so? If women, young girl and children, almost, are allowed to be brutalised by working in factories—I do not use the word brutalised as expressing my own opinion in regard to these girls—but if the exercise of an honorable function like that of voting is degrading to women, what else shall we say of the effect of the hard manual labor by which many respectable girls eke out their existence? I think these sentimental objections may be regarded as having little or no weight. But, on the other hand, it is said: Even supposing all these arguments be true in regard to enfranchising women, it is not advisable to give this class the franchise, because it is merely the beginning of a new policy, because if you do this you must also give the franchise to married women, and to young women living at home and subject to the control of their parents. I do not think there is any analogy between the two cases. Who, that ever considers the important change made in the social relations of a woman by her marriage, in her relations not only to her husband but to all the rest of the world, can think for a moment that the arguments which apply to her rights and functions while she remained an unmarried woman should apply afterwards? We know that in marriage the legal individuality of the woman is almost entirely lost, that in every true marriage that individuality, so far as the exercise of will is concerned, should be, to a great extent, lost also. We know also, as a matter of fact, that there is in most marriages only one will—I do not say which it is—it is often a toss up which it is, but it will be known after a few years of married life that there is only one will between the two, and whether it is the wife's or the husband's does not matter; the will of both should be expressed in one decided and unequivocal utterance. That should be the case in regard to the franchise, and as the man is the nominal head of the house, and as he is in most cases the real head of the house, the exercise of the franchise is properly put in his hand, in the case of married people. He has, therefore, to go to and state at the polls, by means of the ballot, the united opinion of the firm, John Smith & Co., or whatever the firm may be, and in that way a married woman has her share in the franchise. Although she casts no ballot in her own name she has a share, and often a large share, in forming the political opinion of her husband. If she is a woman of sense and judgment she will discuss these matters with him, and will be found pretty nearly as well posted as he is, and her opinions in matters coming within her sphere will largely influence his. She has an influence in that manner upon the representation of the people, not less important for being indirect, and I say that the principle of giving the actual power of voting, in the case of married people, to the male member of the firm only, is one which I think no wise legislators would go beyond. I think that there is not the slightest doubt that the granting of the franchise to married women would simply lead to the husband having two votes on every occasion, or to a degree of squabbling and domestic trouble which would be ill-counterbalanced by any advantages which might possibly arise from that extension of the franchise. I must enter my strongest protest against the idea of giving married women the franchise, and I have tried to point out, and I think I have succeeded in pointing out, that there is no necessary connection between the two ideas. Let me illustrate the matter a little further. We know that spinsters and unmarried women have, a great many of them, rights which they lose immediately upon marriage. We know they have a freedom of action which they loose immediately on marriage. We know that although for many years they have been perfectly free, although they have been their own mistresses, they must immediately, on marriage, become, to a large extent, subject to the will of their husbands. We know that until lately all the property they might possess also became subject to the will of the husband, and still these were not looked upon as extraordinary things. It was not considered extraordinary that a woman, absolutely her own mistress until marriage, should become almost the slave of her husband after marriage, and it is not so looked upon now. Nobody thinks it extraordinary that because a woman, before marriage, was absolutely her own mistress, because she was at liberty to take her lodgings where she pleased, to carry on what occupation she pleased, she should not have the same right afterwards. And why should we assume a different state of things with regard to the franchise? Marriage is such a revolutionary change in the life of woman that no analogy can be drawn between her rights and franchises before and after. There is another argument in this connection which is sometimes used——

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I trust you will see that these disorderly noises are put a stop to. They are not only decidedly disorderly but they are extremely disagreeable.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Which noise is the most disagreeable?

Mr. CHARLTON. These noises which sound like the utterances of an emaciated tom cat are certainly very disorderly.

Mr. RYKERT. Have you the floor? One at a time.

The CHAIRMAN. Hon. gentlemen will please keep order.

Mr. DAVIES. If you will look, Mr. Chairman, you will see who is making the noise.

Mr. CASEY. I am sure these little noises do not disturb me half so much as they disturb other hon. members. If it is any amusement to the hon. member who is making the noise, I am quite content, but I certainly think it is not respectful to the House, or to yourself, Sir. However, if it pleases him, let him go on, for it does not disturb me. I was proceeding to say that there was another argument which was used in this connection by those who oppose female suffrage, namely, that it was disrespectful to married ladies to give the franchise to unmarried ladies and take it away from them. I do not see that there is any force in that objection. If it be not disrespectful to

a married lady to consider that her individuality in in other respects is merged in that of her husband, why should it be considered disrespectful to her that her electoral individuality also should be merged in that of her husband? It is urged that they are the mothers of the country; that they are the worthiest part of the female sex, and it is urged with truth that they do more for the country; that they are saddled with heavier responsibilities; that their position is more prominent and important than that of their unmarried sisters. But, I say, Sir, they have a compensation. If they lose the independence which belonged to them when they were their own mistresses, have they not a recompense in the increased importance which married women possess, the increased influence, the increased responsibility; and would not these make up for the loss of the ballot? I have not the slightest idea that if this law came into force the proportion of spinsters exercising the franchise, who are ready to enter into the bonds of matrimony, would be in the slightest degree lessened by the fact that their entrance into that new relation would deprive them of the power of voting. They would say that they preferred to rule a household than to take a share in the election of members to Parliament. I agree with those who hold that marriage is woman's true sphere, that there she shows brightest and best, and that in that relation her best qualities show themselves. And what of those who do not happen to secure that fortunate lot for themselves—those who do not attain to the privilege of being somebody's mistress or slave, as the case may be, and allowing him to have the whip hand over her? What of those who, in every country, are found to exceed the number of men in that country, for it is remarkable that in almost all countries the number of women is somewhat larger than the number of men? What of the surplus? Are they to be doomed to nonentity, simply because they do not get married—simply because, perhaps, they were too particular in the choice of a husband, and would not be satisfied with the specimens presented to them? Is it not monstrous to say that because a woman has too refined ideas to accept anybody who is offered to her as a husband that she should be doomed to political nullity forever? In England, the number of women who are self-sustaining is very considerable, and I wish to call attention particularly to it. The argument has not so much force here, but it shows what may occur in any other country as well as in England. Mr. Stansfeld, in supporting the Bill for the removal of women's disabilities, in 1875, said:

"It may be well that I should remind the House of the large surplus population of women as compared with men, many of whom have no choice but to remain unmarried, and are forced to maintain themselves by their own exertions. I find the figures on the point are these: The surplus number of women in the United Kingdom is 925,764; against whom ought to be set 200,000 soldiers and sailors who are absent from the country, leaving a preponderance of more than 700,000 over men. I find that of total female population, about 487,000 are widows, who having no man upon whom they can depend for assistance and protection, have to earn their own livelihood, and have to rough it in the world and to maintain families left to them by their husbands who are dead. Through the list of trades in which women are engaged, I find that the number of women so employed is 2,500,000——."

Think of that; in the population of England there are 2,500,000 of women who are earning their own living.

"2,500,000, not existing under the ideal conditions of which we have heard, but having to maintain their own in their unequal struggle—sometimes the really unequal struggle—for bread for themselves and their children against the stronger sex. I find such figures as these—women who maintain themselves by working in the various textile manufactures, 517,000; school teachers, 84,000; shopkeepers, 18,000; and farmers and graziers, 24,388."

And, Sir, there are women in Canada who are farmers and graziers, though perhaps not in the same proportion. There are scores of women in Canada—widows, and even spinsters, who are farmers and graziers, who carry on their affairs with as much business ability as any of their male neighbors,

who have as sharp an eye to the fattening of cattle and to the raising and marketing of crops, and who exercise all the duties of citizens as well as men, though they have not the franchise. Mr. Stansfeld continues:

"I wish to ask the House how, having already household suffrage in the boroughs, and it looming in the not very distant future for the counties, we can admit every laborer in the country to the franchise, and yet shut out from it these 24,338 women, farmers and graziers? Of about 6,000,000 of women, some 3,000,000 are supposed to remain at home as daughters and wives, 1,000,000 partly support themselves, and 2,000,000 are engaged independently in supporting themselves. These are facts which, to my mind, are entirely inconsistent with the theories and the *a prioris* on which hon. members oppose fundamentally any proposition of this kind."

In speaking of the constitutional difference between the sexes Mr. Stansfeld says:

"But although it may be true that there is this constitutional difference between the sexes, yet there is this distinction to be borne in mind—that although there may be an unfitness on the part of women for certain careers in life, such as that of the bar, or that of politics, or to be members of a Legislative Assembly, or of an Imperial Government—that is not the question we have to discuss to-day. The question we are called upon to determine, and in my opinion it is impossible to dispute it, is the competency of women once in every three or four years to vote by ballot at the election of a member to serve in this House. Women have by the common law a local vote, and of late years we have given them the municipal and the school board franchise. It has been said that we gave them the municipal franchise by surprise; but no proposal to withdraw that franchise from them has been brought forward, and I challenge any hon. members who hold the view that they ought not to possess it, to propose a repeal of the law in that respect. I hear such expressions as these used—that it is not the function of a woman and she is not trained or educated to rule great empires? But is the bulk of the male population trained and educated to rule great empires? Can we not draw a distinction between the function of voting for a representative and the function of representing those who vote. I would further ask hon members to bear in mind that fact, that women are gradually accustoming themselves to the exercise of the privilege on voting in consequence of their possessing the local franchise, and that their thus having a share in local government tends to enlarge and elevate their character, and that any distinction you may choose to draw between the exercise of the local and Imperial franchise is one that is destined to diminish and to disappear.

"As I understand the arguments of those who oppose the measure they come to this: That on the one hand the Bill is not a genuine practical measure of reform, because it would only enfranchise a small proportion of women, and not those who, if women were unfranchised, ought to be placed on the register The second objection is that this measure, having no sufficient practical justification in itself, ought to be regarded simply as a stepping-stone to something further intended to be accomplished by the hon. member at some future day, but when it is impossible to say. I take issue upon these objections. As to the first objection, it is perfectly true that the franchise would be conferred by this Bill upon widows and unmarried women, and not upon married women who are not widows; but it does not, therefore, follow that the views of women would not be fairly represented upon every question affecting their interests. What is our experience upon this point? There is a remarkable logic in the course of political events connected with the franchise. As soon as you remove the political disabilities of a certain class, it is not necessary that that class should be represented in proportion to its numbers, or even so as to alter practically the composition of this House. The mere fact that the disabilities of a class have been removed alters its condition, and raises its status in the public and in the legislative mind, and brings those questions in which it is interested to the front, with a fair chance of their competing with others for preference, and in these days the chief question is one of competing for precedence in legislation."

And he goes on to illustrate that, by stating the fact that the mere admission of some of the working classes to the franchise, by the Reform Bill, had not only raised them to a position of power, but made the opinion of the working classes at large something to be consulted and respected by the Ministry of the day. Upon the same occasion the mover of this Bill, Mr. Forsyth, made one point, which I shall quote:

"Take, for instance, the case of the admission of the working classes to the franchise in 1867. The great blot upon the escutcheon of the middle classes of the Parliament of 1832 was that they failed in their legislation to provide for the education of the working classes; but the moment you introduced household suffrage, although it applied only to the towns and not to the counties, a complete change came 'o'er the spirit of our dream,' with reference to the question of education, and we made an enormous stride in that direction. We were told that we must educate our future masters—that we must educate those whom we enfranchised. The same thing will follow if women are enfranchised, by virtue of those among them who are placed upon the register."

Then he goes on to point out that a great many questions come before Parliament in regard to which women have a special right to be heard. He says:

"Among the public questions in the settlement of which women are entitled to a voice, there are the custody of infants, marriage and divorce, marriage with a deceased wife's sister"——

And I hope my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) will, on this ground alone, support this clause of the Bill—

"the control of property, the preservation of infant life, sanitary legislation, factory legislation, mines' Acts, workshop Acts, local taxation, and education. Four-fifths of the measures that are now before Parliament are such as ultimately affect women, on which they are entitled to be heard, and on which their opinion would be valuable."

If that can be said in England, it can be said with still greater force here. I need not go into the numerous matters coming before the House, in regard to which I think women have the right to be heard. That was in 1875. Take a later date, in 1878 Mr. Courtney, in supporting a later Bill, pointed out that there were advantages in giving representation to women other than merely conferring on them the right to vote:

"And lastly, there is this great advantage in representative Government—that you thereby interest every class of the community in the affairs of the community, that you develop among your citizens a sense of citizenship, that you adduce from among the people a common feeling as of those possessing a common history, with common objects, and common destiny. You may have different ways of arriving at the formation of the representative assembly which you aspire to create; but, in some way or other, you follow these principles in endeavoring to bring into your representative assembly representatives of different sections of feeling and of interest in the community itself Of course, there will be differences of opinion—there are differences of opinion now—as to the adequacy or completeness of the machinery you have adopted. Some persons will say it errs in the excess or undue proportion of representation given to one class, or in a different representation in respect to another class; others will think it cannot be materially mended; but the object, the principle, we all have, is to secure in some measure or other, to each section, to each class, a certain representation—and for the purposes which I have stated—namely, to secure information to the House, to secure that justice which is attained when the House has before it the representation of all divisions, and to secure the welding together of the members of the community into a sense of common union. Well, Sir, if we realise a these principles, and turn to the question before us, I think we must at once see that the question of sex, at all events, does not primarily arise in the topic now under consideration. All the principles I have laid down apply without distinction of persons to men and to women. There may be reasons, to which I will refer presently, why women should be excluded from any share of the election of the members of a representative assembly; but, at all events, this much, I think, must be admitted—that the burden lies on those who insist on their exclusion to justify their exclusion, and that, *prima facie*, distinction of sex does not appear as an element in the problem under consideration.

"Now, Sir, I remember that some years ago, when a question of the extension of the suffrage was brought on a Wednesday afternoon before this House, a right hon. gentleman, who then filled the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, came down to the House and laid down this principle—that he thought all members of the community should be admitted to a share in the representation in this House, against whom there could not be established personal unfitness or political danger in consequence of their inclusion. Prove they are personally unfit, and you then establish a good reason for not admitting them to the franchise. Prove that political danger would follow their admission, and you again establish a reason for excluding them; but, unless you prove one or the other, their case is established when they come claiming to be admitted, because you certainly gain something by their admission, and you must prove a loss in order to deny their claim to be admitted. That was thought at the time, Sir, to be either a revolutionary sentiment; but, in truth, it is a commonplace of the constitution, and the exceptions cover every case that may be rightly alleged against the exclusion of any class or any set of persons in the community."

I think those remarks apply as forcibly to Canada as they do to England; the principles of our constitution are exactly the same; the fitness of Canadian women to exercise their franchise is very much greater than that of the average of English women. Canada is a political country; as I heard a Yankee express it once: "There are more politics to the square mile in Canada than in any other nation under the sun." I have never been in any society in the United States, or in England, or anywhere else, where every woman and child appeared to take such an intense interest in politics, and appeared to be so well posted on them as in Canada. I believe that is something to be proud of, and it adds to the strength of the claim put forward for woman suffrage. Women are already acquainted with politics, and are ready to make themselves much better acquainted with politics, and I think, starting from the point at which they are, they will soon make themselves as familiar with politics as the average elector; nay, far more, and that without any serious loss of time in household duties, without failing in the least in their responsibility as mothers of families, as wives, as heads of households, without derogating in the least from that proud position of social superiority and of superiority in taste and in moral sentiment which we are so willing to concede to them. The sentimental objection is, I think, after all, the one that is strongest amongst members of this House, and the male voters in the country generally; that is the one which makes most people hesitate to express their approval of female suffrage; it is the objection to seeing women brought down to the same grade as ourselves, by becoming mixed up in politics. In that we are not paying a very high compliment to politics, that noble profession in which we are all engaged, the profession of law-making for the country, when we contend it would degrade the noblest woman in the world to lend her intellect to the consideration of questions to which one-fourth, sometimes one-third, of our year is given. I think it is high time we should divest ourselves of that false sentiment. I do not imagine there is a single man in this House who has ever been brought into the presence of a charming girl, well posted in political questions and able to discuss the question of the day, who did not feel that her knowledge of politics, the very elevation of mind shown by the knowledge of political questions, raised her higher in his estimation and made him feel she was a more charming companion for the moment, and would be a more charming companion for life, than the ignorant doll which one would almost imagine to be the ideal of some gentlemen when talking about women. I have my views laid before you, Sir, and the committee, very fully. I believe in the theory of woman suffrage as limited by this Bill. I have not, so far, in the debate, been shown any practical inconvenience or danger which might arise from the adoption of that theory, and I therefore remain, and shall remain to the end of the debate, unless more convincing arguments are brought forth on the other side, a supporter of woman suffrage. I am, for the occasion of this debate, a loyal supporter of the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government who introduced this provision; and I hope by the fact of a member of the Opposition supporting one with whom he has so little political sympathy, purely and simply for the sake of the justice which he believes would be done by carrying out the right hon. gentleman's views in this instance, some at least of the hon. gentleman's own supporters will be shamed into giving him their vote on this occasion. It would be most regrettable that on this occasion, when the hon. gentleman has introduced an original policy of his own, he should be deserted by his own supporters. That would be a sad and solemn sight. The visages of hon. gentlemen opposite look sad and solemn already, as they feel they will be doing something cowardly in deserting their leader on this occasion. It would be unkind and ungenerous on their part; they would show themselves forgetful of old associations, of old favors, social and otherwise, should they vote against their leader on this, the first occasion for many years, on which he has propounded to us anything original that he has claimed as his own. I hope he will not be subjected to-night to the humiliation of being voted down by his own followers on a question of his own production. I hope the other members of the Government will stand by him.

Mr. BLAKE. It is a Government Bill.

Mr. CASEY. I know it is a Government Bill, but when it is left an open question by the leader of the Government, there is no knowing what vagaries may strike the other members of the Government. I know the Premier of any Government is only the mouthpiece of the Government, and that his policy is their policy, and that they are all bound, by the fact of a Bill being introduced in that shape, to support it. I know that constitutionally they are so bound, but the whole course of the debate has been so extraordinary, the course of the leader of the Government has been so extraordinary, that I am almost prepared for anything. I am almost prepared to see the Minister of Public Works vote against the proposition introduced by his leader, in a Bill for which he is responsible as a member of the Government. I am almost prepared to see the Minister of Customs do likewise. In fact, I am prepared for anything in the way of mixed voting, where there has been so much mixed debating, and where the whole course of the Government has been so unconstitutional.

Mr. DAWSON. I suppose this is a question upon which, Mr. Chairman, our constituents will wish to hear the views expressed by their representatives in this House. I shall not detain the House very long, but I mean to be decided in the expression of my opinion in regard to this matter before I finish. I do not approve of half measures; and this measure, if it were carried out, would be only a sort of half measure. It would not extend the full franchise to women; it would only extend it to a limited number; and I say that if you give them the franchise at all, you should give them a full franchise, such a full franchise as would not debar them from becoming members of this Parliament, and taking seats on the floor of this House if they chose; and, in that case they would, as I said on a former occasion, be eligible to the highest offices of the State. We might, for instance, have a lady leader of the Opposition.

An hon. MEMBER. They have one now.

Mr. DAWSON. And in that case, where would the Government be? We might have a lady leader of the Government. We must look at this matter in all its bearings. Once admit them to the floor of the House, and admitting, as we must admit, as every hon. gentleman who has spoken has admitted, that they are fully equal to men—highly talented, accomplished, and so on—we do not know to what high offices they might not aspire.

Mr. BLAKE. They would make very good Ministers of the Interior.

Mr. DAWSON. Possibly. If you admit the principle, you should not confine it as you are doing now. We might have a lady in the Speaker's Chair. I have often seen, as matters now stand, gentlemen exceedingly anxious to catch the Speaker's eye, but with a lady in the Chair and the hon. member—I am sorry he is not in his place—who has just stated that there are no ladies' men in the Ministerial ranks, and that gentlemen on this side are deficient in gallantry, if that gentleman were in his seat and a lady in the Chair, I should like to know what hope there would be for any other hon. member to catch the Speaker's eye. I could imagine, however, some little embarrassment on the part of that hon. gentleman, in case he were bringing forward that very wonderful and statesmanlike Bill of his, in which he has provided very pointedly, and no doubt very properly, for the punishment of any impropriety in the relations which might exist between an unruly youth and his great grandmother. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has said that the Province of Quebec was against woman suffrage and the Province of Ontario in favor of it, and therefore he tried to make a point in favor of the provincial franchise, as it at present exists. As far as my experience goes, Ontario is not, as a Province, in favor of the extension of the franchise to women. I was in the Legislature of Ontario when that matter came up and was debated, just as it is being debated here now, and a vote was taken on the subject, adverse to the extension of the franchise to women. If I may be permitted to make a suggestion, I would say by all means extend the franchise to the ladies everywhere, but let them have a Parliament of their own, make this change in the constitution, let them have a Parliament of their own, let them meet in that Parliament and debate, and then perhaps, when they had arrived at some very wise conclusion on things of very great importance to the State, they might give some advice to this Parliament which might be very useful and instructive. I hardly think, however, it would be fitting or proper to have them mixed up in this House. I hardly think they would like it themselves, and I certainly would not be a supporter of the extension of the franchise in that regard, as it is now proposed to be extended. If, however, it were proposed to give them a Parliament of their own, where they could debate matters among themselves, and in their own way, I am sure they would come to very wise conclusions in most matters, a great deal more so than hon. members here generally do. I am sure hon. members will pardon me for saying that. Such a system would not be quite new, for, at the time of the old French occupation of Canada, it is a well known fact that the Indians of those days had two Parliaments—the Parliament of their chiefs and head-men, and the Parliament of the women. The women met among themselves, and debated matters relating to their general intersts, and, after they had come to a conclusion, they very often carried the day. So we have some experience of the working of this system, and I think it would be a great improvement on the system now proposed. There is no doubt that woman has played her part on the world's stage from the very earliest ages. My hon. friend, the member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), has alluded to the age of chivalry. There is no doubt that at that time woman held a very different social position from what she does now. In those days, from all we read and hear of, she was actually worshipped, and in the earliest ages, from the time that Grecian Helen set the world on fire down to the time of the Crusaders, when women played a very active part, and even put on armor and fought in battles, there is no doubt that woman did much to shape the world's history. But, seriously, Mr. Chairman, I think it would be wrong to force woman out of her proper sphere and bring her down to the turmoil and strife of ordinary life. We should leave her in the high sphere which she now occupies, and where we can look up to her in her proper place. I do not say that members of this House do not express their sincere opinions on this subject, but I believe that many men, in speaking on this subject, in order to gain a little popularity for the time being, do not express their real opinions. But I have no fear and no hesitation in expressing mine, and it is that woman should keep her own sphere and leave to men the work that belongs to men.

Mr. CURRAN. I desire to say a few words on the subject now before this House, first, because of its importance, and secondly, because I know that as a result of the deep strategic movement on the other side of the House, we are likely to spend the whole night here, it may be just as well that members on both sides should say a few words on this question. The fact is, the observations of the speakers, in the course of this debate, on the other side of the House, lead us to believe that whilst they may have come to a perfect understanding as to the tactics they are to adopt, they are not at all in accord as to the arguments they are to employ. Now, the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), after a great many staggering attempts to give expression to some idea or other, stated that

it was not statesmanlike for the right hon. leader of this Government to make this an open question, entirely apart from the politics that divide the House and this country. I regret very much for his sake that he should have so very violently come into collision with the opinions of his own leader in the opening speech that he made upon this very important Electoral Franchise Bill. The hon. leader of the opposition furnished us with a statement made by the hon. Mr. Gladstone to this effect:

"My own opinions," says M. Gladstone "upon this question, if I can describe them in rude outline, are that it is a question of immense difficulty, a question upon which nothing hasty is to be done, a question which requires absolutely to be sifted to the bottom, a question which should be completely disassociated from every movement of party, and every important political consideration, and upon which the House of Commons can only, by a strict adherence to these rules, arrive at a satisfactory conclusion."

Now, we have furnished us by the leader of the Opposition the justification of the course that has been adopted by the right hon. leader of this Government. He has left this an open question. It is one of the greatest importance; it is one of great difficulty; it is one that requires to be sifted; it is one that must be disassociated from party politics; therefore the right hon. leader of this Government leaves it an open question for the consideration of members of both sides of the House. I think that is about all the hon. gentleman contrived to say during the three quarters of an hour that he spoke, with the exception of one other point, on which I agree with him. He stated that the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin) and others who had urged in this House that it was ridiculous to offer the franchise to unmarried ladies and widows and not extend it to married ladies, was a proposition that could not be maintained. I do not think that it can. In fact, those who argue on this question remind me very much of the two American politicians who were said to have been discussing very warmly some theological question, whereupon one became angry with the other and said that he knew nothing at all about the subject, and that he did not even know the Lord's Prayer. His adversary wagered that he could repeat it, and so he proceeded as follows:—

"Now I lay me down to sleep,
I pray the Lord my soul to keep."

"Stop," cried the other, "that will do. You are the first man I ever met that could recite the Lord's Prayer off hand." Now the theology of hon. gentlemen opposite is just about as deep as the theology of those two American politicians. If either of the hon. gentlemen opposite had taken up, for instance, the child's catechism in the Catholic church, he would have found that one of the first duties of the wife is to obey. If he had taken up the prayer book of the English church, he would have found, after the question "Wilt thou have this man?" etc. The promise to love, honor and obey, etc., is exacted. Therefore, we have, both in the Protestant and Catholic churches, laid down, in the elemenatary books, that are supposed to be in the hands of everyone in this House and in this country, the doctrine that it is the wife's place to obey; and, consequently, we can hardly understand how she is going to obey when she marches to the poll and votes in an opposite direction to her husband; but, on the other hand, if she were to obey him, by voting in the same direction, we would be giving two votes to the husband instead of one. Now, the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) has also favored this House with an exhibition of his skill. He has repeated the arguments pro and con, and stated that he had not made up his mind as yet, but he would try to make it up before the end of the debate. I trust that he has a mind to make up. His speech reminded me very forcibly of the course that has been adopted by that great organ of the Liberal party in this country, the Toronto *Globe*. When this Bill first came before the country, some two years and a-half ago, the Toronto *Globe*, with which some people insinuate that the hon. gentleman is connected, had an article upon the subject of this Franchise Bill. That journal opened the campaign by an attack upon the general principles of the Bill, but on the 16th April, 1883, it stated:

"It will be noticed that the conferring of the franchise upon unmarried women is the only liberal feature in the Bill. As to that feature of it, we are pleased to say it is a truly liberal measure."

That was the argument of the *Globe* on 16th April, 1883. As regards this particular clause of the Bill, as regards the principle enunciated in it, there is not one iota of difference between that clause to day and what it was the first time it was introduced into this House. But last week the same Toronto *Globe* in another leading article, said:

"It is highly probable that the clauses which would extend the franchise to women were put in by Sir John as a cheap means of earning popularity in some quarters, and that he never had any idea of getting them passed into law. His Bill, as introduced, would give votes to young, inexperienced women, and withhold the suffrage from all married women, thus branding the married state as disgraceful, or at least as a condition of inferiority."

This is the comment upon the very clause which, two years and a-half ago, this very same journal eulogised as being a truly liberal measure. The question of female franchise has been so ably discussed, the arguments pro and con have been so fully presented, that I think it would be very inexpedient to intrude further remarks upon the House. I will merely say that in so far as I am concerned I have given this subject a great deal of consideration since it was first introduced into the House by the leader of the Government, in the first Session of this Parliament. Certainly, if we took pure reasoning alone, there is nothing, I believe, that can be urged against the exercise of the franchise by widows and unmarried ladies, who are taxed to bear the burdens of the affairs of State, and who ought, in that sense, it seems to me, to be allowed, if they so wish to give their views at the polls. In fact, when I take my own constituency into consideration, when I consider that in that constituency there are very many widows and unmarried ladies who depend upon real estate, in many instances composed of a great many tenements, for the revenues which are to support them; and when we consider that during the reign of the ex-Finance Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright) those unfortunate ladies were deprived of their incomes, by their houses being vacant through his fiscal policy, that they suffered greatly from the effects of that policy—I think it is, perhaps, to some extent, a hardship, that those ladies should be deprived of recording their votes, as they certainly would record them, against the hon. gentleman's return to power during the period of their natural lives, or of the lives of any of those who remember the disastrous effects of that policy. But there is more than that point to be considered. We have to take into consideration, after all, what is the sentiment of the people amongst whom we live, what are the views of the ladies themselves. My opinion is that it would not elevate the ladies to have them interfere in election matters. My view is, that the ladies themselves have no desire to participate in election contests or in proceedings at the poll. I am satisfied that if you look through the annals of this country, in no place will you find that any ladies for whom we have very great reverence have ever urged their claims to vote. This is, therefore, one of those questions on which I think the greatest care should be taken not to thrust a responsibility upon the ladies which they do not ask and seek; and in view of these considerations, I certainly shall record my vote against this clause of the Bill, which would give the franchise to the ladies. As for all the rest, as I do not intend again to speak on this subject before the House, I will simply say there is something in this Bill of which the right hon. leader of the Government has a right to feel proud, we have not what is commonly called manhood suffrage, but we have

true manhood suffrage in this Bill. We have a recognition, not merely of the rights of capital, of property, and of great investors, but we have labor placed upon a par with capital. This Bill is so framed that the tenant, the mechanic, the laborer, every class of our society, have a right to give utterance at the polls to the views they entertain, and in view of this fact I feel that the right hon. leader of the Government has done well to bring this measure forward at the present Session. I do not intend to urge the very many reasons which justify the Government in thus placing the crowning stone, as it were, on the edifice of our Confederation, in thus affording an opportunity for the local and Federal Governments to work independently of each other, without being obstructed by any political combinations or temporary exigencies. I believe that throughout the length and breadth of the country there is a feeling of satisfaction with the general principles and details of the measure, which now has been before the country for two years and a half, and which has not evoked that hostility which hon. gentlemen opposite state it does evoke in the minds of the people at large. They have said that this measure is unpopular. They understand the means that are adopted usually, to make known the popular antipathy on matters of this kind, and if they feel safe in doing so, they would not be slow to adopt the means to secure that end. Whether it be as regards female suffrage or any other part of the Bill, whether it be with respect to those ladies to whom it is now sought to give the franchise, or to those who are excluded, they know very well how to call public meetings, as they are calling them, in various sections of the Dominion on another subject, the purpose of which we know very well the great leaders of the party will be the first to disavow, but which I am satisfied they will be particularly careful to take the full benefit of when the proper time and the opportunity present themselves.

Mr. FLEMING. The hon. gentleman has evidently found that the mind which he possesses is too large to enable him to confine himself in one speech to the subject before the Chair. I shall not follow him out of the record, but I shall confine myself, in the few observations I shall make, to the words proposed to be struck out of the clause in question. This measure is perhaps in some points of view the most important that has ever been submitted to the Parliament of Canada. It is, I judge, the result of the Prime Minister's deliberations of many years. I suppose that this is the crowning measure of his political career, following so soon after the celebration which he enjoyed last summer in the various cities of the country. If it be the result of his long deliberation, of his long experience in public life, then it ought to receive that attention from his friends which their admiration for him and for his general public conduct would warrant. This measure, as introduced now, is a part of a franchise to be adopted for this Dominion. I agree that if the principle which is to be maintained in that franchise is one of a property qualification, the Bill properly contains a franchise for single women and widows. The property of a married woman is represented by the vote of her husband, and if the property qualification is to be adopted at all, then the property only should be represented by one vote, and that by the head of the family. But that is just where the difficulty of considering this measure arises. There is no principle in adopting a property qualification for representation in this House. This House does not deal with the property of the people, it has no control over the property of the people. The control of property is committed to the Local Legislatures, and if taxation is to be the measure by which representation is to obtain in Parliament, then the taxation which this Parliament imposes ought to be the basis on which representation to this House is founded, and if that were adopted, then there would be a much more simple principle which could be adopted in extending the franchise to women. But there is the danger that has been pointed out by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), as well as by others, that if the principle is once admitted, that women are entitled to vote for members of Parliament, the logical consequence of that position is that women should have a right to seats in Parliament. I think that principle is correctly stated, that if women are entitled to vote they should also be entitled to the offices which are in the gift of the people; and I would point out that in Canada we are particularly fortunate in that regard. In Canada it would be very proper for us to adopt the female franchise, because if it is thought rather improper to elect ladies to seats in this Chamber, we have, by our constitution, a Chamber to which they might well be appointed, and where they would find congenial companionship, particularly if they were ladies who had attained a certain age. I commend that to the hon. Minister as a way out of the difficulty into which he has got himself. He has brought down a measure after mature deliberation, the crowning act of his political life, and he finds that it is so unpopular among his own supporters that he is about to abandon it. Here is an avenue by which he may escape and retain his honor. He might appoint the ladies to the other Chamber of this Legislature, and I am sure they would grace it well. I am sure they would be becoming ornaments to that end of the building. Indeed it is insinuated—I have heard some people say—that some of them had crept in there already. The hon. gentleman might either appoint ladies to the Senate or give ladies votes for the Senators, and not appoint any more Senators, but make them elective by the votes of the ladies. That would be one way in which the hon. gentleman could still extend the franchise to women, and it would be a very good thing to the Senate as well. If he will adopt either of those suggestions, I am satisfied he will bring credit to the other branch of the Legislature, and perhaps fasten it still more strongly in the affections of the people than it has been for some time past. But I trust in all seriousness that this radical measure, proposed by a Conservative Prime Minister, will receive very grave attention. It is designed, if adopted, to extend the franchise to a large class of the community whose intelligence cannot be questioned, the purity of whose motives cannot be doubted, a class that in the exercise of the franchise would be free from every suspicion of impure motives—a class that would exercise a wide and important influence upon all moral and social questions, and would tend to elevate politics to a higher plane than it occupies to-day—tend to elevate politics to the plane which it occupied when people were less susceptible to improper influences than they are to-day. And if the hon. gentleman will do that, if he will adopt a measure which will have that tendency, he will have done something to undo very many of the measures he has succeeded in placing on the Statute Book.

Mr. McCRANEY. I would like to crave the indulgence of the House for a few moments. I consider the question now before the House—the question of the franchise—perhaps one of the most important questions which has ever come before this House. I have listened to the arguments which have been adduced by the various gentlemen that have spoken, and I have regretted that the hon. gentleman who brought down this Bill has not seen fit to retain the clause in the Bill with regard to female suffrage. Some days ago, when the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Shakespeare) got up in his place and said he was in favor of female suffrage, I thought that he perhaps voiced the opinion of a good many on the opposite side of the House. It struck me as very significant that that hon. gentleman, who possesses such a classical name, should represent a constituency named after one of the noblest women on the face of this earth to-day—

Victoria—a woman whom every one of us loves, and feels honored in being the subject of; and, Sir, there are tens of thousands of noble women in our country, who are capable of using the franchise and of exercising many of the rights that men possess, as well as that noble woman, although she is the greatest and noblest woman on the face of this earth to day. Now, Sir, we have in this country, as every gentleman knows, thousands of women who are possessed of property in their own right, who are intelligent, and who are in every way capable of using the franchise, and of using it wisely and well. I have no doubt that many gentlemen here have women of that class in their mind's eye just now, who are possessed of tens of thousands of dollars worth of property and have in their employ men who possess the franchise, and can go and vote, while they are deprived of that privilege. I know myself of two women who are carrying on a farm of 2,000 acres, and who have in their employ a large number of men. Those two women have no votes, while a large number of the men in their employ have. Allow me to read the words of a noted lady in England, in reference to the franchise, and the view of it taken by one of the men in her employ:

"'Well, John,' said his mistress, 'what do you think of the franchise?' John scratched his head, thought for a moment or two, and then oracularly remarked: 'Ah, I knows the one you means, marm; its that new 'oss Mr. Fawcett (a neighbor) 'as just bought; don't you 'ave nothin' to do with 'im, marm; he's too leggy and light for your single brougham, and I've 'eared on the quiet that he has a sidebone.' John was dismissed, flattering himself that he had created a strong impression, which he undoubtedly had, although not in the way he imagined. The little lady turned to me with an indignant sparkle in her eye, and remarked, 'That ignorant creature is to have a vote, while I, who pay rates and taxes, not to mention John's wages, must not have a voice in settling the affairs of the nation.'"

Now, Sir, I believe the true principle of the franchise—and this is not a new principle with me, for I have believed it ever since I thought of political matters—is manhood suffrage, with one year's residence in the country; and I believe in female franchise, at least extended to females who own property, whether married or unmarried. I see no reason why a married woman should not have the right to vote as well as an unmarried woman. It has been argued that if women have the privilege of voting they will ask the right to occupy offices. I do not consider that that follows at all, although I do not, for my own part, see any reason why many of the positions in life should not be occupied by women. I say, if my wife is more intelligent than I am, let her take the position, or if yours is, let her have the position. Let intelligence be the rule in our country, and we shall have our affairs much better administered than they are at present. I am sure, Sir, that if a Parliament of ladies could not have done more business than we have done during the time we have been here, it would have been a standing disgrace to them. Some hon. gentlemen have referred to the existence of woman franchise in Washington Territory. Roger S. Green, Chief Justice of Washington Territory, writes:

"Woman's suffrage has been the cause of a general spread of sentiment throughout the Territory in favor of her suffrage. We are pretty unanimously not only persuaded but convinced, that to woman of natural right and justice belongs the ballot, and that the interest, not of herself alone, but also of man, and particularly of children, demands that she have it. Her exercise of it has awakened increased public attention to the extent and modes in which political action practically affects the peace and good order of society, and especially has brought the home forward towards its proper prominence as a social factor vitally and most sensitively affected by municipal legislation and administration. We have already, I am sure, clearer, sounder, and more efficient administration than ever before in the history of the Territory. Experience thus far justifies the hope of the suffragists."

Here we have the evidence of the Chief Justice of Washington Territory to the effect of female franchise there. I may say, so far as the franchise has been extended to women in the Province of Ontario, in every instance, so far as I know, they have used it wisely and well, much better than many men have used it. I do not see why women should not have the privilege of voting at vestry meetings, at church courts, and for school trustees, as well as for municipal officers, and at any rate on all moral questions. If the women of this country had the settlement of the moral questions that come before us from time to time, the moral sentiment of our country would stand much higher than it does to-day. If you want to give moral tone to any object, get some women to take hold of that object. If you want to build churches, if you want to establish schools, or if you want to build any great or noble monument, ask the assistance of women; one good woman can do more than double the number of men in any moral movement. That, I think, we all understand; there is not an hon. gentleman in this House who will not admit that fact. Speaking of granting the franchise to married women, I remarked, before, that I cannot see why the mothers of our sons and daughters have not a greater right to vote, if they have property in their own right, than unmarried females. I believe they have as good a right, and I say, if the franchise is extended to women at all, it should be extended to married women as well as to unmarried. Then if it is found not to work well, it can easily be repealed; but I do not apprehend the slightest fear that if the franchise be extended to women it will not be and continue to be an advantage to the country. Allow me to read a few lines from a lady speaking, of the rights of married ladies to vote:

"The real friends of woman suffrage very naturally object to the Bill before the British Parliament, purporting to be in the interest of women. This precious Bill would give a vote to all spinsters and widows who can fulfil the conditions imposed by law on male voters, but would prohibit married women from voting. It is a slur upon marriage."

The writer is Mrs. Jacob Bright, and she is right. I have already referred to the statement made by many, that if women were given the franchise they would want to come into our Legislatures and municipal councils. I do not believe they would. I believe that women would be too independent, too sensible, to do any such thing, as a rule. Woman has her sphere and I believe in extending the franchise to women. It would not have the effect of bringing her out publicly; I believe that women would exercise their franchise quietly, and that it would have a good moral effect, and that we would have better officers than we have to-day and better order in our country. I would like, with your permission, Sir, to read an extract from the remarks of the hon. Mr. Forsyth on the rights of women. He says, on speaking on that question, that it has been up before the English House of Commons on several occasions, and that no petition has been presented against it:

"Has there been a single petition presented to this House against the Bill? Not one. On the contrary, in favor of the Bill. Crowded meetings have been held in every large town in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and by large majorities, or rather unanimously, resolutions in favor of the Bill have been enthusiastically adopted. This Bill is a measure for giving women the electoral franchise—unmarried women, widows and spinsters. It was first introduced, if I remember rightly, in 1866. The number of persons presenting petitions in its favor in 1867 was 13,000, and last year, in the month of August, they amounted to 415,000; while in the present year, up to the month of April, the number is 356,000. I am quite willing that the value of these petitions should be tested according to the maxim *testimonia non sunt numeranda, sed ponderanda*. The petitions have been signed by persons of every class, description and character. Among the signatures are peeresses and commoners, naval and military men, landed proprietors and commercial traders, and a larger proportion of the middle classes than have been willing to sign petitions in favor of any other measure of the last twenty years. Among those who have signed the petitions there are numerous professors of universities and distinguished authors. I may mention one petition that has been presented this morning by my right hon. friend for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Spenser Walpole).

"Now I will briefly advert to the arguments on which I rest the principle on my Bill, and I will also glance at the objections that are urged against it. First of all, I say that taxation and representation ought to be reciprocal and correlative—that is to say, that no class of persons in this country ought to be taxed unless they have also the privilege of voting for those who impose the burden of taxation. Now the only class in this country that is taxed without its consent is that of women. If you take the case of agricultural laborers, they, as a class, are not excluded from the franchise, because any agricultural laborer, who, by

thrift and industry, can raise himself to a position in which he can occupy a house, with a rental of £14 or £15, so as to be rated at £12 is entitled to a vote. Beyond this, a vote may be exercised by a lunatic in a lucid interval, by minors when they have attained their majority, and by criminals who have served the period of their sentences; but women, who cannot change their sex, are, because they are women, forever excluded from a share in the franchise. What, I ask, does the franchise really mean? It means the opportunity of giving a vote in the selection of a person to represent the voter in the House of Commons. The women, for whom I ask this privilege, may be landowners discharging all their duties as such, and bearing all the burdens of taxation for rates incident to property. They may be shopkeepers in active business, dependent, in many cases, upon their own exertions. There is also a large number of female farmers and graziers in this country, and this class would be much more numerous than it is but for the fact that in many counties in England the widow of a farmer has no chance of carrying on his farm, because she has no vote. The fact is, that the landlord wishes to have as much power over his property as he can, and he will not let his farm to the widow of a farmer, because thereby the voting power will be lost. No exception is made with regard to fiscal liability or the burden of taxation in favor of women. They pay their full share of rates and taxes, as owners of property; they are bound by the provisions of the criminal law, in the same way as men; and there is not a single exception, that I know of, made in their favor. We all know, that as regards offences against morality, women suffer much more than their fellow-offenders, who are men, for such offences, than falls upon male offenders. I will give an instance of the injustice under which women labor as ratepayers. Some years ago the borough of Bridgewater was thought to be so corrupt that a Royal commission was sent there for the purpose of investigating the charges against it. The result was unfavorable to the borough, and the cost of the enquiry was thrown upon the town, the inhabitants of which, at least those who were ratepayers, were compelled to pay the expenses. The female ratepayers very naturally said:

"Do not tax us; we have had nothing to do with the corruption that has been enquired into, we have no votes; why, then, do you punish the innocent with the guilty?' But what said the Home Secretary? He said: 'You are ratepayers, and you must bear the burden as ratepayers, innocent or guilty.'"

In the same speech the hon. gentleman states:

"Sir Henry Maine, in his early history of institutions, has said:

"It will probably be conceded by all who have paid any attention to the subject that the civilized societies of the west, in steadily enlarging the personal and proprietary independence of women, and even in granting to them political privileges, are only following out still further a law of development which they have been obeying for many centuries.'

"But, Sir, it has been asked, and the question deserves an answer—what are the wrongs of which women complain? What are the wrongs which we cannot redress? And what also is the help which women can give us in legislation? As regards the wrongs of women, my answer is that it is wrong that any class in a free state should be placed in the position of a political Pariah. Any class must feel that it would be a grievous wrong to be thought incapable of exercising a right which is conceded to the rest of the community. Let me carry your imagination back for a few years. Remember what was the law regarding property in the case of married women. A few years ago every married woman, unless she was rich enough and of sufficient rank to have trustees under a marriage supplement, was deprived of her property, which, upon her marriage, devolved upon her husband. The result was that any poor woman who by thrift and industry had acquired property could have the whole swept away by a drunken husband, because, in the eye of the law, her earnings belonged to him. It was a long time, and not until after a great struggle, that this House remedied that abuse, and more remains to be done in the same direction. As the House is well aware, a woman cannot now by law appoint a guardian for her children. A man may appoint his wife as is children's guardian; but, when he is dead and she is on her death-bed, she cannot appoint even a brother or sister as the guardian of her child. Is this just? Is this fair?"

I might go on and further read this hon. gentleman's speech on this question, and it is all well worth our attention, well worth our consideration. He says:

"I have said nothing in my speech as to how this question might influence the balance of parties. I should be ashamed to have done so, for this reason, that I do not think any of us have a right to support or oppose this measure simply because it may in one way or another affect the balance of party. I do not know how it would affect the balance of party. I believe you would find as great a divergence of opinion among women on political questions as among men. But, however that may be, I say it would be wrong to oppose a measure simply because, in extending the franchise, it would affect the balance of party, unless the measure in itself was wrong."

Then I find that, in a speech delivered by Mr. Jacob Bright on this same occasion, he speaks of the intellectual fitness of woman:

"As to intellectual fitness, I will not discuss such a barren question; I will only say that among those whose claims have been refused a great number are engaged in important pursuits, and wage successful battle to support their families. They have enough intellectual qualifications to decide between the merits of two political candidates If there is no doubt as to their intellectual fitness, what shall we say about their moral fitness? They are more temperate, more law abiding, more frugal; they pay their rates and taxes with greater punctuality, and they are less often in the hands of the police than many of the franchise class. What reason then is there for the exclusion? The one thing put forward as a reason is that they are women. There may be many men to whom this reason will appear all-sufficient. I can only suppose that these are men whose experience of the other sex has been unfortunate, whose mothers, or wives, or sisters have happened to be weak, or ignorant, or selfish; but I am sure that amongst the members of this House there has been a very different experience, and that there are those who are not contented with this answer, as the country is not satisfied with it. The question, as the hon. member ought to know, is growing throughout the country. I do not think you could call together a meeting in any part of the country of a thousand persons where a resolution in its favor would not be carried."

I could read much more and perhaps of much more interest on this question, but I suppose I had better not weary the House. I was very much struck with the remark of the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), and it was just what one might expect from the hon. gentleman. I did not learn till a few moments ago that he was an old bachelor. He spoke of women having a Parliament of their own. That is what we might expect from a gentleman who has never surrendered to the influence of woman; but, if that hon. gentleman had been brought under the influence of woman, had he—

"Paused while beauty's pensive eye
Asked from his heart the homage of a sigh,"

I have no doubt he would have told a very different story here this evening. I shall not occupy the time further. Although the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) went into the whole question, I believe the question is extending the franchise to females, and consequently I shall not occupy any further time. Suffice it to say that I am a convert to female suffrage, and I have been and I am prepared to support it.

Mr. McNEILL. While I am in favor of the principle of this Bill, while I believe that the members of this House, and not the members of some other Legislature, ought to regulate the franchise for this House, and while I could not regard the arguments of the leader of the Opposition as falling very far short of arguments in favor of the federal system of the United States, as against our own federal system, still I cannot support this clause of the Bill. At the same time, I do not at all agree with the strictures which have fallen from hon. gentlemen opposite against the course of the right hon. the leader of the Government, because he has not made this a party question, because he has not used the great majority which so heartily and so cheerfully support him in this House to endeavor to force this measure through the House. I think that the conduct of the right hon. gentleman in this regard is worthy of the very greatest approval, not only at the hands of hon. gentlemen in this House, but at the hands of the people of this country. This question is one of incalculable importance. It is one which is assuming very great prominence in many parts of the world, but it is a question which has been very little discussed, either on the platform or in the press, or in this House—not in this House at all, until the present occasion. In framing a great measure, which laid down the lines of the franchise for this Dominion, it seems to me that it was only natural that such a question as this should have been taken into consideration. It seems to me that it was impossible that a question which is pressing so strongly upon people in the other parts of the world should have been left altogether out of consideration. As it had not been much discussed, either in the House or in the country, it seems to me that it was quite fitting that it should not be made a party question, but that hon. gentlemen should be left perfectly free to express themselves and vote upon it as they please. I believe, from what has fallen from hon. gentlemen opposite, that this course, which has been pursued by the leader of the Government, is not altogether

approved of by them; it does not altogether meet exactly their views. But I do not find that this is an argument which commends itself, to my mind, in the sense of one that would lead me to disapprove of the right hon. gentleman's conduct. I think there are several hon. gentlemen on this side of the House who will agree with me in that respect. I have been reminded, during the course of this debate, of an expression which used often to fall from the lips of Lord Beaconsfield, that it is the unexpected which always happens. I must say that when I heard one hon. gentleman after another on the other side of the House get up in their place and repudiate a doctrine which they have, for so many years, apparently held so dear, namely, the doctrine of French domination; when I heard one after another get up and repudiate altogether that doctrine which they have been inculcating for so many years; when I heard them say, by implication, at all events, that French domination was a myth, that the right hon. gentleman had nothing to do but crack his whip and we must all fall into line and vote through the Bill, I was strongly reminded of Lord Beaconsfield's expression, that it is the unexpected that always happens. Sir, I cannot see my way to support this clause of the Bill, because I can see no element of finality about it. If women are to enter the arena of politics at all as voters, I can see no escape from the conclusion that they must be allowed to have seats in this House. The right hon. gentleman has adduced an argument in proof of the contrary of that proposition, but I find that I cannot follow the right hon. gentleman in that argument; I confess that I must take leave to differ with him in reference to the proposition he there laid down. The right hon. gentleman has said that members of the Civil Service and clergymen are allowed to vote but they are not allowed to have seats in this House, and therefore it may naturally follow that women may be allowed to vote but may not have seats in this House. But it seems to me that a clergyman has not a vote because he owns property as a clergyman but because he owns property as a man, and as a man he has a right to vote, and just in the same way as he looses his right to vote as a clergyman, so a woman would lose her right to vote if she chose, for example, to become a clergyman, that is to say, if she chose to clothe herself with something that would prevent her sitting in this House. We must therefore consider this question as to its ultimate results. We must consider the full meaning of what we are doing. I must admit that in many respects the prospect is a very tempting one. As I have said already I think it is impossible to deny that women, if they are allowed to the franchise, must be allowed to sit in this House. If no other argument could be adduced in proof of that, I think it is sufficiently evidenced from the fact that they would have nothing to do but to elect men to represent them who would vote to do away with any disability they might have in that respect. As I have said, I think the prospect is a tempting one, and I am sure there us no hon. gentleman in this House who would be so savage as not to admit that the presence of ladies amongst us would add very much to our pleasure in our legislative duties. That, I am quite sure, is a proposition that no one will deny. I have also been struck with a remark by an hon. gentleman opposite, with reference to ladies being in this House. It seems to me that if we had ladies here we might probably have a shortening of our debates. We all know, Sir, that it has pleased Providence in His wisdom which is inscrutable, to confer upon ladies the gift of speech, and we all know that it is a gift which they have all of them, from time immemorial, exercised with the greatest moderation; therefore I think we might naturally expect that if we had ladies here as members of the House we would have a curtailing of those debates which, no doubt, sometimes are apt to be rather too protracted. Therefore I think that is also an argument in favor of the Bill. But the idea is that only unmarried ladies should be admitted to those rights, and in that case it would be only unmarried ladies who would have seats in this House. Now it occurs to me, if that were the case, there would be a very noble field of political ambition opened up for good-looking young men. I recollect very well that when Mr. Shaw, lately the member for South Bruce, defeated the hon. Edward Blake in that riding, we all considered it a very great political triumph. But had the leader of the Opposition not been the hon. Edward Blake, but a Miss Blake, and had some young gentlemen aid siege to her heart and stormed the fortress of her affections, and succeeded in carrying her off as his wife, that would have been something like a political triumph; then that young man would for the period of his natural life have deprived the leader of the Opposition of a seat in this House. That, I say, would be something like a political triumph; and if there was such a thing as political gratitude, such a thing as a reward for political service, which we know is not the case, I think that young man might fairly be considered as the champion supporter of the Government of to-day; and he might lay claim to some sort of recognition of his services, an honor such as the great Five Mile Belt, with which he might be adorned, not for its value, but simply as a mark of honor and token of championship. But this naturally leads one to think it would be rather an unfair arrangement to confine this privilege to unmarried ladies only. I must say I entirely agree with those who have taken that view of the question. If it be right that unmarried women should take an interest in politics, it does seem to me it would be very unfair that so soon as they follow the laws of nature and become married women they should be deprived of that right, even though they still retained in their own right that property by virtue of which they received the right to vote and by virtue of which they had voted. It would seem very strange that a woman who had been induced to vote, who had been educated to vote under this very clause—I will go further, and say, who had been compelled to vote—should, just so soon as she became thoroughly familiar with the lesson she had been taught, and as soon as she took to herself a husband, be deprived of this right which has been conferred on her by this Bill. It would seem very hard that the mother should be deprived of the right to vote while the daughter was allowed to vote, perhaps in support of the very political party to which the mother had always been opposed. It would seem very hard that a woman who had been educated under this clause to vote, perhaps, in favor of prohibitory legislation, should, just so soon as she happened to marry a drunkard, be deprived of the right she had hitherto exercised of supporting that legislation. I know that the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) has said that, because the husband is the head of the household, therefore the wife should not be allowed to vote. That argument, however, proves a great deal too much, because, under it, no farmer's son and no mechanic's son would be allowed to vote, and no daughter would be allowed to vote, because they equally might vote against the wishes of the head of the household. If our women are to vote at all their votes must not be subordinate to those of men, but must be placed on a fair and full equality with the votes of men; and therefore it is that I cannot regard this question in any other light than in the light of whether it be desirable or not to confer the franchise on women to the full extent it is conferred on men. If that be the case, we shall have married ladies in the House; and if that be the case, the Minister of Public Works will require to consider seriously the necessity of adding to the Parliament Buildings, in order to provide a good, roomy nursery. I do hope, when he does this, he will take care that the building is very much better ventilated than this Chamber, as otherwise we cannot expect to rear healthy politicians. I recollect reading, some time

ago, in the London *Standard*, a very interesting account of a manufacturing establishment which had been founded by a scion of one of the old aristocratic families in England. A remarkable thing about it was, that all the details had been worked out with such great exactness and with such perfection that even the proprietors of rival establishments admitted that it was in every respect fifty years in advance of any similar establishment in Great Britain. One of the arrangements which was specially admired was the excellent sanitary conditions under which the girls and women, especially, worked; and there was one arrangement made for the accommodation of the married women which struck me very much. There was a section of the establishment in which there was a number of little cots, which were kept constantly gently rocking by machinery. I think that when we are obliged here to add to our Parliament Buildings by providing such a chamber, and when we have little parliamentary babies being gently rocked by machinery, we shall have made a very great advance in the development of the human race. It seems to me these children might almost be expected to have political wisdom rocked into their little brains, and even imbibe it with their mother's milk; and we might naturally expect to have thereby provided for us a class of politicians of a very high order indeed. But I think this question is one of the most important questions that could possibly be commended to our consideration. It is surprising it has not been more discussed. To my mind, it, to a large extent, implies a social revolution. That average men and women are, by constitution, in the main, intended for different walks of life, seems a proposition that can scarcely be gainsaid. There are, of course, exceptions to every rule. But I may take an example of what I refer to—the army. We know very well there have been regiments of Amazons, and we Englishmen must remember, to our cost, that the Maid of Orleans was a very successful military leader. Still, we do not expect many women to command our army or our ironclads. When England and France fought Russia in the Crimea our armies were composed of men and were officered by men, although I believe there are many among us who have forgotten even the names of many of the heroes of that war; yet I think there is one Crimean name which we all remember, the name of a woman whose courage and devotion and energy and wisdom are as clearly defined in the memory of men to-day as they were a quarter of a century ago. But the foe she fought against, the foe she volunteered to fight, was sickness, suffering and death. She was indeed, "When pain and anguish wrung the brow, the ministering angel" of Sir Walter Scott. And by confining herself to her own sphere of uselfulness, to that class of labor for which nature had so preeminently adapted her, Florence Nightingale earned for herself a homage and renown more universal and more profound than that which was accorded to Lord Raglan himself, or to any man who, taking his life in his hand, holding his life as dross, scaled the heights of Alma or held the British position against the hordes of Russian soldiery, swarming through the blue mist on that terrible morning of Inkermann, or any one of those others who—

> "With cannon to right of them,
> Cannon to left of them—"

A handful—600—charged the whole Russian army right up to the muzzles of the guns—

> "Sabring the gunners there,
> While all the world wondered—"

How great, Sir, were the deeds of valor they did—deeds, the very thought of which will make the heart glow in the breast of every true Canadian, and make the blood leap faster through his veins. But, I say, that amongst them all there is not to be found one name whose fame, in the judgment of civilized humanity, is for one moment comparable to the fame of her who, in the self-same place, and at the self-same time, devoted herself to the work which, in the exquisite words of poor Hood, is "pure womanly." Now, Sir, I do not wish to be misunderstood. I do not wish it to be supposed for a moment that I imagine women ought to confine themselves to the nursing of the sick, and such occupations as these. I am far from entertaining such an idea, but what I do believe, and what I have desired to point out by one very striking example is this: That the class of work for which men are well adapted is a class of work for which women may not be at all well adapted, but that side by side with that class of work and inseparably connected with it lies another class of work for which woman is, by nature, admirably adapted, and that is a class of work which is just as difficult, just as useful, and just as noble as the other class of work, and which requires for its performance qualities which just as much command our admiration as those qualities which are required for the other class of work. I say, Sir, that the work of women and men in this world are often complimentary and supplementary of one another, and while it may be quite true that women ought to interest themselves in matters political, while I believe her influence naturally exerted in political matters will always be beneficial, refining, and elevating, I say it by no means follows that that political work may not be most advantageously and usefully exerted in that particular sphere of life, which by common consent is more peculiarly her own—that is to say, in the family circle and in society. We must never forget that there is a natural division of labor which is provided for by an essential difference in constitution and temperament of the sexes, and that any interference of an artificial kind with that natural division of labor cannot be beneficial to the human race, and therefore it is that this question of the franchise is one of such enormous importance. Now, Sir, if any one should suppose that women are not sufficiently intelligent to exercise the franchise—I say that is an idea I can scarcely imagine any one entertaning—it is perfectly preposterous. Women are at least as intelligent as men are. But the question may naturally and fairly be asked: Is political life such as ours the sort of life for which women are by nature well suited. We have heard of municipal elections, and of voting for educational matters. I am not going to weary the Hou e by discussing that question at all, but I wish simply to say that municipal elections are vere different from political elections, both in intensity and in other respects, which I shall not attempt to dwell upon at present. With regard to educational matters, education is natural to women. We all know that the mothers are the educators of the men; but with regard to this, I would state a rather curious circumstance. My friend, Dr. Carver, who is, I may say, the creator of the Dulwich College School, the great first grade school for the South London district, and who is one of the greatest, if not the greatest, educational reformer in England, told me only last summer that the presence of women on the London school board has proved very disappointing to many of those who were most eager to have them there—that, in point of fact, the experiment was not so successful at all as the true friends of education desired and hoped it would be. The question is just this: Can our women enter the arena of politics as men do, without some injury to those qualities most characteristic of, and most admirable in, women. Can they mount the political platform, and in the presence of a mixed political audience, oppose one another, or oppose some male candidate, without losing something of their womanly nature. If the effect be to blunt their susceptibilities, if it be to render them less sensitive, less refined, less feminine, then I do not hesitate to say that the extension of the franchise to women will be a curse and not a blessing.

But who is to be the judge of this question? Who is to say to what extent and in what degree women are to take part in politics. Who are the proper judges? I say they are the women themselves. Now, Sir, there is an argument which would, to my mind, be almost irresistible but for that consideration. I am obliged to say, although I have a delicacy in saying it in the presence of the right hon. gentleman, I am obliged to say, in justice to myself and as part of this argument, that the two British statesmen whom I consider to be incomparably the greatest of British statesmen since the days of Lord Palmerston, are the late Lord Beaconsfield and the present Prime Minister of Canada; and the fact that these two statesmen, these two politicians, men of such immense political experience and wisdom as they are, have supported such a proposition as this, would be to me an irresistible argument in its favor, were it not that I consider that we have a higher authority than they are on this question, were it not that I believe there is another opinion that we should consider before their opinion, and that is the opinion of our women themselves. It is said that women are guided by impulse and, no doubt, they are, but that impulse I have generally found, so far as it is not a matter in which the affections are concerned, is an impulse in the right direction, and, given any question on which a woman is informed, and I am perfectly satisfied, for my part, that she will arrive at a pretty sound conclusion upon it. But with reference to such a question as this, I am certain that the deliberately formed opinion of the mass of our women is incalculable more valuable than the opinion of any man, for women are endowed by nature with an innate subtle sense of what is right for them to do as women, what is fitting and feminine—an instinct to guide and to guard them. And Sir, with reference to such a question as this, no man's judgment can safely be substituted for that delicate female faculty. Therefore, I do not hesitate to say that if our women themselves approved of this measure I should heartily support it. But I believe they do not approve of it at all, and more—I am quite satisfied, from my own observation and enquiry, that a large majority of them are very much opposed to it. When they want such a measure we shall know it very soon. They have a way of letting us know what they want; and as they have not told us that they do, we may conclude with certainty that they do not want it. Therefore, believing that they are the best judges of what is right for them, what is fitting and feminine; believing that they are opposed to this measure, believing that if passed it will drag them into a position from which they instinctively recoil, and believing that it would be an artificial interference with the natural division of labor to which I have referred, and would therefore be injurious to the highest and best interest of society, I shall be obliged very reluctantly to vote against this clause and to support the amendment.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I wish to occupy the time of the House for one moment only in reference to a matter pertaining personally to myself. In the debate upon the principles of this Bill the member for Ottawa city (Mr. Mackintosh) conferred upon me what I presumed he considered the honor of making reference to my remarks. In doing so he extended his sympathy to me for having been led by party zeal into expressions of satisfaction at the trouble from which the North-West is now suffering. The remark, Sir, is not of the slightest importance to myself, but on behalf of those who have sent me here, I deem it to be perhaps improper to allow it to go entirely unanswered. I am alluded to as exulting in those troubles. Sir, I yield to no one in the broad domain of Canada in regret for the unhappy state of things now existing in that country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

M. FAIRBANKS. I am quite in order, I think. I am not going to diverge any further than is necessary to correct the statement which was made.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I do not think the hon. gentleman can avail himself of this occasion for making a personal explanation. It should have been made at the time. When the House is in committee on a particular clause of the Bill, I do not think the hon. gentleman can make a personal explanation with reference to what occurred before the House went into committee.

Mr. FAIRBANK. Mr. Chairman, of course I bow to your ruling. I had not the opportunity of replying at the time. I did not hear the remark. It went unchallenged by the gentleman in the Chair, whether yourself or the Speaker I do not know; it was a remark that should not have been allowed to be made. I simply wish to state that there was nothing in my remarks, or in the source from which they proceeded, warranting the accusation. Now, Sir, I come to the question before us. I consider it one of very great importance indeed. Thus far in the history of our race, every exertion made by man to relieve woman from any of the burdens to which she was subjected in our savage state has been highly rewarded; for every step upward that she has taken we have received a most rich reward. We have only to consider for a moment our condition. We who have advanced woman to a higher stage than other portions of the human race, need only compare our position with that of other portions of the human family to have full proof of this fact. I do not know, Sir, that I shall contend that giving woman the franchise is elevating her; I am not sure that that is the case. What I am sure of, however, is this, that if she took part in politics it would elevate politics. Of her ability to do so there can be no doubt whatever—certainly no doubt on our side of the House, who are accustomed to look at the portrait that hangs over the gallery opposite, the portrait of our Queen. It has occurred to me, from some remarks made to-night, that perhaps it would be well to reverse the position of that portrait, and let it hang in the opposite gallery, so that gentlemen opposite might look at it occasionally. There is no doubt of the quickness of woman's intellect in matters in which she or those dear to her are interested. By some process which we do not understand she comes quickly to a decision which we often are long in reaching. While our intellect is plodding through some slower process, it may be clouded by the influences of alcohol or obstructed by the use of other things, she comes quickly to a decision, which seems to give her a position of command—I use the term command in a military sense—a position which enables her to see the entire ground, and leads her to a quick conclusion, while we are still wandering in some uncertain way to attain it. There is still another question on which I am not so clear. The question is, is woman ready to assume the responsibility of taking upon her, in addition to the many duties she now has to perform the duties of the franchise. In my own mind there are some doubts on this point. I believe possibly there are many who are not prepared to assume those duties; but we, at this time, are, to a considerable extent, debarred from considering the question from that point of view. There is no doubt that without exercising the franchise she has exercised, and will continue to exercise, a tremendous and almost all-powerful influence over our destinies. There is no doubt that it is "the hand that rocks the cradle that rules the world." The question, Sir, has been forced upon us at this time—a most inopportune time I think. You know the state of the Session; you know the business pending; we all know it; some of us feel it perhaps more strongly than others; but the question is forced upon us, and we have to decide upon it now. We have not an opportunity of consulting those for whom we act, and being compelled

to act now we must act to the best of our ability, considering the information we have at hand. It has been said by the Prime Minister that this is an experiment. Whether the spinsters and widows will consider it a compliment to them to be selected to be the parties upon whom the experiment is to be tried or not, I leave for them to decide. Certainly, in the scheme, as it is before us, there are some strange features; that it should be confined to widows and spinsters while the married women of the land are to be excluded, presents a somewhat strange picture to the mind. For instance, in a neighboring city there is a venenerable lady who, like the member for Algoma, has never been bound in the bonds of matrimony; she comes within the law, so far as the property qualification is concerned, in being entitled to vote; she pays a small rental; in her younger days she had the misfortune of losing an eye, and now vends apples at the railway station; she is an authority upon the quality of apples; she knows exactly the sort of apples that should sell two or one for a nickle; indeed, I do not know but that her mind is perfectly clear as to who pays the duty, The proposition, as it stands before us, says to her: Madam, advance; your services are required, your counsels are needed to select the pilots for the ship of state; in fact, you possess peculiar advantages; you will give a single eye to the public interest. In the same city there are ladies of education and accomplishments and wealth, but who are encumbered with husbands; and I grant you a husband in some instances is an incumbrance. The husband is too often but a clog to her. Well, what does the Bill say? It says to the woman: You cannot vote, but your husband, be he ever so ignorant, be he ever so incompetent, be he ever so inebriated, or incapacitated, from any cause, to exercise a judgment such as you are possessed of, he votes, and votes upon your property. This is one of the disadvantages with which we have to contend, and as the First Minister says, this is an experiment and we must accept it with all its disavantages. The Prime Minister told us that he is in favor of the female franchise. It does not become me to question the sincerity of the hon. gentleman, still one cannot help doubting it, from the course he has pursued in relation to this measure. I am not disposed to doubt that he is, to some extent, in earnest. When he looks upon the condition of the country, upon its financial state, when he looks upon the dissatisfaction existing, to a greater or less extent, from one end of the country to the other, there is room to believe that his statement is sincere, to this extent, that he thinks some new tactics should be adopted. I remember, about the close of the civil war in the United States, seeing a small picture of a wreck at sea. There was nothing of the vessel left but the masthead above water, and floating around were the usual things attendant on a shipwreck—bottles, barrels, sea gulls, and clinging to the mast were two men, one representing the President of the Confederacy, Mr. Jefferson Davis, and the other his secretary, Mr. Miminger. Miminger is shown to have asked Davis: "Can you pray"? Davis answered: "No, can you? " And Miminger had to acknowldge that he could not; but, said he, "something must be done and that quickly." From the present condition of affairs, I am not surprised that the First Minister should find it necessary to bring some new blood into the concern. The question is, if he is in earnest and really desire female suffrage, can he get it? We who have witnessed his power frequently of controlling his followers, cannot doubt but that if he says female suffrage must be given it will be given. But if there is really any serious dissatisfaction among his followers, he could, under the circumstances, get a small amount of help from this side. I would undertake to be a supporter of his in this regard, and could further act as recruiting officer to get others. I would do this to remove the Ministry from the difficult position in which they are placed, of having three times notified these classes of females to embrace the franchise. The Government are in danger of being prosecuted for breach of promise, and that we all know is a very serious action frequently attended with heavy damages. The hon. member for Algoma has proposed a remedy for this, by establishing a Parliament for women alone. There is one objection to that. If such a Parliament were established, I believe we would lose the services of the hon. member for Algoma; I believe he would take a permanent seat in the gallery of that Parliament. Why is this question brought here at the present time? Why is it introduced, only practically to be withdrawn? The Premier cannot leave this question where he found it; what he is doing with it now does not leave, and it cannot necessarily be left, in the position in which he found it. This question has rested with the Provinces to decide; that right is now being taken away from the Provinces; some of the Provinces, on this question, are undoubtedly further advanced than others; indeed, I believe that some are standing on the very brink of adopting female suffrage. If it is not adopted here, it cannot afterwards be acted upon by the Provinces separately for Dominion elections; it can only be dealt with by the Dominion as a whole. No one will deny it is easier to act as a Province; a Province is easier to move than the Dominion, and hence the hon. gentleman is putting a positive obstacle in the way of female suffrage, whether he be sincere or not. I think there can be no doubt, after what we have seen this afternoon, that the word has been passed quietly along: "You are to vote down this Bill;" hence, it will not leave female franchise in so advanced a position as it was found. From this position the Prime Minister cannot escape. The musical tendencies of some gentlemen present do not disturb me in the least. It is a sort of lullaby; and, if it will continue vigorously, I think I can stand upon my feet for at least two hours. There is a power in music; I do not know whether my breast is a savage one, but it "has power to soothe" it anyway. It is possible, however, that it may not be so pleasing to some members of the House, and I would barely suggest that the performers should adjourn to the concert room occupied by them last Friday night, a short time after the receipt of the sad news from the North-West, and should engage in the concert which they were then engaged in, to the disgrace of this Chamber. Of the abilities of the Prime Minister to pass this Bill, if he chooses, I have not the slightest doubt. Who does not know here that, when Simon says "Wig-wag," Wig-wag is the order of the day; when Simon says "Thumbs down," instantly they go down. The Order, up to to this time, I think, has been "Wig-wag;" the next move we shall see will be "Thumbs down," and down the thumbs will go. If this the case, and if I am correct in my forecast of what is going to take place, there will be one very serious charge resting against the Ministry of to-day, a charge from which they cannot escape. If they have simply led women into this Chamber, if they have simply led the fair women of Canada into this Chamber to place them on exhibition, and then to be told by the followers of Ministers: "You are incapable to exercise the franchise, we do not believe it is proper for you to exercise the franchise go back to your knitting work;" if that be the position—and that will be the position if the amendment now under consideration is sustained—it is an act women will resent and it is a resentment from which Ministers cannot escape. In the remarks made to us to-day by the Minister, we had a eulogy upon women. If my forecast is correct, the reading between the lines will be that, not of a eulogy but of a funeral service, to female franchise; and the indications at the present moment are that the funeral procession will move on, that its attendance will be small from the Ministerial side; indeed it appears as if you were going to see one directing the hearse, veiled, to some extent, it is true, but underneath the veil I think you will recognise the features

of the Prime Minister, while behind, it appears there would be one solitary Ministerial mourner, in whose benevolent countenance we recognise the features of the member for Ottawa county (Mr. Wright) During this discussion women have been entertained with considerable prose and verse. I shall indulge in neither. There is an impression prevalent among men, to a considerable extent, which I think is thoroughly erroneous, that the proper address to women is what is known as "small talk," hollow compliments. I believe that there is nothing that a woman of sense—and, when I speak of women of sense, I speak of an overwhelming majority—has more contempt for than she has for the man who approaches her with what is called small talk. It is an insult to her intelligence, and so she receives it, although not always resenting it. My own position upon this question is, first, second, third and last, that it is a question which should remain with the Provinces. I protest, first, second, last and always, against the removal of it from its place in the Provinces, where it could be dealt with just in proportion as public opinion is developed in its favor. Fetching it here and purposely defeating it is an injustice to it, is dealing with it in a way in which it should not be dealt with, is wrong all the way through. I shall oppose the amendment.

TUESDAY, 1 a.m., 28th April, 1885.

Mr. WILSON. In a question of this importance, I think that every member is justified in giving a reason why he is intending to vote either for or against the amendment. Everybody should feel that, when a question of the importance of the present comes before this House, we ought to calmly consider it, and decide, after mature consideration, whether we are in favor or against the principle. I am well aware that the question has occupied the attention of, no doubt, every member of this House, not only the members of the Government, but almost every individual member, and some of them, as they have stated this evening, are not fully decided whether they should or should not favor the granting of the elective franchise to women. Some years ago this matter came up in the Local Legislature, where I then had the honor of a seat, with my friend the member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson). The question was discussed pro and con, thoroughly considered, and I think my hon. friend will agree with me in stating that, after a long debate, the division that took place was a very close one, showing that the feeling in the House at that time was very evenly divided. Therefore, after the number of years that have elapsed from that time to the present, I should have expected that my hon. friend, being, as I have been told this evening, a bachelor, would have had the gallantry to come forward on the present occasion and say he had changed the views he then entertained, and felt more inclined to favor female suffrage to-day than he did six or eight years ago. One remark made by the First Minister was that, if we granted the franchise to women, the unmarried, the widows and the married ladies, we might thereby produce a certain amount of discord between the husband and the wife. That argument I think has no effect. We ought not to consider such an argument as that, because I think it has no force. In this very Bill, do we not find that the vote is given to the father and to the son? The father receives the vote; the son is granted the vote, not on account of his own property, but on account of the property held by the father. Such would naturally not be the case if we granted the wife the vote, because she would vote upon the property in her own right. Therefore, if there be any just principle at all in granting the franchise to the unmarried and to widows, it is with greater force that it should be granted to married ladies. I am inclined to think that if we consider for a short time the progress that has been made towards placing the ladies on a higher plane than they formerly occupied, where they are no longer considered merely as the servants of man, we shall feel that we ought to consider, calmly and dispassionately, whether we should not extend the privilege of voting to the females as well as to the males. I know that many of those who occupy seats in this House have strong prejudices against giving the right to vote to that portion of the community, and they feel that they are justified in those prejudices; perhaps they have strong reasons for believing that it would not be prudent on the present occasion to extend the franchise. But I think that cannot be said with reference to the Province of Ontario. It has been said here this evening that the ladies, to no considerable extent, feel a desire to be disfranchised. Well, I think that if we take the views expressed by leading public men in that Province, if we take into consideration the views expressed by the large and influential religious denominations, we must come to the conclusion that such a feeling is, to a considerable extent, prevalent in the Province of Ontario. And, therefore, as that view has been gradually extending, it is our duty now to consider whether the franchise should be extended in accordance with that view. It has been said that no petitions have been sent to this Parliament asking that the franchise be conferred upon women. I would ask, have any petitions been sent here asking that a Dominion Franchise Bill should be passed? If the one argument be good, the other must be also, and, therefore, I feel that if we are not now prepared to do justice in the extension of the franchise, we had better by far allow the present Franchise Bill to remain in abeyance, until we can consider the two questions together. It is said that we ought not to place the vote in the hands of those who would not be very likely to make use of it in coming to the polls and recording their votes. Now, I do not think that is a good argument, and it is not warranted by the facts. Heretofore, females have not taken the same amount of interest in political matters as the other sex, from the fact that they were not permitted to vote, and had no incentive to study public questions; in other words, they considered that the discussion of political matters was something that interested only the male portion of the community, and was something with which they had nothing to do. Therefore, we could not expect them to take the same interest in politics as they would do if they had a right to go to the polls and express their approval or disapproval of candidates or public measures. We know from experience that they will exercise their franchise when they have an opportunity of doing so, from the fact that in the Province of Ontario, where they are now enfranchised in reference to municipal elections, elections for school trustees, and votes on money by-laws, they very generally exercise this privilege. We find in Ontario that where money by-laws are being submitted the female portion of the voters take just as lively an interest, and just as intelligent an interest, in recording their votes, as do the male portion of the community; and if they were entitled to go to the polls and vote in parliamentary elections, I have no doubt they would generally do so, and their influence would have a very beneficial effect, indeed, upon the voting population, and in our various political meetings, and thereby the general tone of political discussion would be elevated. Now, I may be permitted to allude to a subject which has already been referred to several times, and that is the course which the Government has pursued, in leaving this an open question. The Premier stated that Mr. Gladstone refused to consider the question of woman suffrage in connection with his Franchise Bill. But did Mr. Gladstone allow the clause to be placed in the Bill at all? He refused to do so; and therefore I feel that the Government who have brought on this measure are individually bound to support this clause as it originally appeared in the Bill. They were a unit or

they were not; they were in favor of it or they differed in the Cabinet. It appears they must have agreed among themselves, and therefore we shall expect every individual member of that Government to vote against the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend), and vote to retain the clause extending the the franchise to unmarried women and widows. I hope that the Government will find such a strong feeling in the House in favor of extending the franchise still further that they will give the same rights and privileges to married women as they propose to extend to spinsters and widows. I might occupy more time in expressing my views on this question, but I can see no reason. I have heard no arguments offered by those who spoke against the proposition that would lead me to change my views, and I shall therefore vote against the amendment of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend), and, on this occasion, vote, I hope, with every member of the Government, in favor of the clause as it was originally inserted in the Bill.

Mr. DAVIES. Although the hour is late, I should like to take the opportunity of expressing my views upon this question, and I will not do so at any length. I agree with the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) that the question is one of very great importance, and it has not received the attention at the hands of hon. members which I am quite sure the House will expect and the country will expect that it should receive. I have followed the debate very closely, because I may frankly say that my views were not very extreme, one way or the other. I was in favor, I am still in favor, of the hon. gentleman's proposition; but I was not very strongly in favor of it, not so strongly in favor of it but that argument might convince me the other way. I fully expected, as it had been intimated more than once that many of those on the other side of the House who generally support the Premier were opposed to the policy he has brought forward in this Bill, that more than those who have spoken would have given expression to their views; and what is more remarkable than all was, that after three or four members who usually support the Premier had dissented from the policy proposed, not one voice has been raised of all those hon. members whom I have heard, in support of the position taken by the right hon. gentleman himself. I say that is a very remarkable state of matters. The First Minister is known to be one of the most popular leaders the party has every had in Canada, unless all their loyalty is simply lip loyalty. I take their own expressions. An hon. gentleman likens him to Lord Beaconsfield——

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Who did that ?

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. member for North Bruce. It is a most extraordinary thing that the right hon. gentleman, occupying that position in his party with the experience he has had in Canada, and possessing, as he is supposed to possess, so much experience, knowledge and prescience, should come forward and state to his party and to the House that, after mature deliberation and as the result of fifty years experience, he deemed it nothing but an act of justice to offer the franchise to women possessing a certain amount of property; and yet not an hon. member was found in the party, either in the Government or out of it, who had sufficient political fealty and esteem for the chieftain, or who shared in the convictions he held on the subject, to rise and support his views. I had heard that the member for King's (Mr. Foster) was in accord with the hon. gentleman's views; I had heard that other hon. members were in accord—I need not name them—and were prepared to defend them; and it is somewhat surprising that they should remain quiet during the eight or nine hours during which the Premier's proposition has been assailed and attacked pretty vigorously, and yet not one of them rise to support it. Is it possible that the statement made by some hon. gentlemen on this side is true, that we have been playing at a farce, that the right hon. gentleman has passed the word round amongst his supporters, that while he wants to pose as the introducer of female suffrage he wants them to vote it down? It looks very much like it. It does not frequently occur that when the right hon. gentleman proposes a scheme it is received in solemn silence. It does not frequently follow that when the Premier has given expression to certain views the hon. gentlemen behind him either opposed them *in toto* or remain quiescent. When this amendment was proposed by the hon. member for Cumberland, an amendment, mark you, attacking one of the principles of the Bill, the Premier practically threw up his proposition asking for woman suffrage. I find the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) occupied a rather curious position to-night. He followed, to some extent, the lines taken by the Premier. He said he approved of the Premier's position; he was in favor of woman suffrage; that he had heard no arguments to justify him in voting against it; but at the close of his speech the hon. gentleman turned round and cooly said that inasmuch as the members for Quebec did not favor the proposition; he felt it to be his duty to oppose it. Does the hon. gentleman see where that position lands him, where that position is going to land the party to which he belongs, if it is adopted?

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The hon. gentleman has not correctly stated my position.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman was in favor of giving the franchise to women, but inasmuch as it was distasteful to the members for Quebec, he said he would support the amendment to strike the provision out of the Bill. Where does that argument land him? I am not going to say there are not very strong arguments in favor of the hon. gentleman's views. I think there are very strong arguments; but I think he will find that the conclusion to which his course must lead is the acceptance of the provincial franchises. If the hon. gentleman is fair and honest, when he comes to the other Provinces and finds them wishing to retain their provincial franchises, he will act on the same principle, and say, that although uniformity is very plausible on its face, still, if the members for Prince Edward Island oppose this provision, I will support them; if the members for Quebec oppose it, I will vote for them, and so on through all the Provinces, until he comes down to the logical position which should be taken by him in regard to this general question, that each Province should regulate its own franchise. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron), who comes from Ontario, believes in woman suffrage, that women should have the right to vote, and he says that in his Province they are prepared for it. He believes that, at all events, the women of Ontario are prepared to exercise the suffrage, and they ought to have the suffrage; and, therefore, if Ontario had the right to frame its own suffrage, they would get women suffrage, if a majority of the members of the Legislature were in favor of it. Hon. members should carry out the wishes and political aspirations expressed here and give the women of Ontario the suffrage. That involves the acceptance of lines laid down by the Opposition as the only fair lines of policy, namely, that the provincial franchises should be accepted, or, in other words, that the people of the several Provinces know better what particular franchise will suit their Province and their own peculiar circumstances than the members of this Parliament do. Therefore I hope, and I look forward with some expectation and no small belief, to join my hon. friends in the vote, when the proper time comes, to carry out that principle. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal), who spoke this afternoon, argued in favor of the amendment, and against the proposition in the Bill, on the ground that women had no political education,

and were, therefore, unfit to vote. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he considers political education is by the Bill made in any way or sense a test of the fitness of any person to exercise the franchise. On the contrary, have you not declared, in so many words, that the possession of so much property, or the receipt of so much income, alone, and irrespective of intelligence, irrespective of political education, shall entitle or disentitle a person to vote? Therefore, if the hon. gentleman wishes to carry out his view, that education is a necessary condition precedent to the exercise of the franchise, he must introduce a different principle into the Bill before the House than those which have been introduced by the right hon. gentleman himself. Intelligence is a very good thing to have—a very necessary thing to have in a voter—but the Premier does not think so. He does not say in his Bill that a man must be able to read or write, that he must be educated in any school, that he must read the *Globe* or the *Mail* or the *Gazette* newspapers, or that he must listen to the debates of this House. The argument that the women have no political education, and therefore should not have a vote, will apply to a large number of those whom the hon. gentleman proposes to enfranchise by this Bill, and therefore it is no argument at all. I ask the hon. member for Provencher if, in his candid opinion, the ordinary woman of Canada, educated in our public schools and reading our daily newspapers, coming in contact, as she does, with her husband, her father, or her son, is not a fitter person to exercise the franchise than the Indian to whom you propose to give the franchise, who never reads or sees a newspaper——

Mr. BOWELL. What nonsense.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman says what nonsense; he thinks it is perfectly right that the educated women of Canada should be prevented from exercising their proper influence in the affairs of the country——

Mr. BOWELL. No; my remark had reference to what you said about the Indians.

Mr. DAVIES. I am replying to that point; I am showing the absurdity of refusing the franchise to educated women——

Mr. BOWELL. I say that when you state that the Indians have no education you are not correct.

Mr. DAVIES. I say that the Bill gives the Indians of the country the right to vote, and while the chieftain of the party comes forward and says that the educated women should have the franchise, his supporters say, strike out the women but leave the Indians; and I say that the educated women of Canada should certainly have the right of voting, if the Indians are entitled to that right.

Mr. BOWELL. What I say is——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. DAVIES. I am willing that the hon. gentleman should explain.

Mr. BOWELL. I know the hon. gentleman is, but those who sit behind him are not. What I said was nonsense, was this: When you state that the Indians, whom it was proposed to enfranchise, never saw a newspaper, I say that the Indians in my own county have more than an ordinary school education.

Mr. DAVIES. An hon. member from Cape Breton cheers that remark, but I wonder if he wishes this House to understand that the Indians in his locality have the advantage of more than a common school education?

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). They all have education there.

Mr. DAVIES. I say it is perfectly preposterous; it is perfect nonsense. I know the Indians there, and I have seen and conversed with them, and I know them to be steeped in the grossest ignorance. I know that the Indians of the Maritime Provinces generally are very ignorant, and every hon. member who comes from those Provinces knows they are. I know that some few of them have received an education from some priests and missionaries, but as a class it is absurd to say that newspapers circulate amongst them, or that they have ever received any political education. To say that they are educated, in the common sense of the term, and that they should receive the franchise, while the educated women of Canada should be deprived of it, is an insult to common sense. The hon. gentleman knows that these Indians——

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Mr. Chairman, I beg to assure the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island that a few Indians in my own county have had a good common school amongst them for the past three or four years, and that their children are as well educated as others in that county. I beg to assure him also that some of them in that island have been educated for the church.

Mr. DAVIES. I believe that there have been one or two instances of that kind. But, Mr. Chairman, is it worth while wasting time on such an argument. We know that some hon. gentlemen who are so eager to record their votes in favor of excluding the educated women of Canada from the franchise will be equally willing to give that franchise to the Indians, whether they are educated or not. There is no provision in the Bill about these Indians being educated, and though, as a matter of fact, there may be, as the hon. member says there are in his county, a few Indians who may be educated, we know that they have no political education, that they do not read the newspapers.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I wish to correct the hon. gentleman. They do read the newspapers.

Mr. DAVIES. All I can say is, that the Indians that I am acquainted with do not read the newspapers—not one of them. Their instructors may read them to them, or may read to them on some religious subject, but we know that in education they are below the lowest of the white people, in the Maritime Provinces, at any rate.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I beg to assure my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island that some of the Indians in our island subscribe for the newspapers.

Mr. DAVIES. I wonder if they pay for them. What newspaper do they subscribe for?

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). For the North Sydney *Herald*, a good Conservative paper.

Mr. DAVIES. I leave my argument where it was before, and I think it is one which will commend itself to the minds of those whose opinions are not made up. I say that the proposition is unfair on its face, that educated women, who are not only educated, in the sense of having a common school education, but are educated by being brought in contact with their husbands, or their sons, as the case may be, who are educated by the society in which they mix, who read the daily newspapers and the pamphlets of the day—that they should be placed lower in the scale of the franchise than our Indian population—she being refused the franchise, while it is conferred upon the Indians. But if political intelligence is to be made a test of franchise, what do hon. gentlemen say as to the foreigners who come into this country every year. We have Menonites, Germans, Swiss and others, coming in every year; they are all welcome; they do not speak English, and so far as political education in Canada is concerned, many of them have not got it. Still, you are going to give them the vote in preference to the women you educate. It may be all right to give them the vote; personally, I am in favor of it; I believe myself

that taxation and representation should be co-relative. You should not impose one without giving the other. But these people are not necessarily educated, and I do not think it will be said that they know much of the political issues between parties after they have been here two or three years. Now, the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), in making his speech this afternoon, was inclined at one time to be a little facetious over the ladies. He wanted to give them a Parliament of their own. I had no objection that he should import a little of that delightful humor, which is his characteristic, into a debate on this subject. But the hon. gentleman ought to know that mere jocularity on woman suffrage is a thing of the past. The question passed through that stage years ago. It has become a serious question, and the very fact that it is proposed by one in the position in the position of the right. hon. Premier,is itself proof that it has come within the range of practical politics and is worthy of serious consideration, and is not to be chucked aside with a joke or a laugh. The hon. gentleman says he would confine them to their own sphere. Well, it is a very easy thing for us to mark out their sphere, and to say that we shall confine them to that; but it does not follow, because the hon. gentleman marks out a sphere for them, that it is their natural and only sphere. We know that in olden times the sphere of a woman was a very narrow one. In eastern nations she was treated as a slave; she was man's toy and plaything; in Christian and civilized countries she occupies a different position now; instead of being his toy and plaything, she has become man's companion, adviser and friend, and there is hardly any man in this House who does not know that his best companion, adviser and friend has been his mother or his sister or his wife. We all know that, when difficulties in ordinary life occur to us, the first we go to to talk them over with, to take sweet counsel with, is the wife of our bosom; and there are few who take that course without receiving advice which generally turns out to be good. Take the practical affairs of life. You talk about women being moved by sentiment and fancy. I appeal to gentlemen present if it is not true, whatever motives or influences may enable them, that they are enabled, in some way or other, to bring a knowledge to bear on the practical affairs of life which every man has found, at times, to be of great value. There are men sent here to represent farming interests, men to represent commercial interests, and we are glad to have men here with a knowledge of military affairs; but there is a sphere beyond commerce, beyond military matters and beyond party politics, the social affairs of life that presents itself to the eye of woman. That element is not represented in this House, and those great social questions which are moving the minds of the masses of the people of the country and of the mother land, will never be thoroughly discussed, and will never rest on their proper basis, unless we have the counsel of women. It has been said, and said truly, and I give a good deal of weight to that argument, that we have that advantage now, because woman's influence is felt, not only in the home sphere, but in Parliament—that the member of Parliament reflects, to a greater or less extent, the opinions of his wife. It has been said, if the wife is the stronger vessel, why should she not represent his views? I heard a gentleman say to-day, that it would be a disgrace to a man to be known as the husband of Mrs. So-and-So. Why should it be a disgrace, if she is his intellectual superior? In the present day, when mind takes the lead and holds the predominence, the woman of intellect will go to the front, and her lord and master in name, if her intellectual inferior, must take rank behind her; there is no disgrace in it; it is the decree of a higher power than that of man, that the stronger intellect shall be the superior, and it shall be so as long as the world revolves. Now, the law has recognised this great change which has taken place between the sexes. Formerly, when a woman married she ceased to be a separate person, in the eye of the law; her property became her husband's property; she had no control over it; he could do almost what he liked with her and her property. That is all changed by the law, because we have come to recognise the truth that the woman is the equal of the man, that she has rights as well as duties I heard one hon. gentleman across the House talk to-night about obedience, as if a woman's only duty in this world was to obey; but, Sir, we have recognised the great fact that she has rights as well as duties, and I am proud to say that a Parliament of men has been found to concede to her those rights; and I have no doubt, if educated woman continue to exercise, for the next twenty years, the influence she has exercised in the past, that all her just rights will be conceded to her, whether she has a place in the Legislature or not. What have we given her? The Woman's Property Act, which puts her in the absolute ownership of her own property. And more than that. Look to the mother land, the precedents of which we are so proud to follow, and what do you find? You find that there woman is already enfranchised; you find women voting for the town councils all through England; you find women voting for the boards of guardians and for the school boards; and you find them elected to discharge duties on the school board; and I want to ask this question of gentlemen who are seeking candidly to come to a conclusion on this subject, which is not by any means a party question: Have you ever known a Legislature that once gave one of these rights to the women ever to take it back because they had disgraced it? Did you ever know a Legislature to confer the right of voting on women, and take it back because they did not exercise it wisely and well? No; but these concessions have been going on, broadening from year to year, and the argument against them has been weakened by the exercise of the privileges granted to woman. And so it will be here; I am not afraid to let women possessing the property qualification exercise the franchise. I do not believe it will be a political advantage to one party or the other. I think, however, it will soften that which makes politics hateful to many of us; I believe it will introduce into political life a great deal of oil and smoothness, and more of those amenities which make life tolerable. In these respects, I think woman's influence would be felt and would be useful, and I believe that in the settlement of these great social problems that have to be faced within the next ten years, the influence of women would be of great benefit to the Parliament of Canada. Now, I would like to quote just ten lines from the utterances of a gentleman who held a very high position in England. He was called the Nestor of that Parliament. I believe he represented Oxfordshire. He was a Tory of the Tories, an Englishman of the old stock; but he was not like the Bourbons; he learned from experience; and this is the language he used, after women had exercised their right to vote for school boards and town councils for a few years. He said:

"I have been voting on this question; I have been watching what has been done; I have observed how women have voted for local councils and boards of guardians; and I have come to the conclusion that, both as regards themselves and the bodies for which they have voted, the change is beneficial, politic, and much to be desired."

That is an expression of opinion very valuable to me, because it comes from a man who is essentially conservative in his ideas, to whom this change was in itself distasteful, but who did change, because his convictions were changed, from looking at the facts as he saw them. He did not believe in women having votes, but they were given votes in the town councils and board of guardians, and he says the manner in which they exercised the right showed him that it was good and politic that it should be extended further. The hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill)

in his able speech, parts of which were very eloquent, was opposed to woman suffrage, because it seemed to him there was a natural division of labor between men and women. That is quite true as regards labor which requires physical force and endurance, but it is not true as regards that sphere in which certainly the intellect alone attains pre-eminence. It is not true that there is a broad line of demarkation between men and women in those spheres where the intellect is mainly brought into play. We know that years ago women were relegated to a sphere, which was called the home circle, and any woman who attempted to go outside of that was looked upon as degrading herself, and her conduct considered to be highly reprehensible. But the prejudices of our fathers have all passed away. Florence Nightingale taught the world a lesson when she went out to the Crimea; she showed that the best attendant on the sick and wounded were to be found among women; she opened a new sphere for her kind, and to-day her name is held in reverence throughout the civilised world. So, in other matters, women have gone out of what was considered their own sphere; in many of the walks of life you will find her discharging duties which were formerly discharged by men, and discharging them better than the men did; as telegraph operators women have proved themselves as good as men, and in the United States they are to be found in many Government offices. Go to the blocks of buildings on the east and west side of our Parliament, and you will find them filled by sturdy, strong, hearty young men, who ought to be tilling the soil, breaking up the prairie, and who ought to give a chance to their sisters in the lighter departments of labor. Do you imagine that if the women had votes and influence in the councils of the nation that this state of thing would continue long? Do you imagine you would have these hundreds of young men employed in those offices, and a very small percentage of women? No; you would have all those offices, the duties of which can be better discharged by women, filled up by women, as they ought to be, and as they will be, I hope, before many years. I have not very strong convictions on the subject, but having listened carefully to the debate, I have come to the conclusion that in this country, where education is wider and broader and more extensive, and is spreading, year by year, among all classes, more than elsewhere, and where the women are better educated than in other countries, is the place where this problem can be best worked out; here is where I would like to see it worked out, and I will cordially give my vote in support of the proposal to allow women to vote.

Mr. MULOCK. As this is a very important question, about which there are very great difficulties, and as I know there are a great many members in the House, at all events around me, who have expressed their desire to speak on this question, I would, in view of the lateness of the hour, beg to move that the committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I trust the Government, at this late hour, will not force the discussion to continue, because the clause under discussion is perhaps the most important one in the whole Bill. It is one which must necessarily involve a considerable amount of discussion on both sides, and as we have been having very late hours during the past week, I do not think the Government should force us to keep those late hours up this week. The hon. the First Minister said, on one occasion, when introducing the Bill, that it would occupy a full Session, and we were assured every opportunity would be given for a full and free discussion; but after two o'clock in the morning it is impossible we should have anything like a full and free discussion, and, under the circumstances, I think the motion now put should be carried. It is certainly no fault of ours that this Bill was not introduced earlier in the Session. I do trust that hon. gentlemen will have some consideration for the health of members of this House—members on this side, as well as members on the other side of the House—and will consent to an adjournment at something like a reasonable hour, and I should say that two o'clock in the morning is not an unreasonable hour.

Mr. MULOCK. I happened to make that motion, and I supposed I would have had an opportunity of speaking to it when it was made. I can only say that it appears to me that the discussion of this question, as far as we have gone, has indicated that we are only yet at the threshold of the question. Some very wide differences of opinion have been expressed, showing that it requires very wide ventilation before it would be safe or wise to come to a conclusion upon it. I think it is to be regretted that this Bill has been introduced at this late period of the Session, when it has not been before the public. If we had had an intimation that the Bill was intended to be pressed this year, and that this particular clause would become the subject of discussion, then probably public opinion would, to some extent, have been formed upon this question; but that is not the position of it now. We have, for the first time in the history of this institution, this question presented to-day to Parliament, not only for consideration but for decision, a decision that will, I presume, finally dispose of the question for many and many a year. The hon. the Premier expressed himself individually in favor of the Bill, or at least in favor of giving the suffrage to certain classes of women. He stated that his own party, or some of them, as represented in this House, were not of the same opinion as himself upon that question; that there were wide differences of opinion, and he, very fairly, in consequence of the existence of that difference of opinion, declined to make it a party question, and left it to the House as an open question. That shows that opinions are not yet formed upon it, and, if opinion outside is not yet formed upon it, surely it is unwise to press the matter to a decision to-night; surely we ought to have the oppportunity of thinking it over for a short time, and should not be compelled, at this late hour, to conclude our arguments and vote upon a question in respect to which the right hon. the Premier admits that public opinion is not yet formed. I suppose we shall not be long in getting through this measure. The hon. the First Minister declared that he proposed to invite the attention of the House to this measure *de die in diem* until it was concluded. That being the case, and there being no other matters of importance to come before the House this Session, we, having disposed of everything, we are not at all short of time, and I see no reason for turning night into day, and prolonging the discussion to-night. If there were no future before us, there might be a reason for pressing it, but it seems to me that we will make more substantial progress in future if we are not compelled to proceed at an hour when we are all weary, when discussions become profitless and decisions become unsound. For these reasons, and considering the importance of the question itself, it strikes me that it is reasonable that its consideration should be postponed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no; go on.

Mr. MULOCK. It is quite easy for hon. gentlemen opposite to cry "Oh, oh." Of course there is no denying the fact that they are in a considerable numerical majority in this House, but that fact has not entirely handed over to them the control of this House, and because I am moving for this adjournment they must not think we are not able to discuss this question thoroughly. There are a great many gentlemen here who have views on this question, and who are determined to express those views when they are compelled to. I say, and it must be manifest to anyone who desires to treat this question fairly, and to treat a large portion of this House fairly, that the discussion cannot, at this hour and under

these circumstances, be as thorough and satisfactory as it would when we enter upon the question fresh, after a good night's rest. For these reasons, I hope the leader of the Government will see his way to yield to this request, made from this side of the House. It is not often that we ask anything from the House, and therefore I think a reasonable request ought to be dealt with in a reasonable way, in order that members may be expected to act and may be justified in acting reasonably throughout the Session.

Mr. MILLS. I think that the motion made by my hon. friend is one that ought to prevail. It is well known, on this side of the House, at all events, and to some gentlemen on that side of the House, to some gentlemen on the Treasury benches, that there were many gentlemen on this side of the House, while the general principles of the Bill were under discussion, first on the second reading, and then on the motion to go into committee, who had not the opportunity to express their views upon the Bill generally. It is known to some gentlemen on that side as well as to gentlemen on this side, that we abandoned, in the morning, on both those motions, our right to continue the discussion, because we did not wish to imperil our health or the health of gentlemen opposite by continuing the discussion after daylight in the morning. Now, the hon. gentleman, it would seem, is disposed to deal with this stage precisely as he did with the others. There are a number of gentlemen on this side who are desirous of discussing this proposition.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. MILLS. Gentlemen say "Go on," but it is two o'clock in the morning and we began our Session at three o'clock in the afternoon.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. MILLS. We have had a session of eleven hours, and hon. gentlemen may say "Go on," but are they going to facilitate the passage of this Bill through the House or through committee by adopting towards this side of the House that mode of procedure. The First Minister himself, in introducing a measure somewhat similar to this, in 1870, gave as a reason for not proceeding with the measure the late period of the Session, and he assured the House that it would require a whole Session to properly consider the Bill. Now, I agree with him in that view; look at the proceedings of the House of Commons in England, and the hon. gentleman told the people of England that his party was the party that was specially devoted to following English precedent, and I say, if you follow English precedent, you will see that in the Sessions there, though they last more than half the year, there is seldom more than one important measure carried through Parliament. Now, the hon. gentleman, at the end of nearly three months, brings this Bill before the House for its consideration; he proposes a measure that is contrary to the expressed will of the country at the election of 1874, and the hon. gentleman proposes, at the end of the Session, to force this measure through without discussion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MILLS. I say it has been in a great measure without discussion. The hon. gentleman has forced silence on his friends on that side of the House. They have been compelled to keep quiet, and you have had these caterwauls and these interruptions because the hon. gentleman would not give his friends the opportunity of speaking in a parliamentary way. They are obliged to have recourse to this unparliamentary mode of procedure. Hon. gentlemen on that side of the House have occasionally taken the opportunity, like Lord Castlereagh to air their vocabulary, which is, no doubt, an extraordinary one, in some particulars. I say that the proposition to adjourn is a reasonable one, and ought to prevail; because there are many gentlemen on this side of the House anxious to express their opinions on this subject after proper rest, and if the right hon. gentleman will not consent to an adjournment, and give them an opportunity of discussing this question at a reasonable hour, and after having had an opportunity for ordinary rest, the discussion, of course, must go on in a manner very unsatisfactory to both sides of the House.

Mr. CASEY. I am only going to say a few words on the question of adjournment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on; go on.

Mr. CASEY. Those gentlemen who say go on are just those who do not do any work themselves. They are just the men who sit silent, except for the noise that we hear, and allow the Bill to pass through. Now we, who wish to discuss this Bill, wish to do so at a time when the House can appreciate our arguments. The hon. gentleman has shown, by the concessions he has already made, that he considers it a discussable Bill; he has shown, by the concession he has made on the woman suffrage clause, that he considers the Bill amendable, and he has given us to understand that changes may be made in other parts of the Bill. If it is a discussable Bill, it ought to be discussed in a rational way; but it is simply an exercise of tyranny on the part of the majority of the House to insist upon its being discussed when sensible discussion is out of the question. This argument is supported by the fact that the right hon. gentlemen himself has been unable to attend the whole of this sitting up to two o'clock. I am not complaining of that at all, because a gentleman of his age cannot be expected to give that application to business which you might expect from some of his younger colleagues. The right hon. gentleman looks very fresh, but he has been resting himself, while the rest of us have been speaking. If he had not done that he would not be able to be here now. He has shown that for us to continue the discussion of this Bill in his absence, is, to a great extent, a farce. He is the person we wish to impress, and if we can impress him with the propriety of making a change, the change will be made. If we can impress him, the rest of the House will follow his lead. Therefore we want him to be here, to hear what we have to say on this Bill, and the natural consequence is that we should only sit here during such hours of the night when his physical health and strength will allow him to be present. We must all confess that he has had an immense amount of parliamentary experience, and he knows what is fair and proper to be done in a circumstance like this. I hope he will see the propriety of agreeing to an adjournment, and thereby adding to the reputation which he already possesses for party tactics.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I, for one, would like to see the fullest and amplest discussion, but when I see the members opposite taking up the time of this House, merely for the purpose of taking up time——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No; no.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Yes; the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), to-night, took up two hours of time in this House, in a round-about-way, dealing with everything but the subject, staggering here and there over the Bill, and when he got done he left the House and never came back again until he inflicted another speech upon the House. Nearly every member on that side of the House has spoken with the manifest intention of taking up the time of the House. And now they come and ask us to adjourn the debate, in order that they may discuss the Bill more fully. I would like to hear the fullest discussion. I have heard everything that can be urged on that side. The hon. member for West Elgin says he would like to have the Premier here. Where is his own leader to-night? Where was he the other night, when the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) asked that the Premier should go on, and when

the Premier did go on? Now, the hon. member for West Elgin says he wants the Premier in, at a time when his own leader has gone home and gone to bed. I, for one, am willing to sit here until nine o'clock in the morning, if need be, to see this through. But they have shown that they do not want this Bill to pass; they are going to obstruct it. We hear it said in the corridors, in the press, everywhere, that they are going to obstruct the passage of the Bill. We tell them now, they shall have the fullest discussion—and they are young men; they say they are very vigorous; and we say that if they want to discuss it we will meet them.

Mr. DAVIES. It augurs ill for the early termination of this debate that the hon. gentleman should show such a very strong animus and feeling. I do not think the majority of this House will bear out his statement, that nearly every gentleman on this side discussed the Bill merely for the purpose of prolonging the debate. I have been listening to the debate. I know our friends on this side have taken up some fifteen minutes, others thirteen minutes, and others twenty minutes. I think one of the longest speeches came from his own side of the House, a very able speech it was, too—the speech of the hon member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill). I did not lose a word of it; I thought it was well reasoned out, and I listened to it with great pleasure.

Mr. BOWELL. What about the speech of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills)?

Mr. DAVIES. Perhaps we might have shortened some of the speeches. We cannot always cut every speech the exact length. But if the hon. gentleman does not see fit to give way, of course the debate must go on.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would remind the Premier that there is such a thing as tyranny. I have read in a book lately, upon party procedure, that a majority is to be followed because it represents strength between the two parties. Well, Sir, we know what tyranny may provoke us to do, we know what grievances may call for; that is what I wish to say. I hope that the hon. gentleman will not act in a tyrannical manner towards the Opposition.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think the proposition before you is a very reasonable one indeed—considerably after two o'clock, and with a prospect of being in committee from day to day, and from night to night, we will be very hard worked indeed. I certainly cannot be blamed so far for having taken up the time of the House. I have not said anything; but I want to say a good deal. I do not want to insist on the First Minister wearing himself out, but I feel that any remarks I offer should be offered with the First Minister in his place, because, in order that they may prevail, it is necessary that he should hear them before he can accept them. Therefore, discussion that goes on when the hon. gentleman is out of the House simply leads to a repetition of the remarks when he is present. What is the use of hon. members constantly crying, "Go on." We accomplish nothing by such cries. The lives of the First Minister and of the leader of the Opposition are precious to us. I do not know that it is part of the duty of a strong Government to try and push measures through Parliament by the sheer force of the physical strength of the members, and by having members to relieve other members during discussions. I believe my constituents would hold that I had fully discharged my duty if I attended the sessions of the House until 1 a m., besides discharging committee work and other work incident to a member of Parliament, to say nothing about sitting here after two o'clock. During such late sittings discussion is apt to become somewhat embittered. When our physical powers are worn out and our nervous system is at high tension, that courtesy is not extended to members which should be extended in discussing public questions. Even the Minister of Customs was rather ruffled, owing to a misunderstanding. The Minister of Public Works, who has a stronger constitution than almost any other member, and who steadily retains his seat, appears somewhat worn out. Again, I might make a personal appeal to the First Minister. While he has been absent, his supporters have not fallen into line with his heartfelt desire in regard to woman suffrage. There should be an adjournment in order that the Minister might speak to them personally. I have an admiration for the Secretary of State; I admire his graceful presence and eloquence just as the great Conservative convention did at Toronto, but I do not want to see him taking the place of the First Minister. We have found hon. members like the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), who, of all men, should have stood by his leader, ready to desert the hon. gentleman and go with the Secretary of State. And so with other hon. gentlemen. Where is the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster), and the thirty other gentlemen who, it was understood, wanted to have this clause remain in the Bill. There is a revolt in the camp, and the revolt is against the chieftain; and it looks as if some other leader was coming in. If for no other reason, there should be an adjournment, in order that the right hon. gentleman may learn where he stands on this question.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman is very anxious about the followers of the leader of the Government. Hon. gentlemen opposite have begun to realise that what they have stated on former occasions is not correct. The old story was, that when the party whip was cracked we all voted in a certain direction. Now, hon. gentlemen complain that we have minds of our own, and they taunt us in the most unkind way as to what our course is going to be. Hon. gentlemen have no right to declare what is going to be the course of hon. members who have not spoken. They have, moreover, no right to complain that they have had no opportunity of giving their views to the House; and they cannot take much credit to themselves if, after they have occupied 118 pages of *Hansard*, and there will be fifty more added to-day, we are not now prepared intelligently to vote on the question. We listened, on the last parliamentary night, with pleasure or pain, according to our views, to very long speeches delivered by hon. gentlemen opposite. It is paying a poor compliment to the ability and zeal displayed by hon. gentlemen opposite, in endeavoring to press their views on this question, if they have not thrown sufficient light on it yet. We have made up our minds as to our course, and we are not to be changed by any reasoning. I repeat that we are not to be changed now. If we were to be changed, it would have been done before; but, at the same time, we are prepared to listen to hon. gentlemen opposite who choose to further discuss the Bill.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. member for North Perth informs us that they are not to be changed now. That is the key note to the situation. That is the reason hon. gentlemen are not prepared to allow the discussion to be adjourned. They consider discussion on this Bill useless; their minds are made up; they cannot be changed now, and the sooner they reach the final stage of this measure the better. Arguments will be thrown away in all cases. That is the plain statement of the hon. member for North Perth. The feature of the Bill now under discussion is one of very great importaece; it is one of the most important that has been presented to the House. The hon. gentleman who has charge of this Bill, in presenting it to-night, spoke of this feature in the most affectionate and warm manner. He informs us that it was one that was dear to him, that it was the feature which, he believed, above all the features of the Bill, should commend itself to the country, and would produce the best results; and yet the hon. gentleman, in the face of that declaration, made a few hours ago, is not prepared to allow a full and free discussion, is

not prepared to allow the members of this House who are prepared to advocate his own views in this particular feature of the Bill to have the time necessary to present those views to the House. Sir, this is an unjust and tyrannical use of the exercise of power by the majority of this House, to insist that this House shall continue in session after two o'clock in the morning. There is no man can say, when this House remains in session till two o'clock, or half-past two, that the members of this House have not done their full duty, that members of this House have not considerable endurance who are able to continue sitting day after day and morning after morning until this hour. It is unreasonable, it is unjust, that this discussion should go on when this hour is reached. There are many hon. members on this side who have something to say on this question; it is a question of importance.

Mr. McCALLUM. Who has been taking up the time?

Mr. CHARLTON. The men who have been taking up the time are men who wish to discuss this Bill, who wish to discharge their functions as members of the House of Commons, while the creatures who sit and vote for the Government——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CHARLTON. The men who wish to discuss this measure are those whose rights are being infringed upon.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I rise to order, Mr. Chairman. I call upon you to note the words the hon. member used in addressing members of this House—in calling them creatures—a most disgraceful and unparliamentary remark. I call upon you to call the hon. gentleman to order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman made use of language which was not parliamentary. I cannot take it down, as other words have been used since; but he has used an expression towards other members of this House which is not parliamentary, and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. EDGAR. I rise to a question of order. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron), in rebuking the language which was used by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and in calling attention to it, said: "His language was disgraceful and unparliamentary."

Some hon. MEMBERS. So it was.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think the word I used, that exception was taken to, was the word "creature." Well, Sir, we are all creatures, and I did not define what kind of creatures we are.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, chair.

Mr. CHARLTON. We are all God's creatures. If the hon. gentleman supposes I wished to use the word in an offensive sense he is mistaken.

Some hon. MEMBERS. You did, though.

Mr. CHARLTON. Now, with regard to the question of the adjournment of the debate, I repeat it is unreasonable to ask this House to remain in session after this hour in the morning. It is unjust to you, Mr. Chairman. It is unjust to the clerks of this House, one of whom, a few nights ago, was, through the severity of his labors, so exhausted as to be obliged to remain in his chair while calling the names of members of this House on a division. It is unjust to the reporters of this House, who are working to the very limit of human endurance. It is unjust to require these gentlemen to report the proceedings of this House, after a debate which has lasted for eleven hours. It is requiring of them what no reasonable man should require, what no human man should require of his fellow men. For those reasons I believe we should adjourn, as it is in the highest degree unjust and improper to ask members of this House to remain longer, and for the Premier, for the Government majority to refuse this reasonable request, I take it, Sir, would be a proof positive, furnished by themselves, that they wish to interfere with the proper discharge of their parliamentary duties by hon. members of this House who wish to discuss this important measure. I think the Premier, if he is a fair and honorable man, if he is a just man, will hesitate before refusing so reasonable a request as a request for an adjournment at half-past two. Sir, we have discussed this Bill, we have remained until this hour of the morning, this is the first day this House has been in committee on this Bill, and to attempt to put on gag law, as this would be an attempt to do, would be to interfere with the harmony of discussion, with anything like a fair, proper and parliamentary discussion of this question. If we had been discussing it for days or weeks, if the course of the Opposition, after a long and weary discussion, did not meet with the approval of hon. gentlemen opposite, then there would be some excuse for adopting the tactics which they seem disposed to adopt, at the outset of the discussion; but I hope, for the sake of the harmony of feeling which should prevail in a discussion of this kind, for the sake of fair play, I hope the Government will consent to so reasonable a request as an adjournment at this hour.

Mr. McCALLUM. I have been in Parliament for eighteen years, and I must say that I never saw, in that time such waste of time on any measure as there has been on this—and I ask you, Mr. Chairman, if, during your parliamentary career, you have ever seen—as much waste of time as there has been upon this Bill. It has been fairly discussed; they have had every opportunity of discussing it on the second reading, and when we were on the second reading they discussed every clause, and now they are going through it again, discussing every clause. They complain; why, Sir, it is an organised thing to obstruct.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. McCALLUM. I am in order. I want this to go to the country, so that the people of the country may hold them responsible for this waste of time and this expense. They have had ample opportunity of discussing this Bill and of discussing this clause with regard to woman suffrage, and it is pure obstruction on their part. Do they suppose we have no rights, as well as hon. gentlemen opposite? Have not we rights here? Have not we the interests of the people at heart as well as they have? Talk about tyranny; I would say, if it were parliamentary, that their conduct is just the height of impudence. I appeal to my leader, and I hope he will not give way on this question. I am an old man, but I am prepared to sit here until next Staturday night before giving way. I have stood it as long as I could, but I could not stand it any longer, and they must take the responsibility of this waste of time before the people of this country and before the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sure that hon. gentlemen would not propose to discuss this Bill at half-past two o'clock in the morning unless there was a good reason. Now, the reason that has been brought forward for prolonging this sitting is that the Opposition have been obstructing and have monopolised the whole of this discussion. I say these statements are not true. Here is the order in which the members of the Opposition have spoken: The hon. member for North Norfolk, and the hon. member for Bothwell, the hon. member for West Huron, the hon. member for North Wellington, the hon. member for West Elgin, the hon. member for Peel, the hon. member for East Lambton, and the hon member for East Elgin—eight in all. How many have spoken on the other side. Just eight, the same number, and here they are: The Prime Minister, the hon. member for Provencher, the hon. member for Victoria, B.C., the hon. member for North Victoria, the hon. member for Hants,

the hon. member for Algoma, the hon. member for Montreal Centre and the hon. member for North Bruce.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the relative time taken.

Mr. LAURIER. Everyone spoke according to what he had to say; but when eight members have spoken on one side and eight on the other side, it is unfair to say that the Opposition have been obstructing. I appeal to the Premier's sense of justice and fairness in this matter. I could understand hon. gentlemen opposite being angry if all the discussion had been on one side; but can this be said, when eight members have addressed the House on one side, and have been answered by eight members?

Mr. PRUYN. I have listened with a great deal of attention to the several speeches which were made by hon. members on both sides of the House, and, so far, I have failed to be convinced that it would either be beneficial to the country or to the women that we should adopt this provision of this Bill. I am satisfied that gentlemen who are wishing to have this debate postponed must feel in their own minds that if the question is debated for five hours more, as it has been for five hours, they will not convince any of the Conservative members to change their views on this question, and therefore I do not see any object in postponing the debate. I must thank the right hon. the First Minister for leaving this an open question. I believe that he is perfectly satisfied in his own mind that women should be enfranchised. But his followers, many of them, are of the contrary opinion, and I think it would be anything but pleasant if he would force them to do violence to their feelings by voting for an Act that they do not believe in. If he had done so, I am convinced that the gentlemen now advocating female suffrage would have taken the opposite course; but seeing that the majority of the right hon. the First Minister's supporters are against this enfranchisement, they are in favor of it; but they may talk from this time till to-morrow morning, and I am satisfied they will not change a single vote. The whole thing is factious opposition, from beginning to end. That is my opinion, and I am going to vote against the motion to adjourn.

Mr. IRVINE. There are two sides to this question of adjournment. What suits one gentleman may not suit another. It may suit the hon. member for King's, N. S. (Mr. Woodworth), to stay here all summer; he is just as much at home here as he is anywhere else; but it is difficult for me, as a laboring man, as I acknowledge myself to be. It is time I was at home.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Never should have been here.

Mr. IRVINE. There are two of us, Sir. My face is a guarantee, wherever I go, that I never was shut out of Parliament or out of good society. I say I have a home to go to and the means of making a living. I have been here three months or so, and I was one of the members who memorialised the Government to call Parliament together early, in order that we might get home a little earlier. If my constituency likes to send a man here who has labored with his hands, that is their own business. If he is an honest man he has better right here than a man with a brazen face and a dishonest countenance; and I believe I represent as honest a constituency as there is in the Dominion of Canada. I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to point the finger of scorn at any act of mine. I have not spoken thirty minutes during the Session, and during the four years I have been in Parliament I have not spoken four hours.

Mr. WOODWORTH. So much the better.

Mr. IRVINE. Does the hon. gentleman want another shot? You have the whole of your family here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order, order. Let the hon. gentleman keep in order.

Mr. IRVINE. I know when I am in order. I am in order, and I won't allow the Chairman to put me down. What is the point of order?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman should address himself to the motion before the House.

Mr. IRVINE. I am addressing myself to the motion; I claim that right, and I crave no indulgence. I ask whether it is to the credit of the First Minister or the Government that, as I am informed, not one Bill has passed its second reading before the Easter recess. I ask, is that the way the Parliament of this country should be conducted—kept here six or seven weeks doing nothing? The Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition may go to bed, it is the men in the trenches who must suffer. If the Government had brought down their measures in time, we would have no right to complain; but I protest after we have been kept here for six or seven weeks, with nothing to do, against being obliged to remain here, night after night, after three and four o'clock in the morning; I say it is a crime on the part of the Government, to oblige men who have business to attend to, not only to remain here much longer than would have been necessary, had the Government showed ordinary promptitude in bringing down the business of the country; but also in keeping us here to those exceedingly late, or rather early hours. It is enough to break down any man's constitution. Were there any real necessity for this I would be the last man to protest; though I have not a strong constitution, I have a strong will, and a strong desire to do my duty to my electors; but, we know hon. gentlemen opposite well; we know that toryism is in its essence, and that it is impossible that freedom should exist in harmony with toryism. I am not surprised at the exhibition we have witnessed to-night, of a Government forcing a measure through the House which has not received proper discussion, because we know that toryism is averse to fair and open discussion; and I expect the next thing we will see will be the introduction of the clôture.

Mr. WELDON. A good many hon. members complain that they have not had an opportunity of speaking on this measure. I had no opportunity of speaking on the second reading of the Bill, as I was willing to give way and allow the division to proceed, though I was attacked by the hon. member for King's, N.S., who made just such remarks as he has just made. He said that hon. gentlemen who had addressed the House wandered away from the subject; had he been in his seat he would have seen that hon. gentlemen on this side confined themselves entirely to the question of woman suffrage; but the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), in his remarks, wandered over the whole Bill, and no one made any objection to it. Forty-eight days of the Session passed before this Bill was introduced, and seventy days elapsed before its second reading was moved, and it contains clauses of a revolutionary character, more particularly this one which is under discussion; and although this Bill was brought down by the First Minister not hardly any one on his side is prepared to support it, as regards woman suffrage.

Mr. FISHER. I think hon. gentlemen opposite are going very far when they accuse us of extravagance and obstruction in the treatment of this Bill. Last Saturday I visited Montreal and my home and met a good many people, and, far from finding, as the First Minister has said on a good many occasions, that the Bill has had abundant opportunity of being known in this country, I found the people with whom I came in contact, people who took an interest in the politics of the country, knew very little about the Bill. The most universal description of it was that it was Sir John's woman suffrage Bill. If it be the right hon. gentleman's woman suffrage Bill, it is showing but scant

mercy to it, that the clause relating to woman suffrage should be disposed of after a few hours' discussion. As has been said, this Bill is revolutionary in its provisions. The attention of the country has been turned very largely to the North-West, and to the financial affairs of the country; but, notwithstanding the gravity of the situation in the North-West, and in regard to our financial position, I maintain that the effect of this Bill will be far more lasting and important on the country than any temporary difficulty or depression. This is a Bill which is going to materially affect our political "institutions" for years to come. It is not to be supposed that if this Bill becomes law it is going to be repealed lightly or easily. The hon. the First Minister did not choose to introduce this Bill at a time when it could be discussed, and if we are obliged to discuss it as this late period of the Session, and during these late hours, the fault is that of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, and not ours. We, however, on this side of the House, are determined that the Bill shall receive its full discussion, as far as we are concerned; and if the hon. gentlemen have not allowed us to discuss it in the winter we will have to discuss it in the summer. I have no desire to obstruct the work of the House or to keep the House late, and would much prefer that this measure should be discussed in the ordinary way; but if the Government force a discussion upon us at this hour, we will not fail to respond. The motion to adjourn at this time in the morning can in no sense be characterised as obstructive, and if hon. gentlemen choose to vote it down, it will show that they are unwilling the provisions of the Bill should be known to the people.

Motion, Mr. Mulock, that Committee rise, negatived.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) I think was scarcely fair to this House when he stated that his friends had made up their minds upon this subject, and that there was no use in addressing any further arguments to them. I doubt if he had the authority of the members supporting the Government to make that statement. I think too well of them to believe that they have closed their minds against all argument upon a question about which there is so much difference of opinion. I do not know what rank that hon. gentleman holds in his party. It may be that he already finds himself in the enjoyment of their confidence, and that it only awaits the official recognition in order that he shall be entitled to occupy the place which, by grace, he occupied to-night. During the absence of the Premier from this Chamber we found the hon. member for North Perth leading the House, at times with masterly silence, very different from the manner in which he leads it when he occupies his place in the rear, when, in the seclusion of his seat, with several rows of hon. gentlemen in front of him, he has an opportunity, on many occasions, an opportunity which he is not slow to take advantage of, of entertaining this House in many interesting ways. He has developed, of late, a taste for music. He has become a practical performer on various musical instruments.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman is stating what is absolutely untrue. I do not play any instrument; I do not make any noise here. I occasionally speak a word out, and the hon. gentleman hears what I say. I am not afraid of what I say. I do not make any grinding or any music, and I want you to understand that. He will take it back, if he is an honest man.

Mr. MULOCK It seems that I gave the hon. gentleman credit for more accomplishments than he owns up to.

Mr. RYKERT. That is mean.

Mr. MULOCK. I accept his explanation on that point, but I have heard many noises of that kind emanating from the section of the Chamber which he occupies, and if he is not guilty, he simply transfers the guilt to some one else.

Mr. RYKERT. Tell the truth.

Mr. MULOCK. What does the member for Lincoln say?

Mr. RYKERT. Tell the truth whatever you do, if you can do it.

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to the statement of the hon. member for Lincoln, and ask you to say if he is in order.

Mr. RYKERT. Tell the truth whatever you do.

An hon. MEMBER. That is more than you can do.

Mr. MULOCK. Did he say I did not tell the truth?

Mr. RYKERT. I said "tell the truth."

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Calling across the House is irregular in itself. It is very improper and it had better not be done.

Mr. RYKERT. He addressed himself to me, at any rate.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) addressed himself to the House on the question of adjournment, and he expressed to some extent the attitude of his party on some questions. He professed to say that his party were the sole friends of economy, that they looked after expenditure in this country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. RYKERT. I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman is not speaking to the question. There is no question of economy in that resolution.

Mr. MULOCK. I am speaking to what he said.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). That is a former debate.

Mr. MULOCK. I will come to what the hon. member for Lennox said.

Mr. MILLS. That is not a former debate.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. member will remember that the speeches he is referring to were made on a different motion. We have now returned to the discussion of the clause, not the motion for adjournment, on which those observations were made.

Mr. MULOCK. When I refer to the remarks of the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Pruyn), you will remember, Mr. Chairman, that he spoke on the Bill, on the question of woman franchise, and I think I am entitled to refer to his opinion on that question. The hon. member for Lennox said—perhaps it was a slip—that he thought it would be better for all parties if the Bill did not pass. I presume he meant, if the clause in favor of giving the suffrage to the women, or to certain portions of the women, did not pass. He seemed to be of opinion that it was better that the franchise should not be extended to women, but he stands not altogether supported by all his friends on that point. I do not understand that the Premier stands alone, and it is my pleasure on this occasion to concur with him, to stand side by side with him on this question. I have never been able to see why, in this present day, the suffrage should not be extended to women, and the difficulty that I see in the way now is, in supporting a proposition which is, at most, only going to do partial justice. The first question that occurs to me is, on what principle, according to this Bill, is the right to the franchise rested? If we read the Bill we find what the qualification is, and it would seem, from a perusal of the Bill alone, that property of some form is deemed the qualification, and the only qualification necessary, in order to entitle any person to enjoy the franchise. For example, a certain owner of real estate or one who has a certain interest in real estate is to be entitled to the franchise, or a person possessed of a certain income is to be entitled to the franchise, or a person who happens to be related to the owner of property is to be entitled to the fran

chise. Thus it would seem that the guiding principle on which the right to the franchise rests is whether or not the person claiming such franchise is or is not the owner of the property qualifications which alone is made the test. However, whether that is or is not the test, one may fairly look at the arguments that are advanced outside as well as here in reference to this question. Some people in this House, in the course of the debate, have argued that it would be degrading to women to be called upon to exercise the franchise; that they occupy a high plane; that they are ethereal in their character, and that, if they come down to the ordinary struggles in political campaigns, if they become embroiled in party strife and in party politics, they will fall from their high position and will come to the common plane occupied by the ordinary elector. Well, that does not appear to me to be an argument against their having the franchise, but rather an argument in favor of it being extended to them. With the introduction of a better element into the body politic, there would come an elevating influence, no doubt. Under those circumstances, even if they do lose, to some extent, their refinement, they would transfer it to those less refined. Thus we would have an elevation of the characters of the sterner sex, and finally, all would be nearly on the same plane. But if the argument that refinement disqualified a woman to exercise the franchise is to prevail, why, by parity of reasoning, you might say that any man whose character is above that of his fellow men, whose thoughts are more elevated, whose every action is pure, should withdraw from the troubles of political life, and take no part in dealing with the affairs of this country, should stand aloof from the exercise of what we are told is one of the highest rights belonging to man in civilised countries. I see no force whatever in the argument that women, by reason of their superior refinement, should hesitate to take part in politics. Now, some hon. gentlemen have contended that woman is not possessed of sufficient intelligence to enable her to make a wise use of the franchise; that she may be well adapted for private life, that she may be specially fitted to administer domestic economy—I believe that was the term one hon. gentleman used—but, after all, that her mental characteristics were such that she could never make an intelligent use of the political franchise. Well, Mr. Chairman, what position do we find women filling to day in this country? In the Province of Ontario we find 250,000 female pupils attending the public schools. Does not the training they receive there enable them intelligently to exercise the franchise? Are they not acquiring political information by reading the daily journals which are found in every household now? Is all the teaching, all the industry exerted in their study and reading, thrown away? Why, not not only do we find females to-day filling up places of learning as students, but we find them taking a higher position still. For years a great number of women have been engaged as instructors of youth, instructing not only the female portion of those schools, but the boys, in history, in political economy, in teaching them how to exercise the franchise; and yet we are told that women are not themselves sufficiently intelligent to exercise the franchise. It is extraordinary reasoning that though they are intelligent enough to teach others how to exercise the franchise, at the same time they do not know themselves how to exercise it. I think it is generally admitted that instructors are able to practise what they teach. Of course, it may be argued that there are classes of females that are not able, at present, to exercise the franchise. If we take the Bill as we find it, and if we take the speech of the Premier to-day, who expressed himself in favor of extending the franchise to unmarried women and widows, we shall gather the true scope of the Bill. Now, what classes of women, unmarried and spinsters, have we in Canada? It is proposed to enfranchise the Indians. Accordingly it will be necessary, if there is no qualification "of the term female," to extend the franchise to the spinster Indian woman, and to the widow Indian woman. It is proposed to extend the franchise to Chinamen. If Chinese women come here, they will come in under this general clause, and the Chinawoman will be entitled to the franchise. I am not sufficiently familiar with the characteristics of the Chinese women to say how intelligent they are, or whether those who have come to this country have acquired sufficient knowledge of our institutions to be able to make a right use of the franchise. I leave that to my hon. friends from British Columbia, who will be able to speak more fully upon that question. But at present, if the Chinamen become naturalised, the negro, if he becomes naturalised, the Indian, who is our fellow citizen—all these are to have the franchise if they have the property qualification, and with them the females, if the Premier has his way. Now, I have only been addressing my argument in view of the enfranchisement of those of our own blood and race. I do not know whether the Mongolians are sufficiently advanced to be entitled to the franchise or not. But as regards the enfranchisement of Caucasian women, not only are they engaged in occupations which afford a training to the mind, but we find them giving proofs of their intelligence in many ways. It is not so long since women found their way into many callings that, until then, were deemed only fitted for men. It seems to me that the matter of the franchise being extended either to men or to women is simply a matter of custom. Not having been educated to look upon woman as entitled to vote, naturally the proposition seems like an innovation to us, and we feel conservative upon the point. But when we become more familiar with the idea, then we must advance arguments to exclude them, or they must have the franchise. We have no right arbitrarily to refuse it; we must advance reasons. I do not quite agree with the Premier when he says that the matter of giving a franchise to any one is merely a matter of expediency. I think he made a mistake there. I view the franchise in a different light. I view the franchise as a natural right. I consider every man ought to have a voice in the making of the laws which apply to him, subject, of course, to certain limitations; that is, we shall be satisfied that he has given such guarantees of citizenship as make it safe to entrust him with that power. Granted he has given those guarantees, and I do not admit it is a matter of expediency whether he has the franchise; but, on the contrary, whoever refuses him the natural right does him a grievous wrong, and robs him of that which is his own, and of which no one has a right to deprive him. We approach this question with a prejudice, the prejudice of custom, arising from long-established usage. But if we can sweep away such prejudice and approach the consideration of the question with a judicial mind, I am satisfied we must reach a definite conclusion. I have heard numbers of hon. members on both sides speak on the subject from both standpoints; I could not make out on which side they were speaking; in fact, they faced north and south on the question. That is not my position. As far as my intelligence has enabled me to arrive at a conclusion, I have arrived at a definite conclusion on this question. It is not so long since we found men being deemed competent to discharge many of the duties in life that are now discharged by women. Go into our public places to-day, and what do we find? Not many years since we had telegraphs established in Canada, as in other parts of the civilised world. Who were the first operatives? All men. In due time women were engaged, and they became accustomed and qualified for that life. The telegraph strike occurred. Young men rose against this innovation, and declared they would not work side by side with women. The country was interested in the question of having cheaper labor and a reduction of wages, and the women remained in the offices.

In time prejudice passed away. The women discharged their duties well, they enjoyed the confidence of their employers and of the public, and it was found that employment of that kind, whilst it did not injure the women, enabled them to find callings more congenial to them than those to which before they had been limited, and thus in time it came to be admitted, and it is now admitted without a single exception, that it is a proper thing that women should be allowed to earn an honest living in such light employment as the telegraphic service. And so in other walks of life. Take our stores to-day. Not many years have elapsed since nothing but men, young and old, were found in the large retail establishments in Canada. To-day, it is true, men are still employed, but in most of the stores a large number of women are employed. Take other industries. Take the great manufacturing industries of the Canadian cities. It has always been the custom to employ women in cotton factories, but in the boot and shoe factories, and factories of that kind, the custom has sprung up during recent years, it having practically commenced with their employment of the Singer sewing machine. What class do you now find working the sewing machine? Before the introduction of the sewing machine work at shoemaking for the wholesale trade was limited to men and boys; but with the introduction of labor-saving machinery it was found that a class of work could be provided adapted to the weaker sex; and so on went the march of female progress. Women were admitted in other departments to their rights. Now they are recognised as fully entitled to earn an honest living in such light employments as the manufacture of boots and shoes and other industries. What does all this lead to? Does it not convince us that on this very question, the granting of the franchise to women, whilst we may be prejudiced to-day upon the question, and think that the granting of the franchise to women may have disastrous effects upon them, or be productive of no good results to society, is it not reasonable to suppose that we will find out, when we have tried the question, that we were mistaken, as we have found out in regard to those other matters to which I have alluded. But if we take up the Bill and ask the reason why the franchise is given to anyone, we find that the Bill is based on the idea that the rights to the franchise is a question of property qualification. Then it does not become a question of usage at all. If you grant that any person, male or female, possessing the necessary qualifications, is entitled to the franchise, if you seek to disfranchise anyone possessing that qualification, the burthen of proof rests upon the person who seeks to disfranchise her. Ownership of property is the only grounds on which the franchise is given under this Bill, and therefore it will not do for them to deny that franchise, simply because the House has not affirmatively been convinced that females ought to have that franchise. But we must go further; we must assume what they are entitled to ask, and has there been any argument advanced to show that they should be deprived of what we have. I will assume, for argument's sake, that the House will give them what they are entitled to. I assume that they have their rights *nunc pro tunc*, and that is the position in this matter. My hon. friend from West Ontario, referring to the chivalrous age of the past, reminded us that one of the arguments against extending the franchise to women was the fact that they are unable to bear arms; but it seems to me that it is just as reasonable to say that as to say that men should not have the franchise because they are not able to bear children. Now, what will be the effect of granting this franchise? For I think if it can be shown that it would interfere with the public weal we would be justified in making the individual interest defer to the public interest. What would be the effect upon woman herself? It has been said that it would degrade her, but no arguments have been advanced upon that point. My opinion is, it would have the contrary effect; it would elevate her, because we know there is nothing which is more calculated to awaken the latent energies of any class of people than a lively interest in the welfare of the country in which they live. If you extend the franchise to women, to-morrow morning the first thing they would take up would be the newspapers of the day, and particularly that part of them in which the speeches in this House would be recorded; and they would read the speech which I am now delivering. Would not that have a beneficial effect? Would it not elevate them? Then again, in meetings in our constituencies we could tell them how the work of this Session had been conducted, whom we met and with what ceremony this House was opened. We could tell them that these forms, unimportant though they might appear, went back through long centuries to the Saxon witenagemote of ancient times. What a field for thought. And still they tell us that the effect of a woman venturing to unsex herself by her going innocently to the poll and marking a ballot for herself would perhaps be degrading. Not only would the effect on women be good, but the effect on the community, I think, would be good. Apart from the political effect, one cannot but admit that every person has an influence for good, and the more people we have in society who are educated and refined the better for society. Is it not better, then, to have women educated, not in one narrow sphere of thought, but in the broad field of politics? Is it not better then for them to direct their thoughts into this wide field of research than to confine them within narrow domestic channels? The woman with a broadened mind becomes a mother of a new race of men. Is it not safer, too, that the representation of the people should rest on a broad basis than a narrow one? Is is not better that every citizen should have a degree of direct responsibility in the administration of the affairs of the country? If one-half of the country are disfranchised they are more or less dissatisfied with the laws under which they live. They naturally argue that they had no voice in making the laws, and, therefore, while the laws are binding on them, they are not accepted with that unanimity that they would be if they were made by these people's representatives. Let them have their representatives in Parliament to help to make the laws and then they cannot disclaim their binding effect. Thus, it is idle to pass laws in advance of public opinion. In Canada we endeavor, on most occasions, to legislate in the wake of public opinion. Such, in my opinion, should be the course of Parliament, although in portions of this Bill I fear that that wholesome rule has been disregarded. If these advantages which I have mentioned are to flow from the extension of the franchise to women, it follows that the withholding of the franchise leads to disadvantages. What are we to think of a person in the state of bondage or tutelage? Has bondage an elevating effect on the human mind? No; it has a degrading effect. I do not care whether it is slavery, in the literal sense of the term, or bondage in consequence of any undue influence, the mind of the person so enslaved becomes dwarfed and inactive. I say that must be the consequence if we discourage the human mind; if we keep the females in a state of political subjection and tell them that the political book is a book that is closed against them, they, in deference to the wishes of others, recognise patiently and docilely such a request and treat it as a closed book. Why close from them such a source of light? The withholding of this light produces on their minds an effect the very opposite of that which I have portrayed as the result of their being enfranchised. Let me put this in another way. What would be the effect, as regards women as a class, of their having more direct representation in this House. When any matter comes up in this House, we find hon. gentlemen taking more or less interest in it, according as they feel specially called upon to present that question. In all systems of

representation there is more or less of class representation, and it appears to be an incident of human weakness that interests are considered according as pressure is brought to bear. We find people in this House getting up and speaking very earnestly upon some matter, and for a moment we wonder how it is they feel so keenly upon it. A short time ago my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. Cameron) discussed the question of navigation between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. His constituents were interested upon it, and he desired they should be benefited by legislation in this House.

Mr. McCALLUM. What has that got to do with the question?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is endeavoring to illustrate his proposition.

Mr. MULOCK. So we have many other similar cases, of men taking a special interest in something that affects their constituents without prejudice to their general view of the whole legislation, and the reason they take such interest upon particular questions is that they represent persons who have a grievance. But take the case of the unrepresented women. How has it been with them? If we look at the legislation in England we will find that the interests of women were for a time almost totally disregarded. Women could not hold property, according to the English law, until very recently, in cases where she happened to be possessed of personal property before marriage. Under the law of England, with the framing of which she had nothing to do, the moment she married, the bulk of her personal property passed to her husband, and she became a mere dependent upon her husband. Was that such a law as would have been on the Statute Book had women a voice in parliamentary representation? Would her representative have allowed such a law to pass? Let us come to our own country and take the Province of Ontario, of which we boast as being a very intelligent Province. In the first few years, what was the law with regard to the property of married women there? Take the case of her personal property. If she married without settlement, before a certain day, her personal property passed to her husband; and, in regard to her real estate, he was entitled to the rents and profits of it during life. From time to time ameliorations were made in her condition, until to-day we can say that, so far as regards property, she is now practically emancipated from her husband. Why did those laws continue in the Statute Book so long? Is it to be supposed that if she had a voice in the election of representatives she would not have soon discovered her legal status, and have had it secured long before. Take another class of cases—the right of a woman over her child. The time was, in England, when a married woman had no control over her child; it could be taken from her by her husband, even during the period of nurture, and placed in other hands. Her husband was supposed to have absolute domain over that child and wife. Was there ever a more unjust law placed on the Statue Book than a law of that kind? Yet such was the law of the land, passed by a class of people who did not represent the women. Times changed, and with enlightenment and intelligence the acquisition by woman of more influence in social life, an improvement of woman's condition was brought about. It was not long ago when an attempt was made in this House to obtain legislation which was designed to improve the condition of woman. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who has specially championed the cause of the weaker sex, has been endeavoring for many years to free them, to protect them, and to hand his own name down to posterity as their champion, by procuring the passage of certain legislation here ——

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). What is it?

Mr. MULOCK. My hon. friend from Inverness was in the House at the time, but if he does not know what legislation passes, he trying to prevent it passing, it is idle for me to enlighten him. My hon. friend from North Norfolk, time after time, has invited the attention of Parliament to a Bill for the suppression of a great social crime, with what success you all know. Who killed that measure?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. MULOCK. No question about it. The right hon. the Premier, who to-day is advocating the rights of women, killed that measure in this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. MULOCK. Am I not entitled to discuss it? Very well. All I say is, that that measure would have been treated less cavalierly had women enjoyed the franchise and been able to sit in judgment upon hon. members when they returned to their constituents. Class legislation is inseparable from all legislation, and the female class are entitled to legislative protection. We see what is the weakness of human nature by every representative feeling bound to consider the class that he is dependent upon and being less interested in the welfare of those to whom he owes no obligations. If pecuniary interests are entitled to special consideration here, now much more is the welfare of the great female portion of society entitled to be considered? It has been said that women are represented here now. How are they represented? How would we like it if we were told that, women being now considered on a par with men, the time had arrived when the franchise should be transferred to them, that turn about was fair play, that they could represent us for a time? We would think that was a very different matter; but what right would we have to complain if we refuse them the franchise, on the ground that we already represent them in Parliament? If you say that "A" represents "B" in Parliament, why should we not extend the franchise? Men as a class are represented in Parliament to-day, but a portion of them have not votes, and we are constantly extending the franchise, so that at last every male British subject, possessing some little qualification will have the franchise. Why should we not say that more than half a million men have the franchise now, that they represent all classes and conditions of men, and that they are sufficiently interested in the welfare of the rest to choose their representatives for them? You might as well put it in that way as to say that women are represented because their husbands vote. It is argued that the duties attaching to women are inconsistent with their exercising the political franchise. All women are not so involved with domestic duties that they have not the time to exercise the franchise; and, as this country increases in wealth, we shall constantly have more and more women who have no domestic cares to speak of except the maternal cares, and are these people not to take a small portion of time to record their vote? Even if a considerable portion of them are not able to take advantage of the franchise, is that any justification for denying the privilege to those who can? I will read the following extract from an article entitled "Woman's Rights and Duties," which appeared in the Edinburgh *Review*, in 1841, over forty years ago.

"A question has occasionally been raised, and I believe by more than one writer, whether the right of voting be not unjustly withheld from women, but it seems an almost conclusive objection to giving them the franchise that, by the very principle upon which it is bestowed, women are unfit for it, being always under influence. There are, no doubt, some cases of exception to that rule, but so there are to every other rule by which persons are excluded from that right. Perhaps no other rule is so extensively true as that women are under influence; but, further, women have no political interests apart from men."

Now, let us consider this proposition, that women are not entitled to vote because they are under influence. Do you think the writer, who wrote that article forty years ago,

would, if he were alive, repeat it to-day? Is there any hon. gentleman in this House who would attach his name to such a proposition? I submit there is not. What sort of influence ought to disqualify? Undue influence. What man that goes to the poll but is under some influence? He has an affection for some person. He votes for the candidate because, perhaps, he has a respect for him, or because some friend of his requested him to vote for him. He votes for him for various motives other than political motives, and these motives are the result of influence of some kind. The same objection, taken by the writer of this article, applies, to-day, with equal force, to the case of almost every man that goes to the polls. This article goes on to deal with another matter connected with this same question, and I cannot clothe the idea in half as appropriate language as the author has done.

An hon. MEMBER. Go on.

Mr. MULOCK. At the request of my hon. friend opposite, I will go on.

Mr. RYKERT. Read the whole of it.

Mr. MULOCK. The author goes on as follows ——

An hon. MEMBER. Who is the author?

Mr. MULOCK. I am reading from the Edinburgh *Review*.

Mr. DESJARDINS. What year?

Mr. MULOCK I will let you know to-morrow. A third class of women proposed to be enfranchised by the Bill in question has been omitted. How can it be stated, as is stated here, that we men have no particular interests apart from men? We know that in Canada a large number of unmarried women are possessed of property. That property has to bear its burden to the State. It is chargeable for taxes. We are every day passing measures that will impose taxes upon these unmarried women and widows, and yet they are to have no voice, no control, over that legislation which, *pro tanto*, deprives them of their property. The writer does admit that women, even at that day, were entitled to some special legislation. He states that they have hardships which it might not be unjust to the men to consider, with a view to their removal. Is that the way their hardships would be dealt with had they the statutory power themselves? Is that the tender way that we would restore to them their property or their offspring? I need not dilate on this subject further. I have here a book, written by Mrs. Reid, on the subject, entitled "A plea for Women." (The hon. member read from page 49 to 53, inclusive.) I trust that that book was not written in vain. I trust that the perusal of this passage, which I have read at the request of hon. gentlemen opposite, has not been in vain. I trust it will have its influence on them, and that however prejudiced they may be, they will now be in a position to say that they have seen the light, and that they will do justice to this portion of society. I have discussed the question simply with reference to the proposition of the Bill to extend the franchise to a certain class of women only, namely, to unmarried women, and I presume that the hon. First Minister intended, by that definition, to exclude from it Chinese women. I reserve any observations on that point for a future occasion.

Mr. HOLTON. I do not propose occupying the time of the House, at this very early hour of the morning, in repeating the arguments which a few hours ago were advanced in favor of the adjournment of this debate. Those arguments then were good and unanswerable; now they are doubly so. I therefore move that the Chairman do now leave the Chair.

Mr. RYKERT. I rise to a point of order. That is not a proper motion. It should be that the committee now rise.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. It is the same thing.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The member for Lincoln has been a long time in Parliament, and he does not know that that is a proper motion. I think you, Mr. Chairman, will agree that it is an eminently proper resolution. You have sat in that Chair a great many hours; you look sleepy, and weary, and tired; we may not all agree with you, politically, but I am sure we have friendly feelings towards you, and I think the motion may be characterised as a humane motion. Those who have regard for you, I think, will not insist that you should any longer sit in that Chair, because, if the motion is lost, the Chairman has to remain in the Chair until another motion can be put that will carry. Now, in addition to the Chairman desiring to be relieved, I desire some rest myself; I am very tired; I am not tired of listening to the discussion, yet there is a limit to human endurance, and I call your attention now to the hour at which this resolution is offered, that it may go on record. It is now twenty-three minutes to five o'clock in the morning. The House met shortly after three in the afternoon, and we have been continously in Committee since.

Mr. SPROULE. Over one clause.

Mr. PATERSON. And the importance of that clause must be manifest to every member of the committee. I am speaking, Sir, on a motion that ought to prevail at this time that the Chairman be permitted to leave the Chair, and that we may be enabled to go to our rest. I would like to have the right hon. leader of the Government present to hear the views expressed on this motion; but he is unable to be present. I suppose he is wearied out; and going on as we are is not furthering the proceedings of the House at all. Hon. gentlemen opposite know that there is not one of them who is permitted or authorised to make any changes in that Bill——

Mr. BOWELL. You have no right to make a statement of that kind.

Mr. PATERSON—or to accept any amendments in the Bill.

Mr. McCALLUM. We act just as we think we should do as members of Parliament; we do not ask the permission of anybody. The hon. gentleman makes insinuations.

Mr. PATERSON. I made no insinuation.

Mr. BOWELL. You made a statement that is not correct.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. the Minister of Customs says it is not correct; if it is not I stand corrected.

Mr. MILLS. He can only speak for himself.

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. PATERSON. Do I understand that the Minister of Customs has authority and power to accept amendments that may be offered?

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman has no right to say that no member of the Government has a right to make a statement.

Mr. PATERSON. That is not my question.

Mr. BOWELL. You do not happen to be my father confessor, and I am not to be put through a series of questions.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman said that what I stated was not correct.

Mr. BOWELL. I say so now.

Mr. PATERSON. Therefore the Minister of Customs has power to accept amendments. There is an amendment in your hands, Mr. Chairman. If the Minister of Customs has power to accept that, let him do so. It is now near five o'clock, and it is impossible to discuss this

important question at this hour with that degree of vigor which it demands, and I think, therefore, the Government should agree to this amendment. We have only been two days in committee on this Bill, and the leader of the Government informed us, when expressing his intention to bring down this measure, that it would require a whole Session to discuss it intelligently; yet he now wants to force the Bill through in a night. This Bill involves a great many propositions, and we have before us the remarkable spectacle of a Government being divided against itself. The leader of the Government spoke to us of the great pride he felt in extending the suffrage to certain sections of women, and dilated on the great satisfaction that he would feel some future day in being able to give the right of franchise to all the women without exception; yet on this very essential part of this important Bill the First Minister is obliged to pocket all his fine feelings and consent practically to the defeat of his pet proposal. It appears that the position of the Secretary of State is the one that is about to be endorsed by the vast preponderance of hon. gentlemen opposite, and that the First Minister will have to yield with the best grace possible; but it must be very hard on him to let a colleague in the Cabinet triumph over him in this, which he described as the object of a heartfelt desire; to be humiliated at the hands of his own friends; to have them jeer at the sentiments he has uttered—these sentiments of a lifetime—this is the unkindest cut of all. The people will not be slow to appreciate this position, nor will they be slow to condemn the action of a party who is endeavoring to stifle discussion, and by sheer overpowering force of numbers to wear out the physical energy of the men who are opposed to them, and who are determined that the rights of a free people shall not be set aside with impunity. A gentleman opposite inquired, in rather an excited manner, to-night: Have not the members of the Government side as much interest in the country; is it not their duty to discuss questions as much as the members on the Opposition side? Well, their duty certainly lies in that direction; but, whether they have the interests of the country as much at heart or not, their actions, which sometimes speak louder than words, would seem to deny it. But the country will understand this.

Mr. McCALLUM. No mistake about it.

Mr. PATERSON. I think there is no mistake about that, as the hon. member for Monck says.

Mr. McCALLUM. No doubt about it, they will hold you responsible.

Mr. PATERSON. That the gentlemen on the Government side who are endeavoring thus to stifle discussion are doing so in their own individual interests, in order to put a Bill through this House that they think will have the effect of returning them as members of Parliament, when it might be a very difficult matter to accomplish that result without it. It would not fill one quite so much with a feeling of disgust were that all that was involved. It is, of course, to those who like honorable, and manly, and fair dealing, something repugnant to see members of Parliament trying to secure their return to Parliament through an Act of Parliament, afraid to trust the people; but that is not the worst of it. They are not only attempting to force through, by sheer overbearing numbers, a Bill designed to make their own seats safe, but one designed to make the seats of their opponents, in their judgment, very unsafe. It is not a position that honorable men would crave, and the people of the country, even the supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, do not think it an absolute necessity that the present members should represent the Conservative party. I believe there are men in the party, in the different constituencies, who would be willing to run without seeking this undue advantage. Hon. gentlemen may lay their plans, but those plans may fail to work. There is such a thing in the country yet as a love of manly British fair play, and all honorable men and women throughout the country will say that they do not approve of any such conduct. Members of the last Parliament supporting the Government were induced to cast their votes for a measure which was introduced under the same circumstances, and which had for its object the same which I believe is being sought in this Bill, and I saw them acting under the same pressure which seems to be impelling them on in the Bill now before the House, devising in secret, planning in secret, summoning to their aid all the wire-pullers in their different counties, and taking the map of Ontario and cutting and carving it, putting a township from this county into another, and a township out of another county into this.

Mr. HACKETT. I rise to a point of order. Is the hon. gentleman speaking to a clause before the committee?

Mr. PATERSON. A gentleman rising to a point of order should not ask a question. If you rose to a point of order, you must state the point, not ask a question.

Mr. HACKETT. The hon. gentleman is speaking to a Bill which was passed some years ago.

Mr. PATERSON. State your point of order.

Mr. HACKETT. He is not speaking to the clause before the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is not obliged to confine himself strictly to the motion before the House, but he cannot discuss the details of a measure passed some years ago. I think he is wandering very far in going into the details of a measure which has no bearing upon the case before the House.

Mr. BRYSON. Now, apologise.

Mr. PATERSON. No, I will not apologise. The Chairman does not ask me to apologise.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order; address the Chair.

Mr. PATERSON. I am addressing the Chair. I turned round, Mr. Chairman, but I was addressing the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I was speaking to him.

Mr. PATERSON. The member for Prince, P. E. I. (Mr. Hackett) has now the opportunity which was given a short time ago to the member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), of learning something of the procedure of Parliament, even at five o'clock in the morning. I want to point out to you that those members opposite, when they hear the word "gerrymander" mentioned, conscious that they have done an act that would bring anything but credit to them, conscious that they had perpetrated a wrong upon men who sat opposite them, conscious that they had done that which ought to make honorable and fair minded British men blush, do not like to hear even the name of that Act mentioned. When the question was before the electors, so far as I know—and I was in many counties—they did not dare to discuss it before the people; they were ashamed when it was mentioned; they sought to drown discussion upon it, and I saw them bow their heads in shame, in my presence, more than once, when that measure was discussed. I see a member—I can see him now—representing one-half of a county, guilty of conduct that the public outside called craven cowardice, not willing to go back to his constituents to take the votes of the same electors who sent him here before—a strong Conservative riding it was—he dared not consult his constituents again, until he had taken townships out of his riding and put them into another riding, and put other townships into his riding. I witnessed that spectacle, and I saw an amendment, protesting against it, voted down in dumb silence by that gentleman. I saw that same brave,

honorable, noble minded man, that dared not go before his constituents until he had strengthened himself, and figuratively tied the hands of the member who represented the other half of his county, and fellow townsman, and a man with whom he was on intimate terms—helping to tie his hands, and trying to put him to a political death. That is what I saw, and the gentleman who did that act sits over there, ready now to put through another Act to strengthen him in another gerrymandered constituency, not feeling that his seat is safe at the next election, and endeavoring to strike another blow at the hon. gentleman who, despite his efforts, came back to this House from a Conservative constituency, elected by a larger majority than he had in his own constituency. Mr. Chairman, I have mentioned these things to point out to hon. gentlemen opposite that they may strive to weary out the little band in opposition, who ask for nothing but fair play——

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. PATERSON. Sit down.

Mr. McNEILL. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PATERSON. Sit down.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has no right to call out to another to sit down.

Mr. McNEILL. I wish to ask if the hon. gentleman is in order in speaking so loud?

Mr. PATERSON. I expect you, Mr. Chairman, to rule on this question. He rose, and I asked him to sit down. I could see by the lack of intelligence in his face that he had nothing to propound, and I asked him to sit down. I saw that he rose from a sleepy condition, not grasping the position of the debate. I do not attribute to him a lack of intelligence at all times, because he is a gentleman of intelligence. But he did not rise to a point of order, and I consider that he insulted you and insulted this committee, and I ask your ruling on it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman has not insulted me nor the committee. The hon. gentleman was asking whether your tone was not too loud, and I do not consider that an insult.

Mr. LANDERKIN——

Mr. BERGIN. I rise to a point of order. No gentleman in this House, when another gentleman rises, has a right to say, in the tone used by the hon. member for Brant, to another hon. gentleman, "sit down;" the question should be put through you, and the order through you.

Mr. MILLS. It is clear that the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill) had no question of order to raise. It is impossible to believe that he could have supposed that my hon. friend was out of order because he was speaking loud. He must have known that that was not a question of order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to have your ruling on that point. I would like to know if it is within the power of a member of this House to rise and make an attack upon another member who is talking in a fair and legitimate manner. My hon. friend from Brant simply told him to sit down. If he were Irish, he might have knocked him down. But he did not do that; he raised a point of order, and I want your ruling.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I have already ruled that the hon. member for Brant was not in order when he called across the House to another member to sit down.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When the hon. member for Stormont interrupted me I was saying that I thought he was the member for Cornwall. Since then I have found that there is no member for Cornwall, and that he is now member for Stormont.

Mr. BERGIN. There is no member for Cornwall and no member for Stormont, but there is a member who represents both Cornwall and Stormont. As to whether it is in order to walk across the floor and knock a gentleman down who behaves in an ungentlemanly way, I cannot say, but out of doors I think it would be in order, and I know an Irishman who would do it.

Mr. PATERSON. I accept your ruling, Mr. Chairman, and my apology must be that it has been the custom, when interruptions are made, to tell the hon. member making them to cease the noise, to sit down and not interrupt; and that was the cause of my telling the hon. member to sit down. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), who has interrupted me, should recognise the fact that there are other Conservatives in the constituency who would do equal honor as its representative. It is quite possible that while they believe in Conservative principles, it does not follow they are bound to accept as the nominee of the party a gentleman who desires to have his election carried by the appointment of a revising barrister. I say there are people in North Perth who may take that. I use that as an example, among many others, and therefore I think that, notwithstanding what hon. gentlemen may say, there will be sufficient prominence given to it before this measure becomes law, that the people of the country will know that the majority have been acting in a tyrannical manner, that they have been using their overpowering numbers, and that this measure will yield no such success to hon. gentlemen opposite as they desire. For these reasons I think that it is now time that you should resign the Chair.

Mr. MILLS. Hon. gentlemen opposite, led by two Ministers of the Crown, seem very anxious to defeat the proposition embraced in the Bill by the First Minister. I was rather amused, Sir, at the anxiety exhibited, even by the First Minister, to have this portion of the Bill defeated. Then we have one hon. gentleman who, in speaking of this measure earlier in the evening, informed us that this portion of the Bill only applied to the Province of Quebec, and that although he was in favor of woman suffrage—although he was in favor of this portion of the measure—yet because the people of Quebec did not favor the proposition, because this portion of the Bill only applied to the Province of Quebec, he would vote against the proposition of the First Minister, and in favor of the amendment of the hon. member for Cumberland. In fact, it comes to this, that hon. gentlemen feel that each Province ought to be allowed to pursue its own view with regard to this portion of the Bill. I have been pleased to notice how carefully hon. gentlemen opposite have, during the whole night, listened to everything that has been said, how closely they followed the carefully reasoned-out speech of my hon. friend from North York. I think, considering to what an extent hon. members on this side have saved the supporters of the Government from the trouble of investigation on this subject, they should be glad to support the motion in your hand—the motion for adjournment—which is a reasonable one. I am reminded, in looking at this Bill, of a statement which has been made by Mr. Matthew Arnold, that there is a power in this world which makes for righteousness. First, we had the Gerrymander Bill, by which hon. gentlemen opposite hoped to succeed in wiping the Reform party out of existence. But the failure of that measure ought to have warned them against trying a second experiment. We all know what was done on that occassion. We all know the maps were kept in the Eastern Block, and that the vote of each polling division was marked on that map. We all know the labor which the Minister of Customs and others bestowed on the redistribution of seats. We all know the problem which, on that occasion, these hon. gentlemen had presented to their minds for solution,

and we all got the solution which was proposed to this House on the 28th of April. I repeat again what was said by an hon. gentleman who attended the caucus of those gentlemen, who was one of the party, who was rather disgusted with what transpired there, and who mentioned the circumstances to an hon. gentleman who was then on this side, the late Sir Albert Smith. He told us of language that was rather more energetic than polite, that was sometimes used in reference to that Gerrymander Bill. He told us of disputes and difficulties that arose; he told us how townships were traded for considerations; how after the Bill was introduced here on the 28th of April, it was not accepted by a large number of those gentlemen who hoped to profit by it, and who did not profit to the extent they anticipated, and who insisted on other changes; how the First Minister was involved in the difficulty of coming down to this House and pressing the second reading of a Bill which was not the Bill he introduced; and how he was compelled to introduce the measure a second time, or rather another measure, which the caucus had forced him to accept. All these facts, which are in history, show that the way of the transgressor is not always smooth or easy, and the result in many constituencies showed that it was not always successful. Hon. gentlemen are undertaking by this Bill to do precisely the same thing again. They propose that the dice shall be loaded. They propose that they shall accomplish certain results in the electoral contests by the measure now before the House. I have no fear that their expectation will be realised. I know that just in proportion as you impress on any portion of the community the idea that they have been unjustly or unfairly dealt with, just in the same proportion you will nerve them on to a vigorous effort, and give them a determination to succeed in defeating the wrong intended. There are always a sufficient number of men who are not so strongly allied to either political party as to tolerate injustice, when that injustice is brought before them; and those hon. gentlemen are now abusing their position to accomplish an object that ought to be left entirely to the electors of this country. They are endeavoring to do here what has been unheard of in any other country where representative institutions have been established. They are attempting to take out of the hands of the people the preparation of the voters' lists and to put it into the hands of Ministers of the Crown. Sir, you might just as well allow one of the parties to a suit to choose the judge to decide that suit, as to allow a Government to determine who shall prepare the voters' lists and practically determine the elections. Now, Sir, I say we do not want this measure; the country does not want it; the only important feature in the measure, the only new principle of value, is that now before us. Everything else in it is vicious, except this proposition, which the First Minister cannot get his friends to support. The hon. gentlemen should remember that they may "doctor" the constitution of the country too much. They may fail to accomplish what they have undertaken. I remember reading, I think, Lord North, having quoted the words on the tombstone of a celebrated Italian, which were these: "I was well, I wished to be better, I sent for the doctor, and here I am." These hon. gentlemen ought to have considered this rather well, after what they have done before. They wished to be better, and they introduced this Bill, and if they persist in the measure, and if, unfortunately for the country, they succeed in carrying it, I trust that the result will be precisely the result of sending for the doctor, and I have no doubt in my mind that that will be the result. Now, although we are anxious to please hon. gentlemen opposite, they ought to be reasonable and ought now to consent to an adjournment.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think the members of the House must admit that you, Mr. Chairman, have given the greatest amount of patience to the consideration of these matters. You have occupied that Chair since about three o'clock yesterday afternoon, and I think it must strike you as very reasonable and proper that now, when the sun is shining through the windows, it is time for this committee to rise. I do not wish to say anything offensive to hon. gentlemen opposite, by charging them with being obstructionists and factionists in the way they are dealing with this profound problem, but I must certainly say that their present course, when viewed in the light of the history of this Bill, is entirely unaccountable, from the standpoint of sound and practical legislation. This Bill was introduced on several occasions, but never came up for discussion until the present Session, when, although it had been promised in Speeches from the Throne for the last three years, it is brought up at so late a period that the fair, open discussion which it demands is altogether out of question. The course of the hon. gentleman is in accord with the erratic manner which has distinguished his conduct with regard to this measure throughout. He desires to pose as the champion of the ladies on the one hand, but on the other hand he puts up one of his supporters to introduce an amendment which will defeat the cause of which he pretends to be an ardent advocate; and in order to conceal his true position from the people, the hon. gentleman is doing his best to stifle discussion, relying on his strong majority to uphold him in this unmanly and undignified course; but the hon. gentleman will find that the Opposition are not to be coerced into submission, but are prepared to fulfil their duty, so that they, at any rate, will be able to go before the people with a clean record. At this hour of the morning, it is natural for me to think, because I am Canadian-born, how our volunteers are faring in the great North-West this morning. I think it would be a fitting compliment if we were to adjourn now out of respect to those loyal volunteers, at six o'clock in the morning. I think it would be showing a proper appreciation of the gravity of the crisis through which the country is now passing. Now, Sir, this is a pretty difficult matter. You know, Mr. Chairman, you have been almost continuously in the Chair since eight o'clock. We have had pretty long sessions for a month or six weeks back. The protracted sessions have resulted in the illness of one of the Ministers, who is very highly esteemed by this House.

Mr. MILLS. I would suggest that the Chairman should wake up the hon. member, so that he may hear the speech of my hon. friend.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am glad to see that so many hon. members have come in recently, on purpose to listen to me. The hon. gentleman next read from Professor Fawcett on the woman's question, and then quoted elaborately from Julia Wedgwood's works. Continuing, he said: Would the people of this country deem it unreasonable that this House should adjourn at six in the morning, when you, Mr. Chairman, have been in your place from ten to twelve hours continuously. I claim that the people would say that such a demand was a reasonable one and that it is proper the House should now adjourn. Is it the will of the House that it do now adjourn.

Several hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Then what the country would reasonably admit the members of this House are not willing to accept, and a proposition that the people of the country would readily subscribe to, the members of this House are not willing to agree to. The Government and their supporters, who feel that their strength is gradually ebbing away, are trying to bolster up their position by artificial means, and by sacrificing the rights and liberties of the people. They distrust the people, and are afraid to submit their claims to them without obtaining some artificial

strength. The First Minister has not been able to attend during the sitting, to give us the benefit of his knowledge and vast experience with respect to the different clauses of the Bill. The same remark applies to the Minister of Public Works, whose opinions we should like to learn. Even the Minister of Customs has not yet spoken on the Bill.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. You are aware, Sir, that the right hon. the leader of the Government told us yesterday that the emancipation of women and the granting of the franchise to women had been the dream of his life, and he was very anxious that that dream should be realised. Nothing seemed more extraordinary than the almost perfect unanimity with which his followers opposed this view. Every one of them who have spoken on the subject has taken the opposite ground to that taken by their leader. What is the reason they have so departed from their usual mode of procedure? The leader of the Government seems to have set his followers pretty much the example the Yankee officer gave his men. He was posting his men to receive the British, and after he got his men placed on the top of the hill, he said to them: "You will watch the British and keep firing on them until they reach that tree at the foot of the hill, then you can cut and run; and in the meantime, as I am lame, I'll start now, and you will overtake me later." The First Minister appears to have given this advice to some of his followers, and hence the unanimity with which they oppose his views in the matter. Some one has said that the franchise is a gift and not a right. I deny that. I hold it is an inherent right, which we have no power to withhold. Admit the right of unmarried women to exercise the franchise and we cannot help logically going a step further and giving the franchise to every woman, married or single. It has been argued that the right should cease once women get married. Are we going to punish women for getting married? Is it reasonable to suppose that the woman, when single, who has property, should have the right to vote, and that she should be deprived of that right the moment she becomes married. Everywhere we find women filling positions of importance and trust. There is scarcely any occupation in the country with which they have not something to do. It has been found by actual experience that they are, to say the least, just as correct and more neat in their work than men. I have had some experience, in the institution of which I happen to be the head, with female clerks, and we find that they perform their work well and faithfully. I think it is but a couple of months ago that, for the first time in my life, I heard women address a public audience, in the Dominion Methodist Church, in this city. There were three or four ladies who spoke in succession, and I seldom, if ever, heard finer addresses than they gave—more logical in their construction, more conclusive in their argument and more touching in their appeals; and, Sir, this thought came into my mind at that time, and I could not banish it: Not one of these women is permitted to vote. I think that many women in this country are far more capable of exercising the right of the franchise than are a good many men, and if they do not exercise it it is because they are deprived of their liberty.

Mr. FISHER. I wish to say a few words on the subject of adjourning this sitting of the House. I see the hon. Minister of Public Works is looking at his watch. Perhaps he wishes to move an adjournment.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; not at present.

Mr. FISHER. If the hon gentleman wishes to go to breakfast, of course we do not wish to keep him here. But I think it is very desirable that we should adjourn, and then the Minister can go to breakfast. Perhaps the hon. gentleman might also remember that the rest of us would like a little breakfast, too.

Mr. LANDERKIN.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). He might ask us to breakfast.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As the hon. gentlemen opposite seem to want an invitation, I have much pleasure in inviting them all to breakfast, if they will come down now.

Mr. FISHER. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is hardly safe in inviting us all at once. Perhaps he had better go and take some of his friends with him; and if he would say at a quarter past eight o'clock, instead of five minutes to seven, perhaps then the rest of us might accept his invitation to breakfast. However, Mr. Chairman, as there seems to be no disposition on the part of the hon. gentleman to adjourn the debate, I will proceed to give some reasons why I think he should do so, in the public interest. I am sure he cannot pretend that it is in the public interest that the members of this House should be compelled, after sitting here all night, to debate at great length a question of adjournment at seven o'clock in the morning. After devoting ten hours a day for a period of three months, hon. members are called to consider the most important question which has engaged the attention of the House during the present Parliament. The Bill has not been discussed in the country, and it is only after it has been thoroughly discussed in the House that the average elector can come to understand that it is an important measure. No reasons have been given by the Government leader as to any necessity for the measure at this period of the Session. If they have any reason to give I should be glad to hear it.

Mr. HESSON. In reply to the challenge of the hon. gentleman, I would say that it has been stated that hon. gentlemen opposite intend to debate the Bill until next August. The *Globe* has made that statement, and hon. gentlemen opposite must not be surprised if we are willing to allow them to have all the rope they want. When the *Hansard* is published the public will be able to draw their own conclusions as to the honesty and sincerity of hon. gentlemen opposite. I give this as a fair and honest reason why hon. gentlemen on this side of the House should feel it necessary to press this measure, even beyond what might seem fair, but hon. gentlemen opposite have only themselves to thank for it. There is no desire to prevent free discussion, but it must be remembered that hon. gentlemen opposite have already upwards of 200 pages of *Hansard* containing their speeches, and yet we are still debating the question of the woman franchise. There is an evident attempt on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to obstruct Government measures.

Mr. FISHER. I am very grateful to the hon. member for Perth for the reasons he has given. I suppose he speaks as the Ministerial mouthpiece.

Mr. HESSON. I speak for myself.

Mr. FISHER. That was not the point about which I enquired. What I asked was, as to why gentlemen opposite were determined to put this Bill through in this way and at this time. No explanation has been given as to why the Bill should not have been brought down two months ago, and discussed at a time when the House was doing almost nothing. We shall discuss this question just as long as we think it necessary to accomplish our object. It is well known that the work of the House is very much behind, and that the Estimates have been little more than entered upon. No doubt similar hurry will be shown in dealing with the Canadian Pacific Railway; but as hon. members have been disappointed with respect to this Bill, so they will be disappointed when the Canadian Pacific Railway measures comes before the House.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). Any more threats?

Mr. FISHER. I have no desire to threaten. I desire simply to assert our rights to discuss questions the Govern-

ment bring before the House. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think I am extravagant in this matter, but I have been glancing through *Hansard*, and find that in the earlier part of the Session, down to within a couple of weeks ago, a great deal of time was lost by early adjournments, the Government having no business on hand, and therefore I have the right to protest against this indecent hurry and precipitate course taken by the Government at this stage of the Session, on a question of the importance of the one now before us.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I am reminded of a former occasion, on which we sat to as late an hour as this, and a little later. On that occasion we were accused of obstruction, but we were debating a great constitutional question. What are we debating now? We are debating a question upon which the parties on the two sides of the House are divided. It is not a party question, but gentlemen sitting in Opposition have chosen to see in it a question on which they can make political capital, and to make it a party question, a question of obstruction, and nothing else.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Withdraw that expression.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I decline to withdraw it. I am strictly within parliamentary rules.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I rise to a point of order, and I want your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I do not think the hon. member was out of order.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The question now before the House is in no respect a party question. The limitation which is proposed to be made by the amendment of my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Townshend) is simply the point as to whether, in the franchise for the Province of Quebec, women should be allowed to vote or not; and upon that point there are different opinions on both sides of the House; the two parties are divided; and yet hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House have chosen, on this particular question, to obstruct the proceedings of the House. We know the object they have in view, that is, to prevent the passage of any Franchise Bill whatever, delaying and obstructing the proceedings of Parliament; not on a legitimate and proper question, not on a legitimate issue, but they see fit to occupy the whole night and the whole day in this obstructive course, with no other view than to delay the proceedings of this House, to delay the passage of the Franchise Bill, and to keep us here in session until the 1st of July, or later, carrying out their expressed determination to obstruct effectually, if possible, the passage of the Franchise Bill. If they wish to continue the debate by bringing up their relays of refreshed sleepers, we will meet them. If they think to defeat this Bill by having recourse to this kind of tactics, they will find themselves very much mistaken.

Motion, Mr. Holton, that the Chairman do now leave the Chair, negatived; yeas 14, nays 29.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I beg to move that the committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again. A motion that you leave the Chair has just been voted down at fifteen minutes after eight o'clock in the morning. Members attending to their duties have been here all night, forced by a majority of members in this House, acting in a most tyrannical manner. Gentlemen speak about the country taking notice of it; and do they think the Opposition have anything to dread from the country taking notice of it? They want the country to notice it; they are determined the country shall notice it, and sit in judgment upon it. Hon. gentlemen opposite need not lay the flattering unction to their souls that we dread anything in that line. The Ministerial majority are determined to tyrannise over the small minority in this House. We are answerable to the people of the country, to our constituents, for the way we have acted in relation to this measure. The motion that is before the Chair now may be accepted by both sides, because it proposes that the committee rise and report progress; and at three o'clock in the afternoon the House will again go into committee. Is it too much to ask that, from eight o'clock until three, we should have a recess?

[At this point the DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair, which was taken by Mr. TASSÉ.]

Mr. MILLS. I rise to a question of order. I think, under our new rules, it is competent for the Speaker of the House to call some person to the Chair in the absence of the Deputy Speaker, but it is not competent for the Chairman or Deputy Speaker to call another member to the Chair, when he, the Deputy Speaker, is in the House.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). The new rule only applies to the Chair and not to the Chairman of Committee. I ask the ruling of the Chair upon this point.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TASSÉ). I rule that the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. DAVIES. Hon. gentlemen opposite appear to accept the situation. I desire to ask them whether these proceedings are dignified.

Mr. BOWELL. No; they are disgraceful.

Mr. DAVIES. Have the demands for adjournment been fair demands?

Several hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. DAVIES. I submit they have been, and that hon. gentlemen opposite were well aware that at least three hon. members had prepared speeches on this important question, and they were physically unable to proceed. Accordingly, an adjournment was asked. Had an adjournment been granted the business of the House would be further advanced than it is now.

Mr. RYKERT. I have a suggestion which I think will solve the difficulty presented by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). I know he is tired out. I, myself, am tired, but I could go on for the full forty-eight hours, if necessary, although I have not been out of my seat for the last thirteen hours, over ten minutes. My hon. friend seems anxious that the hon. members for Brant (Mr. Paterson), Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), and North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), should speak upon this question. Now, the hon. gentleman knows, if this motion be carried in the committee, and the question is disposed of here, either to wipe out female franchise or allow it to stand in the Bill, that does not stop discussion of the matter hereafter. When the Speaker takes the Chair again a motion may be made to restore that clause, or strike it out, and then all these hon. gentlemen can speak on the question at any length. Why do they wish to obstruct this committee and detain us for forty-eight hours longer, when we can solve the difficulty so easily?

Mr. DAVIES. I think there is an insuperable difficulty. We have been debating for a long time, without approaching a decision, and how can we expect to decide it now, in a House composed of not more than one-third of the members? Does he suppose that either one side or the other, in a full House, would consent to be bound by such an arrangement. The hon. gentleman knows that the leader of the Opposition, when here, has a certain amount of responsibility, and he is not going to commit himself to a policy of talking against time or reopening the discussion of the question which has been once settled.

Mr. BOWELL. I observe that the hon. member for North Norfolk and the hon. member for Charlotte have just come

in, looking very much refreshed, and as if they were quite prepared to give us long orations, and we are quite prepared to hear them. If it be necessary that these two gentlemen should speak, and that the discussion should go on, then let us settle the question now, as to whether the motion made by the hon. member for Cumberland shall be accepted or rejected. Then he says it is unfair that such an arrangement, as proposed by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), should be accepted by the leader of the Government or by the Opposition. Has he forgotten that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), in the debate yesterday afternoon, said positively that this would not be the end of the discussion, that they were determined to have on record the names of those who are in favor and those who are opposed to female franchise? For my part, I say frankly that I am anxious to record my vote in favor of the proposition to grant the suffrage to women. But we shall have ample opportunity for that. I have good reason to know, and I have been told—perhaps it is unparliamentary to say what one has been told in reference to this matter—but I know it is the general rumor around the corridors and the hotels that the Opposition have declared they will prevent the passage of this Bill, if it takes them until August. If this be the policy of the Opposition, we should know it.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. TASSÉ), in support of his ruling with respect to his position in the Chair, quoted from May, page 429, and from Bourinot, page 417.

Mr. CHARLTON. We have been engaged for a number of hours in a work that is fruitless and hardly becoming sane and intelligent men. We met yesterday afternoon at three o'clock, and began the discussion of this Bill, which we continued until two o'clock this morning. It was perfectly evident that the discussion of that clause could not be closed at a seasonable hour, and that the motion to rise and report progress was a reasonable motion. Had the gentleman who leads the Government, and his colleagues, acceded to that motion, the consideration of this Bill would have been promoted and the temper of this House would have been much better. I saw, on coming in this morning, evidences that a very unparliamentary state of things existed. I saw one hon. gentleman in a most undignified position, in a position that made him appear ridiculous to his fellow members, and apparantly in a condition which made him insensible to the reproof of the Chair.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I rise to a question of order. The hon. member for North Norfolk has charged a member of this House with being in a condition that he was insensible to the humiliating position he was in. That is incorrect. I know to whom he refers, and that member, if the hon. gentleman's reference means that he had been taking intoxicating drinks, has not touched them in any shape whatever. It is well known that he does not drink, and the hon. gentleman has made a mean, cowardly, contemptible——

Mr. DAVIES. I call upon the hon. gentleman to retract that language. I ask you ruling, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is not in order in qualifying the statement of an hon. gentleman as mean and cowardly. I think the observations of the hon. member for North Norfolk require explanation. If he means what he is understood by the member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Woodworth) as meaning, then he is out of order.

Mr. DAVIES. I ask if that language is to be withdrawn or allowed. I ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman, on it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will discuss that. You cannot say that a member tells a lie; but you can say that the statement is inaccurate, false and untrue. You cannot say that a member makes a false insinuation, but you can say that an insinuation has been made and that it is false. You can say what you like about language, but you cannot attribute motives or impropriety of conduct to speakers. But with respect to language, you can use just such language as you please.

Mr. DAVIES. I ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman, as to the words "mean, cowardly and contemptible statement."

Mr. WOODWORTH. I said mean, cowardly insinuation.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. member is entitled to make his statement as to what he said, and if the hon. gentleman states, as he has done now, that the language used was "mean, cowardly, contemptible insinuation," I do not think that is unparliamentary.

Mr. CASEY. Did the hon. gentleman say that that statement was made by any member of the House? We want another statement, Mr. Chairman, beyond that of the Premier, who in parliamentary practice is sometimes slightly wide of the mark.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The question of order has been decided.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman who interrupted me in the very pleasant manner in which he did interrupt me was a gentleman noted for amenities of debate, and for his nice choice expressions. So far as my observations went, in regard to the condition of the House, I referred to the conduct of the gentleman who sat in the Chair when you, Mr. Chairman, retired. I referred to the hon. member from Ottawa (Mr. Tassé), who called an hon. member to order, declaring that he was acting in an unparliamentary manner and was sitting in an unparliamentary attitude. I have made no insinuation as to what led to that.

Mr. WOODWORTH. You did.

Mr. CHARLTON. As regards the manner in which the hon. gentleman has addressed me, if it took place out of this House I would say it was coarse and brutal; as it is, I do not criticise it by any language whatever. I rose with no intention to discuss the question in other than in the best possible spirit. We are doing what we shall all regret, and no good will come of it. I remember, when the member for East York was at the head of the Government, and we sitting on that side of the House, on one occasion, attempted very much the same thing as has been attempted to-night. It was a useless and undignified session; it was a session that must have lowered the character of the House in the eyes of everyone who witnessed the proceedings, and the result of that session was the reverse of salutory or good. We are doing the same thing now. The Minister of Customs, a few minutes ago, informed us that he had heard threats here that the Opposition intended to keep Parliament in session till August. I do not know on what authority those boass were made. I know such has not been the determination of the party: that the determination is simply that this question shall be fully discussed.

Mr. RYKERT. The *Globe* says so.

Mr. CHARLTON. It does not matter who says so. That is all we asked, and when we asked for an adjournment at half-past two this morning, it was perfectly in accord with that determination, merely that the question should be fully and freely discussed. I recognise the ability of the Government to pass this Bill. With them rests the responsibility. I believe the Bill is wrong in principle, as well as in detail, and that it cannot be modified so as to prevent a wrong being done. The First Minister promised that this Bill should have full consideration, and yet, on this, the first day in committee, he applies the gag, and attempts to stifle discussion. I hold that the Opposition occupy a reasonable and impregnable position, and I think it would be magnanimous on the part of the majority to give way and allow the

House to adjourn, and on its meeting again the matter in hand would be speedily disposed of.

Mr. SPROULE. The motion for adjournment can only be asked for on reasonable grounds. Up to the present, 240 pages of *Hansard* have been filled very largely with speeches made by hon. members in opposition to this Bill, yet we have not got so far as the second clause. No less than thirty-one members of the Opposition have spoken on the Bill. All of them spoke on it once, several of them twice, many three times, and some even four times; there is scarcely a member of the Opposition, who is in the habit of speaking in this House, who has not made a long speech on this question. I find that no less than forty four speeches have been delivered by the Opposition on this question, up to the present; and if we may judge of the future by what we have had in the past, we may expect as many more before the Bill has gone through all its stages. Has the course of the Opposition been marked by a desire to advance the measure, or has it not been pure, unadulterated obstruction, of the very plainest character. No one can doubt that the latter is the case. Their course has been marked by speeches which have had no relevancy whatever to the question under discussion, and page after page of books has been read to this House which did not touch the question at all, and were plainly read for the purpose of gaining time. If there ever was a question before this House which has had ample time for consideration, it is this one. Any further discussion which hon. gentlemen opposite would have, could only result in a repetition of their argument. The hon. member for Queen's said he had not spoken twice on this subject.

Mr. DAVIES. I said I had no opportunity of speaking on the second reading of the Bill, and that I had prepared a speech on the most important principle of the Bill, at its second reading; but when that came off, it was five o'clock in the morning, and I did not care to inflict a speech on the House then.

Mr. SPROULE. I have here the hon. gentleman's speech in *Hansard* on the second reading of the Bill, and it covers five pages.

Mr. DAVIES. That was on the first amendment, and not on the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. The second reading was on the 16th April and that speech was made on that date. Again, the hon. gentleman treated us to a very long and exhaustive speech last night, and since then he has spoken two or three times on motions. From a reasonable calculation, I find that the delay given to this Bill by members of the Opposition has cost the country no less than $15,000 to $20,000. There have been no less than 240 pages of *Hansard* filled with speeches on this question, and yet hon. gentlemen say they have not had a fair opportunity for discussion; no less than thirty-one members of the Opposition have spoken on it, and yet hon. gentlemen say they have not had time to discuss it. They say: We appeal to the country against the tyrannical majority that are endeavoring to put us down. Where is the tyranny? Is it on the part of members of this side who sit quietly, and have allowed hon. gentlemen opposite to go on with the debates for hours on one clause. Is that an evidence of tyranny on the part of this House, or is it not rather evidence of obstruction on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite? It is quite evident that there is an understanding between them that the work of the Session must not go on. It is rumoured that the Session is to be kept up until July or August; their organ has declared that intention, and yet we are told by those hon. gentlemen to-night, that they have no desire to retard the work. The country is aware that they are responsible for keeping back the legitimate work of the Session, only two clauses of this Bill having been touched, although forty-five hours have been expended in the discussion.

Mr. RYKERT. When I addressed the House I stated that every hon. gentleman who had spoken on the second reading of the Bill, either in favor or against female suffrage, had spoken again to-night, except the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies). I have refreshed my memory on that point, and if the hon. gentleman will turn to page 1206, in the *Hansard*, he will find that in speaking of female suffrage he said:

"But the friend of the ladies himself, who introduced the clause into the Bill, who got all his friends throughout the country to give him all the credit that was due to the introduction of such a clause, is now to throw them over—yes, throw them over, and not in a very gallant way either. It puts me in mind of an old English couplet:

"'He kicked them down stairs with such a sweet grace.
They thought he was leading them up.'

"The hon. gentleman now is going to kick them out of the Bill altogether. And he is doing it in such a mild way. He is not going to do it himself, but he is going to get the House to do it He is to get the credit of putting it in the Bill, and the House is to take the odium of kicking the ladies out."

I stated also that hon. gentlemen opposite were organising for the purpose of fighting this Bill out to the 1st day of August. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) threatened to fight the matter out, if it took him all summer, but the whole secret lies in the fact that these hon. gentlemen got other orders from the *Globe*:

"They must only be men and set their faces like a flint against all such proceedings, and must see to it that, come what may, thought the Session should last till August or December."

These hon. gentlemen have brought their policy of obstruction to its culminating point by their course during this sitting. They say that they cannot allow this clause to go through the committee, because the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Laurier) has certain amendments to offer to other clauses, but they could do this as those clauses came up.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman knows very well the reason we did not desire a vote to be taken was that, up to a few minutes ago, there was hardly anybody in the House. Not one-fourth of the House was present, and we did not wish to obtain a snatch verdict. I suggested to the hon. Minister of Public Works that we should adjourn and let the vote take place to-night, but he refused. There is a very strong disposition on the part of the member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) to make it appear that I had spoken on the second reading of the Bill, but I did nothing of the kind. I spoke on the amendment to the second reading, to postpone the discussion of the Bill, and the hon. gentleman knows that in speeches on amendments we are not allowed to introduce foreign matter.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). We are here as independent members of Parliament, and we are here to take our own course in the discussion of public matters. Hon. gentlemen opposite charge us with obstruction. They have no grounds for making that charge. During the past week we have been sitting until three, four and five o'clock every morning, and I ask you, Sir, is it fair that this Government, with its majority of seventy-five to eighty, should attempt, by means of that majority, to force a measure of this kind through the House, without giving an opportunity to hon. gentlemen on this side to express their views on it. If there is any obstruction, it is on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. The business of the Session only began about three weeks ago, although we have been here now three months, and the Bill now under discussion has only been before the House for five days; and surely a measure of this importance demands a longer time than that for discussion.

Mr. GILLMOR. It is very evident that the Government and their supporters are determined by brute force to rush this legislation through the House, and other legislation which is yet to follow. I have no idea of getting home for

a month or six weeks yet, and the Opposition cannot do justice to their convictions, of duty to their constituents, to the taxpayers of this country, if they allow this kind of legislation to go through without very full discussion. I think this Franchise Bill has been brought down for the purpose of giving the Government an unfair advantage at the polls.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. the First Minister having left this an open question, his supporters seem to take that as a reason for not expressing any opinion on the measure, with the exception of some of his supporters from the Province of Quebec, who, I am glad to see, were not afraid to express their opinion boldly as to the inadvisibility of this Bill. Hon. gentlemen opposite are certainly not treating this side of the House with the courtesy with which they were treated by the Mackenzie Administration in 1874. The Government then carefully considered all suggestions of those hon. gentlemen, especially of the right hon. the First Minister, who was then leader of the Opposition, and embodied several of their amendments in the Franchise Bill under which we are now elected. We, however, are not treated with courtesy of even the slightest consideration, but on the contrary are charged with obstruction, simply because we insist on an opportunity being given us to place our views on record. I believe, however, that the people will become thoroughly aroused to the flagrantly and unjust conduct of the Government on this question, and will not tamely submit to the indignity offered to their representatives in this House, and to the base attempt made by the Government to secure control of the electors.

Motion (Mr. Paterson, Brant), that the committee rise and report progress, negatived on a division.

Mr. COCKBURN. I do not think that the country or society are prepared for such a sweeping measure as is proposed by this clause of the Bill, in reference to woman suffrage. This is a measure fraught with the very gravest consequences, and requires and ought to receive the fullest consideration on the part of this House, and of the people of the country. I am pleased to find that with the advance of civilisation the gentler sex are receiving a much greater recognition for their noble qualities than they have in the past. I do not see that it is possible properly to discuss this measure at so late a period of the Session. I cannot understand the reason of the Government for introducing this measure at the present time, because we have two more Sessions before the next general election.

Mr. MITCHELL. We cannot always tell about that.

Mr. COCKBURN. In all human probability we will not have another election until 1887. I do not think that it would suit hon. gentlemen opposite. When we come to consider the effect of the proposed measure, it is almost appalling, and the greatest responsibility will rest upon this House in the decision we make regarding it. Now, I observe a great inconsistency in this Bill. It is proposed to confer the franchise on the unmarried portion of the female community only. I think that is entirely wrong. If we confer the franchise upon the unmarried portion of the sex, and ignore the married portion, it would be setting the unmarried ladies over the married ones. Now, what class of society is there which deserve a higher respect than the matrons, who from experience in managing the household, etc., are well qualified to vote? The whole community are indebted to the ladies for their elevating and refining influence. Without the ladies I do not know what would become of the gentlemen. Darwin has written largely on the science of the evolution of the human species, but without the refining influence of the ladies on society, I do not know where the men would drift to. They would become monsters, worse than gorillas, I am afraid, many of them. (The hon. gentleman here read several pages from an essay of Lord Jeffry, on the writings of Mrs. Hemans, and followed with other prose and poetic quotations.) There is no haste why this question should be considered. It will be time enough next Parliament to consider it. It is one of the largest questions we have ever been called upon to decide, one which affects all our domestic relations—a complete revolution. Not that I underrate the ability and the qualifications of the ladies, but there are so many things to be considered that the question should be held over until public opinion has had time to form itself upon it.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). We are now discussing the principle of the Bill. We are now dealing with the merits of the proposition contained in the Bill itself, and with the proposition of the hon. member for Cumberland, to strike out that portion which enfranchises the women of the country. I am not going to make any apology, even at this late hour, for making the observations I propose to submit to the House. The provision we are now discussing is an extraordinary one, one that opens a vast field for enquiry and investigation. One of the peculiarities of this Bill is that the more you investigate it the more extraordinary discoveries you make. No man will read this Bill with any degree of accuracy and study without arising from its perusal profoundly impressed with the extraordinary ingenuity of those who framed it. The clause we are discussing is that relating to female franchise; and, as regards that, we have the unique spectacle of the First Minister declaring himself an ardent supporter of it, and then expressing his readiness to yield, should the motion of the hon. member for Cumberland to strike out that clause be carried. I am confident the First Minister did not prepare this Bill, for any statesman preparing it would at once have foreseen the results which it would bring about in our legislation. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) pointed out the consequences that would result from the introduction of this principle into our legislation. The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault), also a supporter of the Government, expressed opinions not in harmony with those of the leader of the Government. He declared he opposed this Bill *in toto*, on the ground that some of the principles contained in it would, when carried out to their legitimate conclusion, lead to a radical revolution in the whole system of the franchise. The consequences of this clause appear to me to be inevitable. One of those consequences was referred to by one hon. member who spoke, namely, that the passage of this clause would lead inevitably to manhood suffrage. Now, I do not say that I am opposed to that; a great deal can be said in favor of manhood suffrage. It is the simplest system of suffrage that can be adopted; it causes the least possible difficulty in the registration of voters, and under it the least possible corruption is likely to occur. But this Government and this Parliament are not prepared to carry the principle so far as that; and we have a suffrage presented to us which is based on a property qualification of some kind.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that we are now discussing the second clause of the Bill, to which an amendment has been moved, and I would ask him to confine his remarks to that, and not to discuss the general principles of the Bill.

Mr. CAMERON. That is just what I am doing; I am showing that the adoption of female suffrage would inevitably lead to something else, and that is a reason why it should not be part of the law. This question of female suffrage has been discussed in the Imperial Parliament, and I may refer to the opinions expressed there by eminent men. A Bill was introduced there in 1876 by Mr. Forsyth, an eminent lawyer, to remove the disabilities under which women labored, by extending to them the franchise. One of those who spoke on that question and whose opinion ought to have the greatest possible weight in this Parliament, was Mr. John Bright. (The hon. gentleman here read, from the English *Hansard* of

1876, extracts from a debate in the English House of Commons on this subject.) Under this Bill every person, with very few exceptions, who has a right to vote has a right to be elected, and if a lady was to be elected to this Parliament, neither the Sergeant-at-Arms nor the Speaker would have the power to exclude her from her seat. That is one of the consequences of this measure, which should receive careful consideration. We have legislated too hastily in the past, and this Session it is proposed to amend two Acts which were passed without due consideration. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal), who discussed this question in unexceptionable language, referred to the fact that giving ladies the right to vote would bring them in contact with an undesirable element. In that he agreed with Mr. John Bright, and I will quote the remarks of that gentleman on this question. (See *Hansard's* "Parliamentary Debates," of the English House of Commons, 1876, page 1738.) You who have undergone the labors, the hardships, the trials and temptations of a political contest, have an idea of the element it is necessary to come in contact with in order to succeed in such a contest. How would hon. gentlemen like to have the members of their families introduced into contact with that objectionable element. I do not mean to say that that objectionable element is of the voting class, because, wherever there is a political gathering, there are elements collected together which are not desirable and which are not entitled to the franchise. After a further quotation from Mr. Bright's speech, he said: If you once concede the principle of this Bill, you must carry it out to its logical conclusion. If ladies are entitled to vote, they are entitled to sit in Parliament, and ladies have sat in Parliament before now. Abesses sat and deliberated in the councils of the Saxon kings, and in the reign of Edward III six English countesses were summond to Parliament. The hon. gentleman has told us that he makes this an open question. He knows perfectly well that the chances are ten thousand to one that his propsition, to which he is so wedded, will be voted down. But, while he deprives the white ladies of this Dominion of the right to vote, deprives the married ladies by his Bill, and allows the proposition to enfranchise the single ladies and the widows to be voted down, he is by this measure allowing the Indians, the squaws to vote. It is true that, in the interpretation clause of this Bill, the word "person" is said to mean a male person, married or unmarried, including an Indian. That might be said to include only male Indians, but, by the Indian Act, it will be seen that it includes squaws, for the interpretation clause of that Act says:

"The term 'Indian' means—firstly, any male person of Indian blood reputed to belong to a particular band; secondly, any child of such person; thirdly, any person who is or was lawfully married to such person."

So that any woman married to an Indian is entitled to a vote. The hon. gentleman proposes to enfranchise the Indians and squaws of the country, a proposition which appears to me to be an outrage—that the wards of the country, living on the money of this Government, the infants of the Dominion, should receive the franchise. We know that, whatever Government is in power, they will exercise a strong influence over the Indians of this country, through the agents who are scattered over the Dominion, and who dole out the bounty of the Government to these Indians.

Mr. RYKERT. Are we discussing the question of female suffrage or of Indian suffrage?

Mr. CHARLTON. Female Indian suffrage.

Mr. CAMERON. Nobody is more out of order than the hon. member for Lincoln is. I am discussing the question of female suffrage.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The hon. gentleman went on to speak of the influence this Government had over the Indians. Was that discussing female suffrage?

Mr. CAMERON. I say so still. I say the influence of Governments is very powerful over Indians, males as well as females. For the reasons I have stated, I am opposed to the Bill and to this particular clause of the Bill.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is with some regret that I rise to address the House at this time to engage in discussing the principle of a Bill which is forced upon us by the action of the Government side of the House. The hon. member for North Victoria stated that I charged the leader of the Government with a lack of sincerity in this matter, but he is mistaken on that point. I did not charge him with a lack of sincerity, but with a want of courage, of determination, in not exerting his power to secure from the House a favorable verdict upon the matter which he says he regards as one of great importance. We are informed that one reason for objecting to woman suffrage is, that that principle is unpopular in the Province of Quebec; but on exactly the same ground the leading principle of the Bill, that of an uniform franchise, should also be withdrawn, as it would, I believe, be rejected by every Province of the Dominion, had they the opportunity of expressing their wishes upon it, and for that reason the Provinces should be left to regulate their own franchises.

Mr. RYKERT. I call attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman is not speaking to the question of female franchise which is now before the Committee.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am speaking of the principle adopted by the Government of endeavoring to enforce a uniform franchise all over the Dominion.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I did not catch the hon. gentleman's remarks, but he knows the rule, and I hope he will not transgress it.

Mr. CHARLTON. I have not the remotest desire to transgress the rules of the House. I was pointing out that the feeling of the Province of Quebec on the question of female suffrage illustrates the fact that it is impossible for the Federal Government to lay down a franchise which shall be satisfactory to all the Provinces.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The hon. gentleman is again out of order in discussing the whole question of the franchise as has already been done on the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think the hon. gentleman was out of order.

Mr. RYKERT. Hear, hear. Always wrong.

Mr. CHARLTON. No doubt if I was possessed of the illimitable knowledge of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) I would never be wrong, but the hon. gentleman at present is offensive, as he almost always is. I say that married women to-day occupy a position in society decidedly different from what they did fifty or one hundred years ago. (The hon. gentleman read here extracts from the Debates of the English House of Commons on the question.) The experiment of enfranchising women has already been tried. It has been relegated from the domain of theory to that of fact. (The hon. gentleman proceeded to quote at great length from Mrs. Hugo Reid's work on the Enfranchisement of Women.) I shall not detain the House any longer. I believe that the principles of justice require that we should not make the distinction we have hitherto made between the sexes, but that if we extended the rights to women with reference to the franchise that are possessed by men, it would be better for the country and better for ourselves.

Mr. PLATT. I have a few remarks to make upon the important question now under consideration, and I wish to

avail myself of the opportunity of speaking for once very early in the debate. You must, Sir, appreciate the difficulty of the task imposed upon us, of discussing this question to its full extent without any adjournment of the House; but it seems to be forced upon us by the course of those who do not perceive its importance sufficiently, to rise to their feet in its defence. We should, perhaps, willingly yield to the evident desire of hon. gentlemen opposite to proceed to the discussion of other clauses of the Bill, if we did not consider, in common with the leader of the Government, that the clause now under discussion was a very important one. The amendment before us, as I understand it, is to exempt a certain Province of this Dominion from the operation of certain clauses of the Bill. It strikes a blow at the proposition of the right hon. leader of the Government to enfranchise women, and also at the argument of almost every hon. member who has supported this Bill in favor of a uniform franchise. It is therefore a direct blow at the foundation of the Bill itself; and that amendment, the very first one moved, comes from one of the right hon. gentleman's supporters. As it is a direct blow at the most vital part of the Bill, I think it is the duty of those who favor the Bill as a whole, as well as of those who do not, to vote it down. If we are to have a uniform franchise, we should have it in its entirety without any exceptions. If the right hon. leader of the Government would withdraw the Bill altogether, that would effect the purpose of the amendment better than could be done in any other way. It must be noticed by hon. gentlemen opposite that we on this side of the House are the only defenders of the great chieftain of the Conservative party on this occasion, and, therefore, they ought to feel obliged to us. Scarcely any of his own supporters have found any argument in support of this particular feature of his measure. The leader of the Government must see that he made a mistake in leaving this part of the Bill an open question, because the mutiny in his ranks has become general. Hon. gentlemen, feeling that it is the first time for many years that they have enjoyed liberty of conscience, desire to take advantage of it, and to see how they would feel as free men who had the privilege of opening their mouths occasionally. Some hon. members have at first spoken in favor of granting the franchise to women, but, after getting their cue from those members of the Government who are opposed to the proposition—perhaps the Secretary of State or the Minister of Public Works—they have at the end fallen into line, and the general disposition on that side seems to be to vote down what their honored leader considered the principal feature of his Bill. The member for King's (Mr. Woodworth) sought to show that the position taken by the leader of the Government was similar to that taken by Mr. Gladstone, and in support of that he quoted an extract that had been read by the member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), which, I think, was intended to show, and does show the difference between the position taken by Mr. Gladstone and that taken by the First Minister. This proposal to give the franchise to women may be considered a social innovation, but a few years ago it was found degrading to women to go behind the counter to assist in selling goods, to take charge of a set of books, or to be operators in a telegraph office. No harm has, however, resulted from women taking these positions. In that way they have had some means of obtaining a livelihood, they are not wholly dependent on the sterner sex, and it is no longer their entire business in life to obtain a husband. I believe that no danger will arise from the extension of the liberties of women. Contention and almost riot arose when it was proposed to introduce ladies into our medical schools, and on the other side of the line to admit them to the legal profession, but step by step these advances are being made. Women are now doctors and lawyers, they are better for it, and humanity is better for it, and none of the dire results predicted have arrived; in the same way the evils predicted by hon. gentlemen opposite as the result of the extension of the franchise to women would disappear if the franchise were extended to them. Women can vote without engaging in any of those matters which, it is objected, are foreign to the genius of their sex, and which might degrade them in the eyes of their sisters. We do not propose to compel women to vote. It has been said that they have not asked for the franchise. It does not belong to women to ask; they generally expect the men to pop the question. They know that we are guarding their interests, and they will approach this House with greater force when they possess the influence of voters. Let us either leave the various Provinces to decide when women shall vote, or let us make the Bill uniform and give female suffrage in every Province.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). It has been urged that women should be kept out of politics; that is, admitting that the political arena is lower than her place. Is it not possible that politics could be elevated by the active influence of woman? If so, much of the complaining about the tendencies of our political differences to lower the moral tone of society would be without force. Our experience is that woman elevates every subject in which she engages. It has been argued that women should not receive the franchise because they have not a special political education in public affairs, but so able a writer as George Cornwall Lewis has contended that the absence of such a qualification is by no means undesirable on the ground that the grand inquest of the nation is expected to deal with all matters affecting the public weal, and that consequently as every member of the community has some education on some one particular point there is no necessity for a special education in politics, because matters affecting every interest must at one time or other be considered. The present condition of woman has been the result of her gradual development from the slavish relations she occupied in ancient times, but she has not yet in any country reached the full measure of that development. (The hon. gentleman quoted from John Stuart Mill on the question.) It has been said that if women did possess the franchise they would not exercise it, but a very strong proof that such would not be the case is furnished by the experience in municipal elections under the law recently passed by the Legislature of Ontario, by which certain classes of women are admitted to the franchise. It is a fact that in municipalities in the west, including that in which I live and others adjacent to it, while the ratio of male voters who voted in proportion to the whole population was 52 per cent., not less than 47 per cent. of the females who were entitled to vote recorded their votes. This feature of the Bill has not been discussed before the country to anything like the extent that a question of its sweeping character should be discussed. I hold that the Government are dealing unjustly by their supporters in the country if they abandon a proposition on the strength of which they have attempted to secure votes. It is not fair to those who have claimed public support on the ground that the Government had introduced a measure for the enfranchisement of women, that they should abandon in this summary way the child on which their friends in the country had set so much store. The Bill as a whole was open to the objection that the necessity for it did not exist, and that neither at the last general election nor at any elections since had it been made a question at the polls. But if this statement should be qualified at all, it was in reference to the female franchise. In elections in which he (Mr. Cameron) had taken a part since the general elections of 1882, the intention of the right hon. the head of the Government to introduce females to the franchise was used as a means of securing support to the Tory candidates. Within recent years the

inclination of ladies to attend political gatherings, in Ontario at least, has developed to a marked degree, and this fact prompted the bid that was made at all these political gatherings to secure support to the Tory side. The ladies present were in all cases asked to support the Tory candidate from the fact that the First Minister's intention was to give them the franchise. Now this was the only circumstance under which this measure had been referred to in the west, and the one feature of the Bill on which a public verdict had been sought, on which public support had been obtained, the Government now proposed to abandon. The Government by their action stood convicted of a fraud on the country in their action and justified more than ever the conviction that this was a franchise of fraud. It does not follow that women, if they had the franchise, would aspire to those public offices and positions which are open to males. Many males are now possessed of the right to vote who are debarred by law from occupying any legislative position. Nor should their lack of a political education be regarded as a reason for depriving them of the franchise, else, on the same ground, many males who now enjoy the franchise might be deprived of it for the same reason. One great objection to the Bill is that it considerately restricts the franchise which is now in force in many of the Provinces; this is particularly the case with regard to the Provinces of Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, as well as the Province of Ontario. To compensate for this restriction we were promised the enfranchisement of women, that it is now proposed to abandon, while the restrictive features of the Bill as applied to men were to be retained.

Committee rose, and it being six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. CATUDAL. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, not withstanding the advanced stage of the debate, I believe it is my duty to say a few words on the important measure which is now before us. That measure is so radical, that none of the enlightened countries in Europe have consented to put it in their Statute Books. Still, the Conservative party, and the Conservative press of the country, who are every day trying to show that we are in sympathy with the radicals of Europe, are those who wish to adopt a law which has been rejected by all these countries, for it is well known that all these countries have refused to grant the right of suffrage to women. There is hardly more than one opinion in the Province of Quebec to condemn this Bill; and I believe that, if the First Minister had consulted the electorate of the Province of Quebec, he would never have dared to introduce a measure which is so contrary to the views of the people; but, if the hon. First Minister wishes to establish woman suffrage, I do not see why he does not carry out this principle to the end, nor why he does not give to married women the right which he desires to grant to widows and spinsters. We know, that in the Province of Quebec, a woman having a separate maintenance from her husband, pays taxes on her property to provide for the administration of public affairs. The same may be said of the woman living in community of goods with her husband, and who is supposed to own half of the property. Once again, why not grant to these women the same right which is sought to be granted to widows and spinsters. (Here, the hon. member reads extracts from Conservative papers of the Province of Quebec, to show that public sentiment is adverse to that measure. He also quoted several authors, to show that the measure introduced by the hon. First Minister is not in harmony with the writings of the greatest writers of the whole world). A measure of this kind has never been adopted in any country, except in the Western Territories, such as Dakota, Wyoming and Washington, and in the territories where the State Government has a right of veto on the Bill, which has been accepted by the legislature. In England, when Stewart Mill proposed woman suffrage, he, at the same time, presented a petition signed by 12,247 men and women, asking that this privilege be granted to women. Here, it is not the same thing; no petition has been sent to this House, neither by men or women, in favor of this right of suffrage; and the hon. First Minister wishes to impose this measure against the will of the people of this country, and especially of the Province of Quebec. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I shall vote in favor of the amendment of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend).

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). Before this question is disposed of I wish to make a few remarks upon it. When the hon. First Minister was in New York some time ago, he was met by a deputation of leading ladies on the subject of woman suffrage. It will be remembered that he delivered an address to them, in which he set himself forward as the champion of their rights and privileges, and that he received their warm thanks for the efforts he had taken in promoting their interests. This fact shows that he is desirous at all events of obtaining popularity amongst the ladies on the ground of promoting their enfranchisement, though I cannot say that I have been able to discover yet that he is thoroughly sincere in his desire in this regard. If he were sincerely desirous that the women of this country should be enfranchised, I do not think there could be any difficulty in bringing that about. I do not think any man will dispute that he is supreme in this Parliament, and that whatever he directs to be done must be done by those who sit behind him. He had but to give forth the fiat, and the men who sit behind him would at once have rushed to his assistance. But we find that while he is desirous of securing public applause and public favor by pretending that he is in favor of enfranchising women, and by bringing in a Bill for that purpose, it is well understood in this House that he has given the wink to his followers that he does not want this clause in the Bill carried. If I was in need of any further proof of this I would refer to the remarks made by the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Pruyn) last night or early this morning, when he made his maiden speech in this House, and when he said that the question was all settled, and that the members who supported the right hon. leader of the House had made up their minds that they were going to vote against the clause for the enfranchisement of women—that it was understood by those who supported the Government that they were to vote it down.

Mr. SPROULE. He did not say that at all.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What did he say? I heard the hon. member for Lennox, and my understanding of the statement was that it was well understood by the supporters of the Government that they were to vote this clause of the Bill down.

Mr. BOWELL. Nothing of the kind.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I suppose he said it in his innocence. If he had been as long in the service and as well posted as my hon. friend the Minister of Customs he would have known when to keep his mouth shut. Now, this question is a burning question at present, not only in Canada but in all civilised countries of the world. In England the question has been discussed at great length in the House of Commons, and to a certain extent the women of England at present enjoy the franchise, and are entitled to be elected to important positions of public trust; and I

am glad to say that the women of England who have been elected to such positions have discharged their duties in a way to do credit to their sex. In the Province of Ontario, too, for some time past, the women have enjoyed the privilege of exercising the franchise. Those who own property have for many years past possessed the right to vote on municipal by-laws for the expenditure of public money, and recently the Local Legislature extended the privilege further. I live in the vicinity of a town where the women exercised the franchise at the last municipal election, and I am happy to say that nearly all the women whose names were on the voters' list availed themselves of the privilege, and voted for the candidates of their choice. There is one question upon which, of all others, I should like the women of this country to have an opportunity of voting, and with regard to which, if they had, there would be a revolution; I refer to the license question. If women were enfranchised to-morrow they would sweep the curse of drink from the land, and would otherwise elevate the moral tone of the country. If we ever reach that stage of enlightenment when we shall entrust the franchise to women, I am satisfied that we shall never have reason to regret it. There are as many intelligent and reading women in this country as there are men. I am satisfied there are as many good active politicians among the women as there are among the men, and any one who has ever attended a political meeting at which ladies have had the privilege of being present, will concede the fact that their presence has had the effect of softening the asperities which often mark the conduct and speeches of politicians at such meetings. Their presence has an elevating tendency at all such gatherings, and I am sure that, did the women possess the franchise, we would not witness the scene now before our eyes of hon. gentlemen opposite trying the force of logic and argument by the brute strength of a powerful majority. As this question of woman suffrage has been thoroughly discussed in England, I will read, for the information of hon. gentlemen opposite, extracts from some able writers, and also from speeches of leading members of the British House of Commons on this important question. (The hon. gentleman then proceeded to quote lengthy extracts.) I am very sorry that I cannot go further into the reading of the opinions of these eminent gentlemen, as I understand that it is not necessary for me to further discuss this question at the present time. I think, however, that, in all fairness to the women who have had their names brought forward in this Bill, we should give their claims to be enfranchised all possible consideration, and I am satisfied that the vote which will shortly be taken in the House on this question will show that there are a number of gentlemen in this House who are in favor of encouraging the women to aspire to higher positions in the management of the affairs of the country, and to discharge duties which in many cases are not very creditably discharged by the men who are sitting here.

Amendment of Mr. Townshend agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to; and the committee rose and reported progress.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. MITCHELL. I desire to ask the right hon. the Premier whether any information has been received from the disturbed district in the North-West?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, there is no information other than what is gathered from the newspapers.

Mr. MITCHELL. I put that question as the next leader of the Opposition, in the absence of the principal leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant).

RETURNS ORDERED.

The following Returns were ordered during the early part of the Session, commencing 27th April and continuing:

Return of all the hardware and railway supplies purchased in Halifax by the Department of Railways and Canals, for the Intercolonial or any other Government works, in each year, from July 1st, 1878, to December 31st, 1884; the names of the different firms, and the amount paid to each firm in each year; amount of goods purchased without tender in each year, and the names of the firms supplying said goods; names of firms in Halifax from whom tenders were asked, and whose tenders were accepted; items of goods purchased in 1884, by tender, and without tender; also, the names of firms from whom these purchases were made. —(Mr. Forbes.)

Return showing the postal revenue at Victoria, B.C., from all sources, specifying the amount from each source, month by month, for the eight months included in the period, 1st July, 1884, to 28th February, 1885.—(Mr. Baker, Victoria.)

Return of all officers of the Civil Service, from the resident Dominion Government agent down to the messenger, in each and every Department (by Department) in British Columbia, giving full christian and surnames, their ages, present rank, pay, allowances, dates of appointment and promotion, made up to the 31st December, 1884, or nearest possible date.—(Mr. Baker, Victoria.)

Return of the freight earnings of the Intercolonial Railway for the year ending 30th June, 1884, similar to the descriptive statement of the freight earnings of the Prince Edward Island Railway, to be found on page 84 of the report of the Minister of Railways, with the addition of such other articles of freight not contained in said descriptive statement as were carried on the Intercolonial Railway. Also, a comparative statement of the operation of the Intercolonial Railway for the said year, showing: 1. Passenger earnings per mile of road in operation. 2. Freight earnings per mile of road in operation. 3. Gross earnings per mile of road in operation. 4. Net traffic earnings per mile of road in operation. 5. Percentage of expenses to earnings. 6. Passenger earnings per passenger train per mile. 7. Freight earnings per freight train per mile. 8. Earnings per passenger per mile. 9. Earnings per ton per mile. 10. Average distance per passenger. 11. Average distance per ton.—(Mr. Davies.)

Copies of all memorials or correspondence presented to or sent the Government by the mayors or city councils of the cities of St. John and Portland, relating to the interruption of traffic between these cities by the railway crossing on Mill street, and for the erection of a bridge across the said street.—(Mr. Weldon.)

Copies of correspondence between the Indians of the Fort William Reserve, or any one on their behalf and the Indian Department, and between the Indian Department and Indian agent, whether by telegraph or otherwise, on the subject of the action taken under the existing timber licenses.—(Mr. Blake.)

Return of any memorials or correspondence with the Department of Marine and Fisheries in reference to the site of the new lighthouse at Quaco, built in place of the former one destroyed by fire; showing what was the purchase money paid for present site and to whom paid, and showing also who is the present keeper of the light, when appointed and at what salary —(Mr. Weldon.)

Copies of all correspondence, reports, recommendations and representations received at, and sent from the Department of Customs since the year, A.D. 1880, to this day, on the subject of the Richibucto Harbor, the Customs business done thereat, and in any way relating to the Customs service there; including all claims made for extra services by or on behalf of any preventive officer of the Ports of Richibucto and Kingston.—(Mr. Landry, Kent.)

Copies of all correspondence, minutes of evidence taken, reports, memoranda or telegrams whatsoever, relating to or causing the dismissal of one Brenton Dodge, of Kentville, King's County, Nova Scotia, from the office of Collector of the Port of Kentville, Nova Scotia.—(Mr. Moffat.)

Copies of all papers orders, letters, vouchers, correspondence or any other memoranda whatever in the possession or under the control of the Department of the Minister of Customs, or any of the members of the Government, or any of the officials of the Government relating to, or in any way connected with the alleged violations of the Customs laws by swearing to false invoices or in any other mode by one John Leander McKenzie, of Canning, King's County, Nova Scotia, and of the firm of Sheffield & McKenzie, of the same place, with a copy of the decision of the Customs Department in such cases.—(Mr. Moffat.)

Return of all moneys received by the Government as export duty levied on oak, pine and spruce logs since Confederation, up to January 1st, 1885, showing the amounts received from each shipping point where such duties were levied, giving in detail the amounts collected each year, and giving the names of each person from whom duties have been collected, and also the amounts he or she has paid each year.—(Mr. Edgar.)

Return of all correspondence and petitions from mariners, vessel owners and others, not already brought down, relative to the selection of a route for the construction of the Murray Canal, or the character of the harbors afforded by Presq'Isle and Wellers' Bay respectively. Also all offers made by tenders or otherwise to construct said canal by any other than the adopted route, together with all reports as to progress of work of construction in possession of the Government.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

Return showing: 1. The detailed amounts actually due to the Supervisor of Cullers at Quebec for culling and measuring; 2. The names of all parties indebted, and the date of the incurring of each liability.—(Mr. De St. Georges.)

Copies of all correspondence, Orders in Council and Departmental Orders respecting the appointment for any purposes of the Government of the agent of the Edmonton and Saskatchewan Land Company, and respecting any difficulties that have arisen between the settlers and the company and the Government.—(Mr. Blake.)

Return of instructions to the health officers of the ports in the Province of New Brunswick, and quarantine regulations issued by the Department of Marine and Fisheries or the Department of Agriculture relating to these ports.—(Mr. Weldon.)

Statement of amounts paid in bounty in the years 1883 and 1884 on fish caught in Bras D'or Lakes, in the counties of Cape Breton, Inverness, Richmond and Victoria, and number of boats drawing such bounty in each county.—(Mr. McDougall, Cape Breton.)

Return showing the actual total cost of laying the telegraph cable from Clover Point, Victoria, British Columbia, across the straits of Juan de Fuca to a point at or near Dungeness, W.T., said return to give the names of persons to whom sums have been paid; nature and extent of services rendered entitling them to such payments; cost of cable, time occupied in laying said cable and its length.—(Mr. Baker, Victoria.)

Statement of all payments during 1882-83 and 1883-84 for the "Dominion Annual Register" to any one except H. J. Morgan, with the names of the persons who received the money and a statement of the manner in which the numbers of the book were distributed.—(Mr. McCraney.)

Return of all papers, correspondence and reports with reference to Nelson & Son's consignments of school books to late firm of James Campbell & Sons, Toronto.—(Mr. Wallace, York.)

Copies of the memorials presented to the Government by the delegates who waited on the Government in reference to the bonuses granted to railways declared to be for the general advantage of Canada.—(Mr. Watson, for Mr. Fleming.)

Copies of all correspondence, Orders in Council, reports and other papers in connection with the removal of Mr. J. E. Starr, of Port Williams, Nova Scotia, from the office of fishery overseer, and the appointment of his successor; and a statement of the distance between the residence of Mr. Starr and that of his successor, and of the length of the coast line of King's County, N.S.—(Mr. Blake.)

1st. For a statement of the names of the original stockholders of the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company, with the amount of stock held by each, and the dates and amounts of all cash payments thereon. 2nd. Statement in the same form as of the date of the prospectus for the issue of sterling bonds by the company. 3rd. Statement in the same form as of the 1st of March, 1885.—(Mr. Blake.)

Return showing seizures made at the Port of Winnipeg by the Customs officers or officials between January 1st, 1883, and January 1st, 1885, in which deposits were forfeited or goods sold after seizure; giving the amount of each sum forfeited and the amount realised in each case in which goods were sold; and stating in detail the name of each officer to whom any portion of the money so realised was paid and the amount in each case thus paid to the said officer; and also stating the salary paid such officer.—(Mr. Paterson, Brant.)

Copies of all correspondence and papers relative to the dismissal of George E. Cherrier from the Indian Agency at Caughnawaga; also of the reports of the investigation into the affairs of the Agency held by Mr. De Boucherville in 1883, and by A. Digman in 1884; with copies of all instructions at any time given by the Department to Mr. Cherrier. —(Mr. Bain, for Mr. Holton.)

Return showing: (1.) How many industrial schools for the instruction of Indian and Half-breed youth have been established in the Province of Manitoba and the North-West Territories respectively, under the authority and by permission of the Government of Canada, and where they are located; (2.) At what places lands have been surveyed and set apart for Indian and Half-breed schools in 1884, and what quantity at each place; (3.) Through whose representations and recommendations these schools are established from time to time, and whether any request from the Indians or Half-breeds themselves is required for the establishment of a school; (4.) What subjects of instruction are provided for these schools in regard to industrial pursuits, moral and religious, and are both sexes included in the general school provisions; (5.) Whether any of the Indian or Half-breed schools are placed under the care or supervision of any religious body or denomination. If so, what are the conditions upon which such control is granted, and what is the extent of the deneminational control, and is it to the extent granted, a temporary or permanent control. If there are denominational schools, what is the number belonging to each denomination, where they are located, and what quantity of land is owned or controlled by each, and what is the number of pupils; (6.) Whether when the moral and religious instruction of an Indian or Half-breed school is placed under the supervision or control of any denomination, it gives to the denomination control of the land and buildings of such school; (7.) At whose cost the Indian or Half-breed school buildings are erected and furnished, and under whose directions the text books are selected or compiled, and by whom they are paid for; (8.) What standing of attainment is required of teachers in these schools; how and from whom they receive certificates of qualification, and whether there is a system of governmental inspection of these or Half-breed Indian schools; (9.) Whether the teachers and trustees or managers of these schools are required to make any periodical returns to the Government of the attendance, general condition, progress and expenditure of each; (10.) Whether any of the religious denominations have obtained lands for church or school purposes from the Government or from any Indian reservation by treaty or otherwise; (11.) Whether any of the religious bodies on their own responsibility have established schools among the Indians, and if they have whether they receive any assistance directly or indirectly by land grants or otherwise for the support of such schools, from the Government.—(Mr. Kirk.)

Return of all sums paid to the Allan Line of Steamships from the year 1878 to 1885,—(*a*) For assisted passages. (*b*) For all other purposes except mail subsidies.—(Mr. Blake.)

Statement showing:—1st. The number of lots sold in the township of Viger, Temiscouata, belonging to the Indians, the amount of the sale and the name of the purchaser; 2nd. The payments made to the Department, to the agent, Mr. G. H. Deschêne, and to Mr. Antoine LeBel; showing in detail the date of such payments; when made, and the amount of each payment; 3rd. A detailed statement of the amounts transmitted to the Department by Messrs. Deschêne and LeBel, out of all moneys received by them up to date, and the date of such transmission; 4th. Copies of the report of Mr. Dingman, on the occasion of his visit to the Viger Agency, in September, 1884; 5th. Copies of correspondence with the Department in relation to the claims of Edouard Morin, and others, for lands purchased by them in the said Indian Reserve.—(Mr. De St. Georges.)

Copy of all correspondence and complaints regarding the management of Bird Island Light, Victoria, Nova Scotia, during the past two years. Also the reports of the several superintendents of lights during the above period and the evidence taken before the several superintendents regarding the management of said Bird Island Light. And also the name of the person, if any, now in charge of said light and the amount of salary paid to such keeper, and if he is permanently engaged.—(Mr. Campbell, Victoria.)

Copies of all correspondence between Charles H. Lugrin and the Secretary of State, in reference to an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada to test the constitutionality of the Canada Temperance Act, between the dates of May 31st, 1879, and May 31st, 1884.—(Mr. Burpee.)

Return of all the correspondence, papers and Report of the Officer of Customs for the Port of Toronto, in connection with the seizure of school books entered at an undervaluation by Thomas Nelson & Son, of Edinburgh.—(Mr. Rykert.)

Return of all the correspondence, papers and report of the Officers of Customs at the Port of Halifax and any other port in connection with the entry by A. & W. Mackinley, as agents of Thomas Nelson & Son, of school books at and under valuation.—(Mr. Rykert.)

All papers, documents and correspondence respecting the claim of John D. Robertson for compensation for taking his factory, premises and land for the Intercolonial Railway, last May, at St. John, the report of Alexander Christie as appraiser, the report of C. W. Fairweather, and others, as valuators, and the evidence taken before Mr. Compton, or any other arbitrator before whom the claim was heard.—(Mr. Mills.)

All letters and correspondence had between the Dominion Government, or any of its members, and the Local Government of New Brunswick, or any of its members, on the subject of the building of a foot and carriage bridge on the St. John River, at or near Fredericton.—(Mr. Landry, Kent.)

Return showing: 1. Duties imposed on various articles in the old Province of Canada, and duties now imposed. 2. Tariff in force in British Columbia and in Manitoba respectively, at time of Union. 3. Length of time tariff continues in force after Union.—(Mr. Watson.)

Copies of correspondence of a recent date between the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs and the agent of the Department in British Columbia, or any other person, upon the subject of establishing Indian schools in said Province.—(Mr. Baker, Victoria.)

Copies of all correspondence and Orders in Council in any way bearing upon the subject of purchase, or offers of purchase of Indian reserve lands in British Columbia, at a date subsequent to 1st June, 1882.—(Mr. Baker, Victoria.)

Copies of a report made by Mr. Joseph Simard, Dominion Arbitrator, under date of 16th October, 1883, recommending that a sum of money should be paid to George Lavoie, of the parish of Ste. Cécile du Bic, for damages caused to his property by the Intercolonial Railway, or fixing the amount of such damages.—(Mr. Langelier.)

Copies of correspondence and petitions on the subject of the case of criminal libel against Saunders and Wood, tried in December, 1884, before a judicial functionary in the North-West Territories.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copies of all Orders in Coucil, correspondence and papers, not already brought down, touching the surrender or definition of the claims of Canada upon any of the railway lands in British Columbia; or touching any change as to the relations of Canada or British Columbia in reference to such Railway Lands.—(Mr. Blake.)

Return showing the number of Volunteer Companies disbanded during the past two years in Military District No. 9, and all reports and correspondence and memoranda referring or relating to said disbandment. Also for copies of the lists of enrolments of the Reserve Militia for 1884 n Military District No 9.—(Mr. Campbell, Victoria.)

Copies of all reports, correspondence and memoranda regarding the calling out and the payment of arrears due the "Argyle Highlanders," Military District No. 9, for services performed at Lingan, County of Cape Breton, in the year 1883; also, all correspondence with Lieut.-Col. Bingham commanding the said Argyle Highlanders, regarding his being deprived of his command while performing duty at Lingan aforesaid, and another appointed to his position contrary to the rules governing military service.—(Mr. Campbell, Victoria.)

Copies of all memorials or papers relating to Reciprocal Trade between the United States and Canada, and of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and the British Government, the British Minister at Washington or the Government of the United States upon the subject of Reciprocal Trade relations with the United States; also, copies of all reports, if any, made by agents of the Canadian Government upon the subject.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Return of all weirs in the County of Charlotte, N.B., for the year 1884, specifying the locality in which they are situate, name of owner, and amount of tax or license money received therefrom. Also, Return showing amount received for licenses on weirs in Charlotte County since the spring of the passing of the Fishery Act of 1882, specifying the amount collected each succeeding year.—(Mr. Gillmor.)

Return of copies of all applications since the first of November last for permission to catch fish in Lake Simcoe, and of all correspondence in regard to such applications between the Department of Marine and Fisheries and such applicants.—(Mr. Mulock.)

Copies of any offers for the construction of a line of railway to connect the Canadian Pacific Railway with the Ontario Railway system at some point at or near to Gravenhurst or Beaverton or any other point in the District of Muskoka or Counties of Ontario or Simcoe; also copies of any written communications by letter, telegram, memorandum or otherwise between any corporation or individuals and the Government of Canada or any member thereof, or any Department in reference to any such offer; also copies of any Orders in Council granting aid towards the construction of such line; also copies of all regulations, terms and conditions prescribed by the Government in connection with the granting of such aid.—(Mr. Mulock.)

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

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 10:15 p m., Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 29th April, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE ELECTORAL FRANCHISE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House again resolve itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

Motion agreed to; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The vote which was taken yesterday on the motion of my hon. friend behind me, the Government accepts as a declaration of the House against the inclusion of the female franchise in the present measure. The Government will, therefore, abandon all portions of the Bill and expressions which relate to the female franchise.

Mr. MITCHELL. Sorry for that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In the 11th line the words "'owner,' when it relates to the ownership by a male person of real property situated in the Province of Quebec," are unnecesary, as the words "person" afterwards means a male person, married or unmarried; and the words "by a female person unmarried, or a widow," and the pronoun "he" and its inflections, having been struck out. I move that the words "by a male person" be struck out.

Mr. MILLS. The arrangement was that we would deal with each particular provision as we reached it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is in the first clause.

Amendment agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then in the 34th line, in the second paragraph, I move that the words "or her" be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) The first sub section of section 2, as it is worded might perhaps suit the other Provinces, but as regards the Province of Quebec it omits a class of people who have rights which are extremely important. That sub section construes the word "usufructuary" as being comprised in the word "proprietor" and the word "proprietor" as comprising the word "usufructuary." It leaves aside the user. Every hon. member who belongs to the bar of the Province of Quebec knows that the user of a property has rights which are very important, just as important as those of the usufructuary, except that he can only exercise them by himself. The right of use is a right which is perfectly recognised by the Civil Code of the Province of Quebec, and which has exactly the same value as the right of usufruct, except that the titular cannot transfer it. I notice that this paragraph completely ignores the user.

Mr. GIROUARD. (Translation.) Is not this covered by the word "occupant?"

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) Not any more than the word "usufructuary." The user is not necessarily an occupant; he is not comprised in this. He has quite a distinct right, which is the object of a special definition in the Civil Code. However, he holds a right of the same nature as that of the usufructuary, only this right is not so extensive, inasmuch as he is not only unable to transfer it forever, but he cannot even transfer the exercise of it. He must exercise it himself, but he may very well have it without exercising it, and then he would not be an occupier. He would not be comprised under the words "proprietor, lessee or occupier." So that this man, who holds a right of the highest importance, would be deprived of his vote. That is not all. There is another very important right which has been ignored, and that is the right of habitation. The Civil Code also gives a definition of it. It says it is the right of use when applied to a house. It is a right of Roman origin, and which is of a special nature in the law of the Province of Quebec. That right is also ignored. Under this Bill a man holding this right of habitation would neither be comprised under the title of proprietor, as defined here, nor under the title of lessee, nor under that of occupier. He would have just as important a right as that of the usufructuary, and he would be deprived of the right of voting. There is still in this clause another omission with regard to the emphyteutic lessee. The importance of the right of the emphyteutic lessee is well known. Every lawyer in the Province of Quebec, also, knows all the essential differences which exist between the ordinary lessee or tenant who pays a rent, and the lessee who is known under the technical name of emphyteutic lessee. The emphyteusis is another right, which, I think, is peculiar to the Province of Quebec, because it is of Roman origin. The different rights of property in other Provinces are of Saxon origin, while in the Province of Quebec they are all of Roman origin. We must go back to Roman law to find out its extent and bearing, and it is to that law that the authors of the Civil Code of Lower Canada referred when they framed it. A look at the bottom of the clause will convince anyone that the authorities they have quoted are taken from the Roman law. The question whether the right of emphyteusis is recognised or not has been discussed in France, but if it is not debatable in the Province of Quebec, our Civil Code has a title which deals with it *ex-professo*. We know that the emphyteutic lessee is neither a proprietor nor a lessee. Neither is he necessarily an occupier.

This property holder may not occupy the property which belongs to him. There is another man who holds a right just as important as that of a proprietor and who will be deprived of a vote. It is a kind of limited proprietorship. The difference which exists between the right of the emphyteutic lessee and that of the freeholder lies in the fact that the freeholder may, as the authors say, use and abuse of the thing which belongs to him. He holds that right forever: that is to say, he holds the most absolute right that can be held on an immovable property. The emphyteutic lessee has these same rights, with two restrictions: 1st. He has the right of property only for a limited time—the emphyteusis cannot exceed ninety-nine years. 2nd. This right cannot be extended so far as to allow him to make an abuse of the property. The emphyteutic lessee must not deteriorate. So that all these points of view which I have just raised, and which are elementary to the lawyers of the Province of Quebec, are of the highest importance. The empyteusis is recognised under a special law; and when the word "proprietor" is defined, as the trouble has been taken to include the word usufructuary in it, it follows that the others will be excluded, by virtue of the maxim of Roman law: *inclusio unius fit exclusio alterius.* If the word "usufructuary" is included under the word "proprietor" the user, the titular of the right of habitation and the emphyteutic lessee are excluded. There is another class of actual rights, a kind of right of property, which also happens to be excluded by the provision of the clause which I am now discussing; it is the right of surface. The superficiary is the man who holds a right of surface on an immovable. The right of surface has not yet reached, in the Province of Quebec, the development which it has reached in France, especially in large cities. Thus, all these great establishments which are seen on the boulevards of Paris, all these immense coffee houses which are to be seen on the Boulevard des Italiens have been built in the following manner: The owner of the land who had not the means of building them himself, has made a grant of the right of surface to somebody who has built the magnificent coffee houses or restaurants, or the large stores which are to be seen; and then, the builder, as a compensation for the cost of building, has the right to keep the property for a certain number of years; he is neither the owner in the strict sense of the word, nor emphyteutic lessee, nor usufructuary; he has a special right; it is a sort of limited right of property. It is evident that he is not the owner; he is not proprietor because he does not hold the property forever with the *jus utendi* and the *jus abutendi*; he has only the right of using the property. The right of the superficiary differs from the right of the emphyteutic lessee inasmuch as it is not an absolute right; it is a limited right of property, inasmuch as it recognises the right of the owner of the land, which our forefathers used to call the subsoil, and the superficiary does not hold that right of property. But the right of the superficiary differs from that of the emphyteutic lessee from another point of view: he does not owe any rent whatever, therefore he is neither comprised in the term "usufructuary" nor in that of "proprietor," and he would be ignored altogether. Now, the Civil Code formally recognises the superficiary. Section 521 says:

When the different stories of a house belong to different proprietors, if their titles do not regulate the mode of repairing and rebuilding, it must be done as follows: 'All the proprietors contribute to the main walls and the roof, each in proportion to the value of the story which belongs to him.'"

Therefore that section formally recognises that there may be proprietors of different superposed parts of an immovable. According to a section of the Civil Code, the right of property comprises the top and the bottom, that is to say, that the owner of the soil is owner at any depth, and above the soil he is owner at any height. This is common law, but there is a kind of property known as the right of surface, which happens to be recognised by section 521 of the Civil Code, and although it is not as broadly recognised in the Province of Quebec as it is in France, still it exists, and we must not overlook it in an electoral law. We do not make an electoral for a few days or a few years only; it is a law which is supposed to last long, and all kinds of rights on property, which are more or less connected with property, and which are more extensive than the right of usufruct, should be included in the clause which we are now discussing, failing which, it will come to pass that we will deprive of their franchise people who hold important rights of property. Consequently I move that the clause be amended as follows:

That the following words be added after the word 'usufructuary' in the 13th line of page 1: He who has a right of use or habitation or superficies, or the lessor by emphyteutic lease.

The object of the amendment is to add those who have rights which are more extensive than the usufructuary, and who, for that reason, should have the same right to vote as the usufructuary. These are the user, the holder of a right of habitation, the holder of a right of surface and the emphyteutic lessee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not fancy there is any objection to these words being introduced in the Bill, but I will point out to my hon. friend that this is not the paragraph where they apply. These are mere definitions, and the definitions, I think, were settled in 1841, if not before. Ownership, in the second paragraph, applying to all other parties in Ontario or the Province of Quebec, means the proprietorship in the land, with the title of freeholder. That describes what an owner is. And the same kind of title, with respect to the Province of Quebec, is described here in the word owner:

"'Owner,' when it relates to the ownership of real property situated in the Province of Quebec, means 'proprietor' or 'usufructuary'——

Or freeholeer, I suppose, in Ontario and the other Provinces,

"either in his own right, or in the right of his wife, of real property in 'franc-alleu,' or in free and common soccage."

That describes a freehold title as well as possible, the absolute proprietorship, and applies, from the word "owner," in the second paragraph, *quoad* those portions of the Dominion in which the English law obtains. Then the next paragraph is as to the tenants; the next is as to occupants, who is a proprietor in his own right, or the right of his wife, when he is the lessee. Now I think the hon. gentleman, in order to prevent confusion, should divide his amendment. With respect to the emphyteutic lease, that comes under the heading of the third paragraph, and that as regards the *usufruitier* under the heading of occupant. The hon. gentleman will see that an occupant means a person in actual occupation of real property, otherwise than as an owner or tenant or usufructuary, so that every possible holding of property is included in these three definitions.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) I shall answer in French to the remarks of the hon. First Minister, because all these terms can be understood a great deal better when expressed in the French language than in the English language. The hon. First Minister must not forget that the words "emphyteutic lease" are quite different from the ordinary word rent. The word rent comprises what the English call lease while the words emphyteutic lease are sometimes translated in English by the word "alienation." It is not a lease, in the ordinary sense of the word. The emphyteutic lease involves a real alienation for the time being; the lessee becomes the proprietor of the real estate, under certain conditions it is true, but he is proprietor, and the hon. First Minister will allow me to refer him on

this point to section 569 of the Civil Code, which says: Emphyteusis carries with it alienation. Property is dismembered in several manners; it is dismembered by mortgage, by emphyteutic lease, by usufruct, and by substitution. Now, we are trying to determine what is meant by the word "proprietor," and I think that the amendment of my hon. friend comes just in time, because, in reality, the emphyteutic lessee is proprietor for the time being, and during the whole length of his lease. So that, in my opinion, I think that the amendment of my hon. friend must be inserted in this clause, and I believe that my colleagues from the Province of Quebec will admit it with me.

Mr. GIROUARD. The hon. gentleman is right and he is wrong. He is right when he says that a person holding property by *bail emphytéotique* is a proprietor; but the hon. gentleman wants to have a word in the first paragraph of clause 2 which is already found there. It says: "Owner, when it relates to the ownership by a male person of real property situated in the Province of Quebec, means proprietor or usufructuary *(usufruitier)*." The hon. gentleman has just read the article from the Code which says that any person holding property by *bail emphytéotique* is owner of the property to all intents and purposes for the time being. That is the manner by which such holder of property is included in the word "proprietor" mentioned in the first paragraph of clause 2. No doubt to hold property under *bail emphytéotique* is, to a certain extent, different from holding it as proprietor, because at the end of the lease the proprietor has a right to take back the property on paying for all improvements; but until the end of the term he has no more right than any mere stranger. Thus the lessee is to all intents and purposes the proprietor. If any change be necessary, there can be no doubt that the word "lessee" under this *bail emphytéotique* should be in paragraph 1 of clause 2, because it affects merely the ownership of the property. The *usager* mentioned by the hon. member for Megantic would come in under the paragraph of "occupant." I believe neither of the amendments are necessary, because the definition of the word occupant means the person in actual possession, other than as actual tenant or usufructuary. Then if there is a man holding property as *usager*, or by any other title than proprietor or tenant or usufructuary, he would come under that definition, provided he was occupant. A *usager* must be an occupant. The article of the Code says so.

Mr. LANGELIER. The mistake is this: such a person cannot transfer the use of the property to another party.

Mr. LAURIER. The only point is as to where the amendment should come in.

Mr. GIROUARD. I see no objection to adding the words, but I believe the point is already covered by the Bill.

Mr. LAURIER. The *usufruitier* has all the rights attaching to possession; he can farm for his own benefit and keep all the fruits to himself, whereas the rights of the *usager* can only be exercised as to the actual necessities of the family. If there is a surplus it must go to the owner. Article 487 of the Code, says:

> "A right of use is a right to enjoy a thing belonging to another and to take the fruits thereof, but only to the extent of the requirements of the user and of his family."

Surely there is a material difference between *usager* and occupant. An occupant could farm for his own benefit. If he obtained products from his farm to the value of $200 or $300, he could dispose of the whole of it if he pleased; but if he was a *usager* and the value of the products was $300, and products to the value of $150 only were required for himself and his family, the rest must go to the owner. Surely, I say, there is a material difference, and the hon. gentleman must see that *usager* cannot come under the definition of occupant. It is a right which is found in no other Province but the Province of Quebec. It is peculiar to that Province, and, if it is defined at all, it must be defined in its proper place. The Bill very properly says that if a person is a *usufruitier* of a certain property he shall have the right to vote, and not the owner. Suppose a case as between the *usager* and a *nu-propriétaire* should happen in our Province, how is the question to be determined as to who shall have the vote then—the owner or the *usager?* The hon. gentleman says the question will be decided by the word "occupant." But he is not the occupant. We have to determine who has the right to vote; it must either be the occupant or the real owner. In accordance with the spirit of the Bill we should determine that the *usager* should have the right to vote and not the real owner.

Mr. GIROUARD. I move in amendment to the amendment that the following clause be added at line 13, paragraph 2: "Or lessee by *bail emphytéotique*."

Mr. CASEY. The committee no doubt desires to hear the points presented by the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier) rendered in English, and I hope the hon. gentleman will repeat them in that language. The committee no doubt also desires an explanation of those terms peculiar to Quebec found in these clauses, from the promoters of the Bill.

Mr. LANGELIER. This law is peculiar to the Province of Quebec, and the technical expressions cannot very easily be translated. The object of the amendment is this: That there are in the Province of Quebec certain estates which are less than complete ownership, which are not included in the definition of the word "owner," as given in the Bill. We have in that Province, besides the usufruct, a less comprehensive meaning of the word. The usufruct has the right to use and enjoy the property of another, and to take the whole product, and the Civil Code has limited the rights of the usufruct. This clause excludes every person who has a less estate than the right of complete ownership or usufruct. Among the estates known to the law, which are less than complete ownership, are those held under emphyteutic leases, which are of Roman origin, but have always been recognised under the old French law, and although there has been some dispute in France, whether they exist in the modern laws of France, there can be no question that they exist in the modern laws of Quebec. The difference is that while the complete owner can do what he chooses with his property, can use or abuse it, the person who holds under that emphyteutic lease can only hold it for a certain time, and not more than 99 years, so that it is a smaller right than complete ownership, and it is also smaller in this respect, that he cannot abuse the property under that lease. He can improve it—it is one of the conditions of his tenure that he can improve it—but he cannot waste it. But under this clause parties holding property under these leases would be deprived of the right of voting. Besides these I have mentioned, there is another estate known in the Province of Quebec as the right to superficies. Generally complete ownership of the soil includes not only what is on the surface but what is under the surface and above it, but as defined by the Civil Code there is a special ownership confined to the surface of the soil, or one flat of the building, and though it is not a complete ownership, it may be very important. This form of estate may frequently occur in the Province of Quebec, and as we should not make our laws here merely for a day or two, I think the clause should be drawn up in such a way as to include every kind of estate in the soil. The object of my amendment is to include all these various kinds of property.

Mr. ABBOTT. I think the Bill covers most of the points suggested by hon. gentlemen on both sides, but the

amendment with respect to emphyteutic leases will make a very serious alteration in the ordinary rights of proprietors. It is true that emphyteutic leases confer a lesser species of property; a lease of that kind for nine years or more is an immovable; and there is a certain right of property conveyed by that lease, which is not conveyed by a lease for a shorter time. Now, if, as is proposed by the amendment, a person holding property under an emphyteutic lease is declared to be the owner, then the actual owner of that property will be deprived of his right of voting. Under an ordinary lease the actual owner has the right of voting himself; he retains the right of property in the property leased and he derives a revenue from it. In the case of an emphyteutic lease he also retains an interest in the property. Plainly there cannot be two owners to the property, and, therefore, if the emphyteutic lessee is declared the owner, then the real owner cannot vote. Now the person who is called under the law of Quebec the *nu-propriétaire*—the owner—whose property is in the hands of a usufructuary, receives no return, has no practical ownership in the property until the termination of the usufruct. He is, therefore, called the naked proprietor under our law—*nu-propriétaire*—and it is a very expressive term. But the lessor receives a revenue just as an ordinary landlord who leases for one year, and it appears to me that it would be wrong to deprive the owner of the property of the right of voting, as you would deprive a man who derived no revenue at all from it. I think the proper way of amending the Act would be to add the emphyteutic lessee to the definition of the word "tenant," although in my opinion it is covered by the definition of that word already. At all events, I think it is well that the House should understand that in declaring the emphyteutic lessee the owner of the property they deprive the real owner of the property of any vote upon it.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I agree, to a certain extent, with my hon. friend, whose knowledge of the law is very extensive, because, under an emphyteutic lease, the property is completely alienated up to the time of the expiration of the lease. Therefore, the owner of the property does not hold the right to vote on it. But I will put the case of a party who holds property by *titre d'antichrèse*. He has the right to hold it for a certain time, until the creditors of the estate are duly paid principal and interest. During that period he occupies the property, and would come under the name of tenant, but the proprietor has not lost his right of ownership, and if the law gives the right of voting either to the proprietor or to the occupant, which of the two in this present case will have the right to vote? Will it be the *propriétaire absolu*, or the creditor who holds the property until he is paid what he has advanced? There would be a double vote in such a case; the proprietor would have the right to vote, and the person who holds by *titre d'antichrèse* would also have the right to vote, which I do not think is the intention of the promoter of the Bill.

Mr. TASCHEREAU. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I do not think that we should accept the amendment nor the sub-amendment which have been proposed. However, it seems to me that between the lessor and the lessee of an emphyteutic lease the latter alone should be entitled to a vote, for the reason that the lessor in an emphyteutic lease, during the length of the lease, completely gives up the whole of the property which has been leased. The emphyteutic lease is a contract which partakes both of the deed of sale and of the lease. Thus, during the length of the emphyteutic lease it is not the lessor who is proprietor, it is the lessee, and I do not see that the lessor should have more right to vote on a property which he has leased by emphyteutic lease than the proprietor who has actually sold his property. On the contrary, it is the lessee who should vote on that property, because during the term of his lease he is at the same time proprietor and holder of the estate. As to that part of the amendment which relates to the right of surface, I think that there is enough in the Bill to allow whoever is proprietor to have his vote. It is true, there is no such a right recognised under our civil law, but there is another thing which is recognised, and that is joint property. For instance, I suppose a four-story house, each story of which would belong to different proprietors; I think there is enough in the Bill to allow each of these four proprietors to have a vote. If you read sub-section 20 of the second clause of the Bill, you will see that the real property or real estate signifies, a lot, or a part of a lot of land, or any other portion or, sub-division of an immovable, or house, store, office or building of any kind whatever, or any portion of a structure erected on an immovable property. Well, I think that by this sub-section it is provided that whoever is joint proprietor of a real property will be entitled to a vote, provided that each sub-division of the property will be worth the amount provided for qualification by this Bill.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) What section is that?

Mr. TASCHEREAU. (Translation.) It is sub-section 20 of section 2. As to the right of use and habitation, I also find that in the definition of the word "occupier" there is enough to qualify as a voter whoever has a right of use or a right of habitation. Otherwise, what could the word "occupier" mean, as defined in the Bill, which says that an occupier is any person who holds property otherwise than as proprietor, lessee or usufructuary. If a man occupies a property under another title besides that of proprietor, lessee or usufructuary, he must occupy it as a user.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) What if he does not occupy it at all? What if he is a user without occupying it?

Mr. TASCHEREAU. (Translation.) Well, if he is a user without occupying it, I think that he ought not to be entitled to vote, for he would be neither proprietor nor holder in part of an immovable property. The man who would be qualified to vote on that property would be the proprietor of the real estate in question.

Mr. SCRIVER. I do not propose to argue this question from a legal point of view, because I am not a lawyer; but I was struck by the remarks of the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott) as affecting some of my own constituents. He said, if I understood him, that if the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier) should pass, the holders of lands under emphyteutic leases would enjoy the right of suffrage and the owners would not. A number of the residents of my county hold their lands under long leases, which I believe are emphyteutic leases, and the real owners of these lands are Indians living on a reserve near by. If anything in this Bill were to deprive any of my constituents, who are intelligent farmers, but who hold these 99 year leases, of the right of the suffrage, and it was to be given to the Indian proprietors, it would be an unfortunate state of things.

Mr. ABBOTT. My hon. friend must understand that any tenant paying the requisite amount of rental has a vote, but the proprietor of the property that tenant occupies has also a vote under the present law, and will have under this law; so that the settlers of whom he speaks would all have votes as tenants. Whether the Indians would have votes as Indians is another thing. I fancy that the Indians do not individually own the property, and no Indian could grant an emphyteutic lease. But that is a question entirely different from the broad question before the House, which is not whether the tenant under an emphyteutic lease would have a vote—it is conceded that he has—but whether the owner of the property, who leases it for 9 years, for instance

should not have a vote, while if he leased it for only 8 years and 364 days, he would have a vote.

Mr. BLAKE. I think there is another question involved. I have a somewhat dim recollection of a discussion of this question of the emphyteutic lease taking place in this House as far back as 1870, in the Committee of the Whole, when Sir George Cartier made use of some elaborate arguments as to the nature of the tenant. The hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbot) argues as to the injustice that would be done to the proprietor, and the only difference he recognises is the difference that would be between a lease for a shorter or a little longer period. But if I recollect aright, as a general rule, the emphyteutic lease is a lease at a nominal rent—a pepper-corn rent, as we call it in English—for 90 or 99 years. In that case, a great distinction would be made by this Bill between the rights of a proprietor in Quebec and in any of the other Provinces, because by the clause which deals with the word "owner," it is provided, for the other Provinces, that he shall be the owner if he is the proprietor of the lands, etc., of which such person is in actual possession or is in receipt of the rents and profits thereof. That is the definition in Ontario and other Provinces, but it cannot be said that a man would be in the receipt of the rents and profits if he were receiving only a nominal rent of a few *sous* per year, what is called a pepper-corn rent, while another man is receiving substantially the rents and profits. He is either in possession of the lands, and is so drawing to himself all the land can produce, or is in receipt of the substantial rents and profits. That is as regards the other Provinces, but according to the hon. member for Argenteuil, in the Province of Quebec, the intention is that a man who has leased his property for a period of 99 years and is receiving only a cent a year, would still be entitled to vote upon it. I do not think he would in any of the other Provinces. Whether he ought, is another question, but certainly the same class of persons should be entitled to vote in all the other Provinces.

Mr. ABBOTT. In answer to the hon. member for West Durham, I would say, in the first place, that I do not think I ever heard of leases of the description he mentions, in existence in Lower Canada. An emphyteutic lease, taking the ordinary state of things in Lower Canada, is the lease of property on which the lessee proposes to make certain improvements; and in order to encourage him he is granted a longer lease; but he pays the fair rental value of the property, as a rule, or at least what the lessor and the lessee agree to consider the fair value of the property, whether the lease be for a year, or 90 years or longer. The question of an emphyteutic lease for a pepper-corn rent has never, to my knowledge, come up in Lower Canada, although the lease of lands for a comparatively long time, that is to say for periods running for 20 years, is a very common occurrence. Now the emphyteutic lessor of that description would be exactly in the position of an owner of property as described in this Act with reference to the other Provinces; he would be the owner of the property, not in possession of it, but deriving the rents and profits of it to the extent agreed between himself and the lessee.

Mr. LAURIER. I can say to the hon. member for Argenteuil that in the township of Durham, in the county of Drummond, there are several leases of that nature in which the rent is just $1 a year. This was formerly an Indian reserve. The Indians who got farms having removed to the mountains over the St. Francis river, where they have a village, leased their farms to the white settlers, principally Scotch and English, who agreed to pay them a yearly rent of $1. To my knowledge there are at least 30 or 40 leases of that description. As far as I could follow the hon. gentleman, he did not agree with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard). The hon. gentleman would give the right to vote to the lessor.

Mr. ABBOTT.

Mr. ABBOTT. To both.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier would give it only to the lessee. But if it be true, and I believe it is generally admitted, that the emphyteutic lease confers alienation and deprives, for the time being, the owner of the right of property, I do not conceive under what principle he could have the right to vote. He is not in possession, because the lessee has possession; he is not the owner, since the lease deprives him of the right of ownership; he cannot claim as an occupant nor as being in possession nor as the owner.

Mr. ABBOTT. Although he does none of those things he receives the rent and revenues of the property.

Mr. LAURIER. That is the price paid for the sale, and whether the price runs for a certain period or is paid down at once does not matter.

Mr. GIROUARD. We are not here to settle these difficulties and distinctions of our civil law; we are here to define who is going to vote and who is not. If it is the intention of Parliament to give the right to vote to the lessor by emphyteutic, let us say so; if it is the intention to give the right to vote only to the lessee let us say so. As I understand the Civil Code of Lower Canada, the moment a lessor gives, by empyhteutic lease, the property to another man, he ceases for the time being to be the proprietor, and, consequently, under the clause as it is framed, the lessor would have no right to vote for the time being. I base my opinion on article 567 of the Quebec Civil Code which says: "An emphyteutic lease is a contract by which the proprietor of an immovable conveys it for a time to another." Therefore the moment he has conveyed the property, he ceases to be the owner of it.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman says that under the law the lessor would not have the right to vote; the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott) says the reverse.

Mr. GIROUARD. The amendment of the hon. member for Megantic does not cover the case nor does mine. If it is the intention of Parliament to give the right to vote to both lessor and lessee, the word "owner" should apply as well to the lessor as to the lessee. But I see a difficulty in some cases. There are some cases in which the property, without taking into consideration the improvements made by the lessee, is not worth the amount mentioned in this Bill to qualify an owner to vote. If we are going to give to the lessor on an emphyteutic lease the right to vote, the right should be subject to the other conditions, one of which is that the property shall be of a certain value. The amendment should be different to that framed by the hon. member for Megantic and myself; it should read: The word "owner" shall apply both to the lessor and lessee on an emphyteutic lease.

Mr. LANGELIER. In answer to the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott), I may say that, though in the portion of the Province of Quebec with which he is more particularly acquainted, the rent of emphyteutic leases is very high, this is not the case in the city of Quebec. If the construction the hon. gentleman puts on this clause were to be admitted, there would be only two or three parties in the upper town of Quebec who would have the right to vote as proprietors. The ladies of the Hotel Dieu would be the only parties who would be entitled to vote as proprietors, in what is called St. John's suburbs, because the property in that locality is held under an original emphyteutic lease given some 85 years ago, for 90 years, and then there are besides emphyteutic leases given by those who rented the property under the original lease.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). Do they not pay rent?

Mr. LANGELIER. Yes, but a mere nominal rent. What is paid to the Hotel Dieu ladies is a mere trifle, and it will be most extraordinary that those ladies alone, who cannot vote under this Bill, would have a right to vote as proprietors, while those who are practically considered as proprietors would be deprived of that right. They could not vote as proprietors, because the member for Argenteuil said he was not willing to consent that the emphyteutic lessor should be deprived of his vote. In Quebec East the same thing occurs. These leases have been granted a great many years ago; they are about expiring and are being renewed, and I repeat the rents paid are mere "pepper-corn rents" as they are called in the English law, a few cents on each lot. It seems to me most ridiculous to give the right to vote to the lessor in that case where he has no real interest in the property, or only a very remote interest in it, and to deprive of the right to vote the party who now has that right. Nearly the whole city of Quebec is held under that tenure. In Champlain Ward there are a number of emphyteutic leases. A number of these people have come from Ireland, and they have adopted, as far as it was possible in Quebec, the system of tenure which exists in Ireland. Nearly all the property in Champlain Ward is held under emphyteutic leases. If this clause were to be adopted, the result would be that, in the whole city of Quebec, only two or three parties would have the right to vote, and those parties happen to be religious corporations, who cannot vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If this were a new provision, the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite would be very valuable, but it has existed for years, and in Quebec and elsewhere those who hold emphyteutic leases have always voted.

Mr. LANGELIER. There was no such definition as is given here including the word usufructuary. In the original law of the Province of Quebec and of Canada, the word proprietor was defined to include the usufructuary. The result was that, as practically the tenant is considered the proprietor, he has always been admitted to vote, but he would be excluded by the introduction of this new definition of the word usufructuary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is taken from the old statutes.

Mr. LAURIER. It does not exist in this form in the Quebec law, which says:

"A right of use is a right to enjoy a thing belonging to another and to take the fruits thereof, but only to the extent of the requirements of the user and of his family. When applied to a house, right of use is called right of habitation."

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). While I do not profess to understand the law as to real estate in the Province of Quebec, yet it appears to me that everything advanced by the hon. gentlemen who seek to make these amendments is covered by this Bill. I may be mistaken, but it seems to me that this term emphyteutic, which is a new one to me, is a mere fiction at any rate.

Mr. LANGELIER. No.

Mr. LANDRY. It means that a lease of nine years becomes freehold estate instead of leasehold property, that the lessee becomes the owner of the property, and therefore the estate that vests in him is freehold estate instead of leasehold property, therefore it is more of a fiction or a technical term than anything in reality. The lessor has all the property in it. He has the right of reversion, and I presume the provision is intended to give certain privileges to the individual who holds it for nine years, such as the power to mortgage it, which he could not do if it were only personal property, sub-section 5 of section 3 of the Bill shows that this person is entitled to vote. It says:

"Is the *bonâ fide* occupant of real property within any such city or town or part of the city or town of the actual value of $300, whether such occupation is under a license of occupation or agreement to purchase"——

Would not this be under a license of occupation or agreement to purchase?——

"from the Crown or from any other person or corporation"——

It is a lease or license to occupy the property.——

"or exists in any other manner except as an owner or tenant."

Mr. CASEY. Except as an owner or tenant.

Mr. LANDRY. What is that? It is explained in another section of the Bill what a tenant is and what an owner is.

Mr. CASEY. It excludes anybody who may be called a tenant.

Mr. LANDRY. Certainly, if he was called a tenant.

Mr. WELDON. That would except a tenant in New Brunswick.

Mr. LANDRY. Yes, but a tenant would come in under the definition here, and if he held in any other way he might come in under that section. I may be mistaken in this, but I throw it out for the consideration of those hon. gentlemen who are asking for the amendment.

Mr. WELDON. Would it not mean an actual *bonâ fide* occupant?

Mr. LANDRY. Yes, but I understand that under the law in the Province of Quebec, anyone who occupies for a term of years longer than nine years becomes the owner.

Mr. ABBOTT. The qualified owner.

Mr. LANDRY. Yes, because he is subject to the right of reversion That being the case, it only makes this difference, that, if he paid less than the amount which is provided in this Bill to become a tenant, he might not be permitted to become a voter under that clause, but he might pay less and be the owner of property which had increased in value. The small nominal amount which these people are paying now may be simply the value of the property when they commenced to occupy it.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman who has brought forward this Bill is illustrating, I am sure, the impropriety of dealing with the franchise here instead of in the various Local Legislatures. The hon. gentleman undertakes to define who are entitled to the franchise in the Province of Quebec. He gives a series of definitions of proprietary rights in that Province. My hon. friends before me point out that his definitions are very defective, that there are a large number of proprietors who are not embraced in the definition. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) comes to his rescue and says there is no necessity to amend the clause, but, after further consideration, he considers that the amendment of my hon. friend before me is not sufficient, and he proposes an amendment. But after a little discussion he comes to the conclusion that even his amendment is not adequate, and a further amendment is required. Then we find that the hon. gentleman learned in the law from the Province of Quebec, the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott) and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), do not agree as to what are the rights of certain parties in the Province of Quebec—these hon. gentlemen who, above all other parties in the House, have an opportunity of understanding this question, and, if we are to deal with it, must assume the responsibility of legislating upon this subject. It is the duty of every member in the House who is called upon to vote on this measure to make himself acquainted with the law, and to know whether he is going to interfere with the rights of any parties by this provision. I say these gentlemen, who are specially acquainted with the subject, do not agree, and have not yet sufficiently considered the subject to deal with it in an intelligible manner. Then I ask this committee how is it possible that the 150 members from the other

Provinces than Quebec, can properly deliberate upon this question? I ask them are they prepared to take this question out of the hands of the Local Legislatures where it has for 18 years been relegated, and to undertake to deal with it here? Why, Sir, the right hon. gentleman, a distinguished lawyer, a gentleman who has been Minister of Justice for many years in this country, as well as Prime Minister, comes here, and he is wholly at sea on the question; he is not sufficiently familiar with the law with which he proposes to deal, and the rights of parties under that law, to propose an intelligible measure to this House. It is pointed out to him by his friends that if this clause were carried in its present form, a large portion of the electors of the city of Quebec would be disfranchised.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). Not at all.

Mr. MILLS. Now, Sir, we have before us a splendid illustration of the propriety of undertaking to deal with this question by the attempted usurpation of the hon. gentleman. I have no doubt that before we get through the discussion of this Bill, we will have many other instances equally marked of the impropriety of introducing this question here at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have the old Act here, but as it is in French, and my French accent is not very good, I will ask the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) to read it.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not at all surprised. I did the same thing myself. I had the old consolidated statute, and I could not make anything out of it, and gave it away again. The hon. gentleman said this was the old definition and that he settled the whole thing by that. But the definition does not agree with the old definition. The definition differs from the old definition in some respects—nay, more, the definition differs from the definition of the Bill of 1870. Now, the Bill of 1870 was the product of three years of incubation; it was a subject of discussion; and the hon. gentleman who is responsible for this measure, as my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says, found it necessary, with reference to this particular clause, when he resumed consideration of this subject, after those years which elapsed from 1870 to 1883, to amend the definition as he proposed it to us in the year 1870; and the definition for the years 1883-84-85 is different from the definition for the year 1870 and the preceding years. So that we are not face to face with the simple, and intelligent, and practical suggestion which the hon. gentleman has made, namely, that we have got a definition which ought to be satisfactory because it was satisfactory in the old Province of Canada. We have it changed. The definition of 1870 was different from the old definition, and the definition of 1883-84-85 is different from the proposed definition of the year 1870.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. member for West Durham is entirely mistaken about the definition in 1870. He says the Act was in incubation for three years. I hold in my hand the Act of 1869, exactly the same as at present. It says that:

"The word 'owner,' when it relates to the ownership of property situated in the Province of Quebec, shall signify proprietor, either in his own right or in the right of his wife, or as usufructuary (*usufruitier*) of a real estate in *franc-alleu*, or in free and common soccage, that is in the Province of Quebec, whenever any person has the mere right of property in any real property, and some other person has the usufructuary enjoyment (*la jouissance et l'usufruit*) of the same for his own use and benefit, the person who has the mere right of property therein shall not have the right of voting, as the owner of such real property, at any election; but in such case such usufructuary (*usufruitier*) shall alone be entitled to vote at such election upon such lands or tenements."

So that the first part of that definition is exactly the same as at the present.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, the hon. gentleman found his error as he proceeded to read the clause. He stated when he began that he held in his hand the Act of 1869, and that the definition was precisely the same as in this Bill.

Mr. RYKERT. The first part.

Mr. BLAKE. No. When the hon. gentleman began to read he said the definition was the same. As he read, he found he had made an inaccurate statement, and when he closed he said the first part of it was the same. I did not say the first part was different; I said the definition was not the same, and the hon. gentleman acknowledges it is not the same. Now, Sir, the Act of 1869 contained the full and matured experience of the hon. gentleman's incubation—the Act of 1870—I have it before me, and the definition in that Act is not the same as the definition in this one. There is a word introduced—I know not whether it is surplusage, but I do not suppose, after thirteen years of consideration, the hon. gentleman would introduce a useless word. I find the words, "the mere right of property or legal estate," are introduced in this clause to-day. Now, are they necessary or no? Is it mere surplusage to introduce in this Bill the words, "or legal estate"? They were not in the old definition before Confederation; they are not in the Act of 1869; they are not in the Bill of 1870. But the hon. gentleman has now introduced them. I know not whether these are words known to the law of the Province of Quebec; I do not profess to be acquainted with that law. I do not know whether the words, "or legal estate" are words known in the jurisprudence of that Province; but I assume that being introduced to-day, they are novel, they are introduced for a purpose, they are introduced because the former definition was inadequate, because it was imperfect, and these words are introduced in order to make it perfect. Therefore, I say the definition is not the same. Once again, in the old Act the words are "the enjoyment of the same for his own use and benefits." Well, now the provision is, "for his or her own use as aforesaid," leaving out the words "and benefits." So that the words "and benefits," in the old clause, were deemed, upon this revision, to be surplusage, to be no longer necesary; I know not, whether they are or not; but I compare the hon. gentleman's production of 1869 and 1870 with his production of 1883-84-85, and find variations in the two. I find some words inserted which are not in the old; I find some words omitted which are in the old; I find a variation in language from the Consolidate Statute; and therefore I deny that we are face to face with the hon. gentleman's proposition, that we are really introducing the old definition that has been in force so many years.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. member for West Durham is famous for his hair splitting. If he reads the paragraph of the definition in the Act of 1869 he will find that the only words left out are "or legal estate" otherwise it is almost word for word the same as in the Bill before the House. He said that after I had read the whole I found I was mistaken. I did not read it as the hon. gentleman sometimes reads a quotation, leaving out the part which did not suit; I simply read it as it was. Now, I will read it again, and perhaps the hon. gentleman can then understand what the language is:

"The word 'owner,' when it relates to the ownership of property situated in the Province of Quebec, shall signify property either in his own right or in the right of his wife, or as usufructuary of a real estate in *franc alleu*, or in free and common soccage; so that in the Province of Quebec whenever any person has the mere right of property in any real property"——

The words "or legal estate" are added this year.——

"and some other person has the usufructuary enjoyment of the same for his own use and benefit, the person who has the mere right of property therein shall not have the right of voting as the owner of such real property at any election; but in such case such usufructuary shall alone be entitled to vote at such election upon such lands or tenements."

The only distinction is that real estate is omitted. Yet the hon. gentleman said, I did not read it, that I did not understand it, and that I did not know the purport of it.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not say that the hon. member did not read it and did not understand it. I said that the hon. member inaccurately stated that they were precisely the same. On reading the clause he found he was not correct, and having read the clause he stated that the first part of the definition is correct. That is a correct statement.

Mr. GIROUARD. The Bill covers every point mentioned by the hon. member for Megantic. I thought I was right, and I still believe I am right.

Mr. BLAKE. Then why move an amendment?

Mr. GIROUARD. My amendment is only to remove any doubts. I said that I saw no objection to allowing such an amendment, but at the same time I could not see how the rights of a *usager* could come under this clause. The emphyteutic lessee during the running of the lease is sole proprietor, because the lessor has transferred all his rights for the time being to him. I find this provision framed in exactly the same words, as late as 1858, in the electoral law passed that year. This covers the same point as we have in the Bill now before the House. I find in the Consolidated Statutes of Canada a clause which is to the same effect. Under the present Bill only the usufructory has the right to vote. The case of the lessor is very different.

Mr. LAURIER. Who will have the right to vote under this Bill? Will the lessor have the right?

Mr. GIROUARD. I believe he will not, and I believe it is not the intention to give him that right. Under the old law he had not the right to vote. Under the Code he ceases to be proprietor for the time being.

Mr. LAURIER. That is not clear.

Mr. GIROUARD. That is how I understand it. We have had no difficulty in the past under the old definition, and the present definition is the same word for word. For that reason I do not believe it is desirable to create difficulty, when the same definition has worked satisfactorily for 30 or 40 years.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Who will have the right to vote as between the proprietor of the land and the person who is a usufructuary?

Mr. GIROUARD. The lessee will have the right to vote.

Mr. LAURIER. This discussion seems to show the necessity of making this law clear. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier says there has not been any difficulty hitherto. But difficulty may arise under this Bill, though if the matter were left in the hands of the Provinces no difficulty would arise. This discussion, I say, shows the propriety of the amendment moved by my hon. friend. Here are two eminent lawyers from Quebec, the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott) and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), who do not agree as to whether under the Bill a lessor would have the right to vote or not. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier thinks that the lessee would have that right and not the lessor, whereas the hon. member for Argenteuil believes both would have the right to vote. I take issue with that hon. member as to whether a lessor would have that right. The argument he addressed to the committee was this: The lessor would have the right because he was the registered owner of the property. My view of the law is, that the argument does not hold good, and I think the hon. member for Argenteuil, whose pupil I was once, will agree with me in this respect. The lessor under the lease has not the profits of the property. The lessor leases the property, but instead of receiving the products he receives a certain rental each year simply to represent the profits of the property. If that be so, the lessor does not receive the benefits from the property, but simply the interest on the value of the land, and the lessor could no come under that section, and hence the necessity of making it clear as to whether the lessor or the lessee should have the right to vote. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) said he thought the point was covered, because the lessee was for the time the proprietor, and the lessor had only a revisionary right. This view is not altogether correct. In our law we have a very energetic expression which says that property can be dismembered. The lessee holds, as it were, part of the property and the owner the other part, and that condition of things is covered by that term. Therefore the lessor is the proprietor under certain conditions only, but yet legally he is the proprietor, so that there are two proprietors upon the property.

Mr. LANGELIER. I think the discussion has shown that either my amendment, or one to the same effect, is absolutely necessary, for two distinguished legal gentlemen from Montreal have taken exactly opposite views of the meaning of the clause as it stands. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) says that the clause would only give the right to vote to the lessee, while the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott) thinks the clause would give the right to vote to the grantor of this emphyteutic lease, so that if it is intended to give the right to vote to the lessee under these leases I think it should be made clear. The door should not be left open to any difficulties as to the construction of the Act. The hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Taschereau) does not agree with the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott), for he says that the lessee in these cases is included in the word "occupant." That is another mistake, for a party may be the lessee under an emphyteutic lease who may not be an occupant at all, but who may live in the United States.

Mr. TASCHEREAU. I said the lessee by an emphyteutic lease had the right of voting as proprietor.

Mr. LAURIER. Is not the lessee always a proprietor?

Mr. LANGELIER. At any rate, I think these differences of opinion demonstrate the absolute necessity of some such amendment as my own. If these distinguished gentlemen have conflicting opinions of the meaning of the clause, what will be the case with people who are ignorant of the law? I do not mean that the revising barristers will be ignorant men, but people who may have to protect their rights under this clause will be people who do not know the law, and therefore the construction should be clear.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I have in my hands the Quebec Election Act which has been in force for a number of years, and I find that the definition of "owner" is precisely the same as that proposed in the Bill. The third sub-section of the second section reads as follows:

"The word 'owner' signifies any one who possesses real estate, or whose wife possesses real estate whether as owner or usufructuary—whenever one person has the mere ownership of real estate, and another has the enjoyment and usufruct thereof to his own use and benefit, the person who has the mere ownership of such real estate shall not be entitled to vote as owner thereof, and the usufructuary shall in such case alone have the right to vote, by reason of such real estate."

This is really the same definition as that in this Bill, only in different words. Therefore, if this law has been in operation in the Province of Quebec since 1875, and we have been able under it to ascertain the rights of an emphyteutic lessee, I do not know how some new difficulty could arise in its operation under this law. Since my hon. friend seems to have made a special study of the question, he might, perhaps, tell us under what title these lessees are registered in the electoral lists as they are now prepared. My impression is that they are registered as owners. The clause as it stands proposes to make no change, and I do not see the use of the amendment.

Mr. AUGER. I think if at any time the question ought to be asked, who shall decide when lawyers disagree, it should be asked now; and as the lawyers do not seem to agree on this point, that is another proof that a great mistake was made in this Parliament in taking away the franchise from the Provinces. In the rural municipalities of the Province of Quebec the officers are not always learned in the law; but we have customs in accordance with the way we understand the law. In the parish in which I live we have our own interpretation of the law; but if we made the list for the city of Quebec by the same interpretation, we might make a mistake. In this case the law ought to be made very clear. If the right hon. Premier himself, when asked to explain this very clause, could only say that he copied the laws of Quebec, how will it be when the revising officer —who will be appointed by the right hon. gentleman, and who may be a man from Ontario, who knows nothing of the laws of Quebec—comes to consider the matter? Who will then decide? The hon gentleman may do an injustice to the Province of Quebec, and therefore I think the law ought to be as plain as it can be.

Mr. LANGELIER. The hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) says that this is the same as the law of the Province of Quebec. It is not the same thing.

Mr. DESJARDINS. It is not worded the same, but it is practically the same.

Mr. LANGELIER. Admitting that it is practically the same, we know what construction is put upon our provincial laws in the courts, but we do not know what construction will be put on the federal laws. All I want to do is to guard the interests of the Province of Quebec. Nobody can deny, that there are difficulties; this discussion has shown that there are great difficulties, and I think we should set these difficulties at rest by amending the law in the way proposed.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me that it would be a very good thing if the hon. gentleman would adopt the definition that the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) has read; then he would have much to recommend it in the view my hon. friend has taken, namely, that these words have received a well-settled interpretation in the Province of Quebec, and that we cannot anticipate what interpretation will be put upon words which are not the same words. I have not been able to extract from the hon. gentleman a reason why he inserts in the first paragraph in this clause the words "or legal estate." They are not in the Consolidated Statute of Ontario, in the law of Quebec, or in either of his Bills of 1869 or 1870. In the Province of Quebec, I believe these words have not the technical signification which is given to them here; and why darken counsel by words without wisdom? If there is a reason for these words, I would like to know what it is. But perhaps the hon. gentleman did not make the change, and perhaps we are dealing with a phrase of the Law Clerk or the Deputy Minister of Justice or the Minister of Justice. If we are to enter upon this business—if a Parliament which has nothing to do with the law relating to civil rights, which cannot control those rights, and which is not supposed to have the power of modifying them in any way, is to deal with this matter at all, I should be disposed to say that the safest course is to adopt the legislative definitions of the Province, signifying what we want them to signify, and what they have been understood by the Province to signify; else we are entering upon a difficult and dangerous course. The hon. Minister has said that there ought not to be trouble about this, because it is well understood; but I would repeat that in 1870 we had a discussion on this very question, which was participated in by the Quebec lawyers, and among them by his own colleague, Sir George Cartier. It is impossible to deal with it as the hon. gentleman proposes, namely, that we should pass it at hap-hazard.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman, I think, is not regular. We are discussing the amendment of the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier), and not a subsequent clause. The clause as it now stands, so far as it is affected by that amendment, is the same clause that was adopted in 1858. It was settled then; it has been the law ever since; no one has ever raised an objection to it; no person holding an emphyteutic lease was ever deprived of his vote. I think we cannot do better than adhere to the law as it always has been; and I have no doubt that no person will be deprived of his vote by a simple re-enactment of the definition that has always existed. With regard to the argument of the hon. leader of the Opposition, I would simply say that he is quite right in supposing that these words, "or legal estate," were put in by Mr. Wicksteed, who is an advocate of Lower Canada and well acquainted with the law of that Province, and who thought it would be well to make the expression more full than it was before.

Mr. WELDON. The discussion which has taken place as to the right meaning to be placed on the language of the clause, instead of making that meaning clearer, has only had the effect of making it more confused than when we started. When I find that lawyers like my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott) and my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) have such different opinions of the clause, I cannot help thinking what will be the difficulties of these revising barristers of five years standing, in dealing with matters of this kind. I think a law of this kind should be made as clear as possible. You may say that there is a right of appeal, but under this Act that right is a very questionable one, for it depends on the option of the revising barristers, and even if the appeal was of right, we all know that appeals are expensive, and, therefore, we should take every care that the law is made as clear as possible. The word "proprietor" is one which I shall call attention to, as I cannot discover that it has a legal meaning at all. In the Quebec Act the word is not used; the definition does not include it, and the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) will understand that, though two words may have the same meaning, may appear to be exactly alike, to a person who has not a legal training, yet when parties come to court, it may be that they will be construed to have an entirely different meaning. For that reason I think we should follow the Quebec Act as it stands, and make the definition under the Act so clear that there will be no difficulty in understanding who have and who have not the right of voting. No man should be deprived of that right by the inaccuracy or ambiguity of the language of an Act.

Mr. CASEY. The discussion which has taken place on this clause of the Bill has, as stated by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon), rather produced a feeling of confusion in our minds than supplied us with information. The right hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill has not been able, or has not seen fit, to explain this provision of the Bill—I do not know which; but I almost think, from his attempt on one or two occasions to obtain the material for explaining it, that his attention must have been called to it for the first time to-day, for I cannot imagine that he should have been unable to explain it if he had given the matter his consideration. It is extremely inconvenient for us who live under a totally different system of civil polity, whether we be lawyers or not, to frame provisions of this kind, conditioned on a system of law concerning which none of us from the other Provinces can know very much; we will be completely at sea as to the appropriateness of these definitions unless we get an explanation of the matter here and now. I may be told that we should depend on the opinions of the lawyers from the Province of Quebec, but

the answer is evident, that two of the most prominent and eminent lawyers of that Province, sitting within one place of each other in this House, have given directly opposite opinions of the meaning of this clause. Two prominent lawyers from the Province of Quebec in this House have given directly opposite decisions upon this clause, so that with the leader of the Government unable or unwilling to explain the meaning of the provisions, with his chief legal advisers from the Province of Quebec, the Province specially interested, differing *toto cœlo* with regard to the meaning of the clause, we must, before passing it, ask to be given some further explanation from somebody, or, if nobody is able to give a decided explanation, that this part of the clause should stand over. The leader of the House said, in answer to the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), that it was not the time now to discuss the meaning of the words "legal estate," on the ground that this clause is similar to one in the Act of 1875. It has been pointed out, however, that it is not similar, and that certain words which evidently appear to the legal mind to mean something, and which strike the lay mind as likely to mean something, have been added. The question has been asked and an answer refused. If these words mean something new, and change the definition from what it was before, the argument against the amendment, drawn from the similarity of form, is gone; if they do not mean anything, the usefuness of the words themselves is gone. The hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) also urges the similarity to the clause in the Quebec Election Act, 1875, which he read; but it is evident that although a number of the same words which occur in this clause are to be found in that Act, the intentions of the two may be wholly different. The word "proprietor," which occurs in this clause, does not occur in the other at all, and the differences are such as to make it quite impossible for anyone to determine whether they mean the same thing or not. This is evident from the fact that no two lawyers in the House draw the same conclusions on this point. If the object is to secure uniformity of interpretation in the Province of Quebec, the proper course to be followed is that suggested by my hon. friend on my right, to take the Quebec clause as it stands, and insert it here as the interpretation of the word "owner" in the Province of Quebec. We all know that judges differ in their interpretations of a new law until precedents are established; and as there must be precedents for the interpretation of the Act of 1875, we should take the clause from that Act. I would ask the hon. the leader of the Government under which of the classes mentioned in this clause, the tenants on the old seigniories, under leases dating perhaps a hundred years back, given by the original seigniors, at nominal rents, are supposed to come. Will the hon. gentleman answer my question?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CASEY. I only sat down to allow the right hon. gentleman to answer my question.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will answer when I am ready.

Mr. CASEY. Well then I will sit down when I am ready. I know from my reading of French Canadian history and conversation with French lawyers——

Mr. HESSON. You know a great deal about it.

Mr. CASEY. If the hon. gentleman from Perth (Mr. Hesson) had given half the attention to the provisions of this Bill which I have given to land tenure in Lower Canada, he would be better able to pronounce an opinion than he is. The attention I have given to it is altogether through reading the history of the French seigneurial tenure and from conversation with French gentlemen, and I am aware whole townships full of people hold lands under these leases at extremely low rents—at such rents as would not qualify them under the tenant clause. I know it is not intended to disenfranchise them; it must be intended to include them under some of these clauses, and I ask under which, and the hon. gentleman refuses to answer until he is ready. By the word ready, he either means willing or prepared; I hope he means merely willing. I can understand his being unwilling to answer questions lest that might prolong the discussion, but I hope he is not in a position to avow himself unprepared. He must know that we from Ontario have special difficulties in dealing with this clause, and I have no doubt he has posted himself thoroughly on those peculiar features of the law of Quebec with which he proposes to tinker, and is prepared to give explanations upon them. I hope he will be able to tell us what nobody has told us, under which definition the seignorial tenants will come. This question may seem unnecessary to our hon. friend from Quebec, but it is necessary to hon. gentlemen from Ontario.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not understand it.

Mr. CASEY. What my hon. friend does not understand may be taken to be beyond the ordinary scope of the intelligence of this House. It has been pointed out by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) that under sub-section 5, some parties whose qualifications are questioned are included. That sub-section says:

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I would ask the hon. gentleman to confine himself to the motion before the House.

Mr. CASEY. The question before the House is a sub-amendment moved by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. It has not been put.

Mr. CASEY. We have been discussing it without being called to order by yourself, Sir, or anybody else, and as the two amendments involve the same question, my remarks are *à propos*. They both imply there is a necessity for change. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) says there is none, and I wish to point out that there is; and therefore my argument is applicable to both those amendments, because if there is no necessity for change, neither amendment should be made. Sub-section 5 says: "Any person who is the *bona fide* occupant of property within any such city or town or part of a city or town, of the actual value of $300, whether such occupation is under a license of occupation or agreement to purchase from the Crown or from any other person or corporation, or exists in any other manner except as owner or tenant." These last words destroy the hon. gentleman's contention, the *usagers* do exist either as owners or tenants. Some hon. gentlemen contend that they should be classed as owners, some, as tenants. It is agreed they must be one or the other, and therefore they do come in under this clause. I wish to ask the hon. the First Minister if they are to be excluded from having a vote. There is a consensus of opinion that they should have a vote. The intention as regards property qualification is to ensure that every person to whom the franchise is given has a stake in the country. The *nu propriétaire* is undoubtedly a person having a stake in the country, and I should like to know why it is intended to exclude him from the franchise which is given to an occupier of land.

Sir. JOHN A. MACDONALD. No one is excluded from the franchise who has had the vote heretofore. This Bill continues the franchise to those who heretofore possessed it, and its only effect in that regard is to extend it further than that under which we now sit here. The *propriétaire* is the person who has the property, of course.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, besides the amendment which my hon. friend before me (Mr. Langelier) has placed

in your hand, there was an amendment moved by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard).

Mr. CHAIRMAN. It was not put.

Mr. MILLS. It may not have been put from the Chair, but, if an amendment is sent into your hands, of course it will be put from the Chair. The hon. member who moves it, cannot withdraw it without the consent of the committee and, before you put the amendment of my hon. friend, the rules of the House require that that amendment of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier should be put. If he was not satisfied with his amendment and thought it ought to be withdrawn because it was defective, he should have asked permission of the committee to witdraw it; but, since I heard the hon. member make the declaration and saw him send the amendment to your Chair, it seems to me that, before you put the amendment of my hon. friend, you should read the amendment to the amendment made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, in order that the committee might become acquainted with its provisions. We did not precisely catch the force of that amendment, and therefore it is desirable that we should hear it, but, if the hon. gentleman is desirous to withdraw it, the consent of the committee must be had.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I have not got the amendment.

Mr. MILLS. I think it would be irregular and unusual to proceed with the amendment in your hands when another amendment was moved and put in your hands. The hon. member ought to have returned that amendment to the Chair.

Mr. BLAKE. It could not leave the possession of the Chair. An amendment moved by an hon. member cannot leave the possession of the Chair except by an act of violence or fraud.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. LAURIER. I see that the Prime Minister will not accept the amendment of my hon. friend.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not mean the amendment of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier; I mean that of the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier); and the reason he gives is that the Bill is simply the law as it stands at present; but the hon. gentleman thinks proper to amend the law as it stands at present, and, after the discussion which has taken place, he must be convinced that the amendment of my hon. friend meets a difficulty which exists. Two of the hon. gentleman's supporters from the Province of Quebec differ on the interpretation of the law, and it would be only due to the House to meet the difficulty. We are to appoint judges to make the list, and these very difficulties will come before them. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier will make one contention, and the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott) will contend the very reverse. How is the revising officer to meet that contention? It seems to me that this amendment ought to be accepted.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier moved an amendment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. MILLS. There is no question until that amendment comes. That amendment is the question. No other amendment can be put until that is here.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Hon. members will observe that the Chairman is desirous to do what is regular, and I am sure he will not insist on himself performing an irregular act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Here is the amendment. It was on the hon. member's desk.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. It is moved by Mr. Girouard to insert the words "lessee *par bail emphytéotique*" after the word "*usufructuaire*" in line 13. Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the amendment?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Lost; carried.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think the noes have it.

Mr. LANGELIER. This amendment would not meet the case at all.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I have put the question.

Mr. CASEY. No, Mr. Chairman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MILLS. The question has not——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I have declared that I think the noes have it.

Mr. MILLS. This committee has not been asked if they were ready for the question, and that is the first step in order that they may not be taken by surprise. I think that the amendment cannot be put until the committee are asked, are they ready for the question?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I never heard that before.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I asked the committee whether this amendment should be adopted and I said: I think the noes have it, I am in the judgment of the House. If you ask that the yeas and nays be taken, that is another thing, but I cannot go back on my action.

Mr. CHARLTON. I noticed that the hon. member for Megantic——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I am in the judgment of the House.

Mr. MILLS. I understood, Mr. Chairman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I now put the amendment of Mr. Langelier.

Mr. CHARLTON. I notice an hon. member——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order, order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I am in the judgment of the House.

Mr. MILLS. I understood, Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment I declared lost. There can be no discussion after the decision of the Chair. The question is now on the amendment of Mr. Langelier.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CHARLTON. The yeas and nays are called, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. No, the mover has not asked for it.

Mr. LANGELIER. I move that after the word "or," in the 14th line of page 1, the following words be inserted, "or whose wife is proprietor or usufructuary;" and that the words, "either in his own right or in the right of his wife" be struck out of the same. It has been suggested that a difficulty would arise on account of this clause being different from the law in the Province of Quebec, and the object of the amendment is to harmonise this definition with the law of Quebec. The words I propose to substitute are used in our provincial law instead of the words "in his own right or in the right of his wife." The law of the Province of Quebec says: "The word 'owner' signifies any one who possesses real estate, or whose wife possesses real estate, whether as owner or usufructuary," while this Bill uses this expression, "in his own right, or in the right of his wife." Everyone acquainted with the law of marriage settlements in the Province of Quebec, knows that there are several kinds of matrimonial *régimes*. There may be com-

munity of property, there may be separation of property, there may be simply exclusion of community. Under these several conditions the rights of the husband to the property of his wife are entirely different. Under separation of property between husband and wife, the husband has no right whatever to the property of his wife; the wife not only retains the ownership of her property, but she enjoys the use of it entirely separate from him; whereas, if community of property exists, then the husband is the manager of the community, and as such he has the usufruct of all the property of his wife.

The committee rose, and it being six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. LANGELIER. When the House rose I was explaining that the object of this amendment is to harmonise this first paragraph with the election law of the Province of Quebec, in so far as it relates to that Province. I was explaining that under the *régime* of a community of property, the wife retains the ownership of her property, but the husband has the management of it. There will be no difficulty in his having a right to vote on that property under this law as it is, because he would be considered as a usufruct of the property of his wife, as representing the community. But if they are separated as to property, the husband has no right whatever to his wife's property; the wife is a single woman, so far as her property is concerned, and the husband would have no right to vote on that property. Under the law of the Province of Quebec the husband has a right to vote on the property of his wife, but then it is stated that he shall have the right to vote, whether he is himself the owner, or whether his wife is the owner, which would include the case of a separation of property. But as this Bill is drawn up, it would not give the right to vote to the husband on the property of his wife; while, if it is intended to give him the right to vote on the property of his wife under the *régime* of a community of property, these words in the paragraph are useless, because it would be included under the word "usufructuary." The object of the amendment is to bring this clause into conformity with the electoral law of the Province of Quebec.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I do not see that it is necessary, in order to protect the right of the husband to vote on his wife's property, to change the section as it now reads. It has the same effect as the provincial law. We are not here to decide under what community the wife is under marriage. She may be *en communauté de biens*; she may be separated as to property; she may have the right to administer her own property. The law does not define under which *régime* she may be in order to entitle the husband to vote on her property; and when the Bill says that the husband shall have the power to vote on his wife's property, that means the same as the provincial Act.

Mr. LANGELIER. It is not the same. The husband who is separated as to property from his wife is not, in any respect, the owner of the property. He has no right whatever in that property, any more than in that of his neighbor. If it is proposed to give to the husband the right to vote on his wife's property, the clause must be drawn up in a different form.

Mr. DESJARDINS. When the Bill states that:

"If such proprietor be a married man, it means the proprietor in his own right or in the right of his wife, of freehold estate, legal or equitable, in lands and tenements held in free and common soccage, of which such person is in actual possession or is in receipt of the rents and profits thereof."

I do not know what that means if it does not mean that the husband shall vote on the wife's property.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not think the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) apprehends the objection of the hon. member for Megantic. In the Province of Quebec a man and wife are either separated as to property or have community of property. Take the first case. Suppose a man and wife have community of property. The wife's property then is under the management of her husband. Under this Bill he would be qualified to vote, because he would be owner of it by right of his wife. Suppose they were separated as to property. Then the husband would have neither possession nor management of it, nor any right whatever to it. He cannot, therefore, vote upon the property. The intention clearly is to give the husband the power to vote upon property belonging to his wife when she is separated as to property; but the Bill does not secure the object which it is intended to attain.

Mr. FISHER. Is it the intention of the Government to provide that a man, when his wife is separated as to property, shall have the right to vote? If that is the intention of the Government, they should express that intention and have it thoroughly understood. This Bill and the Quebec Act are entirely different. The member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) seems to think they are the same. Anyone who reads them carefully must see that in the one case it covers husbands whose wives have property in their own right, a right which places the property entirely out of the power of the husband; whereas, in the other case it only applies to owners of property belonging to the wife when the wife is not separated as to property. It is due to the committee and especially to members from Quebec that the Government should declare what they mean by this clause. If it means what seems to be intended, let us understand it; but if it means exactly the same as the Quebec Act, let us understand that such is its meaning and insert language to express it.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I admit that the wording of the provincial Act is more clear. The French translation reads so as to state that the wife being owner of the property is qualified by that fact to vote on the property. Will the hon. gentleman pretend that when the property is owned by a wife although not *en communauté de biens* she is not the real proprietor of it?

Mr. LAURIER. Yes, but she has the administration of it.

Mr. MILLS. It is not simply for the Government to determine this matter, unless the committee abdicates its functions and is willing to accept the decision of the Government, whatever it may be. It is for the committee to determine what clause shall be adopted in regard to the qualification of electors in the Province of Quebec. It is perfectly clear, from what my hon. friends have stated, that if this clause be adopted in its present form, the husband will only have the right to vote when he has a legal interest in his wife's property and when there is community of property; but where that does not exist the husband will not have the right to vote. That, it would seem, is not the intention of the committee, and unless the committee intends radically to alter the present property qualification in the Province of Quebec the clause should not be adopted in its present form. Under the Quebec Act as it now stands, which this Parliament has declared is the law for the Province of Canada, so far as the Province of Quebec is concerned, the husband has the right to vote wherever his wife has, in her own right, sufficient property to have given the owner the qualification to vote. That being the case, the proposition of the Government is, in this particular, to make a very wide departure from the existing law in the Province of Quebec, and unless the committee are prepared to say that a change onght to be made, then, I say that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier)

ought to be adopted. If not, the effect will be to disfranchise a number of people in the Province of Quebec who now have the right to vote.

Mr. BLAKE. I trust that the hon. gentleman will give his consideration to this matter, which is, I think, one of great importance. I believe a large number of married men in the Province of Quebec are married under arrangements by which there is no community of property between them and their wives, and these men have, under the law of the Province of Quebec, the right to vote on their wives' property, notwithstanding that they have not that community of property. The question of community is of no consequence; the man, even if separated from his wife, has the right to vote under the Quebec law as it now stands. I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), that the English version of the clause which we are now discussing would produce the same result. The language here is that an owner means a proprietor or usufructuary, either in his own right or in the right of his wife, but a man cannot be said to be a proprietor, in respect of his wife, of property in which he has no more interest than if it was his neighbor's property; in fact, his wife is his neighbor for this purpose. She occupies no nearer relation, and therefore you are proposing to lay down a law disfranchising a large number of persons in the Province of Quebec who now hold the suffrage. Now, is there any object in that? Of course, if that is the intention, let us understand it, but if not, there can be no intention to make this discrepancy. I will be glad to hear the observations of the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Coursol), who is conversing with the First Minister, because I am confident that his opinion will agree with my own.

Mr. FISHER. I trust that the First Minister will give us an answer on this question. If he does not, we must suppose that he means to put in the Act what the English version says, and that version says clearly that the owner of property in the Province of Quebec, where the voter is separated as to property from his wife, and the property stands in his wife's name, shall not have the right to vote. The hon. gentleman says that the reason that he does not give married women the right to vote is that their husbands have that right, but by the language of this clause, as it now stands, these men will not have the right to vote. If the hon. gentleman considers that this clause as it now reads is a correct interpretation of the franchise, and wishes to extend the franchise to the class of voters I have named, I think we will have to have an amendment in the direction of the franchise which is now embodied in the Quebec Act. Until, however, the right hon. gentleman expresses himself on this point, we are rather in the dark in our argument.

Mr. MILLS. I think we ought to have some explanation from the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill, or from some of his colleagues. Surely we are not going to here disfranchise a large number of people in the Province of Quebec without warning to them, or without complaints that they have abused the franchise which they now enjoy. It does seem to me an extraordinary proposition, and yet, although that fact has been clearly pointed out on this side by several hon. gentlemen, the First Minister will not venture to undertake to answer the objection which has been raised. Surely it is not the proposition that the committee shall vote down in silence the amendment proposed by my hon. friend, to retain to the people of Quebec the franchise they have at this moment? The position taken by the Government on this question is an extraordinary one. We are here undertaking to deal with a question which has never been submitted to the people, upon which their views have not been sought, upon which their opinions have not been had, and now it is proposed to make a radical change in the qualification of the electors in the Province of Quebec. We have one hon. gentleman supporting the Government saying that there is no change being made by the clause, that the law will be left precisely where it is, while the First Minister knows it will not. The hon. gentleman understands legal argument, and he knows it has been made clear beyond controversy, by the hon. member for Megantic and the hon. member for East Quebec, that the effect of his proposition will be to disfranchise a large number of people in the Province of Quebec, and yet he makes no answer. He has neither said that he intends to retain the law as it is, nor given the committee any reason why those people should be disfranchised. Has the hon. gentleman found that those people who have the right of voting upon their wives' interest in certain property, are not qualified to vote? or that they have abused the trust committed to them? Unless he shows that they have done so, I think the committee ought not to support this proposition, but should support the amendment of my hon. friend from Megantic (Mr. Langelier). It seems to me that the burthen of proof is, in this case, on the hon. gentleman who proposes to disfranchise these people, and he ought to give the committee some good reason for taking that course.

Mr. AUGER. I understood that before six o'clock the hon. gentleman stated that this part of the Bill was borrowed from the Quebec law, but it is quite certain that in the English yerson, at all events, its effect will be to disfranchise a number of the electors in the Province of Quebec. Now, I understand very well why there is only one of the other side to speak on this question. On a previous amendment several spoke, but they did not seem to agree; but this time they are sure to agree, as there is only one to speak. If some of the other lawyers on the other side would speak on this clause, maybe they would side with us. The hon. member for Missisquoi (Mr. Baker) is a lawyer, and one of the hon. members from Montreal is a lawyer, and we would like to hear from either of those gentlemen.

Mr. CURRAN. As one member from Montreal, I entirely agree with the remarks of my hon. friend from Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins).

Mr. LAURIER. Surely the hon. member for Montreal Centre will not say that husbands, separated from their wives as to property, should qualify on the property of their wives.

Mr. CURRAN. Leave the law as it is.

Mr. LAURIER. Well, here is the law, as it is in Quebec:

"The word 'proprietor' means he who possesses or whose wife possesses."

Here is the Bill:

"'Owner,' when it relates to the ownership by a male person of real property situated in the Province of Quebec, means proprietor or usufructuary, either in his own right or in the right of his wife."

A man cannot be the owner of his own property and the property of his wife at the same time. His wife has her own property and he has his own property. If it is the intention of the Government to exclude a husband from qualifying on property held by his wife when they are separated as to property, well and good. But if it is the intention to leave the law as it is, the wording is not accurate and ought to be amended.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. member for Montreal Centre says he agrees entirely with the hon. member for Hochelaga. I would like to ask him if, with his knowledge of the English language, he is prepared to stake his professional reputation on the statement that the two clauses—that in the Quebec Act and that in this Bill—mean exactly the same thing.

Mr. CURRAN. If the hon. gentleman wants my opinion on this subject, I will say that I believe that he is talking against time.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman has not answered my question. I ask him to state his opinion, and to stake his professional reputation upon it, and the hon. gentleman tries by a miserable quibble to get out of answering that question. He says I am talking against time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FISHER. Hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House may think I am talking against time; but I wish to find out the true meaning of the words of this Bill. If it passes and becomes law, the question will arise in my own county as to what this means, and I wish hon. gentleman to say what is the meaning and intention of the words of their Bill, since I cannot find out from the words themselves.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. LANGELIER. I have another amendment to move. It is as follows:—

"That all the words in *franc alleu*, or in free and common soccage, be struck out of the 15th line, and wherever they appear in sub-section 1 of section 2."

I will explain at once the object of the amendment; it is to strike out a portion that is entirely useless. This clause makes a distinction between property held in *franc alleu* and in free and common soccage. The two kinds of property exist in the Province of Quebec, I will admit. But since the abolition of seignorial tenure, in 1854, there has been no practical difference between the two. It is a mere technicality; property held in *franc alleu* is not held at all; it is free property, held in the same way as the Crown may hold property, while property held in free and common soccage, according to the law of England, is held direct from the Crown. In some old election laws the distinction might have been observed, but there is no practical difference now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It does no harm.

Mr. LAURIER. It does neither harm nor good.

Mr. FLEMING. I think the amendment ought to prevail, because it strikes me that there will be a marked distinction if these words are retained. There can be no land held in free and common soccage unless a patent has issued from the Crown. There may be a purchaser from the Crown, owning a large tract of land upon which full payment has not been made, and for which no patent has issued; and a person in that position will not be entitled to vote under this definition of "owner," although he may own a large amount of property. A purchaser from the Crown ought to be in the same position as an equitable owner as a purchaser from anybody else.

Amendment negatived.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move that the words, "or her," in the 31th line, be struck out.

Mr. BLAKE. I understood that it was arranged yesterday that these clauses should be taken separately, one by one. Is that arrangement to be departed from?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There was no such arrangement. They were to be taken in the order in which they are. It is one clause. When I or my hon. friend behind me made that motion which would have excluded the motion of the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier), I said I would not prevent any amendment being moved to anything before the motion of my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Townshend). That was the arrangement, but there was no arrangement that every paragraph of the clause should be put. I never heard of such a thing.

Mr. BLAKE. I am afraid my memory differs from that of the hon. gentleman. I suggested to him that we should take clause by clause, because I pointed out that the discussion otherwise would wander over the whole interpretation clause—that the whole of it would be open for discussion as to the interpretation for each Province—and the hon. gentleman said he accepted my suggestion to take each of the conditions of this clause by itself, and he put that first division upon which we have been since that time. You did not, Mr. Chairman, put the whole clause; you put the division, and the committee has been upon and is still upon it, under the arrangement made by the hon. gentleman. Subsequently, it happened that the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend) put his motion. I said I understood that there were some suggestions to be made for amendments in prior lines of the clause, and the right hon. gentleman said that was of no consequence, because they could be taken up after the disposition of the motion of the hon. member for Cumberland. I had supposed we were about to dispose of these considerations, which were to be suggested with reference to this portion of the clause, before proceeding to any other portion of the clause. That certainly was my understanding yesterday.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I never saw, nor has the hon. gentleman ever seen, portions of a clause put in committee; the clause stands as one, and it is put as one. I agreed, and it was reasonable I should do so, that each of the definitions should be taken in order. If there are any other motions to be made after the 24th line, after we get through they can be made. You do not take a solemn vote on each.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend behind me has some proposition to make in reference to this first section. It is as well we should understand the order of procedure. Does the hon. gentleman propose to make this motion which is for the second division, and then that we should go back to this, the first division.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I waited for a reasonable time to see if there was any motion made as to the first paragraph. If there is any other amendment to be moved to the first paragraph, let it be moved now.

Mr. BLAKE. That is all I want.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is quite a different thing to saying we should vote paragraph by paragraph. Of course, we do not vote paragraph by paragraph.

Mr. BLAKE. That is a matter of form. I do not care to have a formal vote upon each paragraph, but upon that point I wish to read what took place. The hon. gentleman began by saying that in the second interpretation clause he proposed to move an amendment to the paragraph relating to persons. The hon. member for Bothwell said: "There are many other points in that interpretation clause before that one, and it would be well to know precisely the way in which the hon. gentleman proposes to proceed." I said: "I think we will have great confusion, unless the hon. gentleman takes each clause by itself in the order in which they occur in the Bill. There are many important points preceding this one, which may elicit much discussion." The right hon. gentleman then said: "Perhaps so. The suggestion thrown out by the leader of the Opposition is a good one, and I shall adopt it. Say we take the first clause." So I understood we were taking the first clause.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well; but I understood I was challenged for not having a formal vote on this first paragraph.

Mr. BLAKE. I certainly understood it was to be in that way, because I do not know how else we can determine how we are to reach the end of the first clause.

Mr. LAURIER. I propose to substitute the clause in the Quebec Act for this one. I beg, therefore, to move the following amendment:—

That the whole of sub-section 1 of section 2 be struck out, and the following substituted therefor:—The word "owner," in the Province of Quebec signifies any one who possesses real estate, or whose wife possesses real estate, whether as owner or as usufructuary. Whenever one person has the mere ownership of real estate and another the enjoyment and usufruct thereof to his own use and benefit, the person who has the mere ownership shall not be entitled to vote as owner thereof, and the usufructuary shall have alone the right to vote by reason of such real estate.

Mr. CASEY. I am very glad my hon. friend has moved this amendment, and I say so as an Ontario man. I do not pretend to understand or to discuss the points of Quebec law involved in this technical description of an owner, and it is for that reason I am glad to see this amendment moved. I intended to propose it myself, if the hon. gentleman had not moved it. We certainly ought to know what we are doing before adopting the clause in the Bill before us. We have the very highest legal authorities from Quebec, who are present in the House, differing as to the construction of that clause; we find the right hon. gentleman who proposed the Bill apparently very doubtful himself as to its meaning; we, non-legal English-speaking members from Ontario, are consequently utterly in the dark as to what this may mean, but if we adopt the clause, as it stands in the Quebec Act, in substitution for the one in this Bill, we shall know what we are doing. That Act has been in force since 1875, and any misapprehension as to its meaning must have been thoroughly settled before now by judicial decisions. It always takes some years to settle the meaning of any new Act, and it would undoubtedly take some years to settle whatever meaning there may be in the clause before us; but as to the meaning of the clause proposed to be substituted, there can be no doubt. No doubt, also, the electors, the assessors, and those who compile the lists, know what it means, and are therefore saved from errors in making up the lists. Any gentleman who is likely to be appointed revising officer under this law would also know what it means, and would be saved from error in making or revising the lists. I think, therefore, it would be infinitely better for us to adopt this than the other, and I cannot see why the Government can have any objection. It has been stated time and again that the clause in the Bill before us was intended to mean, and, in the opinion of its promoters, does mean, exactly the same as that now proposed to be substituted. Where there are two clauses meaning the same thing, and, in regard to the one, the legal meaning has been settled by decisions, while, in regard to the other, the ablest lawyers in the House differ as to its interpretation, there is no room for choice. It is our duty to adopt the one which has a settled and definite meaning, and those who propose the Bill should be satisfied to accept it, since they say that it embodies the meaning which they propose to put into the law.

Mr. AUGER. I believe it is not the intention of the Government to pass a law to interfere with our rights in the Province of Quebec, and I believe the members from that Province will have no objection to accept the clauses which are now in the election law of that Province, and I feel sure that the members from the other Provinces will not try to force upon the Province of Quebec clauses that may lead to lawsuits. This is a law which is intended to render justice to all the Provinces, and there is one member of the Government who was, I believe, a member of the Government of Quebec when this Quebec election law was passed, and, if it was found then that the definition of "owner" was the correct one, why should the Federal Parliament change that for the Province of Quebec? If you change it, make it the same for the whole Dominion, but if you make an exception for the Province of Quebec, as this paragraph does, why not take the definition which you find in the Quebec law? Then there would be no misunderstanding and no reason for lawsuits. There are terms in this section which I do not exactly understand. Of course, I am not a legal gentleman or an Englishman, but there is one term I do not understand, where it speaks of "property or legal estate." Questions may arise, and when we have to go before the court in regard to a new law, judges may differ in opinion and it may lead to confusion. When the question was put before the House, I was glad to hear members on the other side, from the Province of Quebec, cry "carried," and I hope they will say "carried" to this amendment, and that the members from the other Provinces will not force upon the Province of Quebec a new definition of the word "owner."

Amendment of Mr. Laurier negatived. Yeas, 37; nays, 58.

On paragraph 2,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move that the words, "or her," in the 34th line, be struck out.

Mr. DAVIES. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to accept the vote in committee the other night in reference to woman suffrage as the vote of the House on the question? Personally, I voted along with him on that matter, and I know, from the expressions that fell from some gentlemen on that side of the House, that while they voted to expunge it from the first section *qui quoad*, in defference to the wishes of members from that Province, they were not inclined to vote in that way with regard to the other Provinces. There was a small majority against it, when all is said—51 to 78—in a very small House. I am satisfied that the view of the House is not to prevent women from voting in the other Provinces, though they voted in that way in regard to the Province of Quebec. Does the hon. gentleman intend to abandon the woman suffrage altogether?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman had been in his place, he would have heard me say that, in deference to the opinion of the House, the Government had abandoned that feature of the Bill, and that I therefore moved that the words, "or her," be struck out.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman will remember that some of his supporters—the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron), I think, for one—approved of the principle of woman suffrage, but considered that, as in that first paragraph the question involved had reference only to the Province of Quebec, and a large number of the members from that Province were adverse to it, they should vote against its retention in that first paragraph, but intimated their intention to support the principle with regard to the other Provinces. It seems that the hon. gentleman is in a hurry to abandon the principle to which he was so ardently attached. He assured us that he had given years to the consideration of this subject; that it was his mature conclusion; and now, without giving the rest of the House anything like the time for the consideration of the subject that he has devoted to it himself, he is ready to abandon the principle, when some of his own friends declare their readiness to support it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If I had thought that my adhesion to the clause in the Bill giving female suffrage would have enabled us to carry the measure, I certainly would have adhered to it; but having made up my mind during the discussion that the whole Bill was likely to be imperilled by the sudden turn of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, who deliberately gave up their own opinions and the opinions expressed by their leader, for the purpose of getting, as they thought, a great political advantage—I was not going to fall into the trap.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the right hon. gentleman has no right whatever to say that members on this side have abandoned their principles on that or any other matter. The conduct of the First Minister looks a great deal more like this—that he had no sort of sincere desire to

promote the cause of female suffrage; and it would not absolutely surprise me to hear that that enormous majority of his own followers who deserted him last night deserted him under orders. However that may be, the hon. gentleman may know what influenced his own followers, but he certainly does not know what influences us. Now, Sir, there is very good reason, indeed, why this should be adopted with respect to the English-speaking Provinces, even if our friends from the Province of Quebec—which I believe is the case—do not desire it. There is no doubt whatever that there is, and has been, for a great number of years—I may say for almost 2,000 years, if the hon. gentleman wants to go back so far—a very great difference of opinion indeed between those who belong to what are called the Teutonic races and those who belong to the Latin races, on subjects of this kind. Unless I have entirely forgotten the description given by Tacitus of our Teutonic forefathers, from whom, as everybody who has studied these matters knows, all parliamentary usages are in the long resort derived, this very Parliament of ours is only an expansion, after all, of the Teutonic principle. It is perfectly well known that among the Teutonic races women were in the very highest repute as councillors and advisers. They took an equal share with their husbands in almost all perils and dangers; they even fought side by side with them. One of the greatest and most marked differences between the two races, to which I may say the people of our two chief Provinces, in general, belong—has always been, that the one have recognised the power and value of women as councillors to an infinitely higher degree than even the gallant French have done, to which race our friends from the Province of Quebec belong. Now the hon. gentleman has the opportunity to realise his alleged desires. There is very strong reason to believe that a majority of the English-speaking members of this House are disposed to give the franchise to women—at any rate, in that moderate and restricted degree to which the First Minister proposes to give it. Now, he has the opportunity, if he chooses to improve it, if he is desirous to do so, without in the least imperilling the Bill; because I do not think that the members from the Province of Quebec care very greatly whether woman suffrage be introduced into the other Provinces or not. But here we have the First Minister deliberately abandoning what I may call the sole redeeming clause in his Bill. Here he is giving it up, he is here disposing of the sole original thought in the Bill which he brought down, the only thing which separates and differentiates his Bill from other measures of the kind introduced in past times. Sir, I am inclined to think that last night the hon. gentleman was rather hardly treated by his own followers, and although in most cases I do not feel disposed to sympathise with him, I did feel, to a certain extent, disposed to sympathise with him when I saw, I think, only four out of the 140 who usually support him adhering to his views. I was disposed to offer him, on my own behalf and on behalf of a majority of my friends here, our support against those mutinous malcontents who are robbing the Bill of its sole decoration, of its one redeeming feature, and which, if I may be allowed to parody Shakespeare, compared with it—

> "As shines a candle in a darksome place,
> So does this good clause in this naughty Bill."

I must say that under these circumstances the hon. gentleman shows only too clearly what an exceedingly perfunctory regard he had for women's rights. I may say, Sir, that if he persists in this course, if he makes himself the champion of those gentlemen who, out of deference to the feelings of the people of the Province of Quebec, wish to strike out this whole clause, we can only come to the conclusion that in this, as in a great many other cases, the hon. gentleman had no real regard at all for the rights of those whom he professed to serve.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has a great deal of sympathy for me, I dare say, and he and the other hon. gentlemen opposite have always shown a great deal of sympathy with the Province of Quebec. He is of opinion that this is an innovation on provincial rights, that we should have an electoral franchise which accords in every way with the legislation of the Province of Quebec. Well, the hon. gentleman is not quite consistent. If the hon. gentleman is in favor of provincial rights, as expressed by Provincial Legislatures, I think that the Local Legislature of the Province of Ontario has just passed a Bill, and they have ostentatiously refused to give the ladies the right to vote. And here I expected that the hon. gentleman, like the rest of his party, would have got up and denounced this Bill, upon the ground that it was an infringement upon the provincial rights of the people of Ontario, as expressed in their Legislature at its last Session. They refuse to allow the ladies to vote in Ontario; and are we going to force upon the people of Ontario, are we going to commit such an assault upon the rights of Ontario, as to force upon them woman suffrage? Perish the thought! No; on this question I am acting on the practice, but not on the principle, of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CASEY. The right hon. gentleman has done well to afford us a few minutes amusement in the course of such a serious discussion. It is amusing to see the right hon. gentleman, on this Bill, above all others, posing as the defender of the rights of the Local Legislatures to establish their own franchise. Why, Sir, he proposed, when he brought this Bill down, to over-ride what he must have known to be the opinions of the people of Ontario, and he also must have known that it was contrary to the will of the French-speaking population of Quebec, at all events. He proposed to force that on them; and he admits to-night that the reason why he left this woman franchise an open question was because he feared he could not carry it. He found out, by taking the opinion of his Quebec friends, that they would not support it. Then he takes the first step in constitutional experimentalism; he made the first experiment of leaving this provision of the Bill an open question, to see how it would take, and he found it did not take. Perhaps he knew how it would take beforehand. Perhaps, as my hon. friend suggested, he may have known how his friends would vote; he may have advised his friends from the other Provinces to yield to the prejudices of the people of Quebec on this subject. The slip of the tongue that he made to-night almost leads us to that impression, because, when he was speaking of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Cumberland, he said, inadvertently: "I moved the other day." Well, Sir, a slip of the tongue sometimes lets out the truth. I do not suppose he intended to say that "he moved;" but when the mind is not on the watch, the tongue sometimes lets slip a little more truth than the speaker intended. I have very little doubt that the hon. member for Cumberland moved, with the hon. gentleman's sanction, if not on his direct suggestion, the amendment to strike out this clause. It was a peculiar position, certainly, for the father of that proposal to take, that in making a provision for his child's future he should have "arranged, even before its birth, to have it farmed out to a committee of this House," as the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Platt) expressed it. The committee has dismembered that child. He began by destroying so much of the provision for woman suffrage as applied to the Province of Quebec. What does the proud parent of this grand policy of woman suffrage do, when the child of his love and affection is thus maimed? Does he turn round and shake his curls at his followers, and call on them to rally to the support of his beloved child? No. He turns and slaughters the infant with his own hand! He comes before us to-night and gives that measure the *coup de grâce*.

He admits that those followers who declared by their votes that the policy he propounded was not a wise one were correct, and instead of turning round and cowing them into submission he slaughtered, with his own hand, this clause to which they object. He said: We deliberately give up our opinions and will not risk attempting to carry the provisions in the clause in the face of our own mutinous followers. He charges us with inconsistency. Who, on this side, gave up their opinions? Can the hon. gentleman name one who spoke against the proposal and voted for it? This side was much more divided on the question than was his own side. We divided according to our own individual opinions. Some spoke in favor of the proposal, as I and others did, and voted for it; and there was no inconsistency between speech and vote on the part of any hon. gentleman on this side of the House. On the other side the unanimity that prevailed in opposition to the hon. gentleman's professed opinions on this subject made it appear as if some hon. gentlemen must have suppressed their opinions for the nonce; but the very fact that we are broken up on the question showed that we followed whatever opinions we entertained on this important subject. To infer that because the House agreed, in deference to the opinions of the people of Quebec, to strike out this clause, so far as concerns that Province, we should also be willing to strike out the clauses with respect to other Provinces, is altogether too wide and unwarrantable an inference. The hon. gentleman has told us that the Bill lately passed in Ontario did not include woman suffrage. It did not, and that fact shows that the majority of the Legislature of Ontario are opposed to the introduction of woman suffrage. It would, of course, be over-riding the opinion of the Legislature to put it in force; but no more so than to carry out the hon. gentleman's original intention of introducing it in Quebec. I do not know how far the question has been discussed in any other Province. Although the opinion of the Legislature of Ontario, for the time being, is opposed to woman suffrage, that is no reason why the minority in Ontario, who are in favor of this principle, should not have an opportunity of speaking and recording their votes in its favor. It is no reason why the question should not be discussed with special reference to that Province, so as to have an effect upon its public sentiment. Very probably the reasons for not taking more notice of the demand for female suffrage in Ontario were the reasons urged by us against this whole Bill. In fact, I think I remember an account of an interview between Mr. Mowat and some ladies who favored woman suffrage, in which he expressed reasons similar to those I am about to give for not incorporating that principle into the Ontario Bill—namely, that it was a question which had not hitherto been much discussed by the people, and one which had not been submitted at the general elections to the people for their decision. That argument would apply to Ontario at that time. It would equally apply here at this time, and equally to this whole Bill. We are proceeding in a revolutionary manner, making important changes without having obtained the opinions of the people at the general elections; we are taking away from bodies of people the franchise, although we have not obtained their opinions in regard to it, and we are extending the franchise without consulting those who exercised the voting power at the last election. This extension took place in Ontario, but the question of an enlarged franchise was largely discussed there at the general election. It has not been so with respect to this House. When the First Minister is taking such an irregular and unconstitutional course, it is rather amusing to hear him taking small constitutional points against the adoption of female suffrage for Provinces outside Quebec.

Mr. TROW. I regret exceedingly that the First Minister has abandoned his position. I think his argument in moving the first reading was that women had a right to the suffrage was sufficient to convince me that it was essentially necessary that this provision should become law. I had been under the impression that any Government bringing down an important measure should sink or swim by the measure itself. I am rather surprised that the Premier has been so vacillating in this respect. What has brought about this extraordinary change I cannot say. I can easily understand why some of his supporters from Quebec should have opposed this principle; but that provision being expunged, as regards Quebec, since its introduction, I see no good reason why we, in Ontario, and the people of the other Provinces, should not secure the privilege of having ladies voting at elections. I do not know any class of the community better qualified to exercise those rights than are the ladies of Ontario. Of late years our educational institutions have enlightened our ladies very much. As a rule, we have ladies' schools in every city and town in Ontario, and there is an excellent ladies' institution in this city, as in various other parts of this Dominion; and the ladies are now occupying prominent positions in the State which they did not fill until recently. We find lady telegraph operators, we find ladies in the medical profession, and in some parts of the continent acting as lawyers, and engaged in almost every avocation of life and doing service to the country. Why, then, deprive them of the privilege of the franchise, one of the dearest rights we possess. I regret exceedingly that the Government, after the Premier has stated his intention to pass this measure, should have concluded to expunge this provision with respect to female suffrage. I hope the matter will be reconsidered. I think the House is favorable to its adoption, or at least a very large number of the members are favorable, judging from the speeches they have made during the last few days in regard to woman franchise. I should think that he would conclude that the representatives, at all events from the Province of Ontario, are favorable to according that privilege to ladies. There has been no factious opposition in this matter on the part of the Opposition in this House. It was only to confirm hon. gentlemen on that side, who are diametrically opposed to that clause being inserted, particularly hon. members from the Province of Quebec, that speeches have been made on this side in favor of ladies suffrage. It has been alleged by some that to give the right of the franchise to ladies would have a tendency to draw them from their domestic affairs; but I do not think there is any just reason to suppose it would have that effect. It might have that tendency for a few hours during election contests, but on the other hand, it would be much better for ladies themselves that they were brought out and induced to mingle in the community, and take an interest in public affairs. Ladies, as a rule, do not exercise, as much as they should, the privilege of coming out and hearing discussions on public affairs. I have heard it stated, and I believe it to be the fact, that the lady of our Premier is probably better posted in the political affairs of this country than any other lady in the land, and the right hon. gentleman should be proud of the fact that a lady who stands so high in the estimation of the public is so thoroughly posted; he should be proud of the fact that, in my opinion, there is not a lady in the whole Dominion who is better informed on these matters than Lady Macdonald herself. But why not extend the privilege to ladies? Lady Macdonald has, no doubt, acquired that information by mingling with society, and if we close up every avenue of information of that description to the ladies of the Dominion, we will be doing them a great injustice. I hope, therefore, the Premier will reconsider this matter, and allow the clause to remain in the Bill. Some allege that ladies are more easily influenced than the male sex, but I do not think that the many strong-minded ladies we have in society would be more easily influenced than men. I do not suppose, for instance, that a lady's

vote would be influenced by the sum of $2, or by a glass of whisky, as is stated to be the case as to some male voters. At all events, property should be represented in some shape or form. In the town of Stratford, in the county I represent, there were, last summer, 130 or 135 widows and spinsters holding property, and who had therefore the right to vote under the municipal law. Many of the citizens were anxious to encourage a certain firm to establish a manufacturing industry in that town, by giving them a bonus, and though the by-law was opposed by many of the most wealthy and influential citizens, these ladies exercised their rights in the interests of the town of Stratford by supporting the by-law. We find in many parts of the country ladies have extensive property—perhaps thousands of acres—which are unrepresented at the polls, though the widow or the spinster who holds such property may be well educated and otherwise qualified to exercise the franchise. I have here an excellent article written by Millicent G. Fawcett, wife of the late Postmaster General of England, and as it is not very long and is a very able article, I shall read it. (The hon. gentleman read the article in question, in favor of conferring the franchise on women).

Mr. McCALLUM. Will the hon. gentleman come down to the front so that we may hear what he has to say. We are quite anxious he should be reported in *Hansard*, so that the people of the country may know how he is taking up the time of the House.

(Mr. TROW continued to read the extract.)

Mr. HICKEY. I call the hon. gentleman to order. I think it is pretty clearly laid down that no gentleman has a right to get up and read a whole book or pamphlet. An hon. gentleman is allowed to make a speech, and to make quotations in support of his speech, but not to read interminable extracts, and simply to interject a few remarks to modify the speech he is reading from a book. It is quite absurd. Any child could get up and read a book and here and there interject a remark; but I think it is too bad if we have to submit to this sort of thing any longer.

Mr. MILLS. I think my hon. friend is quite in order in the course he is is taking. The hon. member for Niagara, in a former Parliament here, read, I think, one hundred and odd pages of Macaulay, in illustration of the propriety of adjourning the House, and the point of order was considered then, and it was held that he was in order; and a former member of the old Parliament of Canada, who was afterwards Speaker of the House, Sir Henry Smith, proposed to read to the Parliament, and actually began reading, the seven volumes of Clarendon's "History of the Great Rebellion," and he was held to be in order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I would ask the hon. member whether he is reading an extract.

Mr. TROW. An extract.

The CHAIRMAN. I think it is an abuse of the privilege when a member occupies the greater part of his speech by reading a whole essay or a speech through. It is taking up the time of the House, contrary to the meaning of the rule and of the interpretation which I would put upon the rule, prohibiting the reading of newspapers, except as extracts. It is an abuse of the rule, which I shall endeavor to apply.

Mr. TROW. I shall submit to your ruling. There are a few remarks further, which are quite pertinent to the question at issue. They are closely connected with my opening remarks, and if the hon. gentleman says that anyone can read, I question very much whether he can read himself. It is only an extract that I wish to read.

The CHAIRMAN. I have ruled that the hon. gentleman is entitled, by the rules of the House, to read extracts; but to read continuously I consider an abuse of the rules. If the hon. gentleman concludes reading an extract, he will be in order, but to extend his remarks, by reading the length of time that he has been doing, is an abuse of the rules of the House.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). If he ought to stop at any time, it is when you have decided that he is abusing his privileges.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The night before last the Chairman ruled against my rising to address him after he had given his decision, but he has permitted the hon. gentleman from New Brunswick to do what he put me down for the other night.

Mr. VAIL. I do not differ from the ruling of the Chair, but I say that it has been ruled, in this and every other House of Parliament, that a member has a right to read extracts. The Chairman has stated that it is quite proper to read extracts from either books or papers. Every rule of this House may be abused, but at the same time no gentleman is out of order in abusing the rule.

Mr. TROW. If there is one gentleman more than another who wishes to observe the rules of this House, it is myself. I do not often trouble you, and I am surprised that hon. gentlemen opposite are not willing to allow me to read an extract from the pen of one of the greatest female writers in England. I propose to conclude my remarks by reading a short extract from the writings of Mrs. Fawcett.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). I rise to a point of order. I understood the ruling to be just now that the hon. gentleman was abusing the rule in reading so long.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). No.

Mr. LANDRY. If the Chairman says I am wrong, I will take my seat. If I am not wrong, then I want that ruling to be adhered to, and the hon. gentleman is out of order in continuing to read from the same author.

Mr. MILLS. We may just as well settle this question now as later. I understand the rule to be this: It may be an abuse of the privileges of members to speak seven or eight hours, but there is no rule of Parliament, so far as I know, that prevents a member speaking as long as he chooses, although it may be an abuse of the rule for him to continue to speak. There is exactly the same rule with regard to reading extracts. The length of the extracts is not a question at the discretion of the Chairman, but of the member who is addressing the Chair.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). The hon. gentleman is out of order in arguing against your ruling.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. No, he can argue.

Mr. MILLS. Now, my hon. friend was reading these extracts in support of his contention that the suffrage ought to be granted to women, and whether they be long or short he has a right to read them. It is possible for a member of this House to abuse his right to speak, and make an unnecessarily long speech, but he is still within his right, and he does come within the rule you laid down a few moments age.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If the interpretation of the rule, as given by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), is to be adhered to, it will lead to the most absurd conclusion to which any deliberative assembly has ever been led. Such a rule would never have been followed in this manner in England. I regret to have to say it, but I think this House, in its conduct since the discussion of this Bill began, has merited the deserved contempt of the people. We had yesterday presented to us in this House a spectacle that was most absurd and most discreditable——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am perfectly in order. I say that we have given to the public a spectacle of a deliberative Assembly violating not only its own rules, but the rules of common sense, to such a degree as rightly to deserve public condemnation. We have been using the public money—for what? To recite whole volumes, that sometimes those reading them could really not understand, because the books were on different subjects from those with which the speaker was dealing. The rule is this: An extract can be given from any book by any speaker to support his view or express any idea he possesses. The speaker expresses an idea, and in order to give more force to it he reads an extract on the question he has been treating, and which he desires to be explained. Here a member is reading a book, not upon what he has said but on the general question—a book which every man can go to the Library and read, a book which every hon. member could easily obtain. The hon. gentleman had better say: I quote from such a book which can be found in the Library, from page so-and so to page so-and-so, and that book expresses what I am unable to express. I say that if the rule, as laid down by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), were good, any man in this House, with sense or without it, can get up with a book of 400 pages and proceed to read from page 2 to page 399, and be within the rule of reading extracts as interpreted by the hon. gentleman, because he has not read the whole of the book. It is for this House to make its own rules. It is for the Chairman to say: You have been reading generally from a book treating on a general question; you have not been reading a quotation, but reading a speech written by another; you have not the right to do it; you must be restricted to discuss within reasonable limits the subject before the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is not a new question to us, although it may be a new question to the Secretary of State, who is almost a new member. I have had the pleasure of being present at similar discussions before, and I recollect exceedingly well that not only the then member for Niagara, but a good many other members, some of whom are in this House to-day, adopted precisely the same practices and were sustained by the Speaker at that time, in opposition to remonstrances addressed by us, and I very clearly remember that those remonstrances were very much of the same character as those now addressed by the Secretary of State to you, Mr. Chairman. The rule laid down was this, and I think the House will see the reason of it: The Speaker had only to declare whether any particular extract was or was not relevant to the matter under discussion. If an hon. gentleman chose to take any book and read matter which was clearly not relevant to the question before the Chair, then the Speaker ought to call him to order. But so long as the extracts read were perfectly pertinent to the question, then it rests in the discretion of the member himself. I do not think the hon. member behind me would have at all exceeded that discretion. He was almost at the end of his remarks when he was interrupted, and but for the interruption he would have been through at this time. But the rule has been settled over and over again, and that is, that so long as the extracts are pertinent, the hon. member is in his right in making them.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I thank the hon. knight for the compliment of calling me a new member; but I may say that for seventeen years I was a member of a Legislature where I learned something which might be useful knowledge to the hon. gentleman. The first thing I learned was common sense, and that the rules of the House were to be interpreted according to common sense, and not be carried to absurd conclusions, and according as honest, decent——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I say that the rules of the House were to be interpreted in the manner in which honest and intelligent members would interpret them. In the Quebec Legislature I am perfectly sure this would never be allowed, and it would never be attempted, to take a book and read eleven pages on the general subject on the pretence that it is nothing but reading an extract.

Mr. DAVIES. The rules of the Legislature of Quebec are, no doubt, very good for the guidance of that House, and no one would find fault with them. The hon. gentleman will, however, see that the rules of that Legislature are not precedents for the guidance of this House. This House is guided by rules laid down by itself and by the Parliament of England, and we have the rule applicable to this case laid down in express terms. I need not quote it. Before 1840 it was doubtful whether this practice could be followed. It was then settled by the Speaker of the House and by the whole House, that it was perfectly in order to read extracts from books and newspapers, and that there were certain limitations.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. I think those limitations are very sensible ones, and they mark what is common sense practice and common sense limitation. I will show how very far the common sense limitation of my hon. friend, the Secretary of State, goes. His limitation is to be, according to the mind of the Chairman of the committee for the time being. That would be a limitation to which this House would never assent. The extract must be pertinent to the subject matter of debate. The Chairman of the committee cannot over-rule the decisions of the Speaker and of the House, and of the books of authority which he has to guide him in his decisions. I further say, it would never do for a majority to put limitation upon the time an hon. member should occupy in addressing the House. Half an hour might be placed as a limit, or perhaps twenty minutes, or perhaps ten minutes, and the majority might decide that the House would adjourn at a certain hour to-morrow, and that there should be no further debate. There is no more precious privilege we possess than the right of debate. And it is laid down, that so long as an hon. member reads extracts pertinent to the question under discussion he cannot be stopped. That rule is laid down in May, page 362. [Rule read]. A learned gentleman who wrote a book on parliamentary procedure and practice in Canada has admitted that, and laid it down in broad and general terms. He says that it is now in order to read extracts as part of a speech, provided that a member in doing so does not infringe on points of order. And he says there are certain limitations to this. He goes on to show that the extract must be pertinent, and that it must not be part of a previous debate during this Session. Subject to these two limitations, an hon. gentleman is perfectly in order in reading any long extract, and the position taken by the Secretary of State is one which this House will never submit to, because it places it in the hands of an arbitrary majority to decide what shall be said and what shall not be said. I had the advantage of being near the hon. member, and I listened to the extracts. They were very pertinent, and nearly every sentence was relevant. The Secretary of State, no doubt, could not hear.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did hear.

Mr. DAVIES. I think hon. gentlemen opposite could not hear, because of the noise. The noise is so great that unless a man has a voice like thunder he cannot be heard.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I listened to the hon. member, and I counted the number of pages of the book as he turned them over. I have not pretended to import here the rules of the Legislature of Quebec; but I have said that if, in England,

and I challenge any hon. member opposite to deny it, such a course had been pursued as has been pursued here, for the last thirty-six hours, the man who attempted it would have made himself the laughing-stock to the community. I say that when—not for the purpose of reading extracts, but for the purpose of reading treatises, or of manufacturing the semblance of a speech in reading books on the question—hon. gentlemen only wish to take up the time of the House, not only the precedents in England, but something better than precedents, the common sense, which should be a rule in this House as in every other House, supports the position I have stated.

Mr. MITCHELL. As the two great political parties in this House have both gone wrong, and are wasting the time of the House, and sacrificing public money, I feel it due to the public interests that I should make a few observations. I think the proceedings of the last few days were anything but creditable to an intelligent Parliament, such as this country possesses, and I do hope that after we have had our fun and amusement, after we have endured these long-continued night sessions, we are not going to have a repetition of scenes which, if our constituents had an opportunity of looking upon, certainly many of us would not be sent back by them. What are the facts? It is well known that a battle is going on between the two great parties. Thank God, I stand free of both of them; I look on this question of the franchise in a different position from the group of hon. gentlemen who sit around me, whom I respect, and among whom I have many friends, and very differently too, from hon. gentlemen on the other side, many of whom, I know, esteem me highly, though I may not agree with them. I hope that we have seen the last of this manner of conducting the public business, and I hope that, with a view of forwarding the business which is before Parliament, it will not be said to-night, as was said by an hon. member the other night, that the reason he did not read more extracts was that he had gone to the Library, but found that some person had taken away all the books, so that he was not able to read them, or else perhaps he might have read us the whole Library. I would be the last man in the House to restrict the freedom of public debate. No man would stand up for that freedom in a more determined manner than I would, or with more sincerity, and endeavor to observe those liberties we possess and that freedom of expression of opinion which I am proud to say we exercise in this country.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the Grand Trunk?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes; the Grand Trunk, or any other question of public interest; and if any other great public corporation owed this country $46,000,000, as the Grand Trunk do, I would talk to it as I do to the Grand Trunk. What is the question under discussion? It is not the question of woman suffrage, for that question was settled last night.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. I appeal to the Chair if I am not right.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. It is a question of order.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is a question of whether the word "her" shall be struck out of that section, in order to make it harmonious with the rest of the Bill. That is the question, and the reading of extracts in relation to the intelligence of women, their superior qualifications for taking part in legislation, or for domestic or family purposes, is not at all in order in discussing this question. I appeal to hon. gentlemen not to waste the time of Parliament by reading long essays or books, which we ourselves can read at our leisure, and the reading of which costs the country thousands of dollars a day, or perhaps an hour. If we are to have a franchise Bill imposed on us—and I may say that I do not approve of it in its entirety—I object to a good deal of it, and when the Bill reaches the proper stage I shall take the opportunity of stating my objections—but let us proceed to make the Bill as perfect as possible, so as to preserve the liberties we possess and give our constituents an opportunity for as free an expression of opinion as possible at the polls. But I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to deal with this question from a practical standpoint, and not take up the time of the House uselessly in reading extracts. If they have to read extracts which are pertinent, let them do so, but not read whole volumes, whole libraries, and thereby waste the time of the House needlessly. And now a word to hon. gentlemen on this side. If an hon. gentleman gets up on the other side, no matter whether he is a bore or not, and I think there are enough of them on that side, as there are on this, no matter whether hon. gentlemen may dislike to hear them talking the twaddle which I must say comes from both sides, let them listen patiently, so long as he does not begin to impose on the patience and consideration of Parliament. If he does, then let them go on making their cat-calls and other music, and if they do they will not find me calling them to order, but if they attempt to interfere with an expression of a man's views and opinions, or attempt to prevent him getting a fair hearing from the House he is addressing, I will do my share in attempting to get him that hearing. With these words, I would ask hon. gentlemen to approach this question so that we will not be here three months more, as we have been here three months already. We cannot afford to wait here until the end of July.

An hon. MEMBER. We will.

Mr. MITCHELL. I dare say you will, but you are as anxious to get home as I am, and we want to get through with the business of the House. The country does not want us to remain here, but to do our business in a business-like manner, and that would be the best recommendation that we could give ourselves to our constituents.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think it is desirable, as the discussion has been renewed with your permission to-night, that our order of procedure shall be defined. I think hon. gentlemen will agree that it is desirable that we should have a rule which applies equally to both sides of the House, and to each individual member of the House.

An hon. MEMBER. Insinuations.

Mr. PATERSON. No, not insinuations; I am referring to a previous ruling by the Chairman. When I spoke the other night, after he ruled on a point of order, he ordered me to sit down, saying I was out of order in discussing a point on which he gave a ruling, and to-night we have observed the Secretary of State repeating himself three times, under precisely the same circumstances as those under which I spoke that night. We have heard the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) talking of the Grand Trunk——

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes, in reply to a remark which was made by an hon. member behind you.

Mr. PATERSON. I am now talking with reference to a rule laid down by the Chair. The Secretary of State talked about the point of order, and admitting that it was not within the province of the Speaker, perhaps, to stop this kind of thing, yet that the country, the constituencies would hold individual members in contempt—he was pleased to say—for doing it. We have seen a discussion of that kind taken up by several members, and permitted by the Chair, in spite of previous ruling, in my case, when he ruled that a member was out of order in rising to make a few remarks after he had given his ruling. Now, after what has been permitted to-night, I may be allowed to refer to the point of order which has come up again, notwith-

standing the Chairman's ruling, With reference to the precedents which have been referred to, I think there is no doubt at all that the rule which some hon. gentlemen on the other side wish to apply cannot at all be applied. The authorities have been given so clearly bearing on the point, the precedents both in our House and in England, the mode of procedure laid down by May, and by our own authorities in this country, show that it is impossible for hon. gentlemen opposite to have the ruling carried out as they desire. Why, Sir, I remember in our own House a discussion which has already been alluded to, in which almost whole books were read. I remember that the hon. member for Lanark read out of a book, page after page, and that the Speaker, who was in the Chair, would quietly remark to him, once in a while, that he hardly thought the quotations which the hon. gentleman was making were relevant to the subject, and then the hon. member for Lanark would reply, "I was just beginning to think so myself," and then he would turn to another page and continue reading. If I remember aright—I may be mistaken—the hon. member for Frontenac read extracts at great length—at all events, many hon. members on that side did. It became a matter of history, and it has formed a precedent for us. I think, therefore, that hon. gentlemen opposite cannot successfully press the point, and I have only to remark again, that they have reached the point which they have reached against the ruling which the Chair has already delivered in the matter.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has hardly made out his case by the quotation he has read from May. He said it was unfair that a majority of this House should declare what was or was not an extract, and that they were not borne out by the precedents established according to May. He went on to say that it would be most unreasonable that a Chairman should have the arbitrary power to say what was and what was not an extract The very quotation he read stated that the Speaker said that the rule was so-and-so, but that the House ruled against him, and that therefore, in ruling the second time, he ruled in harmony with the ruling of the House. If I understand anything about the duties of a Chairman or a Speaker, his duty is to give his ruling; then there is an appeal to the House, and the decision of the House must be final. If that is correct, the House has to decide, and that is exactly in accordance with the quotation from May's practice given by the hon member for Queen's.

Mr. WOODWORTH. There is a page bearing on this question which has not been quoted. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) might have quoted it with great effect, if he had chosen to do so; but he chose to quote another page, which did not bear so directly on the point of order before this committee. The page to which I refer is page 319 of Mr. Bourinot's admirable work on Parliamentary Procedure; and of course it is based on May and other constitutional authorities:

"Relevancy of speeches.—A just regard to the privileges and dignity of Parliament demands that its time should not be wasted in idle and fruitless discussions; and consequently every member who addresses the House should endeavor to confine himself as closely as possible to the question under consideration. If the Speaker of the House believes that his remarks are not relevant to the question, he will be promptly called to order by the former. On such occasions he may very properly suppose that the member will bring his observations to bear upon the motion before the House, or that he will conclude with something that will bring him within order; but the moment there is no doubt as to the irrelevancy of a member's observations, the Speaker will call his attention to the fact."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Hear, hear.

Mr. WOODWORTH. "Hear, hear," say the hon. member for South Brant and the hon. member for South Huron. I ask if any member of this House can rise in his place and quote eleven columns from a book that has very little relevancy indeed, if any, to the subject under debate, and if another member can get up after he is through and read eleven pages more. We are 211 members here, with the Speaker, and if every member of this House can do the like of that, why, Sir, it would be intolerable We had better decide this question right here now, whether members can send pages and messengers into the Library, and get out books which may not contain a page bearing on the subject before the House, and read the whole of those books. Why, we had a member the other night reading the biography of Mrs. Felicia Hemans, the poetess; and after he had read a while, you, Mr. Chairman, decided that he could not do that, and he had to sit down. Here is another case exactly parallel to that, where the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow), after being called to order by the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey), as he was very properly, goes on reading page after page. And it will not do for him to say that what he reads is a tangent to that, it merely touches the subject; it, with force and relevancy, must have to do with the subject; and the moment the Chairman, for the time being, believes that he is not reading for the purpose of elucidating the subject, but for the purpose of losing time, and indulging in fruitless discussion, he should be called to order. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said, just now, threateningly: Withdraw the Bill, and we will stop this; withdraw your Bill, or we will go on bringing books here from the Library, and reading what we like, and we will keep you here until June or July. You, Sir, sitting there as Chairman of this committee, will, I believe, use the power that is given to you by the rules of Parliament, and say that these gentlemen who have come here for the purpose of indulging in fruitless discussion, of keeping this House, as they have threatened——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Yes; I am in order. The hon. member for Bothwell let the cat out of the bag, and when he said threateningly, withdraw the Bill, I say you had the proof of the fruitlessness of the discussion, and an evidence that they intend to keep it up. I ask you to let us have this fight out right here, and decide whether we are to have this idling away of our time, this attempt to baffle true and legitimate discussion. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that there was a similar occasion in 1878—the Letellier matter, I believe, they allude to—when the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) read long extracts. They know that on that occasion a constitutional question was before Parliament, embodied in a set resolution, and that it was only after full notice had been given that that resolution was discussed here. Although I was not in this House then, I think it possible the members did vary from the subject a little; but it was a great constitutional question, on which every member knows the authorities are very voluminous in extent. But here is a question of the elimination of a word from a clause, and upon that these hon. gentlemen go to the Library and bring here biographies of poets and other books in which they can find a word upon the attributes of woman, as an excuse for using those books, and proceed to read them in this House. I say the case has no parallel, and it is not only your right, as Chairman of this committee, but your duty, to see that the rules are obeyed, and that these members shall not act in a way to stop the public business of this country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I was just wondering, Mr. Chairman, if you should follow the rule, and if it had been applied to the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat, what his speeches in this House would look like, if you took out all the extracts. I see the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) looking up authorities. Go to *Hansard* and take from that hon. gentleman's speeches the extracts printed in small-sized type, and tell me what kind of speeches you would have left.

Mr. WOODWORTH. They are relevant.

Mr. PATERSON. Relevant! and I have to tell the hon. gentlemen opposite, as the Chairman knows, that there is not a word that the hon. member for South Perth has read to-night that is not perfectly relevant to the question under discussion. That far, and as far as the hon. gentleman has read the authority of Mr. Bourinot, this side of the House agrees with him. Relevancy must be maintained; it is within the Speaker's right to maintain it; but hon. gentlemen opposite have been seeking to dictate to members what length they shall make their speeches and what length they shall make their extracts. That is something out of their power, and something which, I think, the Chair will not sustain them in.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). The discussion of the point of order has taken a wider range than I thought it would when I raised it, and the point raised has been almost entirely lost sight of. The first point raised was raised on this side of the House, and was to the effect that the hon. gentleman who had the floor was reading, not only extracts, but a whole book. I understood you to decide—and I asked whether I was right or wrong—that the hon. gentleman had, by the length of time he read, abused the rule. Now, the same discussion is going on after that decision. I understood you to have ruled that the hon. gentleman was out of order in reading from this work; and when he got up to speak again, instead of speaking to the question, he made a few observations about some hon. gentleman on this side, and returned directly to the reading of the work, although you had declared that in doing so he was out of order. I raised the point of order that the hon. gentleman was acting contrary to your ruling, and the hon. member for Bothwell rose, not to answer my point, but to discuss the point of order you had already ruled upon; and I asked you if I was not in order in calling the hon. member for Bothwell to order, and you said I was not. I was not discussing the original question, as to whether the hon. member for Perth was taking too long or not, but simply raised the point that you had decided that question, and that, contrary to your decision, the hon. gentleman had returned to the reading of the book. I ask you now, Sir, to decide whether you gave any such decision, and whether the hon. gentleman has not acted contrary to it?

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Woodworth) read a quotation from Mr. Bourinot's "Parliamentary Procedure," but he omitted to read two sentences in that quotation, which completely destroys the position he took. It is always well, when an hon. gentleman quotes, that he should read the extract in its entirety.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. He might have read the whole book as the hon. member for Perth was doing.

Mr. DAVIES. In reading page 49, the hon. gentleman omitted the two most important sentences in the whole page. He gave the sentences that preceded and those that followed, but omitted the two I have mentioned. They are as follows: "The freedom of debate requires that every member should have full opportunity to state, for the information of the House, whatever he honestly thinks may aid in forming judgment upon any question under consideration. It is, therefore, always a difficult matter for the Speaker to interfere, unless he is positive that the member's remarks are not relevant." I have two remarks to make about that quotation. One is, that the hon. gentleman did not deliver it fairly, leaving out the most important point; and the other is, that if he had read the whole, it is not pertinent to the point of order. The question is not about the relevancy of the extract, but of the member's right to read the extract at all. The relevancy of the extract has been ruled upon; the Chairman has ruled that it is relevant, and the question now is, had the hon. gentleman a right to read it?

Mr. BOWELL. In all this discussion we have lost sight of the objection first taken by the hon. member for Dundas. The hon. member for Perth does not very often address the House, and, as a rule, we always listen to him with a great deal of attention and pleasure; but on this occasion he has proceeded to read, not an extract, but the whole essay written by an eminent lady, the wife of the late Postmaster General of England. It was to this that the hon. member for Dundas made objection. Upon that objection, hon. gentlemen have been discussing the question of reading extracts; but this is not a question of reading extracts at all. It is a question as to whether an hon. gentleman has the right to read a whole work through from beginning to end. That is neither the meaning nor the language of the rule laid down in the work written by the Clerk of this House. That rule says distinctly that extracts from papers and books, which are relevant to the subject of debate, may be read; but there is a vast difference between reading an extract from a newspaper and reading the whole newspaper, beginning from the first column and going through to the end, including advertisements. The decision of the Chair is strictly in accord with the authorities on this subject, and I think it is the duty of the House to sustain the Chairman in the ruling he has given.

Mr. MILLS. I do not think any such ruling has been given. It is obvious that the rule which the Chair has to consider is whether the extract is relevant or not. That is the point to be considered, and not the length of the extract.

Mr. BOWELL. It was not an extract at all; it was the whole work.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman says it was not an extract at all. He will see that we would be putting the liberties of the minority of the House in the hands of the majority if we were to recognise such a rule. The question is not whether the extract is a long or a short one, but whether it is relevant.

Mr. TAYLOR. What question is now before the House? Is this discussion in order or out of order?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. There is a point of order being raised, but I do not think the discussion is very orderly.

Mr. MILLS. Hon. gentlemen have taken exception to the extract read by my hon. friend, but they do not take exception on the ground that is irrelevant. There can be no question but that it is relevant. They say, however, that it is too long. I ask them to produce a single authority to show that the length of an extract is under the control of the Chairman or the Speaker. The hon. gentleman might as well undertake to say there was a rule that hon. members should not speak longer than a given time. We are all under the control of the public opinion of the House with regard to extracts as with regard to the length of speeches, and hon. members express their disapproval by having recourse to making extraordinary noises; but to make such a rule as the hon. gentleman wishes to have made, would enable the majority, at any moment, to bring to a close a discussion, if they had it in their power to say an extract was too long. They could have it cut down to a single sentence. It is clear such a power would be a power to destroy the liberty we now possess, and would be contrary to the rule laid down in Mr. Bourinot's work.

Mr. RYKERT. I do wonder at the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) alluding to me and the speeches I have made in this House, because I have always quoted the member for Brant against the member for Brant. Whenever I have found him asserting a certain principle in this House, I could turn up a speech made by him on a former occasion to show that he was inconsistent. That is the reason why

he does not like to ready my speeches, because there he sees Brant quoted against Brant, and Paterson against Paterson. As I understood your ruling, and I saw you looking very attentively at the clock, you thought that time should be considered in regard to a person making an extract. I understood you to say that the member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) had quoted from that book extracts of sufficient length to convince this House of the necessity of considering whether they bore upon the subject or not. I understood that you looked upon the time as the essence of the whole question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. RYKERT. No; of course not. It does not suit the hon. gentlemen now, because they would like, if possible, to weary out this side of the House by reading long extracts. They cannot do it, even if they keep up till next Saturday night. I am prepared to sit them out, and the whole House, if necessary. The hon. gentleman quoted from different authorities to show what the rule is. I will quote from an authority to show that the extracts quoted must be pertinent to the question, and that a member is not allowed to quote a whole pamphlet, but that he must exercise some discretion; or, if he does not, the Speaker must exercise his discretion. I will read——

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is not in order.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) is not in his seat.

Mr. RYKERT. I am ready, when the hon. member for Grey gets through.

Mr. MILLS. Are you reading an extract?

Mr. RYKERT. I do not know why the member for Bothwell is so excited. I will read an extract from Bourke's "Precedents," an authority which is recognised by this Legislature and by the English House of Commons. Upon 9th July, 1885——

Some hon. MEMBERS. 1885?

Mr. RYKERT. July, 1855. That is one point the hon. gentlemen have made. It affords them considerable consolation to catch me once:

"Mr. Archibald Hastie, in making a speech, read copious extracts from a pamphlet on the subject by Mr. McCulloch, and was proceeding to read further, when

"Mr. E. Ball said: 'I rise to order, and presume that it is not usual that gentlemen are allowed to read whole pamphlets as portions of their speeches.'

"Mr. Archibald Hastie justified the course, and was proceeding to read other portions of the pamphlet, when

"Mr. John McGregor said: 'I rise to order, and object to the hon. member reading the pamphlet of Mr. McCulloch.'

"Mr. Speaker said: 'The hon. member for Paisley is quite in order in quoting extracts in support of his own views, providing he confines himself to quotations which are pertinent to the questions.'"

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. RYKERT. I knew that would make them squeal, but wait till I get to the end of it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). I rise to a point of order. I wish to appeal to the Chair, whether the member for Lincoln has not read a sufficiently lengthy extract in regard to his point.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. He has not exceeded.

Mr. RYKERT. Your decision was, I suppose, that the member for Brant was silly, or *non compos mentis*, probably.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. RYKERT. That is quite in order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. RYKERT. No; I will not take it back.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has stated or insinuated——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Stated.

Mr. CASEY. Stated, as I understand, that the hon. member for North Brant was silly, or *non compos mentis*.

An hon. MEMBER. He has only made a mistake in the man, that is all.

Mr. CASEY. I ask for the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman who uses the words *non compos mentis* in regard to an hon. member of this House is not in order.

Mr. RYKERT. I said that I understood you to decide in that way, that he was *non compos mentis*, or silly. If I was wrong in making that assertion, you will consider that I would like to have said so if I could.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order. I understand you to rule that the remark was unparliamentary, and there is no doubt that it is the usage of Parliament that, when one hon. gentleman has made a remark which is ruled to be unparliamentary in regard to another hon. member, especially when it is an insulting remark of this kind, he should make a full and satisfactory apology to the member and to the House before he goes further. I call upon you to require that apology before he goes further.

Mr. RYKERT. I said——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think the hon. gentleman ought to withdraw the expression.

Mr. CASEY. And make an apology.

Mr. RYKERT. I did not wish to insult the intelligence of this House, and if it were unparliamentary to make that statement I withdraw it, but I wish it were parliamentary, and if so I would like to repeat it.

Mr. CASGRAIN. When you have made a ruling, Mr. Chairman, your ruling is your own judgment and is supposed to be the judgment of the House, and we are all to abide by it; and what can be more impertinent and insulting to the House, as well as to the member to whom the expression has been addressed, than to repeat it in an indirect manner. This is adding injury to insult, because it is insulting the ruling of the Chair.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. member is in order.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I am perfectly in order, and I want the dignity of the House to be preserved. If the Chairman is not respected, we had better not sit here at all. I say this, and I call the attention of the Chairman and of the committee to this point, that the hon. member who has spoken last withdrew *pro formâ* the words he had used, but reiterated them afterwards. Any work on parliamentary precedure will show you that he is putting himself doubly out of order to insinuate in an indirect manner what he has been obliged to withdraw in formal terms.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The question of order is well taken by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BAIN. Before this point is decided——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. An hon. gentleman has no right to put hypothetically an insinuation which he, at the same time, withdraws, and in that respect I think the hon. member for Lincoln would do well if he withdrew the expression altogether.

Mr. RYKERT. I am sorry if I insulted the intelligence of the House, but if I could not say what I thought, I withdraw it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). You would not dare say it outside.

Mr. RYKERT. I am going on to quote a high authority, a portion of which I read. You will find this matter of discretion decided as to how long an extract should be. You have already decided that half an hour is full time. I am going on to read the rest of it:

"At the same time, there is a discretion to be observed in making such quotations. It is not regular to quote whole pamphlets."

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) has just read an extract in accordance with the rule I gave previously. The first question I put to the hon. member who was reading very long extracts was, whether it was an extract, and if it were an extract, I said it could be permitted under the rule; though, at the same time, I think that the hon. gentleman is not permitted by the rules of the House to read whole speeches, to make them part of his speech. But the rule of the House allows the reading of extracts, and does not limit their length. At the same time, when an hon. member reads a whole speech, I believe he is infringing on the rules of the House and abusing his privilege. If the hon. gentleman is reading an extract, I cannot call him to order.

Mr. TROW. I submit to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, with pleasure, but I am rather surprised at being called to order by the Secretary of State. This is the first time that I have ever been called to order in this House, but certainly I did not show such stupidity and ignorance as the Secretary of State did the other day, in reference to an appeal from the revising barrister.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is out of order in two points. In the first place, he is not speaking to the question; in the second place, he is using language which is offensive to an hon. member of this House.

Mr. TROW. I submit to your ruling, Mr. Chairman. As a rule, I observe the rules of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw the language.

Mr. TROW. I was unquestionably right in replying to the remarks of the hon. Secretary of State bearing upon my speech.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I rise to a point of order. The hon. member has continued to speak, with the assistance of his friends, without withdrawing the offensive language. He should do that first.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman has heard my ruling. I hope he will abide by it.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Withdraw the language.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Give him an opportunity, will you?

Mr. TROW. In speaking of the stupidity and ignorance of the hon. gentleman, I only used language that is used in our part of the country when people are in error. The other day when the hon. gentleman was speaking about revising barristers, he said that every gentleman in this House must know that there is an appeal from the decision of the revising barristers.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not care very much for the language the hon. has used towards me. But he said that I interrupted him, that I called him to order. I did not interrupt him, and it was not I who called him to order.

Mr. TROW. The hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster) had also something to say with reference to the argument. Why, Sir, that hon. gentleman sang "Old King Cole," three times as long as the extract I read.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order. I did not sing "Old King Cole."

Mr. TROW. In reference to the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), I was rather astonished at him, because he kept us occupied a whole Session talking about Mother O'Rafferty's cow. My object in reading a portion of that history was to convince hon. gentlemen that they were wrong in abandoning that very important clause in the Bill. I was surprised at the vacillating conduct of the Premier, and those who are associated with him, in abandoning the best portion of the Bill, that which gave the ladies the right to vote. Hasty legislation always leads to a great deal of trouble. See what position the country is now in, from their hasty legislation on the license laws. The right hon. gentleman abandoned that bantling of his and gave it in charge of an hon. gentleman who sits along side of him.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman, in my absence, made some reference, and an incorrect reference, to myself, when he said that I spent a whole Session talking about Mother Murphy's cow. I did nothing of the kind.

Mr. TROW. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am not through my point of order yet.

Mr. TROW. I did not refer to Mother Murphy's cow, but to Mother O'Rafferty's cow.

Mr. MITCHELL. The hon. gentleman was incorrect in what he stated. It is true, I made reference to the case of an unfortunate widow woman who had had her cow killed on the Intercolonial Railway.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am in order. I am going to show that the hon. gentleman is wrong in his reference to me. When I presented that claim to the then Government, it was not listened to, and I was resolved that if it took the whole Session I would make Mr. Mackenzie, on behalf of the Government, pay the widow for the cow; and I did it.

Mr. McCALLUM. I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow), who has just been speaking, has been reflecting on the action of this House. He said the First Minister had strangled the proposition in favor of woman suffrage. It was by a vote of this House that the proposition to give the franchise to the ladies was struck out of the Bill. The hon. gentleman has, therefore, reflected on the action of this House, and is therefore out of order. I think he ought to apologise to the House.

Mr. TROW. I think the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) should apologise to the House, because it is evident he does not understand the question.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I wish to say to the hon. member for Monck that the House has not decided by vote as to whether women shall have the franchise or not, and therefore he is entirely in error. The hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow) is quite in order, and the hon. member for Monck should apologise for having interrupted him. The very question before the committee now is whether we shall strike out the word "her."

Mr. McCALLUM. The hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow) has slandered the Premier, because he said he had abandoned the Bill. The hon. gentleman was, in that respect, out of order.

Mr. PATERSON. It is quite true, as I stated, that the House has not decided the woman suffrage question, as the hon. member for Monck has alleged. He has now tried to cover himself by saying that the member for

South Perth must have been wrong in saying that the First Minister had abandoned the female suffrage proposal. The hon. gentleman is wrong again. It is true the House has not abandoned it, but the Premier has abandoned it, because he has moved to strike out the word " her."

Mr. SPROULE. That is not the question before the committee.

Mr. FAIRBANK. It is said that the First Minister has abandoned this clause of the Bill. He has not only abandoned the women, but he has abandoned the whole House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order. I have decided the question of order, and I now call attention to the fact that the amendment is now before the committee.

Mr. TROW. I have a decided objection to women being struck out of the Bill. The ladies act their part with a great degree of intelligence, and I do not know an element of society better qualified to exercise the franchise than the ladies in this country. As a rule, I think they are well adapted to exercise that privilege if they possessed it. I have no objection to ladies taking a seat in Parliament. I think the First Minister would also have no objection, and in that view he would be supported by the Minister of Railways and by the Minister of Militia. I will now proceed to read an extract from an article written by J. E. Cairns, in opposition to Goldwin Smith, in *Macmillan's Magazine*. (The hon. gentleman here read from the Magazine.)

Mr. McNEILL. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has been addressing the House for a considerable length of time, and during almost the whole of that time he has been reading us extracts. I find a ruling on the subject, on page 345 of Mr. Bourinot's " Parliamentary Practice," which I shall read. (The hon. gentleman here read an extract from the book in question.) Now, the point I desire to have your ruling upon is, whether it be in order that, under the color of delivering an oral speech, the hon. gentleman should in reality deliver a written speech, and that of the worst kind, because it violates the very principle by which only oral speeches are admissible—reading a speech prepared, not by himself, but by somebody else.

Mr. TROW. Of course, I do not pretend that I wrote this.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I have ruled already that extracts can be read. I have been listening to the hon. gentleman for the last five minutes, so long as I could hear him, and I do not think that thus far he has transgressed the rule. I must remind the hon. gentleman, however, that if I find that his extracts are not relevant, or that they are not in reality extracts, but the whole of his speech, then I shall call him to order for a violation of the rule. I think the hon. gentleman is interposing some observations of his own, which has put it out of my power to call him to order.

Mr. TROW. I am much obliged to you, Mr. Chairman, for continually ruling in my favor. I wish to say, with regard to the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), that we know why he is anxious that the Bill should become law——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. TROW. The hon. gentleman must know that the revising barrister under this Bill——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. TROW. Why he would not occupy a seat in this House but for the fact——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is out of order. I have ruled in his case, on the other point, that he is in order, and therefore he will please to continue to discuss the question before the House, and not criticise the remarks of the hon. member for North Bruce.

Mr. RYKERT. The third time for you, Mr. Trow.

Mr. TROW. I merely wish to state the position which the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. McNeill) occupies in this House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I rise to a point of order. It appears that some of the Government supporters have come to this side of the House. I wish to see them go to their proper places—they are out of order.

Mr. TROW. I have come nearly to the conclusion of this extract. I hope hon. gentlemen will listen with a degree of attention, for it will only take me till about two o'clock in the morning, and the quieter they are the more quickly I will be through. (The hon. gentleman then proceeded to read a continuation of the extract.) Now, I have several other extracts from eminent writers bearing on this important measure. I do hope sincerely that hon. gentlemen opposite will use their influence with the Premier, and advise him to reconsider the abandonment of such an important portion of his Bill. I know that he is susceptible to their influence, because I am persuaded that it was the influence that was brought to bear upon him from the Province of Quebec that caused him to abandon the provision relating to that Province. We have no objection to allow it to be expunged, so far as it relates to that Province, but we have decided objections to removing it so far as it relates to Ontario. Our ladies are educated, and they would be a desirable element to introduce to the franchise. I did intend to read some other extracts and to make some further remarks, but I may take another opportunity to do so during the night.

Mr. WATSON. I do not intend to occupy the time of the House at any great length or to read any extracts. But I believe that all property ought to be represented in Parliament, and that all women or men who hold property ought to have votes. I believe the extension of the franchise to women would have a good effect on the legislation of the country; as a rule, they are as well qualified to give an intelligent vote as men, and I am satisfied that their votes would generally be found to be in the right direction. In 1879 the Dominion Parliament passed an Act which provided that any person, male or female, who is the head of a family, or any male who has attained the age of eighteen years, shall be entitled to enter for 160 acres, or a less quantity, for a homestead. There are a great many women in Manitoba who have availed themselves of that privilege, and I maintain that the land held by them should be represented in Parliament, and for that reason they ought to have a vote. The Bill before us has no particular attraction for me. The only redeeming feature I could find in it was that it proposed to enfranchise the ladies, and I am very sorry the hon. Premier has signified his intention of having that provision struck out. At present, ladies have a right to vote for municipal officers and school trustees in some of the Provinces, and we have yet to learn that they have abused that right. The effect of giving women the franchise, I believe, will be beneficial at public meetings and in this House. If we went so far as to declare that ladies having votes should be eligible to represent constituencies in this House, there could be nothing wrong, if the electors saw fit, in their sending women to represent them in the House. In other institutions we have representative ladies occupying high positions. We find that they are eligible to practise as physicians. Some of our best school teachers are ladies, and in some of the municipalities the ladies are school trustees, and we have yet to learn that they have not filled the position for which they were elected with credit to themselves. Were they eligible for election to this House, I believe the business

of this House would be carried on in a more respectable manner than it is at present. Hon. gentlemen opposite would not continue their obstruction, by making uncouth noises, such as imitating cat-calls and blowing tin whistles, imagining it is all right because they are not seen. Had women the right to seats in this House those hon. gentlemen would conduct themselves like gentlemen and keep within the rules. The extension of the franchise to women would have a good effect all through the country. We frequently see ladies at political meeting, and we also see them taking great interest in the debates of this House, and there can be no doubt but that they are well able to properly appreciate the questions of the day. I would not go so far as to say that we should give universal franchise to women; but when the Dominion Government recognises the right of women to take up homesteads and own real property, they should also give the women the franchise and enable them to vote or members of Parliament.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not know that I would have addressed the committee to-night if it had not been for a remark made by the hon. the First Minister, who has charge of the Bill. The right hon. gentleman accused hon. members on this side with having turned about on the question. I put it to the common sense of every hon. member of this House, whether there has been any individual who has made a quicker turn than the right hon. gentleman himself. So far as that change is concerned, every hon. gentleman ought candidly to admit that it was altogether needless for him to make that turn; for if he had the slightest anxiety that this clause should pass, he had only to express the wish, and it would become the law of the land. Four-fifths of the members on this side were ready to carry his wishes into effect; and, judging by our experience of hon. gentlemen opposite, the Premier had simply to express his wish to them, and they would have carried it out. I am sorry the hon. gentleman saw fit to withdraw this clause. We have been told, since the discussion began, that this Bill was going to become the law of the land, despite any efforts that might be made on this side. If such is going to be the case, I greatly regret that the hon. gentleman has withdrawn this feature from it, for it is the only decent feature of the Bill, the only one that redeems it from utter reprobation. The question has been raised, whether the franchise was a gift or a right. I hold it is a right. Every freeborn person, under certain conditions, is entitled to its exercise. In this country, unlike some others, we impose a certain test, we require a certain standing of all parties to whom this right shall extend. That test is the test of property. What we require is, that before the right of a man to exercise the franchise shall be recognised or secured to him, he shall be the owner or the occupant of property valued at a certain amount, so that we make property, in all cases, the test of the right to enjoy the franchise. The hon. gentleman who preceded me has pointed out that the Government has recognised the right of women to take up homesteads in the North-West Territory and in Manitoba. I hold it to be an anomaly that, while we make property a test qualification, we do not allow property to be represented when it is owned by a woman. In my own locality, I have a case in my mind's eye at present of a woman, an immigrant, who lost her husband on coming to the country, and was left in charge of a young family; she moved into the bush, and took up some land and managed, with the assistance of kind neighbors, to clear off the land and pay for it; and not only that, but became wealthy. Her children are wealthy, and yet that woman and her property has never been represented in the Legislative Councils of the nation. I hold that that is an anomaly; I hold that if you make property the test, property should be represented. As regards the advisibility of granting the franchise to women, the only possible objection that can be made to it is that there is something to prevent women from exercising it, either that they have not sufficient intelligence or do not take the necessary interest in politics. The only valid reason for refusing them the franchise must be that they labor under some disability. The position of women has immensely advanced within the last fifty or a hundred years. In barbarous countries, woman has been considered the slave of man, and it is one of the best marks of civilisation that respect is shown her in all civilised countries. In what are known as the ages of chivalry, though the ideal woman was the object of veneration, the actual woman was treated as little better than a slave, and she often found the convent the only safe harbor from the brutality of the chivalric knight. All that has been changed, and the change has been marked, in no age of the world, more than in the happy age in which we live. It is not very long ago that women were looked upon as unfit for the profession of teaching, but to-day they form the majority of the teachers in Ontario, and they have proved themselves worthy of the positions which they have won for themselves. Where one female candidate fails as a teacher, three men fail. In other occupations they have been fully successful. I can remember when you would see a great, strong, well-muscled man standing from morning till night behind the counter; measuring out tape and muslin. Now that work is done by females, and they do it much better than men, and it is more in accordance with the eternal fitness of things. In literature, in their own field, at least, they have proved themselves the equals of men; and in Ontario, and I think in some of the other Provinces, the halls of the highest education are being opened to them. The normal schools are as open to females as to males, and in most of the colleges and universities they are allowed to write for degrees, and we have women who have taken their degrees as Doctors of Medicine. There can be no argument founded on any disability of women, so far as business aptitude is concerned; neither can there be as regards their general intelligence. As to their interest in politics, I have met ladies who knew a great deal more about politics than I did, who could teach any gentleman in this House something about politics, with whom you could not talk for an hour without coming away wiser than you went. So far from that having any degrading effect upon them, I believe it has an educating effect, and that it will have an elevating effect upon the practice of politics. In the west, it is very common to see ladies present at political meetings, and I have never seen more attentive auditors than the ladies who attended those meetings, and the meetings were rendered much more orderly and respectable by their presence. By recognising the right of women to vote we do not impose the duty upon them, we do not compel them to engage in political discussions or frequent political meetings; we simply recognise their right to the franchise, and they are at perfect liberty to exercise it or not as they see fit. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) deprecated the long discussion which is taking place on this question. I submit that, for many gentlemen on this side of the House, this is a struggle of life anddeath, a struggle for political life.

Mr. RYKERT. No.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Hon. gentlemen on the opposite side may say no, but that is the intention of this Bill, and though I regret that the claims of women are not to be recognised under this measure, I cannot say that I regret it altogether, because, when you strike that out of the Bill you leave it in its naked deformity, a measure to deprive the people of the right to say who shall represent them in this House, to leave to the Government, by appointing men responsible to nobody but the Prime Minister for the time

being, the power to say who shall have votes and who shall not. If I understand the Bill rightly, it proposes to strike at the seats of the most prominent members in this House. I do not wish to be out of order, so I will say nothing more on that subject. I repeat that this is a life and death struggle which we are making on this side of the House. I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite would like us to take their advice and submit to it quietly, but I want to tell them that we are not foxes, to die in silence; we are going to make our voices heard; we are going to vindicate the right of free discussion, a right for which our fathers suffered in the old land, for which some of them stood in the stocks, and in the vindication of which many of them lost their lives.

Amendment of Sir John A. Macdonald agreed to.

Mr. DAVIES. I called for the yeas and nays before the Chairman declared it carried.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I say the hon. gentleman did not say a word—not one word.

Mr. DAVIES. I will not be contradicted in that way. I tell the hon. gentleman that I did.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I must say that I did not hear the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DAVIES. I called quite loudly, two or three times.

Mr. MILLS. The First Minister is mistaken. The hon. member did call for the yeas and nays.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He did not speak so that the Chairman, or any man on this side, could hear him. A whisper is not a statement. The hon. gentleman did not call for it, and the Chairman waited sufficiently to have heard it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is not courteous to say that a person did not, if the person did. Now the First Minister would be quite right if he said: I did not hear the hon. gentleman say that. But the gentleman did say that, because I heard him say it, although the First Minister may not have heard him. When the First Minister has the word of a gentleman confirmed by the word of a gentleman who sat beside him, and by my word, I think he ought to accept that statement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then, Mr. Chairman, I did not hear it, and I was paying particular attention to the debate. I move that the words, "or her," in the 35th line, be struck out; and you may take a division on that, if you like.

Mr. MULOCK We ought to have an understanding on these points. If the committee has a right to a division it would be well to have it understood at what time they are obliged to call for a division known. If the Chairman may declare a motion carried, although there is a request made for a division, then, of course, the right to have a standing division is overruled. Now let us understand what is necessary in order to have an expression of a more formal kind.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The practice is quite clear. At the cessation of a debate the Speaker, or the Chairman, says: "I think the yeas have it," or "the nays have it." Then is the time to say, "Divide." The Chairman took that course on this occasion, and then he said, "I declare the motion carried." When he says, "I declare the motion carried," it is too late to call for a division. But when he uses the phrase, "I think the yeas have it," then is the time to call for a division.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does not the Minister make a mistake when he says that the presiding officer says it is carried, or lost, as the case may be? I suppose the same rules govern us in committee that govern us in the House. The Speaker will say, "I think the nays have it; I do not say it positively;" and not being sure of that, then we ask for a division. An hon. gentleman over there said: "But you did not do it until after the Chairman declared it carried;" but if the Chairman declared the motion carried, when we were saying "Divide," there would be no opportunity of demanding the yeas and nays at all. I call the attention of the First Minister to the fact that that rule did not prevail on the occasion. I asked for a division, and the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) called for the yeas and nays. I used the word "Divide," and he used the words "Yeas and nays." The First Minister thought, perhaps, there was an attempt to gain a catch vote, but there was nothing of the kind.

Amendment agreed to; yeas, 75; nays, 31.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I desire to make a remark, and it is this: I would call the attention of the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow) to it, as I see he has voted. I have a letter from Col. Williams, in which he tells me—I forget his exact words—that Mr. Trow would not vote because he had agreed with me that he would not vote during my absence when he could not get me a pair.

Mr. TROW. I got him a pair.

Some hon. MEMBERS. What pair?

Mr. TROW. Col. Williams came down to my hotel and asked me to pair with him. I said that other members would pair with other gentlemen who left for the North-West. I had no control over other hon. members, but I told Col. Williams I would see he was paired on each and every occasion on Government measures. I have done so, and some hon. members will bear me out that I have invariably kept pairs with Col. Williams.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am quite satisfied with the hon. gentleman's explanation. But I felt it due to the hon. gentleman that I should state that I had received a letter from Col. Williams, at Swift Current, calling my attention to the matter.

Mr. DODD. I think, in justice to Col. Williams, I should state that I was present when the arrangement between Col. Williams and the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow) was made, when the latter hon. gentleman agreed that, in the absence of any other pair, he would pair with him (Col. Williams) on any and all questions.

Mr. CASEY. I suppose the question is on the definition of the word "owner," as stated in this clause. I want to call the attention of the committee to that definition of ownership.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman cannot go back to the word owner in the second paragraph, because we have gone past that.

Mr. CASEY. I do not want to go back, but I wish to propose an amendment to the whole paragraph. I call attention to the fact that the rights of real estate being within the purview of Local Legislatures, the definitions of such rights are naturally more correctly made by the Local Legislatures. In each Province there are peculiarities, not only in regard to the tenure of land but in regard to terminology used in legal documents. I suggest that the definition of ownership formulated by the Legislature of Ontario in their own electoral Act should be introduced here as referring to that Province. I move in amendment the following:—

But as regards the Province of Ontario the word "only" shall be held to signify a proprietor, either in his own right or in the right of his wife, of an estate for life or any greater estate, either legal or equitable.

If it is ruled that I cannot go back to any word which has been passed, I shall move that it be added to the end of the clause.

Mr. WELDON. I understood that the reply made to the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), the other night, was that that rule would not be insisted on.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That only applied to the first paragraph.

Mr. WELDON. It was on that understanding that we proceeded. (The hon. gentleman then read the report of the discussion on the point in question, as reported in *The Debates.*) Those remarks would tend to show that the arrangement was as claimed by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; it so happened that the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend) moved his amendment immediately after we went into committee, and after an explanation with the hon. member for West Durham it was settled that it should be taken up clause by clause. Then he said that the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier) had an amendment to move which affected an earlier portion of the clause, and came before the amendment of my hon. friend from Cumberland. I said I did not wish the amendment withdrawn at that time, because I wished as early as possible to get the judgment of the House on the question of female suffrage, but I did not wish to cut the hon. member for Megantic out of the amendment he was going to make, before we arrived at that portion of the paragraph, and I said there could be no objection to have that amendment moved, as I did not wish to have him deprived of his proposed amendment. Otherwise, I would have asked the hon. member for Cumberland to withdraw his amendment, and allow the hon. member for Megantic to make his earlier amendment to the earlier portion of the clause. This was only in consequence of what the hon. member for West Durham said, that an hon. gentleman had such earlier motion to move. Now, as we are going on clause by clause, there is no necessity of breaking the rule of Parliament. Hon. gentlemen can see the lines of each clause as they go on——

An hon. MEMBER. But they cannot all rise at once.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course; but by observing the line of the paragraph on which he intends to move, priority can be obtained. (The right hon. gentleman then quoted the rule on the subject of amendments in committee.) That is the practice, and I think we should adhere to it, unless there are strong reasons to the contrary. When we go to the next paragraph, then any hon. gentleman can commence by an amendment to the first line of the clause, and so on consecutively. That would be regular and according to practice, and I think I must call on you, Mr. Chairman, to adhere to the practice.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I have no doubt the hon. gentleman is correct as to the rule, but we certainly, on this side, had a different understanding of the conversation which took place, and which is recorded in *Hansard.* It was understood that, although the hon. member for Cumberland moved his amendment affecting the fourth or fifth line of this clause, that did not prevent an amendment being moved to prior portions of the clause. I think if the rule, as laid down by the First Minister, is adhered to, it will be a great hardship. Several hon. members may get up at the same time, and one may catch the eye of the Chairman, whose amendment is further on in the clause than the others, and thereby the others will be debarred from moving their amendments. In this way important and valuable amendments would be excluded altogether from the consideration of the House. Of course, if the rule applies in that way, we must govern ourselves accordingly and submit to it, but I think that after the language of the First Minister, in reply to the leader of the Opposition, it would be a hardship to apply the strict rules of Parliament to this particular sub-section, because we would be deprived of our right to move amendments at this stage of the measure, and that is something which I should think is not the desire of the Government or any member of the House.

Mr. CASEY. If the right hon. Premier insists on strictly carrying out the rule which prevents going back to prior words in a clause, I shall not put into your hands the amendment I stated my intention to move, because I understand that some hon. gentlemen on this side have amendments to offer to some other lines of the clause, and if I move this amendment, under the strict wording of the rule I suppose they could not move theirs. The right hon. Premier made a very good suggestion—that if notice was given of an intention to move amendments, they should be taken up in their order. It is quite possible for any person, merely for the purpose of obstruction, to get up and move an amendment to the last line of a clause, and thereby prevent anybody from moving any other amendment to the clause. In order to avoid that, I think it would be well for the Chairman to call upon all members who propose to move amendments to state what amendments they intend to move, and then they can be taken up in order. I would like to have the right hon. gentleman's opinion on that suggestion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think it is advisable to commence a new practice.

Mr. CASEY. It is not a new practice.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If we lay down a rule with regard to this Bill, it will apply to all other Bills, and I do not think we should alter the well understood practice of Parliament. I am quite willing to do this: Suppose an hon. member gets up and says, I move an amendment to the second line of this clause, and it is handed to the Chairman, I have no objection that another member should get up and say, I propose an amendment previous to that.

Mr. MILLS. I think the hon. gentleman has to some extent lost sight of the understanding that was had. When he proposed the other day to amend the second clause excluding Chinamen, I was anxious to know whether the hon. gentleman proposed to enforce this rule, with the view of preventing discussion or the preceding portions of the clause. It was not the first clause that was under consideration. The hon. gentleman moved an amendment after the very one we are now considering. Then Mr. Townshend moved an amendment which would have been out of order if the hon. gentleman intended to enforce the rule which he now thinks so necessary. Now, we permitted the hon. gentleman to proceed, although we had amendments to move to this clause. He proposed to strike out the words, "or her," to conform the clause with that preceding it. Did he do that for the purpose of preventing amendments to preceding portions? If so, he is departing from that understanding which was had between himself and the leader of the Opposition, when the discussion of this clause was begun a day or two ago, which was, that no matter what the rule might be, we should have the opportunity of moving amendments to this clause as we proceeded. Are we prevented from dealing with this whole sub-section by the hon. gentleman's amendment? I think not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I made a proposition, in answer to the proposition of the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Casey). He accepted it in the same spirit, and if the hon. gentleman will not agree to that, I shall insist on the strict carrying out of the rule laid down in May.

Mr. MILLS. As I understand the practice in the English Parliament, when various amendments are proposed to a particular section, is to put them all in the hands of the Chairman, and to leave him to arrange them in the order

in which they occur. If the hon. gentleman insists on the rule, we shall of course adopt the practice.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I understand—in case an amendment is moved, and a member gets up and says, I have an amendment to a prior line—that the First Minister is willing that that should be put. That will have precisely the same effect as the practice in England.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It seems to me it would be necessary to follow that course. For instance, suppose the hon. the First Minister found it necessary to make an amendment, he would be excluded himself from the privilege of doing so. I have been thinking of moving an amendment myself, which I might be able to support with arguments that might commend themselves to the House, but I shall be precluded from moving it unless the hon. gentleman will not object to an amendment being offered, say to the 43rd line, after an amendment has been moved to the 45th.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. An hon. gentleman moves an amendment to a particular line, but before his motion is put another man can rise and say: I intend to move an amendment to a previous line; and that will have precedence.

Mr. CASEY. Supposing an amendment is proposed and not carried, will that interfere with an amendment to a prior part of the clause?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. No; the amendment must be carried.

Mr. WELDON. I propose to strike out, in the thirty-fifth line, from the word "benefit" to the word "wife," in the thirty-seventh line. With regard to the word "proprietor," that is not a legal term. It is not used in legal language; it simply means the owner of property. There should be some definition of what it is, whether the person is possessed or is entitled to. I intend to propose to put, instead of the word "proprietor," "the person possessed or entitled to in his or her own right," in the phrase, "in his own right or in the right of his wife, of freehold estate, legal or equitable, in lands and tenements, held in free and common soccage." Would a person who is in possession over twenty years be included? He could not come under the word "occupant." Take the case of a tenant by courtesy. He does not hold, strictly speaking, either in his own right or by right of his wife, because he does not occupy the property until the death of his wife, and then not by the death of his wife, but by the fact of there being issue. The tenancy is not in his own right or in that of his wife, but by the courtesy, under the English law, he holds, because children have been born of the marriage. Under the old feudal law, when the children were minors, the father had to fulfil their duty, and it was therefore considered that he should enjoy the tenancy by courtesy. The amendment I proposed is involved in the woman suffrage question. Formerly, a man could vote on his wife's property, because under the common law he had control of it in many ways, but that law has changed entirely. In the Province of New Brunswick we have for thirty years denuded the husband of the right to his wife's property. The property which she has before or after coverture is free of the husband, is not subject to his debts or to his engagements, and I believe the same law pravails in Ontario, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. Prior to the Married Women's Property Acts, the husband represented the property, but now he does not, and therefore the principle upon which he is given a vote falls to the ground. The principle upon which unmarried women and spinsters were to be entitled to vote was taxation or the representation of property; but that applies to married women also, because they hold property in their own right, which is liable to be taken in execution if it does not pay the taxes. It is not now represented by the husband, and if female suffrage is to be excluded, I do not see why a man who marries a woman who owns $150 worth of land should be entitled to the suffrage if he is not otherwise entitled to it. Then, if he has no interest, no estate at all with regard to the right of his wife to own property, it does not fall within the principle of qualification which is put forward by this Bill, that he is a person possessed of property to the extent of $150 or $300, as the case may be.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I think the objection raised by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) is well taken, and that his amendment ought to prevail. The theory on which the Bill is based is that of a properly qualification—that the voter, with the exception of what may be called the income franchise, must have some interest in real estate; that he must either own land in fee simple or be a freeholder, as the hon. gentleman terms it in his Bill. The theory on which the right to vote is based is that the voter must have an interest in the land, either as the owner of the estate in fee simple, or have some interest in it in some way. The hon. gentleman provides that he must either be the owner himself or claim the right to vote by virtue of his wife's property, because this franchise is based purely on real estate. I do not know what the law is in some of the other Provinces, but in Ontario the husband has no interest whatever in his wife's real estate. Some years ago this peculiar wording would have been correct, and I believe in the old Franchise Act the voter was required to own the property himself or have an interest in his wife's estate. Now, the First Minister knows that in Ontario the husband has no right whatever in his wife's real estate, except in one case, and that is a doubtful one. He knows that in the lower courts two judges have decided that in Ontario there is no such thing as a tenancy by courtesy; although I believe that the Court of Appeal has held that the husband still has a right as a tenant by courtesy; but the current of recent decision in the courts of Ontario is that the wife has absolute and unlimited control over her real estate. Until recently she could not part with that real estate, except by the consent of her husband, and it was supposed that he had still some right, by virtue of his marriage, to the possession of his wife's real estate; but since then the Provincial Legislature have enacted a law that gives the wife absolute and unlimited power over her real estate. She can sell it, without her husband being a party to the conveyance, and if he refuses to be a party to the conveyance, she can go before a county court judge and obtain power to part with it, irrespective of her husband. She can make a contract; she can make a promissory note, and enter into a covenant. On breach of contract action can be brought against her alone, and judgment can be levied upon her property alone. She cannot only dispose of it by conveyance, but by will, and leave it to whom she likes, quite irrespective of any power her husband may have over her. In fact, in every respect, as concerns property, the married woman now, in Ontario, is treated as if she were unmarried. Now, if this franchise is based upon property qualification, and if the husband takes nothing by virtue of his wife's property, then, in this Bill, the husband ought not to qualify to vote by virtue of his wife's real estate. The premises laid down, I think, are correct. Any one who will take the trouble to investigate the authorities in our own courts will have ample evidence of this. Now, I submit the First Minister ought to amend this clause, and make his Bill consistent. If it is to be based on property franchise, he ought to strike out such portion of sub-section 2 as enables the husband to vote on the wife's real estate.

Mr. MILLS. I think it is clear this section would have the same effect as the provision of the former section, with regard to property held in Lower Canada, where the husband has no community of interest with the wife. In many

cases he would not be proprietor at all. Under the Ontario law the husband would have no right to the wife's property and have no interest in it after her death, except issue were born. If it is the intention of the Premier to exclude the husband from voting on the property of the wife, except as tenant, because if he rented the property he could have a vote under a subsequent section, that intention should be stated; but the strict interpretation would exclude the husband from the right to vote on his wife's property. If it is the intention of the Government that the husband should vote on his wife's property, the wording of the section should be changed.

Mr. DAWSON. All the hon. gentleman has said is that the election law of Ontario is about as perfect as a law can be. With respect to the word "owner," what does it say? It says: "The word "owner" shall signify a proprietor, either in his own right or the right of his wife of an estate for life or any greater interest, either legal or equitable."

Mr. FLEMING. The amendment should be adopted, because hon. members who have had any practical knowledge of the working of the Act in Ontario will know that in very many cases great impropriety has resulted from the state of the law. A number of cases are known to myself, one of which was of a peculiarly disgraceful nature. The husband had become a vagrant and criminal, and spent a number of years in Kingston penitentiary; yet at every election he turned up and voted for the property which his wife's industry had acquired. This is not a single instance, but it is a sample of many which have come under my own observation. If a man is such a character as not to have acquired any property for himself, and has no right to vote by virtue of the possession of property other than the property of his wife, and is not in possession of his wife's property, he should be excluded from voting. If he is an industrious man he will be qualified to vote under some other section. The adoption of the amendment will assist in justice being done.

Mr. MULOCK. I support the amendment on somewhat different grounds from those held by other hon. members. The continuation of the franchise to the husband, the wife being owner of the property, is the continuation of an old system, after the law has been changed. Under the old system that law was no doubt right, but in most cases that law has been changed, and the question now is, whether there are not some classes of married women who hold and own property absolutely free from all control of their husbands, on which the husband should not be entitled to vote. The principle on which the vote depends is property. If we were called on to say whether, in view of the present law, the husband of a married woman should be entitled to vote because she was in possession of property, how would we deal with the question? We would ask what interest he has in the property? is it a personal interest, vested interest, future interest, contingent interest, or an interest when a certain time arrives? It must be remembered that under the Married Women's Act of 1870 the law has been very much changed. Under that section a husband had no present interest in his wife's property. I think the only thing that ought to entitle him to a vote ought to be a beneficial interest in the property at the time he is exercising the franchise—not a prospective interest, but a present beneficial interest. Under that section the husband has not such an interest as, in my opinion, ought to be considered a proper property qualification; though of course all these complications and difficulties arise from the fact that we are resting the franchise on what is not a proper basis, that of property qualification. We have decisions that the wife can dispose of her property, can encumber it with her own debts, and can actually deprive her husband of the use of it. We have a case of Merrick *vs.* Sherwood, bearing on the point; and that case deals also with 35 Vic., chap. 16, of the Ontario Statutes, passed in 1871. (The hon. member quoted several sections from this Act, and from the Ontario Married Women's Property Act, 1884, and cited the case of Merrick *vs.* Sherwood, and the decision of Mr. Justice Gwynne thereon.) I think that judgment fairly establishes one point—that under the law, as it is to day, in the case of any marriage entered into the husband has no beneficiary interest in his wife's property. To give, therefore, a vote to the husband because the wife owns property, is to continue something after the reason for its original existence has ceased to exist. When the law gave the vote to the husband in the first instance, it was because the husband was entitled to the gains and profits and the immediate possession in common law, because he was a tenant for life, and a tenant to the exclusion of his wife; but when the law has been changed, and all these interests have been taken from the husband and handed back to the wife, as effectually as if the wife had given them by deed, on that principle are you going to give the vote to the husband now? If there is any objection to the woman going to the polls, why not authorise her to give a power of attorney to her husband, telling him how he should vote? I think we should strike out all provisions in this Bill which entitle the husband to vote in respect to his wife's property. This is offering a premium to husbands to live on their wives, instead of obtaining a right to property by their own exertions.

Mr. EDGAR. I cannot see any logical reason for giving a husband a vote because his wife owns property. Is it in accordance with the spirit of free institutions that a man should vote because he owns a woman? Surely we cannot treat that as a piece of property, either real or personal property. As a rule, the result of marriage is that the woman owns the man. It is so in my own Province, and I dare say it is so in the other Provinces. Under the old law, before 1859, the husband had a real interest in his wife's property, but that law has been changed, and when the First Minister introduced his Bill, conferring the franchise upon women, he was only carrying out to the logical result the laws which gave women the control of real and personal estate and the right to make civil contracts. (The hon. gentleman then quoted extracts from the judgment in the case of Wilson, tried in the Ontario Court of Appeal.) Before this Bill leaves our hands I hope we shall have brought to bear on it all the information and erudition possessed by members of this House, so that there will be no chance of the language of our legislation being strained in any improper direction. But as it is now near three o'clock, and as other opportunities may or may not arise for discussing this point, I will close here.

Amendment (Mr. Casey) negatived.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 2:45 a.m., Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 30th April, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

COX DIVORCE BILL.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved first reading of Bill (No. 138) for the relief of George Branford Cox—(*from the Senate*).

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time, on a division.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 137) to make further provisions respecting Pawnbrokers—(*from the Senate*).—(Mr. Small.)

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—RATES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. REID asked, Have complaints been made, or any other notice given to the Government of the excessive rates charged by the contractor on that portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway between Port Moody and Savona Ferry? If so, is it the intention of the Government to take such steps as will remedy the hardship complained of?

Mr. POPE. Some complaints have reached the Government about excessive charges upon that portion of the line; but as yet the Government are not in possession of the line. The contract time will be up about 1st July. When the line is handed over to the Government, they will see that the charges on that line are not excessive.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Was any report or representation made, and when, by any member or officer of the Government, and by whom, with reference to the claims of the half-breeds of the North-West Territories to be placed in a position analogous to that of the half-breeds in Manitoba, to whom a grant of 1,400,000 acres was made under the Manitoba Act? Was any such report or representation requested by the Government or any member or officer of the Government, and when? Was there any Order in Council on the subject prior to that of 28th January, 1885; and at what date?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to this question and all other questions the hon. gentleman has placed on the paper relating to the North-West, so far as I am concerned, I would state that the Government think it is highly inexpedient in the public interest to answer those questions.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Was any communication received by the Government or any Department touching any of the half-breed claims in the North-West Territories, or any of the settlers' claims, or the agitations in the Prince Albert District, or the action of L. Riel or his associates, or the condition of feeling among the half-breeds, Indians or whites, and expressing the views of any, and which of the following:—Archbishop Taché, Bishop Grandin, Bishop McLean, Father LeDuc, Father André, Lieutenant Governor Laird, Mr. Dickieson, Lieutenant Governor Dewdney; The North-West Council, any member of the council; any stipendiary magistrate; any person connected with (1) The Mounted Police; (2) The Indian Department; (3) The Interior Department; (4) The Militia, Colonel Houghton, General Strange, Mr. Royal, M.P., Louis Schmidt, Louis Riel, any of the inhabitants of the disturbed districts?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The same answer.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Through whom and at what time during last summer, did the Government receive occasional intimations that if they gave Louis Riel a sum of money he would depart in peace? Was any answer given to these intimations; to whom, and when?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The same answer.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Was any part of the Mounted Police force ordered to Prince Albert last year? When and in what strength? Was the action taken on representation from the North-West, and on whose representations?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The same answer.

Mr. EDGAR.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Did the Government receive any representations, and from whom and when upon which they thought it prudent last summer to have some additional force at Carlton or near Prince Albert?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The same answer.

Mr. BLAKE asked, When did the Government first communicate with the Hudson Bay Company as to the occupation of Carlton? At whose expense were the repairs and improvements made there last year? When were the police ordered there and when did they arrive there?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The same answer.

Mr. BLAKE asked, When and through whom were the half-breeds of the North-West Territories told of the action of the Government on 28th January, authorising the appointment of a commission to enumerate them?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The same answer.

Mr. BLAKE asked, When were the commissioners under the Order in Council of 28th January, 1885, for the half-breed enumeration selected? When was the proposal to appoint each gentleman made to him? What is the name of the gentleman who, being unable to go, resigned, and when did that resignation take place?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The same answer.

Mr. BLAKE asked, When did the Government receive the news that a rising in the North-West was imminent, and from whom? When did the Government receive the information that the proximate cause was some letter as to Louis Riel not being a British subject, and from whom?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The same answer.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the five North-West corps organised in 1879 were ever inspected after their first organisation? Whether they were ever authorised to drill? Whether they were ever uniformed? Whether they were, in August, 1882, relieved from drill till further orders, in consequence of not being uniformed? Whether they were removed from the list of the corps of active militia in 1884? Whether their arms were taken up in 1884, under the orders of the Minister of Militia? At what time and by whom? Whether the action taken in 1884 was in whole or part due to representations made as to the state of feeling in some of the localities, and to whose representations? Whether any of the Mounted Police were stationed in the neighborhood in view of the removal of these corps?

Mr. CARON. It is quite impossible for me to give the information asked for in answer to this question. If the hon. gentleman will place a notice on the paper I will bring down any information I can bring down which is not of a strictly confidential nature.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether any, and what action and at what date was taken on the various requests made during the last few years for the formation of corps in Manitoba and the North-West Territories mentioned in the Militia reports?

Mr. CARON. The same answer.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether Colonel Houghton made in July, 1884, a report or communication to the Department of Militia of the impression formed by him when travelling through a portion of the North-West Territories last July? Whether Colonel Houghton made any report touching the same subject when engaged in taking up the arms of the North-West corps? Whether any, and if so, what action and at what date was taken on the reports?

Mr. CARON. The same answer.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

On paragraph 3,

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I propose to move an amendment to this paragraph, and I think when the First Minister hears it explained he and the hon. gentlemen supporting him will assent to it. Under the clause as it now stands no tenant can vote except one who pays his rent in money or in the produce, or the revenues, or profits issuing out of the property rented. It will be easily understood how very important it is that we should have a clear definition of the word "tenant," because in the clause which enables a tenant to vote it simply uses the word as a tenant of real property.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I give notice of my intention to strike out the words "or her" in the second line of this paragraph.

Mr. CAMERON. My amendment does not touch that. Under the fourth sub-section of the third section the tenant must be in possession for a year, and he must have paid a year's rent, and it is quite clear that, if the hon. gentleman will adhere to the interpretation given in the paragraph now under consideration, a large number of people who are tenants will be excluded from the right of voting; for it is perfectly well known that many leases in the country are made where the rent is not paid in money, or any produce issuing out of the property itself. At one time it was supposed, and the general impression is now, that there cannot be a valid lease unless the rent is paid in money, or in something issuing out of the property itself, as a revenue or profit. But that does not appear to be correct, for there may be a tenant of a property although the rent is not payable in cash, or in any of the produce of the farm rented. (The hon. gentleman here quoted Woodfall on "Landlord and Tenant," page 338.) From this authority it appears that in order to constitute the relationship of landlord and tenant it is not necessary that the rent should be payable in money, or in the produce or revenues or profits issuing from the land itself, but that relationship may exist where the rent is payable in labor, or improvements made on the land, or even improvements or work done elsewhere. Smith, in "The Law of Landlord and Tenant," lays down the same rule. (The hon. gentleman here quoted from the authority in question.) The hon. gentleman will understand that in country places it often happens that a man has a bush farm which he rents to another man, in consideration of occupancy and of his clearing so many acres per year, the lessee having the use of it for a series of years; and in the eye of the law the lessee in that case is a tenant, but under the interpretation clause of this Bill he would not have the right to vote. He is not paying rent in money or anything that issues out of the produce of the soil, or any portion of the rent and profits. I know cases like this: a man rents a piece of property and gives the landlord in return for the use of the land certain improvements—perhaps so much ploughing, so much summer fallowing, so much work done in fencing, cultivating, or clearing up the soil. Can it be said that he would be a tenant under the interpretation of this particular clause? He is not a tenant under the clause, and would not have a right to vote, because he does not pay anything that issues out of the land itself. There are also cases of this kind; A. B. owns two farms; he lives on one and rents the other to C.D., who in return does so many days' work on the farm of A. B. In that case there is nothing paid that issues out of the land leased, and therefore the tenant would not, under this clause, have a right to vote. The right under the paragraph we are now discussing is confined exclusively to tenants who pay their rent in money or in some of the rents and profits issuing out of the leased land. I have given the hon. gentleman at least three classes of cases in which occupancy does not give the right to vote, and such cases are numerous, especially in the newer sections of the country. Woodfall specifies a large number of tenants who would not come under this interpretation clause at all. For instance, a tenant by courtesy cannot vote; he is a tenant and he cannot vote as an owner.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He is a tenant in fee-simple.

Mr. CAMERON. But he does not hold the fee-simple. He cannot say he is the owner of the land, for he is not. In the law books he is called a tenant by courtesy; and if that is the only estate he has got, he would not be entitled to vote under this clause, because he pays no rent and renders no service to anybody else for the land. Then, a tenant in dower or the assignee of a tenant in dower would not have a right to vote because he renders nothing to the landlord. The clause only applies to the tenant himself, that is, the man who holds an estate from the landlord. I propose to amend the clause by inserting after the word "person" in the first line of this paragraph, the words "or the assignee of such person," so as to cover the case of the assignee of a tenant, who is not a tenant as between himself and the original landlord. After the word "leased," in the third line of the paragraph, I propose that the following words be inserted: "or any service rendered or work or labor performed by a tenant on the land leased, or goods supplied to the landlord in lieu of rent." I think the hon. gentleman must admit that under the interpretation put upon this clause such a person would not have the right to vote, because he does not pay anything in the shape of money, and does not give to the landlord any portion of produce of the property, or any portion of the profits or revenue derived from the property. All the classes that I have named would not have the right to vote under the clause as tenants. I therefore move these amendments.

Mr. LANGELIER. If this amendment be adopted a great many persons will be deprived of the right to vote who have it now. Sub-tenants will be deprived of the right to vote because they do not pay anything to the proprietor but to the original tenant.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think I can follow the argument of the hon. gentleman who makes this motion. We are not settling what the definition of tenant is for the purposes of real property or the law of real property. We are settling the definition of what kind of tenants shall have a vote. A person who is a freeholder is a tenant in fee-simple; a person who has an estate in entail is a tenant in entail. The word tenant here has nothing to do with its legal signification. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to read the definition of the same word in a Bill recently passed in the Ontario Legislature, which the hon. gentleman wishes to become law here:

"The word tenant shall include any person who, instead of paying rent in money, shall be bound to give the owner any portion of the produce of such property."

With respect to the remark of the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier) a tenant is a person who pays rent to somebody else; if he is a sub-tenant he has his own landlord, and there may be many degrees of tenancies, for the process of sub-letting may go on *infinitum*.

Mr. WELDON. Will that enable tenants and sub-tenants to vote?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Would a man who pays no rent but does work for his landlord in payment of his rent be entitled to vote under this clause?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly not; if he works he does not furnish produce but comes under the title of occupant because he is a person in the possession of real property who receives the rents and profits thereof.

Mr. CAMERON. If the hon. gentleman will look at the clause which gives the occupant a vote, he will find that a man who occupies a piece of ground, in this way, is not entitled to vote. His occupancy must be under an agreement or license of occupation from the Crown or corporation or some individuals. I did not fail to observe the interpretation given to the Ontario Act for the word tenant, and I say it is a very bad definition. By it they have cut out a large number of tenants who were just as much entitled to vote as a man who paid $500 rent. One man may pay rent in cash and another may pay in services rendered, such as cutting down the timber and clearing the land. I see no reason why the latter is not as well entitled to a vote as the former. Under this clause it is manifest that a man who pays for the use of a place by his labor on it will not have a vote, nor will he have a vote under any other clause since he cannot vote as occupant, because his occupancy must be under some agreement.

Mr. FLEMING. I understood the First Minister to say that the tenant and the sub-tenant and the intermediate tenant would all have the right to vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I said that the word tenant will include those who have holdings for which they pay rent.

Mr. FLEMING. Technically and legally that would be the case. Is it the intention to give intermediate tenants and sub-tenants votes? This would bring a great innovation into the law.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is merely a dictionary, and when you come to the franchise laws and find the words, tenant and occupant, we will turn to the dictionary to see what it means.

Mr. FLEMING. Looking at section 4, we find that a tenant must have been in possession as a tenant for at least a year. That would exclude all tenants except those actually in possession. It would exclude the first tenant in case he had gone out of possession and sub-let the premises to others. The hon. gentleman says that a tenant such as my hon. friend from Huron has referred to would be entitled to vote under the subsequent provisions of the Bill, but I do not think that is the case. Where the landlord receives the revenues and profits, the tenant could not vote under the definition of "occupant," and he could not vote under "tenant," because he does not render such rent as is necessary to that definition.

Mr. WELDON. According to this clause the word "occupant" expressly includes a tenant, owner, or usufructuary.

Mr. DAVIES. If the Prime Minister would consent to strike out the words in the "occupant" definition which follow:—

"Otherwise than as owner, tenant, or usufructuary in his or her own right, or in the case of a married man in his own right or in the right of his wife."

And would leave the clause to read as follows:—

"'Occupant' means a person in actual occupation of real property who receives to his or her own use and benefit the revenues and profit thereof."

I think that would better carry out the idea which is probably intended, and it might meet the objection suggested by the learned gentleman from Huron. I agree with him, however, that limiting the meaning of the word "occupant" to persons otherwise than owner, tenant, or usufructuary includes the tenant, owner, or usufructuary.

Mr. LANGELIER. In answer to the objection which I made that sub-tenants would be deprived of the right to vote under this clause, the Premier said that the word "landlord" means every party who has tenants or sub-tenants. I must say that the translator of this Bill into French has not adopted that construction of the word landlord. Here is the literal translation of that translation:

"Tenant means a person who is bound to remit to the proprietor of the real property some portions of the produce, revenues or profits of the property leased instead of rent, as well as the person who pays the rent in money for the occupation of the property."

Everyone will see that, under this version, a portion of the produce of the property must be paid to the proprietor, not to the landlord. It is not the expression "landlord" which is used but the expression "owner." The result of it would be that a sub-tenant, not paying anything to the owner, would be deprived of the right to vote.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would call attention to a few cases in my own experience. I have a tenant who is in possession of a house which he has agreed with me to plaster on the outside, and I have agreed to give it to him for three years on that condition. Before that, he paid $2.50 a month, or $30 a year. If the view of my hon. friend to my right is correct, he will be deprived of a vote under this section. I have another case, in which a man has a farm. He has made an agreement with me to erect a barn of a certain size, and I give him the farm for four years on condition of his doing that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The question now is that, after the word "person" in the third line, the words "or the assignee of the said person" should be inserted. There is another amendment which the hon. member for Huron has given notice of, which we will discuss afterwards, but we must dispose of this first.

Amendment (Mr. Cameron, Huron) negatived.

Mr. FLEMING moved:

That after the word "person" in the third line, the following be inserted: "resident in the municipality in which the demised land is situate."

He said: The object of this is to secure residence as a requisite to the right of the tenant to vote. I think that is, to some extent, the case under the law, at all events, in the Province of Ontario. I think that the property should be in the municipality or parish that would entitle a tenant to vote.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think that a great injustice will be done if the amendment is not added to the clause. A number of people who are anxious to get votes in more than one constituency will get their friends to place them upon the assessment roll and they will become tenants, perhaps, for the time being, under a certain agreement, and possibly may be able to comply with the clauses of this Bill, and in that way they will be able to record their votes in more than one constituency. I think, in framing this law, we should endeavor to guard against any injustice of that kind. I know that in the past instances of this kind have occurred, where people have become tenants in order to be allowed to exercise the franchise in other constituencies than the one in which they live. If this amendment is not added, it will leave an opening whereby people may take advantage of a technical point of this kind, and get themselves enrolled and be able to record their vote. As this section is, as has been stated, the dictionary of the whole Act, we should be exceedingly careful to prevent cases of this kind occurring. In explaining all these words the

word "tenant," particularly, should be carefully defined. Freeholders, undoubtedly, will be, to some extent, placed at a disadvantage. A man who wants to record his franchise honestly in a constituency where he lives, will, no doubt, be able to do so; but if a man wants to act dishonestly and wants to get a franchise in another constituency, he has only to get a friend to assess him for a few acres of that friend's farm. If he gets on the assessment roll, and if the revising barrister leaves him there, the result will be that that man will have a right to record his vote in a constituency where he is not a resident.

Mr. BOWELL. Is not that the case now, under the present law?

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, it is. We have suffered from that in the past. I have known instances of that kind to exist, and now is the time to correct the evil, when we are passing an election law, which we should endeavor to make as perfect as possible.

Mr. RYKERT. The effect of this amendment would be that if a wholesale merchant residing in the county of York, just over the line, who has his residence there, but who occupies property in the city, which he rents and for which he pays taxes, that man cannot vote; this amendment excludes him. The same thing may happen in Hamilton. A man may be doing business in that city on property which he leases and for which he pays taxes, but if he resides on his own property in the county of Wentworth, he cannot vote in Hamilton.

Mr. WELDON. The difficulty I see is this: A is the owner of property, and he rents it to B for $100 a year. B may sublet that property to five tenants, say, for $20 a year each. The question is, who will be entitled to vote.

Mr. WALLACE (York). I am surprised at the amendments moved by the hon. gentlemen opposite, the effect of everyone of them being to restrict the franchise instead of extending it, as I believe, they profess to want to do. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Fleming), I think, would restrict the franchise, and very unnecessarily. The law at present in the Province of Ontario gives a vote to the very class that this amendment would prevent from voting. Under the law at present a voter may reside at any place; if he is a tenant in a certain county it is not necessary that he should live in that county to be able to vote in it. But this amendment proposes that he shall not only live in that county, but that he shall reside in the municipality in which the lands are situated. For instance, if my hon. friend who resides in the town of Brampton, were to remove half a mile outside of the town, he would be prevented from voting by the very amendment he now proposes. I think the nearer we get to universal suffrage in these matters, the better it will be. I cordially support the Bill as it is, because it comes much nearer to that than the amendment proposed by the hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. FLEMING. It is not the object of the amendment to restrict the franchise in any sense. But I know, by actual observation in my own county, that a practice has been in vogue—though not so much now as formerly—for persons on one side of the town line, or one side of the county line, to lease a portion of the farm of the man living next to them, and to give in return a lease of a portion of their farm to their neighbor. They actually exchange leases of a portion of their farms, and leases have been drawn up and the documents produced. By that means they secure votes in both counties. One was a tenant of a portion of his neighbor's farm, and *vice versa*. It is with the object of doing away with the possibility of this abuse that I move this amendment. Of course, I can see that difficulties might arise under it in the case of a city or town where persons occupying valuable property might be resident out of the limits. Perhaps it might be better to restrict the operation of the amendment to the electoral district.

Mr. McMULLEN. I will give the committee an instance, in my own experience, of the abuse complained of. There is a man in the adjoining county to my own who is a large land owner in the riding I represent. In the last election that took place, three of his brothers-in-law, who were residents in Centre Wellington, were assessed for lots that he owned in North Wellington. They were all assessed as tenants of these lands, and these men came to the poll claiming to vote as tenants, and actually recorded their votes. It was well known that these parties were put on the assessment roll for a purpose. There was no means of preventing them from voting, and they took the oath in each case. I know another case where a man in my riding had his son assessed for a part of his property. The son returned the compliment, and in this way their voting power was doubled.

Mr. BOWELL. If a tenant votes he must be a resident of the electoral district in which he votes.

Mr. MILLS. The Minister's recollection of the law is rather imperfect. If a tenant's lease has expired and his name still stands on the voters' list, if he continues to reside in the locality, he has a right to vote although his tenancy has expired. If he has moved out of the district, his right to vote is gone; but if he is a non-resident and the tenancy still continues, he has a right to vote. That was the old law.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is the duty of every hon. member to state where abuses of the law have occurred in order that they may be prevented by the new Act. I am quite cognisant of the cases I have brought forward. I am quite sure the parties recorded votes, and thus abused the exercise of the franchise, and to that extent interfered with the free will of the constituencies. We should guard the law so that injustice should not be possible under the proposed Act.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). All the abuses mentioned by the hon. member could have been remedied by the court on the revision of the lists. The hon. gentleman says that because he has not taken the trouble to have the abuses corrected by the proper tribunal, therefore we should legislate to correct his default.

Mr. McMULLEN. If there is one thing we should guard against it is that of leaving too much power in the hands of the revising officers. The more we can restrict the duty of those officers the better; and it should not be in their power to say whether a man shall be placed on the list or not.

Mr. CASEY. The remarks of the hon. member for Victoria are erroneous in another particular. There is no way under the law to strike off these voters. Such votes would be perfectly legal. The law is so framed as to allow parties to double up their voting power, as has been illustrated. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) said this was an attempt to restrict the franchise. It is an attempt in another direction. To allow an accumulation of votes in one individual is not an extension, but a restriction of the franchise, because it is unfair to the constituencies. It gives an unfair power to those individuals whose property is situated in several ridings, as compared with those whose property is in one riding. Thus a person may have five votes if his property is situated in as many ridings, and possess five times the electoral power wielded by a man who has the same amount of property in one riding. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) pointed out that the amendment would prevent a resident in the county of York from voting on his warehouse in the city of Toronto. That would be the effect of the amendment;

but I do not think it is an objection, but is rather a reason why we should support it. To allow a man to vote wherever he has property is contrary to the spirit of the franchise. The theory of the franchise must be one of two things: either that every person qualified, by possessing sufficient intelligence, should have a vote; or that property, as such, should be represented. If you take the latter ground, you must give a person a vote for every so many hundred dollars he may possess, which no one has yet proposed to do. On the other hand, if you consider property qualification simply as a guarantee of intelligence and social standing, there is no reason, theoretical or practical, for giving a person more than one vote because he has property in different ridings. No doubt the contrary practice has been in force, but there must come a time when abuses will be reformed. This abuse has been reformed in the Ontario Act. Some of its provisions cover the cases of those tenants with which we are now dealing. The tenant as well as anybody else must be domiciled within the electoral district, within which he voted at the elections to the Legislative Assembly. I think the principle is a just one, of allowing a person to vote wherever he has property, though it is liable to abuse at the instance of those who may be able to bring in a large non-resident vote at election times, when that vote happens to favor their views. These abuses occur constantly in the neighborhood of cities and towns, and I can quite understand that members representing these suburban districts should dislike the removal of this abuse. The hon. member for West York told us the other day that this clause would strike off some 400 votes in his constituency, but that is no reason why the clause should not pass. I have tried to point out, and I have no doubt others will endorse my opinion, that this plurality of votes in the hands of one person, is an abuse, and, if so, it should be removed. I do not know whether these non-resident votes spoken of by the hon. member for West York, are friends of his or not, but I should think they were, from the fact of his objection to their being removed, but whether they are or not, the principle is wrong. I shall lose, myself, a considerable number of non-resident votes; but I take my stand on the principle that one person should have one vote, and that vote where he lives, unless you go to the other extreme, and give him a vote for every so many hundred dollars property he possesses. The reason why the person should vote where he resides is quite evident, namely, that there he will have a better knowledge of the candidates who are running than he possibly can of candidates who may be 100 miles from where he lives.

Mr. WALLACE (York). I wish to point out that under the Act of the Legislature of Ontario, which I presume these hon. gentlemen are desirous of imitating, the one man does not get the vote, and I will give an instance. I met a man in Toronto the other day, a strong Reformer, and he said that this Bill of Mr. Mowat's was a good one. I replied that I had no objection to it, so far as he was concerned, for although he had property in three ridings, he could not vote in either. He did a large business in West Toronto, and had a vote there; he resided with his father in Centre Toronto, so he should have had a vote there, and besides this he had a large property in West York, the result of Mr. Mowat's law being that he could not vote in either of these places.

Mr. CASEY. If he carried on a large business in West Toronto, surely he would derive $100 income from it, and therefore he could vote where he was domiciled.

Mr. WALLACE. He cannot at both places.

Mr. CASEY. But he can choose the one or the other.

Mr. WALLACE. He does not vote in West Toronto because he does not reside there, nor in Centre Toronto because he lives with his father, nor in West York, although he has, as I have said before, a large property there, but he does not reside upon it.

Mr. DAVIES. The effect of the amendment would be to deprive non-residents of the right to vote, and if so I would not approve of it. Besides it would not get rid of the difficulty which has been mentioned by the hon. member for St. John. It seems to me, however, that section three of sub-section four should be read in connection with this clause, and there possession and payment of the rent is required as well as the mere fact of tenantcy.

Mr. RYKERT. According to the amendment he must be a resident.

Mr. DAVIES. I was speaking of the objection raised by the hon. member for St. John, and if possession here means actual possession the difficulty is cured, and if not, the difficulty which he mentioned remains. I think, however, that there is actual possession. I cannot understand constructive possession by a tenant, though I can by a freeholder.

Mr. WELDON. I do not quite agree with the present amendment, because I am in favor of what is evidently contemplated by the Bill, that non-residents should have a vote. But there is this difficulty, that persons may become tenants for the sake of having votes. The case mentioned by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) is a legitimate one, and I think such persons are justly entitled to vote if they are domiciled outside of the city. At the same time, however, we should guard against the door to the manufacture of votes. I think it would be well to define a tenant as a person who is either a resident upon the property, or in actual occupation of it, and this would also get over the difficulty about sub-tenants.

Mr. DAVIES. As I remarked before, I think the clause should be read in connection with the fourth sub-section of section three. Being a tenant does not give the man a right to vote for he must also be in possession and he must have paid the rent.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There is the whole difficulty. No doubt by reading the interpretation clause along with the other, we get the meaning stated by the hon. member for Queen's. But what the hon. member for St. John says—and there is a great deal of force in it—is that possession does not mean actual possession; there is a constructive possession, and it could be argued before the revising barrister that if a man were not in actual possession but in constructive possession, he was entitled to a vote. I know a case in which a farmer leased 50 acres of land to five sons, no doubt to secure them votes. Only one son remained in possession but all the others claimed the right to vote, because they were in possession with their brother, although not in actual possession.

Mr. BOWELL. You do not argue that they could possibly vote if they had not interest in the land.

Mr. CAMERON. That is a question you would have to determine in the courts. Under the old practice you would go to the Court of Revision, and you would raise that question; the Court of Revision would say, we are not lawyers and we cannot settle that point; and you would have to appeal to the County Court Judge.

Mr. BOWELL. They would put the oath as to the person's actual interest in the property.

Mr. CAMERON. Did the hon. gentleman ever know a case of a man refusing to take the oath?

Mr. BOWELL. I am sorry to say that there are too many of the hon. gentleman's friends who are of that class.

Mr. CAMERON. I know of two young men in my own constituency who took the oath, and whose father afterwards

swore that the eldest was not 20 years of age, and they both voted against me. I regret to say that men seem to think less of an oath in election contests than in other cases; they think it a good joke, a clever thing, if they can get votes in by swearing falsely. What I say is that we should not leave any room for doubt in questions of this kind. We ought not to put candidates to the expense—for after all the expense falls on their heads—of having questions of that kind decided before the courts. Where five names are in a lease, you can only object on the ground that the possession is colorable, and is only for the purpose of obtaining votes. That is a question of fact; but questions of fact and questions of law are combined; and these questions will only be contested before the Court of Revision or before the judge on appeal by those who are candidates or who want to run for Parliament. These things are not done merely out of patriotism; but they are done by some persons who take an interest in our public affairs. Hon. gentlemen opposite are as much interested in this matter as we are. If we can lessen the chance of expense in matters of this kind, we ought to do so. By inserting the word actual, we should put it beyond the shadow of a doubt that no person not in actual possession of the demised premises is entitled to vote. That would do away with colorable leases gotten up for the express purpose of making votes, would get over the whole difficulty, would leave no chance of errors or appeals either to the revising barristers or anybody else, and would save the expense of testing these matters in the courts.

Mr. FLEMING. There is another class of persons who would be entitled to vote under this definition. Very frequently in the making of farm leases the actual tenant has some person joined with him in the lease as surety. It is not expressed in the lease that he is merely joined as a surety, but he becomes a party in the lease as tenant. In that case the surety under this definition would be entitled to vote unless there was something to limit his right. I would point out that my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace) is in error in the case he refers to of his friend who is a merchant doing business in East Toronto, living with his father in West Toronto, and having a farm in West York, and not entitled to vote. Under Mr. Mowat's Act he is entitled to vote where he resides, in respect of his father's property, as the son of a landholder. You can scarcely devise a case in which any person is deprived of the right to vote under Mr. Mowat's Act. It is true he may only have the right to vote once, but that is the policy of the Act, that one person shall not exercise any more power in the election than another, no matter what may be the extent of his property.

Mr. FISHER. In listening to all the discussion of this section, I must confess that I am rather surprised to find that the law in the Province of Quebec is so very different from the law proposed in this Bill, as is also, it seems, the law now in force in the Province of Ontario. In the Province of Quebec not only must the tenant reside in the municipality or the electoral district in which the property lies on which he wishes to qualify, but he must be a tenant absolutely in possession of the property on which he wishes to qualify as a tenant. I think it is a very reasonable and just provision to prevent any such system of fraud as some hon. gentlemen have alluded to. There is no doubt that under such a provision as that in the Bill a great many votes may be created, and although this Bill extends the franchise very largely, it does not afford a sufficient safeguard against fraudulent votes being made. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) accuses the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) of having been inert in not properly watching the execution of the law in his constituency; but if this Bill becomes law, as it stands, I do not see how the exercise of any vigilance can possibly prevent the practice to which we have alluded. Under this Bill, tenants such as those to whom the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) referred can be, and no doubt will be, very largely created. Believing as I do that the law in Quebec is a just law, I think the amendment proposed is not only reasonable but does not go far enough, and I trust the Government will see their way clear to accept it as a moderate concession in the direction of the actual law in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have been endeavoring to point out to the committee evidence of irregularities that have occurred in the section of the country from which I come, and I am anxious that the provisions of this Bill should be so framed that they will prevent the recurrence of those irregularities. If, however, the Bill is passed in its present shape, we are bound to have a repetition of them. People will take advantage of this loophole to record votes in constituencies which otherwise could not be recorded. If it were made necessary that a tenant should be an actual tenant of the property, these injustices in municipalities would be prevented. Men who are not disposed to be strictly bound by the oath will stretch a point, under the excitement of an election contest, in order to be allowed the privilege of recording their votes. I am sorry the First Minister is not present, for if the remarks I have made were pointedly brought before him he might suggest some way of getting out of the difficulty. I can sympathise with men who own property in one riding and reside in another, and do not think they should be deprived of this right of exercising the franchise in each riding; but at the same time there should be some protection against the irregularities that will creep in under this system.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not going to enter into the legal merits of the question, particularly as there is so much difference of opinion among my legal friends; but I may remark that there is tolerably good proof that the dangers alluded to by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) have actually taken place on a pretty large scale in other counties. Unless I am greatly mistaken, the whole practice which prevailed in Scotland, under the style and title of "faggot voting," arose owing to certain negligences with respect to tenants and occupants, very similar to those to which the hon. gentleman has called attention; and, as the lawyers in the House are probably aware, it was found necessary to make special provision in one or two English Acts against this abuse. The Midlothian contest, in which no less a person than the Hon. Mr. Gladstone was the candidate on the one side and the son of the Duke of Buccleuch on the other, was practically determined, not by the votes of the parties really entitled to vote, as I have been given to understand, but by the dexterity of land owners in causing to be recorded the largest number of faggot votes. Unless great care is taken in the framing of this clause, similar abuses may occur in many constituencies.

Mr. BOWELL. Under this amendment, if, for instance, by way of illustration, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who has a summer residence at Lachine, where he lives during the summer months, and a town residence in Montreal, was living at the latter place when an election took place in the winter in the county of Jacques Cartier, he would not be able to vote because he did not happen to be a resident of the county at the time.

Mr. WELDON. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman as regards residence.

Amendment (Mr. Fleming) negatived.

Mr. LANGELIER moved:

That the following words be added after the word "leased" in the 5th line of page 2:—"By actual or implied contract."

He said: If the clause remains as it is, more than half of those who are tenants in large places like Quebec and Montreal would be deprived of the right to vote. It is well known to those who are acquainted with the way in which property is left in those cities that very few of the small tenants take any regular leases. They hold the properties they occupy under the state of things which is represented in article 1602 oft he Civil Code, which reads as follows:—

"Persons holding real property by sufferance of the owner, without lease, are held to be lessees and bound to pay the annual value of the property."

Mr. GIROUARD. Then they are lessees.

Mr. LANGELIER. If the hon. member for Jacques Cartier reads the clause of this Bill, he will see that they are excluded. It says:

"'Tenant' means as well a person who is bound to render to his or her landlord some portion of the produce or of the revenues or profits of the property leased."

The clause says the property must be leased, but there is no lease whatsoever in the case I have referred to. There can be no lease when there is no agreement between the owner of the property or the landlord and the party who occupies the property, but the law of the Province of Quebec—and I think the law of Ontario is the same, but I cannot say—says that in that case the party who occupies the property shall be considered as a tenant, although not a lessee.

Mr. BOWELL. Would not the class of tenants to whom the hon. member refers be entitled to vote under the 4th section?

Mr. LANGELIER. No. In every portion of the Bill where the word "tenant" is to be found it must be construed according to the sense given here. The law of the Province of Quebec gives this definition of the word tenant:

"The word 'tenant' means as well the person who pays rent in money as the person who is obliged to give to the owner a certain part of the revenues and profits of the real estate which he occupies."

The definition is quite different. There can be no difficulty under the Quebec law, because the word "leased" is not used at all, and for a very good reason, because the objection I now make was foreseen. If the word "leased" had been used as it is here, it would have excluded those parties whom it was intended that the law should include. The object of my amendment is to include all those parties by the addition of two very simple words, "express or implied." There can be no difficulty in adopting that amendment, and, if it is not adopted, a great number of persons will be excluded.

Mr. LAURIER. I am surprised that no answer is given to the argument of my hon. friend. This is a very serious objection, and I call the attention especially of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) to it. He knows that the amendment now moved by my hon. friend from Megantic is in the direction contemplated by article 1608 of the Civil Code. This article is not taken from the old French civil law, but was statutory law introduced into our legislation between 1850 and 1860, because it often happened that parties were occupants of property, not in the sense of squatters, but by sufferance of the proprietor; but, when the time came to collect the rents from them, they pleaded that there was no lease and there was great difficulty in collecting the rent. The law was therefore amended so as to provide that, when persons occupied property under such conditions, there would be an implied lease, and that has been the law ever since. This new law should be framed to meet the case as it now exists, but, under the Bill as it now stands, a man who holds property simply under an implied lease, as contemplated by article 1608 of the Code, would be deprived of his vote. He will be met by the objection: No, you are not a lessee; you have neiter a verbal nor a written lease. What answer can be made to that objection? Surely, if the law on the Statute Book is meant to accord with the law of the Province of Quebec in order to meet such a case as I have referred to, the Bill should move in the same direction and contain such a provision as that which is now proposed, otherwise the Bill will certainly deprive a great many men of the right to vote.

Mr. CASGRAIN. This amendment ought to be adopted. It can do no harm, and will certainly do good.

Mr. GIROUARD. I did not pay any attention to the objection, for the simple reason that I never saw anything in it. From the quotations which have been made by the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langelier) and the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) from the Civil Code, it is plain that where a man is occupying property by sufferance, as mentioned in the Code, he is held to be a lessee, and being held to be a lessee, he will have the right to vote under the definition of the word "tenant." The word "lease" will include not only the case of a man holding property under a lease, written or verbal, but also under the law of occupation, it being the same as a lease; and the article of the Code read by my hon. friend says that positively; it says that in that case he shall be held to be the lessee.

Mr. LANGELIER. That is to say, he shall be bound to pay rent.

Mr. GIROUARD. No; the definition says he shall be held to be the lessee.

Mr. LANGELIER. But the law does not say that they are lessees: the law says expressly that they have no leases. They must be supposed to have no leases in order to fall under that article.

Mr. SPROULE. I take it that applies to a written lease.

Mr. LAURIER. Is it not a fact that this article 1608 is statutory law introduced to meet the very objection which has been raised?

Mr. GIROUARD. Whether statutory law or common law, it has been in force in the Province of Quebec for 30 years; and the meaning of the words "tenant" or "lease," to be found in this Bill, will be defined according to the laws of the Province where they are in force.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) The object of my amendment, which is very short, is to make the law similar to that of the Province of Quebec. In that law—and I know something about it, for I have taken part in its adoption by the Legislature—it is not said that a tenant is a man who has a lease, but it is said that it is a man who pays a rent. Whether he pays that rent under a verbal lease or a written lease, or tacit lease, it does not matter; the moment he pays a rent, whether he is a tenant or not, in the strict sense of the law, he is dealt with as a lessee by the election law. Such is the law in the Province of Quebec; there is no difficulty whatever. Suppose a man wants to be put on the list, and he is told that his name cannot be inserted, because he has no lease either written, verbal or tacit. This individual would say: That is immaterial to me, because the law does not require me to have a lease; all that it requires of me is that I should pay a rent. Now, I am pay-

ing a rent, and under section 1608 of the Civil Code, I am required to pay a rent—and I have a right to be put on that list. Could he use the same reasoning under this law? Not at all. This clause says that, in order to be a tenant, he must have rented the property, but he has certainly not rented it. The law of the Province of Quebec deals with him as if he had rented, but it has never said that he had rented, that would be a nonsense.

Amendment (Mr. Langelier) negatived.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I see by the clause that only two classes of tenants are entitled to vote. The first is the class that pays rent in money; the second is the tenant who pays rent in kind, or part of the produce, Now, Sir, there is another class of tenants who, I think, are equally entitled to exercise the franchise. There are not many of them in the older settled portions of the country, but I have no doubt they are still quite numerous in the newer portions of the country; I refer to persons who hold land and make improvements as compensation to the owner for the use of it.

Mr. FARROW. That means profits. That comes under the heading of the word "profit."

Mr. ARMSTRONG. No, that does not cover it at all; it has no connection with it. If this clause passes in its present form, this class will be debarred from the privilege of voting. If I understood the right hon. leader of the Government correctly, he said they could vote as occupants; but I think if you look at the matter closely you will find such is not the case. I find in the definition of the word "tenant" the same thing is expressed:

"Is the tenant of real property within any such city or town, or part of a city or town, at a monthly rental of at least two dollars, or at a quarterly rental of at least six dollars, or at a half-yearly rental of at least twelve dollars, or at an annual rental of at least twenty dollars, and has been in possession thereof as such tenant for at least one year."

But on turning to page 10 you will find that, in making out the list, it is provided that it shall be the duty of the revising officer to procure certified copies of the last revised list or lists of voters; and, if I understand it rightly, he is bound to make out the list in accordance with them. In Ontario there is a column where the nature of the title to the land is to be set down. If a man holds land as freehold the law provides that the letter "F" shall be written opposite his name, and if a tenant, "T." The question as to when he comes to vote, as to whether he can vote as an occupant or not will be answered in the negative. It is provided that the returning officer shall make out a list in the same shape; but on looking at the schedule, I find there is a column in which must be mentioned the nature of the qualification. When the person so assessed comes up to vote the question will be asked: What is your qualification? He says he is a tenant. Then the question will be asked: Do you pay rent on any part of the produce, and as he cannot answer in the affirmative to either of the questions, he will consequently be deprived of his vote. In our newer districts there are still many tenants of this class, and even in the old settlement of Ontario there are some. I have one under my own observation, and this drew my attention to the defect in the clause. In the newer parts of the country there are undoubtedly many cases where men owning land put upon it people who are too poor to purchase land for themselves, and they pay for the use of the land by doing certain improvements. I move in amendment that the words "or make any improvements in lieu of rent" be added to the clause. As the hon. First Minister will see, this is not in the interest of any political party, but in the public interest.

Mr. FLEMING. I hope the First Minister will see the propriety of my amendment. In my county there are a number of cases which will be covered by the amendment. There are a number of farm laborers throughout the older districts of Ontario who hire with farmers and occupy houses as part of their wages. It is obvious that we should encourage such a practice. A few years ago when the English farm laborers' delegates visited Canada they urged the desirability of Canadian farmers providing houses for their laborers, and Joseph Arch and his companions pointed out that the emigration of farm laborers to Canada would not be so earnestly advocated until this provision was made. We are expending large sums of money by Government grants and otherwise to secure the immigration of farm laborers, and in order to give those men who should be entitled to vote, this amendment is necessary. It may be thought, perhaps, that under the definition of occupant such a person would have a right to vote. I contend that is not the case. The word occupant is stated to be:

"A person in actual occupation of real property otherwise than as 'owner,' 'tenant,' or 'usufructuary,' in his or her own right, or in the case of a married man, in his own right or in the right of his wife, and who receives to his or her own use and benefit the revenues and profits thereof."

It cannot be said that a tenant receives to his own use and benefit the revenues and profits of the property. Those go to the landlord. So it is clear that a farm laborer is not such a person as will come under the word occupant, for although he is in actual possession, he is not in the receipt of the revenues and profits, those belong to the farmer who receives in lieu of rent an undefined portion of the laborer's wages. Under the usual contract made between farmers and laborers the wages are so much a month or year with free house and garden, and sometimes with a small portion of land for planting potatoes. It is absolutely necessary in my view of the law as laid down in this Bill that a provision of the kind covered by my amendment be inserted before such farm laborers are entitled to vote. They cannot vote as tenants, under the definition, because they do not pay rent or render any part of the produce of the property to the landlord, and they cannot vote as occupants under the definition of that word. They are paying revenues upon the profits of the property, but are not in receipt of them, and therefore I trust the words suggested will be added and thereby enfranchise a number of very worthy persons.

On the amendment of Mr. Armstrong,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would like to meet the views of the hon. gentleman, but I think they are fully met under the definition of the word "occupant," and therefore I am unwilling, unless there is a clear necessity for it, to alter the definition of tenant or occupant, especially as they are identical with the present law of Ontario—speaking from an Ontario point of view. (The right hon. gentleman here read the section of the Ontario law in question.) The basis of the voters' list, so far as Ontario is concerned, and elsewhere, is the assessment roll taken in each place, and hence the importance that the definition should be the same, so that the roll should be made up for the Dominion elections in the same way as for the provincial elections. I think the hon. gentleman's views will be met under the word occupant. The man who instead of paying rent pays in work, is in possession in the first place, and the revenues and profits got out of the land he gets to his own use. The revenues and profits do not mean what goes to the landlord; those that go to the landlord are the improvements he makes on the land. The revenues or profits are what he extracts from the soil. The hon. gentleman may depend upon it that, under any construction possible, a person situated as the hon. gentleman mentions in his amendment will come under the next head, and the hon. gentleman will admit

that it is of consequence to keep the definitions as nearly as possible the same as in the Ontario Act.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I see fully the force of the right hon. gentleman's statement, and I have no doubt of the word "occupant" fully covering the case of a man holding under such a tenure. But that is not the difficulty which I fear. I am afraid that when such a person goes to the poll he will have difficulty in having his vote allowed, if it is challenged. A man holding under the conditions I have mentioned, and entered on the roll as a tenant, will be transferred by the revising officer to the schedule of his list, as a tenant, and when he is asked whether he pays his rent in money or produce, he will have to reply that he pays it in neither, and hence his right will be challenged.

Mr. FLEMING. I may state that one of the reasons for my suggesting the amendment was that the county judge of my county, Judge Scott, who has had a great deal of experience in revising the lists, sent for a copy of last year's Bill, and upon examining it he wrote me to the effect that he could not see how the Bill provided for the franchise to be given to these particular classes. My object, therefore, was to secure such a definition as would leave no difficulty to the revising officer in construing it.

Mr. FARROW. I understand the class mentioned by the hon. member for Middlesex very well, namely, the class who take, say, 50 acres of bush land to clear up for another, for the crop, say, for five years, clearing a certain number of acres a year. There is generally a proviso in the lease —and I have drawn many of them—that if they do not clear up the quantity each year they have to pay so much money. I contend, however, that they are covered by the tenant class, because it is quite certain that as to these men who clear up this bush land year after year, a certain profit undoubtedly goes to the landlord. It is there any way, and covers the case completely.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is highly desirable that the interpretation clause should be made so clear that every voter should comprehend it. Many voters are often deterred from voting because they do not understand the interpretation clause of the Act. Some voters have such a reverence for the oath that they will shrink from recording their votes if it is tendered to them, and some voters will not take the oath if they do not fully comprehend the interpretation clause. I do not see what objection there can be to inserting the amendment proposed by the hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong). In my own riding there are a large number of Germans who have such a reverence for an oath that they will not take it unless they comprehend the full meaning of what is tendered them; consequently, many of these will be deterred from voting if this clause is not made so clear that every person shall comprehend it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. While the section itself seems to bear the construction the hon. member for North Huron (Mr. Farrow) puts upon it, if he looks at line 45 on page 5, he will see that it precludes any such construction.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will see then that his amendment should apply to that clause, and not to the definition.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Perhaps it would come more properly there.

Amendment (Mr. Armstrong) negatived.

Mr. AUGER. I have an amendment to move which I hope the First Minister will accept, because it will save, I think, a good deal of trouble. If the hon. Minister had been here during this discussion he would have seen the necessity of my amendment. I propose to add to this tenant clause part of the corresponding clause in the electoral law of the Province of Quebec. I beg to move:

That the following words be added after the word "therefore," in the sixth line on the second page: "Provided, however, that such tenant must be *tenant feu et lieu*, except in the case of the lessee of a shop, workshop, or office."

This law has worked well in the Province of Quebec, and I think it would work well in the whole Dominion. It would not deprive a merchant of a vote who hires a store in a city and lives outside of the city, because he is declared a tenant under this clause. It would only require that in other cases a man must be a resident on the premises that he occupies under contract. I hope the Premier will see his way to accepting this amendment, because it will settle the difficulty which arose this evening.

Mr. FISHER. I think the fact that this is the law in the Province of Quebec, where it has been found to work very satisfactorily, is a fair justification for the amendment proposed by my hon. friend from Shefford (Mr. Auger). A tenant who does not hold the property in absolute occupation I do not think has a just right to vote. It is not at all likely that anybody holding property of sufficient value to entitle him to vote would live somewhere else where he would not have sufficient property to qualify him; and this clause is simply an inducement held out to people to create voters by means of what I may call a fraudulent simulation of tenancy. This is a thing which the Quebec Act has been drawn to avoid. I think the amendment is reasonable, and one which the Government ought to accept.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think we should agree to that proposition. It would mean that a man might rent a valuable property, and might not perhaps be qualified in any other way; and if he had a property that for any purpose he did not chose to live upon, he would not have a vote at all.

Amendment (Mr. Auger) negatived.

Committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into committee.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. On paragraph 4, "occupant."

Mr. MULOCK. The paragraph relating to tenant was not carried.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The clause was carried. All the amendments were disposed of, and I had begun to read the next clause when it was six o'clock.

Mr. MULOCK. There were amendments offered which were voted down, but there was no motion to carry the clause as a whole. However, the amendment I have is only a brief one.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I do not declare each clause carried as a whole, but after we have gone through it and disposed of all the amendments I proceed to the next clause; the clause which the hon. gentleman wishes to amend was disposed of, and it cannot be brought before the committee again.

Mr. MULOCK. I cannot see how you can declare the clause carried, when it was not put as a whole.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman will accept my ruling, I am sure. Following the practice which I have followed throughout this Bill, I declare each paragraph carried as it is finished, and when all the amendments are

disposed of and all the paragraphs carried, the clause is disposed of and I go on with the next. I had begun with the next, when it was six o'clock, and I rose from the Chair.

Mr. MULOCK. I did not know you were going on with the next clause, because it had not been put as a whole, and I have still an amendment to offer.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I cannot submit to have my decision questioned.

Mr. MULOCK. Then I must appeal from the decision of the chairman to the meeting.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). You will surely hear some argument on the subject.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. No, I have given my ruling.

Mr. CAMERON. I was sitting here when the amendment was disposed of and was not aware that the clause was carried.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I cannot allow hon. gentleman to discuss my decisions.

Mr. CAMERON. We are not discussing your decision.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I have given you my ruling, and the practice I intend to pursue. I had called the first word of the next paragraph.

Mr. CAMERON. Well, nobody heard you. We would have moved an amendment had we known that you were going on to the next clause.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I must ask the hon. gentleman to respect the Chair.

Mr. CAMERON. I am respecting the Chair, but I think the Chair ought to respect the House. We were not aware——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CAMERON. You need not get so excited; we have rights which we will assert. Nobody was aware, Sir, that you had declared the clause carried.

Mr. MULOCK. I appeal from the ruling of the Chair to the committee; I ask for the decision of the committee upon the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman will have to be regular in that and make his motion, appealing to the House from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. MULOCK. The first practice is to appeal from the Chair to the committee, then from the decision of the committee to the Speaker, and then from the Speaker to the House itself.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman will have to make his motion an appeal to the House.

On paragraph 4,

"'Occupant' means a person in actual occupation of real property otherwise than as 'owner,' 'tenant,' or 'usufructuary,' in his or her own right, or in the case of a married man, in his own right or in the right of his wife, and who receives to his or her own use and benefit the revenues and profits thereof."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move in amendment to strike out the words "or her."

Mr. DAVIES. I think it would be better if the words from "otherwise" down to "wife" were struck out.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There would be no use then in having the definition of an owner or occupant at all.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman may see how often an owner may be in constructive possession. In Prince Edward Island there is a large number of people who years ago came and squatted on the land. They do not hold a patent from the Crown or the proprietor. Their title is simply owner by statutory occupation. These people would come under this clause, and I do not see what sense there is in the words I struck out.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It appears to me there is no real sense in retaining the words referred to by the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies). There does not appear to me to be any sense in the words "otherwise as owner, tenant or usufructuary in his or her own right, or, in the case of a married man, in his own right or the right of his wife," because section 3, sub-section 5, declares what an occupant shall be who is entitled to vote. It declares the intention is that the occupant of real estate worth $300 shall be entitled to vote; if that is so, why insist or declare he must be in receipt of the revenues and profits? Does not sub-section 5, section 3, cover the whole ground? He must be an occupant under a license of occupation, and that ought to be sufficient to entitle him to vote, but according to this interpretation clause, although he may be an occupant under license of the Crown to the value of $300, he is not entitled to vote unless he receives to his own use the benefits. But under a license from the Crown, he is not obliged to live upon the property himself; the intention is that the man who gets the license from the Crown to occupy land worth $300 shall be entitled to vote whether he lives on the land or not.

Mr. BOWELL. Have you ever known a difficulty to arise under that clause in Ontario?

Mr. CAMERON. In my county I have never known of any, simply because it might not arise, but it might arise elsewhere where the Crown grants license of occupation.

Mr. BOWELL. There are other occupants besides those who derive their titles from the crown and besides squatters. This clause, in exactly the same words, has been the law in the Province of Ontario ever since we have had an election law, and no difficulty has arisen under it.

Mr. CAMERON. That may be true, but we are not passing a Bill for Ontario, but we are endeavoring to make a Dominion Bill as perfect as possible, and unless the change is made I cannot see that this class will be entitled to vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman will consider a moment he will see that the word "occupant" is a merely explanatory definition, as these various other terms are—they are merely explanatory of what the meaning of the word is, whenever it occurs in other parts of the Bill.

Mr. MILLS. Would you include a person who has gone wrongfully upon another's property, where a suit of ejectment was pending?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly. The assessor does not enquire whether a man is a squatter adversely to the rights of the real owner or not.

Mr. MILLS. I think that there are English cases which would go against that rule, and as our use of the word "occupancy" seems to be derived from the use of the word in certain American land Acts, I think we should be very explicit as to whom we include and whom we exclude.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not think the words which I suggested should be taken are of vital importance, but I thought that they would be clearer. I suppose the inten-

tion is that the man who occupies *bond fide* and receives the rents will have the vote.

Mr. EDGAR. There is a large class in Ontario, farm laborers and others, who occupy houses belonging to their employers, receiving the right to occupy as part of their wages. Under the decision in the Brockville election case these were held not to be occupants, so I think we should have a form of words which would include them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The words are the same as in the Ontario Act and the reasons are the same.

Mr. EDGAR. Perhaps they are, but I do not think any of us here are responsible for Ontario legislation, and I think this class should be specially included, unless the hon. gentleman desires to exclude them.

Mr. MILLS. In the Ontario Act that class is provided for elsewhere.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will see about them when we come to the enfranchising clauses.

Mr. EDGAR. As the hon. member for Bothwell says, they are included further down in the Ontario Act as wage-earners.

Mr. SCRIVER. I believe that though the class referred to have been put on the electoral list in some cases, in our Province, but it has been held by the courts that they did not possess those rights, and I think they should possess them. I think, too, that the amendment suggested does not go far enough, because there is the case of laborers, and especially a most respectable and intelligent class, namely gardeners, who occupy buildings not actually the property of their employers, but provided by them, the rent being paid by their employers. I move to add to the amendment, after the word "house," "the property of, or the rent of which is paid by their employer."

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask if squatters on school lands would be entitled to vote under this definition.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the person is the apparent owner, enjoying the rents and profits, he has the vote.

Mr. MILLS. I think that some more specific provision should be made for that large number of persons, who by the decision in the Brockville case, cannot be regarded as tenants and who cannot be regarded as occupants because the proprietor does not give up possession.

Mr. MULOCK. It is a fact that a considerable tract of land in Ontario is not held in free and common soccage. During the period of the French *régime*, which extended over the late Province of Upper Canada, large quantities of land were granted under the French authority, to settlers at that time, and the English law was re-established after the Treaty of Paris in 1763. In a short time, namely in 1774, the Imperial Act was passed, restoring the old French law which prevailed down to 1791. By the Act passed in that year lands granted thereafter by the Crown were granted in free and common soccage, but it in no way dealt with lands theretofore granted under the French law. The result is that in the Detroit River district especially where there are large French settlements, many lands are unpatented to-day, as for example in the town of Windsor, and therefore I think that either the words "free and common soccage" should be struck out altogether or else that the amendment I suggest should be adopted.

Amendment (Mr. Mulock) negatived.

Amendment (Sir John A. Macdonald) to strike out "or her" in ninth line carried.

Mr. DAVIES.

Amendment (Sir John A. Macdonald) to strike out "or her" in the eleventh line carried.

Mr. WILSON. I think the First Minister ought to grant this request. Farm laborers are often provided with a small tenement house, and for that reason the farmer gets the labor for proportionately less. The assessor may assess a laborer for the full value of the house, but the county judge may decide that the house is of no value—so far as the occupant is concerned, and, therefore, the laborer is deprived of his vote. These laboring classes consist of intelligent men and good citizens. They pay their fair share of taxes in the way of revenue, and, therefore, it is only right and reasonable that they should have a vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That will come under a subsequent clause. This is merely a definition.

Mr. MILLS. But it is important to know what the hon. Minister proposes to do now, as it is necessary to harmonise the definition with the subsequent clauses of the Bill. At present these parties are entitled to vote under the law of the Province of Ontario, which is at present the law for this House. The Bill proposes to repeal that law so far as the Province of Ontario is concerned, and, therefore, to take away from those parties a right they now possess. It does seem to me that the burden of proof is on the hon. gentleman to show that these people are not qualified to exercise the electoral franchise.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may state that it is my intention to add in the enfranchising clause the words, "or moneys worth" in which rent may be paid.

On paragraph 5, "person,"

Mr. MILLS. I rise to ask the hon. gentleman how we are to understand the word Indian. Does he use it in the sense of an Indian enfranchised under the Indian Act, or in the sense of Indians who are not enfranchised?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I fancy that an Indian who is qualified would have a vote if he is a British subject. If an Indian has an income of $300 a year, he will have a vote the same as any other person.

Mr. MILLS. What we are anxious to know is whether the hon. gentleman proposes to give other than enfranchised Indians votes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. Indians residing on a reservation?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, if they have the necessary property qualification.

Mr. MILLS. An Indian who cannot make a contract for himself, who can neither buy nor sell anything without the consent of the Superintendent General—an Indian who is not enfranchised?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Whether he is enfranchised or not.

Mr. MILLS. This will include Indians in Manitoba and British Columbia?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. Poundmaker and Big Bear?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. So that they can go from a scalping party to the polls. Now, I propose moving in amendment:

That the following words be added after the word "Indian," "who has been enfranchised under the Indian Act and has had conferred upon him the same civil capacities as other persons who are qualified to vote under this Act."

I can easily understand that we might desire to enfranchise Indians having the same civil capacity as other people, but why the hon. gentleman should be anxious to confer the electoral franchise upon a portion of the community who are not taxed, who are not subject to any burdens in the conduct of the Government of the country, who are not permitted to buy or to sell or to make contracts on their own behalf, who are dealt with by the Government precisely as children are dealt with, and at the same time withold the franchise from large numbers of the white population, a great many people will not be able to understand. That class of the community who are held to be wards of the Government, utterly incapable of managing their own affairs, are to be entrusted with the most important franchise that can be conferred upon a free people. In so far as the Indian population are prepared to assume the responsibilities of citizenship, I am prepared to say that they shall be dealt with precisely as the rest of the community are dealt with. I am prepared to say that an enfranchised Indian, capable of managing his own affairs and allowed to assume the responsibilities of a free man without Government interference or Government control, if he possesses the necessary amount of property, ought to exercise the electoral franchise as any other citizen; but I am opposed to placing in the hands of the Administration a certain number of votes because that is precisely what this provision means. An Indian who is a ward of the Government, who can buy or sell nothing without a license from the Superintendent General, and who is less qualified to exercise the franchise than many a boy running through the streets of this city, is to have the franchise conferred upon him, while many a white man is denied that privilege. I think the people of this country will understand the object of this. We had a Bill before which was intended to divide the constituencies up to suit the Government; and we have here another measure, more offensive still, by which it is proposed to confer the franchise upon a class of people who are notoriously incapable of exercising it, in order to enable the Government to defeat certain candidates who have seats in this House. By the Indian Act the Government are authorised to issue patents enfranchising Indians under certain conditions, and they may be controlled in the exercise of the franchise by the power the Superintendent General has over them. If the hon. gentleman is prepared to say that the Indian population of any one of the Provinces have reached such a condition as to be entitled to be enfranchised, that each reserve should be divided, and each Indian given his own holding, that the Government should withdraw its control over the Indians and allow them to stand in the same position as any other citizen, I make no objection; but he proposes to give the franchise to those Indians who would not possess the qualification if the Government did not exercise its care over them. There is not a particle of justification for the course the hon. gentleman proposes to take. It is only necessary to look at the report of the Indian Department and see the number of Indians in the different constituencies throughout the country in order to ascertain precisely what the intention of the hon. gentleman is. The very reasons that prevent a guardian from dealing with a ward's property ought to prevent the Indian from voting as a free man, while he continues to be a ward of the Government. Under a condition of things which renders a police force necessary to prevent the Indians from taking up arms, in which white people are being driven from their homes and some of them massacred by the Indians, the hon. gentleman proposes to give these Indians the power of voting under this law—he proposes to give to such men as Poundmaker and his band and Pie-a-pot and his band, the power of electing representatives to seats on the floor of this House. These men are dependents on the State. They are paupers of the State, supported by the State, and notwithstanding that fact, if they have a small shanty, or a plot of ground sufficient for the qualification, they would have a vote. The hon. gentleman proposes to take the franchise from a large number of those who shouldered their arms and went to the North-West to restore order, and to give it to the men who are massacring women and children in the North-West. The hon. gentleman is ready to do anything in the way of legislation to keep himself in office, and prevent a fair expression of opinion on the part of the intelligent electors of Canada.

Mr. DAWSON. I should have thought that the hon. gentleman would have been more liberal in his views towards a class who were once under his charge. The Ontario Act provides as fully for giving the franchise to the Indians as this Bill does. (The hon. gentleman read from the Ontario Act, 48 Vic., chap. 144.) That was the law in Ontario for many years, but two years ago they altered it, so as to prevent Indians who drew annuities, or certain sums of money for lands ceded to the Government, from having votes. The Indians, I may say, would be far from voting uniform in any particular way; for they are guided, like other people, by their opinions and predilections; they do not change their opinions readily. (The hon. gentleman quoted further from the Ontario Act, 48 Vic., chap. 144.) This, Sir, is a very sweeping clause, and I think it is a very illiberal and unsound provision to exclude Indians for no better reason than that of drawing moneys from the Government for lands which they have ceded—moneys which continue to be paid to them by all Governments, and of which no Government of the day can deprive them. It is surely ungenerous to call them paupers, dependent on the Government. In the district I represent there are many Indians who have property, and pay their taxes, who are educated, and who have been elected as members of the municipal councils. One was reeve of a municipality, and many of them are well off. Yet, because these men draw money from the Government on account of the lands they ceded, they are deprived of votes. That, I think, is unfair. The hon. gentleman says he will allow the enfranchised Indians to vote, but I say, anyone who reads the Act with reference to the enfranchisment of the Indians, which dates from a somewhat remote period, will see that it is almost impossible for the Indians to become enfranchised under that Act. (The hon. gentleman here quoted from the Act 43 Vic., chap. 28, at considerable length). This provision makes the Act practically ineffective, for if you give an Indian an allotment on a reserve, that moment you break up the reserve, and render it useless for the purpose for which it was established. Besides, the Indians themselves are so attached to the tribal system that they would not consent to it. The clause with reference to enfranchising Indians who are educated looks fair enough, but it, too, is utterly impracticable, as the idea of an educated man going through a probationary term of three years to become enfranchised is absurd. The Act now before us is intended to apply only to Indians who have left their wild life and acquired property sufficient to keep them and their families comfortable, and these men are as able to exercise the franchise as white men, for the Indian is naturally intelligent, and when he gives up his wandering habits makes a very good member of the community. As to the Indians of the North-West, I have no doubt the present state of things has been in a great part due to the want of sympathy manifested for and to them by the white people. The French of old adopted a much better system,

by treating them as human beings and not as something altogether inferior to them. Their plan was gradually to lead them forward in civilisation and education; my opinion is, that even the Ontario Act is much more liberal in its provisions than is the spirit in which hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side have spoken to-night.

Mr. BLAKE. The question before us is not one of sympathy with the Indians at all. I do not suppose any well-regulated mind can feel anything but sympathy with the original possessors of the soil of this continent. That is not the question. The question is, whether the Indian, in the sense in which the hon. gentleman uses that word in this clause, is a fit subject for the exercise of the franchise. Now, what is the word franchise? It is a symbol of the freedom of the party, and it is not upon any except a free man that you have a right to confer the power to elect the representatives who will make the laws. Freedom is essential to this right; and I maintain that under the laws as they exist there is sufficient evidence to show that the Indian—at any rate the Indian who is not enfranchised within the meaning of that word in the Indian Act—does not occupy that position in which it is safe to give him the franchise. In the Act of the hon. gentleman himself—that of 1880, amended in 1884—he makes provision, by a slow, probationary and, as the hon. member for Algoma says, impracticable process, to enfranchise the Indian. He says that the ordinary Indian may, by a slow and painful process, establish his right to be enfranchised, and when he does that, he shall be deemed to be an enfranchised Indian. Now, the hon. gentleman is not proposing to give the franchise to those enfranchised Indians, but to all Indians who may be in occupation of a plot of ground of sufficient value to entitle them to a vote under this Bill, though they may not be enfranchised, or may not be deemed by his own law fitted to enjoy the ordinary rights of free men; though they are under his own control; though for their own safety, he says they must be kept under his watch and ward; but they are to be, for the purpose of ruling us, enfranchised. Such an enfranchisement is not a real enfranchisement. It is a liberty to vote, it is true, but it is a liberty to vote as the Superintendent General wishes; it is the liberty to vote of the unenfranchised Indian. Now, what is the position, under the law, of those persons whom the hon. gentleman proposes to make into capable citizens? I am not asking what you ought to make the Indian; I am asking what you have made him. If I were to ask what you could make of the Indian, I would read what the hon. gentleman himself thinks on the subject, from his own remarks, upon the consolidation of the Indian Act in 1880, when my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) suggested a more speedy and complete method of enfranchising the Indian than was already in existence. (The hon. gentleman read from the speech of Sir John A. Macdonald in the *Debates* of the House of Commons for 1880, page 1991.) Now, Sir, I have selected a few clauses from the Indian Act to show the power of the Government, and the officer of the Government, the Superintendent General, over the Indian population. (The hon. gentleman quoted at great length from the Indian Act of 1880, and amendments thereto, to show the powers exercised by the Superintendent General in the administration and control of the affairs of the Indians, and to show that by the Act passed in 1884 greater powers were given to the Superintendent General, with respect to the devising of property by Indians, the election of chiefs, the setting aside of the election of chiefs, the enfranchisement of Indians, and other matters, than were conferred upon him by the Act of 1880.) I think I have read enough to show that the proposition now before us is one of the most monstrous that was ever made to any legislative body—that the First Minister of a Government, the leader of a party, being himself Superintendent General of Indian affairs, having passed the laws which place these people so entirely under his control, should propose to this Parliament to give them a vote. It is an audacious, an impudent proposal, to take the votes of the unenfranchised Indians under his own control. Now, we know what the traditions of the Indians are with reference to the Government; we know that they speak of the Queen as the Great Mother. We saw, the other day, that three chiefs of a tribe of Stonies sent a message to the hon. gentleman, declaring that they had determined to place their trust in three things—first, in God, as revealed by our Lord Jesus Christ, and second in the Canadian Government; and you have your local superintendent, the sub-officer of the Superintendent General, over them, controlling them, deciding in many cases what shall be done in daily concerns of their life, representing, in a tangible form, the Superintendent General, lording it over them. That is the position of affairs; and yet you propose that these Indians shall be enfranchised. You do not enfranchise them. I should rejoice to see them enfranchised if they were fit for freedom. You declare in your law that they are not fit for freedom; that they must be guarded, protected, subjected to disabilities, kept in a state of tutelage; you say in your speeches to Parliament that that is essential to their welfare; and while you say that, you propose to give them votes which they are not free to exercise—which, according to your own speeches, they are not capable of exercising intelligently. Now, this measure has been before this House for three Sessions, but the hon. gentleman did not include the Indians in it until this Session. He delayed introducing the Bill this Session for seven weeks, although this is the only significant word which was added to it, as it was introduced last Session. It is known that there are a great many constituencies throughout this Dominion in which a few votes will turn the scale, and I declare unhesitatingly my opinion, belief and conviction to be, that the hon. gentleman is introducing this clause, knowing the traditional obedience, respect and honor that the Indians have been accustomed to pay to the Crown and the Government, knowing that their notion would be that they ought to vote for the Government, knowing that he has the appointment of the men who control them locally, knowing that his name appears in almost every Act before them as the person who is the arbiter of their destinies, in the belief that he can control their votes; and I say that a more infamous proposal was never made to any Legislature.

Mr. DAWSON. I think the hon. gentleman who has just spoken misapprehends the Indians to whom this provision will apply. He speaks of the tribal Indians situated on reserves, who are under the control and management of the Government. The opinion was expressed very decidedly yesterday by the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott), who has legal knowledge that goes for something in this House, that Indians not holding property could not have votes.

Mr. BLAKE. But the Indian on the reserve can have a separate location ticket.

Mr. DAWSON. Then he is an Indian so far advanced that he should have a vote.

Mr. BLAKE. Not under this law.

Mr. DAWSON. The hon. gentleman has held forth the idea that the franchise is to be given to Indians who are hardly removed from the condition of savagery; but let me tell him that there are Indians throughout this Dominion who are far advanced in civilisation. There are Indians who have been in France, in England, and in other countries in Europe, for their education. I believe that the Premier of Manitoba will come under the designation of an Indian; the wife of one of the Governors in Manitoba, before that Pro-

vince was part of the Dominion, and who was remarkable for her hospitality and good breeding, was an Indian; I believe the wife of another Governor, a lady who has been looked upon by people along the Pacific coast as a very accomplished person, was an Indian; and we have a very intelligent class of people among the Indians all through the country. I know some wealthy Indians who draw this little annuity from the Government because it marks their connection with their race. There is one on the island of Manitoulin, who has a shop in which there are $10,000 worth of goods. It is a mistake to suppose that these Indians are without the affections common to other men; they are not the barbarians which many people imagine, and I say that this law, which the hon. gentleman has quoted, and which has come down from past generations, is an antiquated one. I know of another case of an Indian in Algoma who sends his children to Paris to be educated, who has white people in his employ as servants, and yet, because he draws his annuity, he is not allowed by the Ontario law to vote.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member for Algoma is mistaken in supposing I made any disparaging remarks about the Indians. I quoted the remarks made by the Superintendent General himself as to the Indian character and the possibility of civilising the Indians, and I read clauses from the two Acts of Parliament—the one passed in 1880 and the other in 1884. I say that any Indians fit to be enfranchised should be enfranchised, and that any difficulties in the way of enfranchising such Indians should be removed. But I object, when you have a law on the Statute Book which declares that except under certain special circumstances the Indian is not fit to be enfranchised, and still leaves him under the control of the Superintendent General, to your giving him the power to vote when you have that law, for as long as you have that law he cannot be free to vote.

Mr. DAWSON. Perhaps I misunderstood the hon. gentleman. He certainly used some strong expressions on the subject.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman will see that while, by the Indian Act now in force, these Indians are not capable of managing their own affairs, it is proposed by the present Bill to say that they are capable of managing the affairs of the country. The House and the country will know that the object of passing such a law is to enable a party to succeed in certain constituencies that otherwise they could not succeed in. I say this proposition is more offensive to the liberties of the people of this country than treason itself, because this indirect way of taking away the rights and liberties of the people is doing infinitely greater violence to the constitution of the country than anything that can be done by men who take up arms against the Government of the country. This Act is an attack upon that system of government which we have inherited from the mother country. The hon. gentleman had the audacity to tell the people of England that he and his supporters were the men who stood up for British principles, but I would ask him if there is anything British in this proposition to degrade the electoral franchise, and put it in the hands of men who are held incapable of managing their own private affairs. The hon. gentleman stands here in the position of a man who has taken sides with those who are taking up arms against the Government of the country.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order, order. I call upon the hon. gentleman to withdraw the expression; he has no right to make such a charge.

Mr. MILLS. I say that is the position in which he stands, and is not that the fact.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sorry that the proposal to put in one word in this clause should excite the blatant indignation of hon. gentlemen, and move them to make such an exhibition of themselves in discussing the question of whether or not an Indian is a person. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well, and the hon. member for Algoma, in his admirable and well-informed speech, has told us that many of these Indians are respectable, educated and worthy persons in every respect, and he knows perfectly well that the Bill can in no way apply to the savage nomads of the North-West. It is only designed to give a vote to those Indians who have the ostensible evidences of property which the white man can show—have houses, furniture, and civilised appliances of a certain value. With regard to what has been said by the hon. member for West Durham, he knows perfectly well how these Indian affairs are managed, and that as a matter of fact these duties are performed through subordinate officers and that the Indians are just as little dependent upon or interfered with by the Superintendent General as any trustee of a trust estate interferes with those who are the subjects of that estate. The Superintendent General represents the chief trustee—the Sovereign—but is that any reason why those who are the inhabitants of this country, who own property, who live, and raise families and die in this country, if they are otherwise qualified, should not have votes. The hon. gentleman knows that this system was adopted because of the tribal character of the Indians, and has been continued because that character still subsists. With reference to what the hon. gentleman has said about the increased powers of the Superintendent General, he knows that the reason for conferring those increased powers was that the Indians, as a whole, do not want their able, and educated, and capable men to leave the tribe, or to break up the reserves, and therefore their consent could not be obtained. That was the reason that the system which was adopted during the vice-royalty of Sir Edmund Head was an utter failure in effecting the enfranchisement of the Indians; and it was to prevent these educated Indians from being hampered in their desire for enfranchisement that the consent of these Indians was no longer required, but that on evidence being shown to the Superintendent General, as trustee, that a man was really worthy of enfranchisement, he would be enfranchised, and ultimately get his location ticket. The hon. member for Bothwell says it is worse than treason to give the unenfranchised Indian the right to vote, and yet Mr. Mowat and his Government committed that treason, because they declare that the unenfranchised Indian as well as the enfranchised should have the right to vote. Of course, there are restrictions in the Indian Act, because the purpose of that Act was by slow degrees—but as speedy degrees as possible, as speedily as the old prejudices and habits of the Indians would justify it—they should be freed from these trammels. As quickly as the prejudices of the Indians themselves will allow, the whole effort of legislation respecting them has been to free them from those trammels, and to enable them to go forward and become independent British subjects as if they were white men. The enfranchised Indians are allowed to vote, by Mr. Mowat's Bill, in all political as well as municipal elections, although there is, perhaps, a good reason why, in municipal elections, they should not be allowed to vote, while in Dominion elections they should. The Indians, while on the reserve, while unenfranchised, do not contribute to the municipal assessment of the country; they are not liable to be assessed or taxed; and therefore it might be well held that until they became so liable they should not have a vote in municipal affairs. Notwithstanding that, they have been given votes if they did not receive a portion of the Indian annuities. There was no excuse for that restriction. The annuities paid to the different bands are their own moneys, and they go to them as their right. Their lands have been sold; the proceeds have been funded at a certain rate of interest, which

the Government pays; and the Indian has the same right to his annual payment out of that fund as if he were a shareholder in a bank receiving a dividend. It is his own money; anyhow, why this illiberal restriction should be put on an unenfranchised Indian I cannot see, unless it is for some political reason, which I will not say, as the hon. gentleman opposite might, who chooses to attribute motives. If it is wrong, if it is treasonable, if it is infamous, if it is audacious, and I do not know what else, what is it in the Government of Ontario? We are actuated, I believe, by the same desire to give British subjects, red or white, if they have the property qualification, the right to vote as such. The Indian contributes to the revenue just as well as the white man. He buys taxed goods, he wears taxed clothes, he drinks taxed tea, or perhaps excised whiskey, just as well as the white man; and, according to the liberal principle, we are to have taxation without representation in the case of the poor Indian. How hon. gentlemen opposite would exclaim against the crushing tyranny of depriving a man who contributes to the revenue of the right to vote for representatives in Parliament; we should hear the Liberal drum rub-a-dub-dubbing round the country that here was an instance of oppression and tyranny—here, in a country that boasts of representative institutions; here under a Superintendent General who said, in England, that his party drew their inspirations from England, that I imposed taxation on men and then deprived them of representation.

Mr. MILLS. What about the Chinese?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman wants now to change the subject. He has had enough of the Indians; and now he comes to the "Heathen Chinee." Sir, in humble imitation of the Province of Ontario, I have ventured to say that an Indian is a person, and I have ventured to ask Parliament also to say that when the Indian has the necessary property qualification he should have the same vote as a British subject—as the white man has.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman claims that we are illiberal and are urging taxation without representation in saying that these Indians should not have liberty to elect representatives to Parliament. Sir, the whole of my argument has been to show that the Indian has not the liberty to elect representitives to Parliament—to show that he is not, under the law, free to elect, and that because he is not free to elect, therefore you cannot give him the franchise. The question is this: Whether these men are free to vote. If they are not free to vote, then the franchise is not an advantage to them; it is an advantage simply to those to whom they are subservient. The whole of my argument has been to show that under your laws they are subservient, and if they are we cannot make them free to vote. Now the hon. gentleman is very fond of quoting the statutes of Ontario, and he and other hon. gentlemen seem to think that the fact that any Act or resolution passed in the Province of Ontario is an absolute bar to argument or criticism on the part of us who are Liberals. I entirely deny that proposition. There may be Acts of the Legislature of Ontario of which I do not at all approve. My mouth is not shut simply because there is an Act of the Province of Ontario on a particular matter. But it is really amusing, and it shows how very hardly the hon. gentleman is pushed, when he is obliged to set up as his shield for this Bill that it was in humble imitation of "that little tyrant, Mowat" that he has introduced this clause. I conceive there might be a difference between the case of the Province of Ontario and the case of the Dominion. The Prime Minister of the Province of Ontario is not the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs; he is not the guardian, the father, the protector, the arbiter of the destiny of this class of the population. The Indians are the wards of this Government; they are subservient to this Government; their convenience,

their aspirations towards liberty, their desires for enfranchisement, are dependent upon this Government; and it is because they are the dependents of the Government which proposes—I cannot say to enfranchise them, for it would be an abuse of that noble word, but which proposes to say to them: You shall vote—that, I say, that their vote cannot be a free vote. The hon. gentleman said Mr. Mowat's Act gave them votes. The hon. member for Algoma has been kind enough to lend me the Act, the provisions of which upon this point I have not seen before. I find that two provisions are made—one for the case, which is the ordinary case, in which there are voters' lists; and the other, which I think only relates to a few unorganised districts, where there are not voters' lists. First of all, the enfranchised Indian; secondly, the Indian who, though not enfranchised, does not reside among the Indians, even though he does participate in the annuities, is allowed to vote. Why, I cannot tell; but I understand that the intention of the law is that the Indian who has separated himself from the tribal life, if he is otherwise qualified, is allowed to vote the same as a white man. I presume that the Ontario Government had found that in the unorganised districts frauds and irregularities were committed, and they found it necessary to make some further restriction there. That is merely my speculation; there must have been some exceptional cause for so dealing with the Indians where there were no voters' lists. However, if it were proved perfectly plainly that this law was not defensible, according to the arguments I am advancing, that would not make it defensible. An indefensible law on the part of the Legislature of Ontario does not become defensible here; therefore, I say we have but little to do with that. The hon. gentleman says the law was changed in 1884 because the mass of the Indians opposed the enfranchisement of the more advanced and the more educated amongst them. Now, it is this mass we are dealing with. The hon. gentleman has taken steps to enable him to enfranchise the more advanced and intelligent men, and therefore he has taken them under his own control. If they are not free enough under the law, make them freer. If you believe that with a shorter period of probation, and with fewer restrictions, the Indian may be enabled to become a capable citizen, abolish those restrictions and provide for his enfranchisement at an earlier date, or with fewer difficulties than now exist; but you have your law, with all these careful provisions, and you tell me that the reason you make this change is that you find that the mass of Indians are opposed to the few amongst them who are capable of rising into the scale of free and enfranchised citizens; and it was that mass who, not choosing to rise themselves, refused to their brother the right to rise; from whom the hon. gentleman, by changing his law, took away the right of obstructing those who want to rise; it is that mass to whom, though not enfranchised—to such as the Superintendent General gives a location ticket to for a lot in the reserve—this Bill proposes to give votes. Here is the hon. gentleman's certificate of character of the Indians whom he proposes to enfranchise—that they do not like enfranchisement; that they do not aspire to it; that not only do they not aspire to it, but they put a veto upon the efforts of those who want to rise, so seriously that he was obliged to withdraw that power from them and say to them: You may rise, although your brothers would keep you down;—these are the Indians to whom he proposes to give the vote—not to all, but to such as he will give location tickets to. The hon. gentleman said that I had read a great many clauses and had harped on the word Superintendent General, but that everybody knows that the Superintendent General represents the Sovereign, and that he acts through his agents. I know the hon. gentleman is a man in authority, having servants under him; and I can

well understand that the untutored Indian, who knows what his agents can do to help or to hurt them—who finds how heavy is the little finger of the hon. gentleman's agent—should conceive a great idea of the hon. gentleman himself, who passed an Act of Parliament which places their freedom, their power of rising, their power of disposing of their property in their lifetime and willing it at their death, in his own hands. The hon. gentleman said the Superintendent General was the representative of the Sovereign. So he is, and I have told you what the Indians' reverential feelings are towards the Great Mother, represented by the hon. gentleman; and don't you think the Indian would be inclined to vote for the representative of the Sovereign?

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). What about the ballot?

Mr. BLAKE. It is the man's will, his inclinations, his views, that I am speaking of. They are the hon. gentleman's humble servants, his wards, and of course they will vote for him. The hon. gentleman says that the Superintendent General interferes no more with the Indians than the trustee of a trust estate, but I would like to ask what trust estate is there in which such power over the individuals who are the subjects of that trust is exercised as is exercised by the Superintendent General over the Indians and their affairs. Such a comparison is entirely out of the question, except in the case of some very special trusts, in which a testator, having every confidence in the trustee, places him *in loco parentis* over his children, who are minors, and these children, as to all their material interests, would be in something like the same relation to this trustee as the Indians are to the hon. gentleman. But I would like to ask how free would the children be over whom that trustee has such a power? The question is, whether, under the condition of things which I indicated, these people are really free for Dominion elections? and the hon. gentleman has not at all dealt with that argument.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman if he is prepared to accept any amendment as to this provision?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have pointed out that this paragraph merely says that an Indian shall not be excluded from the definition of the word "person," and if the hon. gentleman wishes to make any special provision, regulating, restricting or enlarging the Indian vote, he can offer it on the enfranchising clauses.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The amendment is, that after the word "Indian," in the fourteenth line, to insert the words "who has been enfranchised under the Indian Act and has had conferred on him the same civil capacities as other persons who are qualified to vote under this Act."

Mr. PATERSON. Will the hon. gentleman consent to that amendment?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think I can consent to that, because, if what the hon. member for Algoma says is correct, there has not been a single Indian enfranchised.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, there has; and the hon. gentlman has said so over his own signature in his report. (The hon. gentleman quoted from the report of Indian Affairs, as to the enfranchisement of the Wyandotte band of Indians.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I had forgotten that the small Anderdon reserve had broken up, and that the Indians were now acting as separate individuals.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The question before the committee is an important one, as it proposes to bring within the rights of citizenship—no, not within the rights of citizenship, but proposes to give to the Government of the day power to bring to the polls a very large number of supporters, for it is quite clear, from what has transpired, that the object the First Minister seeks to attain is not the elevation or benefit of the Indians, but the securing of his party in power. The right hon. gentleman refuses to accept the amendment proposing to place the Indians on precisely the same footing as the other voters entitled to vote under this Act. The First Minister is disposed to press the clause as it is, providing that the word "person" shall mean an Indian. Now, what does the word "Indian" mean? That, I think, we can best ascertain from the interpretation clause of the Indian Act. (The hon. gentleman here quoted the clause in question.) Therefore, the hon. gentleman proposes that not only male Indians, but every female Indian who is or was married, shall have the right to vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; this Act defines for itself. The word "person" means a male person, including Indians.

Mr. PATERSON. But what is an Indian? That is something for which we must look to the Indian Act. So that the hon. gentleman who has gradually abandoned the subject of his life-long desire to enfranchise the females of Canada—he has gradually abandoned them all, except the female Indian, and I am not sure whether he will not be willing that that right should also be taken from them. I think we must conclude that by this provision of the Bill it is not intended to elevate or uplift the condition of the Indian in the social scale. It confers no rights on the Indian. If his desire is to benefit the Indians, let him give greater facilities for them to attain the full status of their rights and liberties, to emancipate them from the guardianship of the Government of the day, to make them free agents, with the right to manage their own affairs. The Act does nothing of the sort. It gives the Indian the right to vote, but the Indian and his vote are virtually controlled by the Government of the day, and will be used by the Government as a means of retaining themselves in power. The leader of the Opposition has pointed out the intention, the meaning and the purport of this measure, namely, that, in many constituencies of this Dominion, to give the vote to a class of people whom the Government control, and who are the wards of the Government. During the summer there had been vague hints passing through the constituency in which I live that the Indians were to be enfranchised, and that South Brant, which the Government tried to win for themselves through their infamous gerrymander, would at last be secured for the Government. They are trying to do that now, and though they may fail again, as they did before, their desire, their intention, is in that direction. Why this tone of exultation as to giving the power of voting to the Indians? Why do they suppose that these Indians would vote for the Government? Is it because the present representative of that riding is unpopular with them—because he has not the confidence of these people? No; they will not take that ground, for it is known that there is no better friend of the red man than the humble individual who now addresses the House. Whence, then, comes this tone of exultation on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to this clause? It comes from the knowledge of the fact that the votes they propose to give these Indians would not be exercised by the Indians of their own free will, but would be votes given under the control and by the will of the Government; and there are hon. gentlemen sitting there disposed to prevent one from pointing out the meaning and intent of this Bill. If these Indians were free and untramelled, and not under Government influence and control, I would say to give to the advanced Indian his full rights and liberties, and let him assume the responsibilities of citizenship; but that is not the object of the Government, because this Bill proposes to give to Indians in all the Provinces, who have no power, even to sell their own produce, the right to vote. How will

the vote be cast? They will not have the right to vote until the Government give them the location ticket; and if there were any Indian outspoken enough to give to the Government the idea that his vote would be cast against them, is it beyond the bounds of possibility that the Government would delay the issue of the location ticket until it was too late? Why, under the provision of this Bill, a person might be appointed an Indian agent, might arrange the vote for himself, and then run as member; for many of the Indian agents, if not all of them, although nominated by the Government, without the consent of the band, are not paid out of the Consolidated Revenue of Canada, but out of the moneys belonging to the band. Is that in the interest of freedom, in the interest of intelligence or in the interest of the selfish aspirations of people to enter Parliament, or in the interest of a Government who are afraid to submit their actions to the verdict of the people, and are trying, by this Bill, which is so reprehensible, to secure the power in their hands. When the hon. leader of the Opposition was questioning the independence of the votes that would be exercised, the hon. member for Leeds and Grenville asked, where is the ballot? How many of the Indians in any of the tribes or bands can read or write? In a large number of the bands, perhaps a majority of the Indians can neither read nor write, and their vote must be an open vote; because, with the eyes of the Government officer upon them, and the ears of the Government officer open to hear the names of the men they vote for, how can we expect an independent vote from them? The hon. First Minister says that we, on this side, have taken ground against the principle of representation after taxation—that these Indians pay taxes upon the clothing they wear and upon the food they consume. It is true; and if he is proceeding on that ground, I would ask him if there are not hundreds and thousands of white men and women who are paying taxes upon what they use, and who are not enfranchised under this Bill at all. (The hon. gentleman here quoted a number of the provisions of the Indian Act.) The whole tenor of the Act is to give the Superintendent General absolute control over the Indians, in whose hands it is now proposed to place the franchise. Now, the question arises, is it a desirable thing that the Government should have the power to control the votes of some tens of thousands of Indians scattered throughout the different constituencies of this Dominion? Is it in the public interest that any Government should possess that power? That is a question that the Government and their supporters are bound to ask themselves, as intelligent men, and as men who are supposed to have the interest of the country at heart. The question of the Indians' advancement does not come in at all, for that must be accomplished by other means. But you propose to give a man a vote who is not a free agent, and therefore you are not conferring a liberty on that man at all. The uplifting of the Indian, his improvement and advancement, must come in the direction of giving him his full rights with the vote, irrespective of any control by the Government, to use that vote as he thinks fit. I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as the First Minister is not in his place, whether the Indians have asked to have the vote given to them?

Mr. McLELAN. You will get particulars in the course of time.

Mr. RYKERT. Yes; you will get the letter from the squaws.

Mr. PATERSON. Has it come to this, that the country is under the control of those who cannot give any better answer than this to a pertinent question? Not only is a civil answer not given to a pertinent question, but an insulting, impudent answer is given. The hon. gentleman may be a Minister, but I stand as his peer in this House, elected by a constituency which is as good as his, and though he may be clothed with a little brief authority, he is not clothed with authority to give me insolent answers when I ask questions.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I would ask the hon. gentleman to adhere to the discussion of the question before the committee.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I will adhere to the question. I ask the Minister a question, and if he is ignorant of it, let him stand up and say so, like a man. After the answer he has given, I venture to say that the Indians have never asked to have the franchise conferred on them, and that it has been forced on them by the Government. I had a personal reason for asking the question. Last year we passed what is called the Indian Advancement Act, designed, as the First Minister told us, to encourage the Indians to adopt municipal institutions, and to exercise greater powers in other respects. I think it would be as well to read that Act. (The hon. gentleman proceeded to read the Act in question).

An hon. MEMBER. Louder.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Come a little nearer. My hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. White) is a happy man, with this clause in the Bill, because he has a large number of these individuals in his constituency.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Yes, and they are all sound, too.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). And if they were not sound he would take care that the Indian agent made them sound. The hon. gentleman sits there glorying in this clause; he feels the same kind of pleasure that was experienced by members supporting the Gerrymander Act, when they thought they would secure their own seats or cut the heads off some of their opponents.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

Mr. PATERSON. No wonder you do not like to hear of the gerrymander. Now, I have read the whole Act. You will have observed that it was an attempt, on the part of the Government last Session, to encourage the Indians living on their reserves to adopt municipal institutions, instead of having their affairs legislated upon by their chiefs. I have done so for the purpose of bringing before the attention of the First Minister—who, I am sorry to see, is not present on so important an occasion as this—the report of a meeting of the Six Nation Indians in my own constituency on the 17th of April, 1875, when they decided against availing themselves of the Municipal Advancement Act, as they call it. (The hon. gentleman read a newspaper report of the meeting). That is proof positive, to my mind, that not only have these Indians not asked for this vote, but that they do not desire it. It may be replied that they need not exercise it; but they are the wards of the Government; they are under the control of the Government; and being in that position, we can readily see that, unwilling though they might be, very many of them might be persuaded, to use no other word, to cast their vote in a particular direction. Another reason why the Government should hesitate before doing anything like forcing something on the Indians that they have not asked for is the peculiar manner in which some of them view their rights. There are chiefs and warriors among the Six Nations who take the position that they are not subjects of the Crown, but are allies; and that is the reason I should like to have the First Minister present, tell me what position the Six Nation Indians occupy with reference to the Crown, and what was the nature of their treaty. Can the Minister present inform me, for instance, whether the Government have power to order out for military duty the chiefs and warriors of the Six Nation Indians. I ask it with the view of ascertaining in what

position the Indians really do stand with reference to the Crown? I want an answer to that question.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman, a short time ago, asked a question of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. His answer was: I will obtain the particulars and bring them to you. The reply he got to that was, that it was impudent and insolent. I do not propose to put myself in a position, in any answer I give to the hon. gentleman, to be dealt with in that way.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman seems to have put himself in that position now.

Mr. BOWELL. If the remark of my colleague was impudent and insolent, my own is more so, and I am quite willing to accept the compliment of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PATERSON. I did not understand the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to give the answer either in the tone or in the words the hon. Minister of Customs has used. I understood his answer to be, You can get particulars by and by, with a careless shake of the head, which I thought was insulting and contemptuous to me. If the hon. Minister said he would get the information for me later, I would apologise, for I do not wish to be offensive.

Mr. McLELAN. The words I used were, that I would obtain the particulars, and "you know."

Mr. PATERSON. Well, the hon. Minister of Customs excuses himself from making a reply to my question because of a reply I made to a previous answer. The question I ask concerns the Indians in my county, and I desire to have it answered, to enable me to make up my mind on this matter. It is a question which ought to be considered by the Government, but which evidently has not been considered by the Government. There is not much satisfaction in going on and debating a subject when no answers can be given by the Ministry. I would therefore move that you rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again, so that we may get information on this point.

Mr. WALLACE. We have been listening for several hours to the hon. member for South Brant, arguing against the proposal to enfranchise the Indians. Well, the hon. member has a peculiar elasticity of conscience.

Mr. PATERSON. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. He has not heard me say one word against enfranchising the Indians. I protested against giving them votes, and withholding enfranchisement from them. I am in favor of enfranchising them.

Mr. WALLACE. I understand enfranchising means giving them votes.

Mr. PATERSON. Then you are wrong.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman was not always of that opinion. We find him readily changing his opinion on the question of protection. We shall also find him as readily changing it on the question of giving votes to the Indians. In 1880, when the Minister of Interior brought in a Bill to consolidate the Indian Act, the hon. gentleman objected to the Bill, on the ground that it did not provide for the enfranchisement of the Indians, for according to them the rights and privileges of citizens. To-night he says that in a large number of bands the majority of the Indians can neither read nor write. I suppose he was referring to those Indians whom he knew something about. In that same speech he used these words:

"I speak on behalf of 3,000 Indians, among whom six missionaries have been laboring for the past thirty years, and who have twelve public schools and an industrial institute."

Yet he says that a large number of these Indians can neither read nor write.

Mr. PATERSON. I did not say large numbers of the Six Nations could not read nor write.

Mr. WALLACE. I suppose that in these public schools the Indians had opportunities of learning to read and write, and many other branches of education. At present, Sir, he protests against enfranchising the Indians, while five years ago he urged the Government to adopt this very principle.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman does not at all comprehend the question. He has mis-stated what I said. He says I stated a large portion of the Six Nation Indians could not read or write.

Mr. WALLACE. I did not say so.

An hon. MEMBER. He did not say the Six Nation Indians.

Mr. PATERSON. But he applied it to the Six Nation Indians. What I said was, that in many of these bands large numbers of them would be unable to read or write, and my remarks were not with reference to the Six Nation Indians. What I said with reference to the Six Nation Indians was correct then, and it is correct now. What I say is, that the hon. gentleman should give the same right, liberties and responsibilities to Indians as to others; that would be the solution of the whole question, while the Act proposes to keep them in the same condition of tutelage that they are in at present.

Mr. DAWSON. I am rather surprised at some of the remarks of the hon. member for Brant, because heretofore I have had the greatest respect and the highest esteem for him, just on account of the fact that every Session he has stood up for the rights of the Indians, who have but few to take their part in this House. To-night, however, I must differ from some of his observations. He asks if the Indians have sought for the franchise. It is not at all likely that whole communities, spread over the continent, would come here and petition the Dominion Parliament to give them votes, but I can assure him that many educated Indians in my constituency—men of intelligence and property—have commented to me on the strangeness of the fact that the white servants whom they employed could record their votes while they were deprived of that privilege. There are many different classes of Indians; there are the half-breeds whom we found in Manitoba, at the time of the first Indian troubles, who are generally intelligent men, and who, by exercising the franchise and holding political meetings among themselves, were enabled to throw off a large quantity of superfluous steam—if I may use the expression. I believe that if the half-breeds at Qu'Appelle and other places had representation in Parliament it would divert their thoughts to higher aims, by showing them they had a voice in the Government of their country. I believe that the whole Indian race, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, should have some sort of representation in this House. The Indians of the class I have been referring to, of the class belonging to the Six Nations, which the hon. gentleman has mentioned in connection with the meeting they held on the reserve, should have the franchise, but no one proposes to give it to the wild Indians of the forest. The amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell would prevent the Indians who are not enfranchised according to the Act, from voting. It would simply have the effect of preventing all Indians from voting, because the Indian Act is impracticable, but few Indians have been enfranchised under that Act.

Motion (Mr. Paterson) negatived. Yeas, 24; nays, 51.

FRIDAY, 1st May, 1885.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I wish to make a few remarks in reply to the hon. member for Algoma. As I understand, the

First Minister intends to give a vote to these Indians living on their reserves, which the hon. member for Algoma seems to think would be ridiculous. The Bill will apply, I think, to such Indians as these, if the Government sees fit to give them location tickets. Everybody is in favor of giving the franchise to such Indians as the Wyandottes, who are, to all intents and purposes, the same as the white man; that is the real enfranchisement of the Indian, and the aim of all legislation should be, as in the case of the Wyandottes, to make them free men, with the rights, liberties and responsibilities of free men. But the Act does not propose to do that at all; it proposes simply to give him a vote, but to leave him practically unenfranchised. If the member for Algoma carries out the principles he has enunciated, he will accord with me and he will vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell, which brings in enfranchised Indians, that is, Indians who have the right to manage their own affairs. The position of the hon. member for Bothwell is to give every enfranchised Indian a vote, as a matter of course; and it seems to me that the Government of Canada ought to offer all the inducements they can to the Indians to become enfranchised, and of course, along with that, to give them the right to vote, with the other powers of free citizens. But that is a different thing from giving them votes and keeping them still the wards of the Government.

Mr. SPROULE. What distinction does the hon. gentleman draw between an enfranchised Indian, under this clause, and giving him the right to vote?

Mr. PATERSON. Under this clause his position is not changed. It does not give him the control of his own property. He is under the control of the Government, just as he was before.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose we had enfranchised women, how would that apply to them?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They are not under the Superintendent General.

Mr. SPROULE. But we enfranchise the Indians as we proposed to enfranchise women. I understand they were in the same position.

Mr. PATERSON. The Government does not control your wife's affairs, but the Government controls the Indian's affairs.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order, order; the hon. gentleman should address the Chair.

Mr. PATERSON. I certainly did not make that remark in any offensive way, and I do not think the hon. member took it in that way. The position of an Indian is not like that of a woman under the control of her husband, if you use that expression, but it is like that of a child under twenty-one years of age, and under the control of his father. The Indians are minors in the eye of the law, and therefore it is that the very Act you are passing now declares that a minor shall not have the power to vote. Why? Because he is not his own master, and has not control of his own affairs, but is under the control of his father; and yet, in giving votes to the Indians who are unenfranchised, you are giving it to those who are minors.

Mr. DAWSON. The effect of the motion before the Chair would be to apply the Act, not to the Indians on the reserves alone, but to the Indians all over the Dominion who have now the right to vote; and it would deprive the whole Indian race of the power to vote unless they acquiesced in the impracticable conditions set down in the Indian Act.

Mr. WHITE (East Hastings). I am happy to say that the Indians of the east riding of Hastings almost entirely manage their own affairs. They rent their own land, buy their horses, reaping machines and other goods, and a great many of them have votes, which I know many of them have given on the Reform side. I think the East Hastings Indians will vote independently of the Government and according to their own opinions.

Mr. PATERSON. They are not on the reserve.

Mr. WHITE. There are quite a number of them who have deeded lands.

Mr. WATSON. I am sorry that I cannot express myself in the same way as the hon. member for East Hastings. There are a great many Indians in my county who are not as intelligent as the Indians he mentions, and the First Minister has stated that they would be enfranchised. I believe this Act will enfranchise 1,800 to 1,900 Indians in Manitoba; and the First Minister has stated that the Act would apply to the Indians of the North-West Territories, provided they had the same qualifications as white men. I believe that about 1,900 Indians will be enfranchised in that Province. There are 10,206 Indians altogether in Manitoba; they have 1,876 houses, and I suppose that each of these houses, with the ticket location they would have on the reserve, would be worth $150. I do not think it is right that the wards of the Government should have the franchise. There are a great number of roving Indians over the plains, who might qualify under this Act, because they may have property worth $400. They may have a cart or two, and a pony. And, when the Territories have representation in the House, Poundmaker or Pi-a-pot might become members of Parliament, for I think that, according to this Act, they would be eligible, and they would receive the majority of the votes, because the Indians have a majority of the votes in the Territories. If they came here as wards of the Government, they would probably support the Government. The amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is a good one. The Indians ought to be encouraged to leave their reserves, take up land, and work it in the same way as other people do. The young Indians are being educated, but I do not believe there are fifty Indians in Manitoba who can read or write, and I do not think the franchise should be extended to these uncivilised people.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I agree with the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), that the extension of representative institutions to the half-breeds in Manitoba tended to allay the discontent in that country, and that, if the same rights had been extended to the half-breeds on the Saskatchewan, the same beneficial results would most probably have followed. Why were not those rights extended to them? The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) introduced a Bill for three Sessions to give the right to vote to the people of the North-West Territory, but what gentleman on the other side gave his sympathy and support to that measure? It is erroneous to assert that we, on this side of the House, are opposed to the enfranchisement of the Indians. There is not a member on this side who is not anxious for the enfranchisement of the Indians, but on a proper basis. We want to see them emancipated first, and do not want to see them voting as wards of the Government, brought up to the polls and instructed how to vote by the Indian agent. Wherever the privilege of voting is granted, a corresponding duty accompanies it, but the granting of this privilege to the Indians does not carry with it the performance of any duties. I may mention a case in my own experience. In the township of Caradoc there is a band of Indians, whose land is leased by the agent to white men for farming purposes, and the municipal council, though they have to build roads through that district, cannot collect any taxes from the white men, because they claim that they are exempt under the Indian Act. And yet these Indians, from whose land no taxes can be collected, and who themselves cannot contract a debt, cannot buy or sell, are to have the franchise conferred upon them so that one of them will have as much influence in public affairs as the highest taxpayer in the municipality. The only object of this

Bill is to enable the Government to control an immense number of votes throughout this country, by means of these Indian agents, who manage the affairs of these people, who will lead them to the polls and tell them how to vote; and it will be for the Government candidate always. The clause under which these Indians are to have the franchise conferred upon them is the occupant clause, which provides that where a man occupies land, which the revising barrister considers to be worth $150, he is to have the privilege of the franchise. All that an Indian would have to do, therefore, in some of the townships, if he had but three acres of land, would be to enclose it with a fence and put a sort of wigwam on it, to enable him to have the same privilege of voting as the men who pay taxes for the building of roads and the administration of justice—taxes which are much higher than they would be, owing to the very Indian reserves. I do not think it is right that we should give the franchise to Indians while we do not impose on them a single duty of the many the white men have to perform.

Mr. ALLEN. I agree with the hon. member for Algoma, that many of the Indians should be enfranchised; but of the 700 Indians living in my county, only about twenty of them can read and write and are in the position of being enfranchised. Before giving the right to vote to the Indians they should be men possessed of property and of a certain rudimentary education; they should be enabled to manage their own property and be responsible for their own debts—treated as men, in fact, and not as children. For the past quarter of a century they have been completely under the control of the Government, directed by the Government, as children, and the majority of them are as much afraid of the Government and its officials as school boys are of their teachers. There can be no doubt that in any election contest the Government could control their vote absolutely, without any difficulty, and in a riding like that of North Bruce, where the majority of either political party is very small, the election of a representative for that riding in this House would be entirely placed in the hands of the Indians. Are we going, not to enfranchise, but to place in the position of voters the Indians on the prairies, who, by their late action, have been the cause of the murder of many of our fellow-citizens? I hope Parliament will take this matter into further consideration, and not give the semi-barbarians the exercise of the greatest privilege enjoyed by the intelligent citizens of the country.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for North Grey says, if Indians had the property qualification, the same as white men, he would understand why they should have the right to vote. That is exactly what the Bill says.

Mr. ALLEN. How can you enfranchise a minor, and those Indians still retain the position of minors.

Mr. WELDON. It is proposed by this Bill to give the Indians the franchise, that is, the privilege of voting, the privilege of selecting their own representatives. This is a privilege which, under every free Government, is given only to free men. There may be differences of opinion as to whether universal suffrage should be the rule or whether property or other qualification should restrict the suffrage, but there has never been any question as to the principle that to free men alone should the franchise be granted. There are two classes of Indians in this country, those who have become enfranchised by their industry and through motives of ambition, and who stand exactly on the same footing as other citizens, and those who still retain their nomadic habits and live in their tribes, according to the Indian original system. In the Act of 1858, passed when Sir Edmund Head was Governor General of Canada, there is a provision for the enfranchisement of Indians after fulfilling certain conditions, such as being able to speak and write English or French, being of good moral character and owning property. These enfranchised Indians ceased to remain, as a general rule, members of the tribe, and abandoned the Indian customs. There is another class, the tribal Indians, who number in the neighborhood of 130,000. There are about 33,000 of them in Manitoba and the North-West Territory, 35,000 in British Columbia, 10,000 in Ontario, and the balance are scattered through Quebec and the Maritime Provinces. These still keep up the tribal system as a distinct community. These Indians are fettered and controlled by the Superintendent General of Indian affairs, and have no freedom of action. In Minnesota, persons of mixed blood, who have adopted the customs of civilisation, after an examination before a court, may be permitted to enjoy the rights of citizenship; in Wisconsin, civilised persons of Indian descent, not members of any tribe, are allowed to vote, and, in Michigan, every civilised male of Indian descent, not a member of a tribe, has the privilege. The essential principle of the right to exercise the franchise is perfect freedom of action. These Indians, particularly in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, are not qualified by their mode of life to exercise the franchise, and I do not think the Indians in British Columbia, who form nearly a majority of the population, should be entrusted with the power to send members to this House. In the Maritime Provinces, I am sorry to say that the Indians have learned many of the vices and none of the virtues of the whites, while they still retain many of the habits of their ancestors, and yet the hon. gentleman proposes to disfranchise men who have have had the right to vote as free men in the city of St. John for over 100 years, and to give a vote to these Indians, who are really nothing but dependents of the Government. The First Minister stated this Bill was in the direction of that brought by the Attorney General of Ontario; but if he really intends to follow humbly in the course taken by that gentleman, he should adopt the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell, and confine the Bill to those Indians who are fairly and justly entitled to the franchise under the Act of 1858, and not give it to men who, from their habits and modes of living, are not qualified to exercise it.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I rise to support the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell. When the First Minister proposed the adoption of this clause, he stated its application was as general as possible—that every loyal Indian was embraced in it. The hon. member for Algoma takes an entirely different view, assuming that only those will have the right to vote who are enfranchised in every sense of the term. It is only fair to assume the First Minister knows what he intends, and that therefore he intends to enfranchise all the Indians in the county of Middlesex. There are about 1,345 Indians on the Delaware reserve, which would represent a total of about 300 males. It is well known the lands of these people are held in common, leased by the Crown for the benefit of the band, and that a large number of the Indians are in the enjoyment of grants from the Government, in the shape of salaries and allowances. It was stated by the First Minister that the grants to the Indian funds were in the nature of a community, but on looking over the Indian report it will be seen that last year the sum of $7,415 was paid for the maintenance and support of the Indians of that band, a considerable amount of which was paid as salaries and not in the nature of an ordinary community grant. Practically, the men who distribute this money have absolute control over the affairs of the Indians, for the time being, who look upon them as personal benefactors and not merely as the agents of the Government; and it is doing the Indians no injustice to presume that on every occasion they will be the servants of the Government. I therefore ask, is it right that the franchise should be given

to people occupying that position. There is another feature of the question to be considered. It is well-known that the Indians are still the wards of the Crown, and consequently in law minors. This is the first time that in a deliberative assembly, within the domain of the British empire, such a proposition has been submitted, as to give the minors the right to vote. This Parliament deliberately refuses to confer the franchise on women, and yet is prepared to confer it on Indians, who occupy in law a position similar to that of minors. It has been urged that the franchise should be conferred on the Indian population in their present regulationship to the Crown, because they pay taxes. But if the payment of taxes is to be the basis of representation, why not confer the right to vote on numbers of youths under twenty-one years, who are not only earning their own livelihood, but materially contribute, from their own resources, to the coffers of the Dominion. The unreasonableness of this proposition is evident on the face of it. The proposition is one, as explained by the First Minister, to give the right to vote to the Indians who still live on the tribal reserves, and consequently the right is given to them on property which is not theirs, except as a portion of the tribal allowance; and yet this Franchise Bill excludes from its operation many young men who are entitled to come within its provisions, who should be entitled to have a vote. by virtue of their loyalty, as practically expressed in their readiness to risk their lives for the safety of their country in quelling the disturbance in the North-West. None of the Indians have asked for this provision. Until this particular clause in the Bill came up, I think that any one who had merely listened to the discussion would have had some little doubt as to what was really the purpose of the measure before us. It would have appeared, that after all, though the Bill was not going to do very much good, it was not going to do any very great amount of harm. But the reason for the introduction of the Bill has now been reached. I say that the mismanagement, and the gross extravagance, and all the charges that have been laid at the door of the Ministry and of their supporters, are to be met by the introduction of this clause, and others similar to it. There are gentlemen sitting in this House who have every confidence of providing, by that clause in the Bill, for their return to this House, when they have participated in the mismanagement of the Government to such an extent that it is necessary that this clause should pass in their interest, and that accounts for the fact that it is in this Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). Does any one demand that I should give the name?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). An hon. gentleman sitting in this House now has become a participant in favors from this Government. I will read a letter, dated Department of the Interior, 9th March, 1883:

"The undersigned has the honor to recommend to Council that John White, of Roslin, Ontario——"

Mr. CHAIRMAN. You cannot go into that discussion on this clause.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I had as much right to that as anybody else. I paid the Government $250. I got elected here before you did, and I may get elected after you, perhaps. This does not affect me at all. You are wrong to talk that way. There is no one on that side of the House whom I have ever attacked or said an unkind word about. I have done nothing I am ashamed of. This is the sixteenth Session I have been in Parliament, and I have never attacked any gentleman. You have no right to attack me. You are unfair, and you will be sorry for it.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I assume all the responsibility of my action, subject to your ruling, Mr. Chairman. I made no attack on any gentleman personally, but I say deliberately, with all my responsibility as a member of Parliament, that the reason why hon. gentlemen opposite make such efforts to pass this Bill is ——

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). If you say it is my case, you say what is not true, and you dare not say it out of doors.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I submit that the hon. gentleman is clearly out of order. You have ruled that my hon. friend from Middlesex (Mr. Cameron) should not proceed with what he was quoting, and he should not be interrupted in his speech. My hon. friend was quite within his rights. He was challenged by hon. gentlemen opposite, and he proceeded, in response to their challenge, though you quite correctly called him to order, as the matter was irrelevant.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. member for Huron is out of order. The member for Middlesex said there were gentlemen sitting in this House who were expecting to receive advantages from this Bill. My hon. friend from Hastings received advantages which were open to every member of this House, and to every man in Canada, and my hon. friends opposite took advantage of it, as well as anyone else in this House.

Mr. BOWELL. I think the hon. member for Middlesex went a good deal farther than he should have done. This debate to-day has gone on very harmoniously, and if the member for West Middlesex had not thrown out insinuations against the honor and honesty of members of the House, I do not think this would have taken place. He said there were members here who were anxious to have this Bill passed to cover up advantages they had received from the Government. He was called on to give the names. I admit that I myself said "Name." Then he indicated that the member for East Hastings was the member to whom he referred. He insinuated that the hon. member had been purchased by the Government in order to support this Bill, and if that be not out of order and an insinuation which should be resented by any man who has a particle of honesty about him, I should like to know what was.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am not going to contend that the member for West Middlesex (Mr. Cameron) was in order when he made that statement, but I contend that he ought then to have been called to order, and not challenged to name the parties. But, instead of the Minister of Customs then raising the point of order, he, as he admits himself, called for the name.

Mr. BOWELL. I did, for this reason: That when a gentleman throws out an insinuation that a member is acting from improper motives, he should be prepared to give the name and to sustain his statement, in order that the member may defend himself, and I am quite sure that my hon. friend and colleague from Hastings (Mr. White) is quite capable of doing that, either by his tongue or in any other way.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Then the hon. member for Middlesex should not be abused for doing what the House asked him to do. I do not argue that my hon. friend was in order, because, as I understand the rules of Parliament, no member has the right to attribute motives to any other hon. member. If he did that—I did not catch his remarks myself—then it is quite possible that he transgressed the rule.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I stopped that.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Then the discussion should not be allowed to go on upon the other side. I am sorry it

arose, because everything has been very harmonious to-day, and I hope it will continue so to the end.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). There is not a gentleman on that side of the House who will say that I ever insulted him, either directly or indirectly. I think the member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) will bear me out in that. I may laugh or joke across the House, but I have done nothing wrong, that I know of. If he thinks I have, let him make the charge. He will take it back now or out of doors.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman should not make challenges of that kind.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I would be very glad to make all the apologies that one gentleman should make to another, but when any man tells me I must take something back here or outside, he entirely mistakes my character.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The hon. gentleman had no right to attack me, and should apologise; for my part, I am willing to withdraw the remark I made.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I am glad, therefore, to withdraw what I said. The question before the Chair is what I consider the one material element in the Bill, to give votes to a great many unenfranchised people. On every principle on which our franchise is based, that is wrong. The Indian exists in his tribal relationship, but the law to-day provides means by which he can become enfranchised. This Bill, however, proposes that every Indian, whether enfranchised or not, provided he occupies a part of the tribal land, will have the right to record his vote. Either we are consistent in keeping the Indians as the wards of the Government, or we are not. If he is still to remain as the ward of the Government, he should not be put in possession of the franchise. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot defend their position of keeping the Indian as the ward of the Government, and at the same time giving him a vote under this Bill; it requires a personal qualification, an income of $400, in order to entitle a white man to vote, if he has no other qualifications; and there are many men, in western Ontario, at any rate, who are not earning this amount; yet it is solemnly proposed that the Indian, the larger part of whose subsistence comes almost directly from the Government, should have this right. This is doing an absolute injustice to the man who is earning less than $400 a year, who may be a tenant, but is assessed at less than that, but who, at the same time, is raising a family of perhaps five or six children, and contributing proportionately to the revenue of the Dominion. It has been said that the Local Legislature of Ontario has given a franchise—a qualified franchise, not that proposed under this Act—to the Indians, and that this Parliament should go further, because the contributions to the revenue by the Indians are made to this Government. But when the charge of extravagance is made against the Dominion Government, their great defence is, that a very large porportion of the expenditure goes towards the sustenance of the Local Government. That being the case, it is evident that the Indians, in contributing to the revenue of the Dominion, contribute a share towards the revenue of the Provinces, and thus the legislation of the Province of Ontario cannot be questioned, on the ground that the Indians pay no revenue to that Province. In the qualified franchise given by the Province of Ontario, it is insisted that the Indian enfranchised should have a personal estate, absolutely controlled by himself, and if the Government wish to follow the example set by Ontario, they should adopt the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell. It is well known that the Indian is under the control of those to whom the Government has given the administration of his affairs. There are a certain number of Indian superintendents, Indian inspectors, and other officials, who come in direct contact with the Indians, and some of whom occupy a position of peculiar authority towards them. For instance, when any difficulty arises in any Indian community, the Indian commissioner is invariably appealed to, if he has their confidence at all, and that fact shows that, besides being a minor in law, the Indian is in every other respect a minor. I contend, therefore, to give these people the right to vote would be doing an injustice to the electorate of this country and assuming a responsibilty this Parliament ought not to assume in the way provided in this Bill.

Mr. CASEY. As there are about 1,500 Indians on the reserve between the constituencies of South Middlesex and West Elgin, I have a personal interest in this question. The change proposed is a revolutionary one, a departure from all the ideas that have hitherto characterised all our legislation in regard to the Indians, who have been, from the time they submitted to the British Crown, in a very peculiar sense, the wards of the Crown, never having possessed any of the privileges of citizens, and until lately could not be sued in our courts. It is now proposed that we should make these people citizens, in the highest sense of the word, though not in its ordinary sense, by giving them the privilege that every citizen possesses, of electing representatives to this House. I think it is a very extraordinary thing that, when the ordinary civil rights of the country are refused to these Indians, they should be entrusted with the franchise. I would point out to the member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) that Indians living apart from their tribe, where there is a voters' list, are allowed to vote under the Ontario law, even though they participate in the annuities or moneys of the tribe; but it excludes those Indians who reside amongst their tribe, and are under the thumb of the agent. I agree with the hon. member for Algoma, that the Indian Act places unnecessary obstacles in the way of an Indian becoming a citizen; but I think that should be amended, and that this Bill goes too far in the direction of giving the franchise to those Indians who have no other rights of citizenship. (He quoted the speech of Sir John A. Macdonald, on the subject of potlach in British Columbia, in the Session of 1884). I would ask the hon. members from British Columbia whether they desire to enfranchise people of the class thus described? I have shown conclusively by the extracts I have quoted, and it will be seen also by the statement of the right hon. the First Minister himself, made last Session in this House, that these Indians are not of a character to be entrusted with that greatest privilege of citizenship, the right to vote; and I am confident that no one who looks at this question in an impartial light will deny that so long as the Indians remain as they now are, the serfs of the Government, they should not be placed on the voters' list. We must protest against the idea that men who are not in the least degree citizens, who have no civil rights, should be put on the voters' list, and be enabled to out-vote men who are in the full enjoyment of all the privileges and responsibilities and duties of citizenship. This Bill will include the Indians who are engaged in rebellion against our country in the North-West, if they should decide to settle down on their reserves and cultivate plots of land. It is scandalous that those people should have a share in the Government of the country, that their votes should be admitted, and allowed to cancel the votes of responsible, well-meaning citizens. I do not know how this proposition will be received in Manitoba and the North-West, but I can assure the House and the Government that the friends of the volunteers in Ontario will consider it as an intolerable disgrace to our Statute Book. It seems part of a general scheme, that the hon. gentleman should take the right to say who shall be enfranchised Indians, and who shall be enfranchised whites, for his control, through his nominees, over the list of white voters, will be as absolute under this Act as his control over the enfranchisement of the Indians is under the Act of 1884. An

Indian who cannot appear in a court of law as plaintiff or defendant is to be allowed to have an indirect voice in the nomination of the judge of that very court. It is a peculiar coincidence that the Indians who are to be enfranchised, so far as the Province of Ontario is concerned, are distributed in counties which either return prominent members of the Opposition or have returned supporters of the Government by very narrow majorities. An hon. member from Quebec, a supporter of the Government, stated the other day that the mere fact of proposing this Bill would crush the Conservative party in that Province in the next election, and I think that I am justified in saying that this proposition will be sufficient to crush that party in the Province of Ontario. The feeling against giving a vote to those Indians who are denied the rights of citizenship will be so strong and so hot that I am sure neither my hon. friend from West Middlesex (Mr. Cameron) nor myself have any fear of the result of the wards of the Government being led up to the polls in our constituencies. I wish to point out that the tribes in the North-West that have gone into rebellion would otherwise have been entitled to vote under this Bill. (The hon. gentlemen proceeded to read an extract in regard to Beardy's band.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I do not think the hon. gentleman is in order in continuing those extracts.

Mr. CASEY. I am trying to show the kind of people whom this Bill would enfranchise.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. That could not be admitted, because the North-West Territories are not represented in this Parliament.

Mr. CASEY. I think there is a provision in the Bill that it may be extended to the North-West and to Manitoba by proclamation, and it is understood that the North-West is to be represented here shortly, and as this Act is not for the present year only, I think we are justified in considering this matter.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I have allowed incidental references to it, but not copious extracts.

Mr. CASEY. If you allow any reference to it at all, you must allow copious extracts.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Oh, no.

Mr. CASEY. Oh, yes. My point is in regard to the applicability of the Bill to the North-West Territory. The other point is, that it is in order, as you decided the other night, to quote extracts, the only limit being that the whole work or pamphlet must not be quoted.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I have expressed my opinion, and the argument of the hon. gentleman does not alter it at all. I have ruled that the reference to the North-West Territories is not in order.

Mr. CASEY. I understood you to rule in regard to the length of the extract. I will refer hon. gentlemen to a description of the Manitoba Indians, which appears in this report, and which also shows clearly that they are not entitled to be allowed the privilege of voting. (He quoted from Mr. McColl's report on the Manitoba Indians.) An Indian enfranchised should not only have the privilege of citizenship but the responsibility as well, and I must protest warmly, in the name of the people of the whole Dominion, against the proposal to give the people who are not citizens in any sense of the word the right to out-vote people who are citizens.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). This Bill is of such great importance, creating almost a revolution in the franchise of the country, that every member ought to have an opportunity of expressing his views on every point in the Bill. We have already had a very full and intelligent discussion on this clause to-night, and I think it is only reasonable, that at this hour, after the long and arduous sitting we have had up to now, the Government should consent to an adjournment of the debate. I move, therefore, that the committee do now rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. That motion has been put and lost, and no motion made since. Therefore it is out of order to put it in again.

Mr. DAVIES. We might now take a division on the question we have been discussing, and then adjourn. I do not want to see this debate prolonged until it will degenerate into a scene, such as that we witnessed the other day. I agree cordially in the remarks of the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), that so far the debate has proceeded upon this Indian question in a very reasonable and interesting manner, in a way equal to the importance of the question. It cannot be expected, however, that at this late hour the debate can be proceeded with in the same spirit, because it is beyond the limits of physical endurance to do so. I think, therefore, as it is now four o'clock, a division should be taken on this clause, and the Government then consent to an adjournment. There are many other clauses in the Bill which require to be fully discussed, and it is not fair on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to force a discussion of them at a time when, owing to the strain put on our physical endurance, we are unable to give them the discussion they require. It is reasonable that, at half-past four, the debate having been conducted fairly, the House should adjourn and proceed with the discussion in the afternoon. I know that the spirit which is getting up on both sides is likely to interfere with the progress of the debate.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). It is one of those differences of opinion which must be decided by the vote.

Mr. DAVIES. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that it is right that brute force should be exercised here?

Mr. LANDRY. Does the hon. gentleman want me to say what I mean?

Mr. DAVIES. Yes.

Mr. LANDRY. Then I will, in very few words. I am speaking for myself entirely, and am not speaking the sentiments of anyone else. As an individual member of this House, I am thoroughly convinced and satisfied that the system which is being pursued by the hon. gentlemen on the other side is as perfect a system of obstruction as they can possibly make it by organisation, by numbers, by ability, by perseverance, by energy, and by a sense of annoyance to us, if they can. I may be wrong, but I am convinced of that. I am convinced of another thing, that it is intended to carry it on at as great a length as endurance can allow it to be carried on by them. Being convinced of that, I told the hon. gentleman that any argument he might make for adjournment was talking against time and a waste of time, and if hon. gentlemen on this side think as I do, if he does not want to waste time, he will take the vote, and if hon. gentlemen think as I do, they will vote the adjournment down.

Mr. DAVIES. If every hon. member felt as the hon. member for Kent says he does, it would be another matter. He says: I intend to carry this through by brute force, I care not whether it is reasonable or unreasonable. He says he wants no argument and will listen to no argument, whatever it may be, because he has made up his mind.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). You do not call what you have been talking argument?

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. member for Victoria was not in his place, and did not hear the discussion.

Mr. McCALLUM. I complain, on behalf of the people of this country, of the waste of time in this House, caused by

the obstruction of the hon. gentlemen opposite. They are not satisfied with our having trouble enough on our hands now, with our having fire in the North-West, but they want to burn the other end of the candle. They are obstructing legislation, not to-day or the day before, but for the last month. They have moved an adjournment. Was it not the same the other night? Did they not discuss a motion to adjourn for hours? Now they are talked out on argument, they cannot find any more, and so they want to discuss this motion to adjourn. Was there ever any obstruction in any Parliament in the world to equal it. Have they not made their boasts outside of this House that we could not pass this Bill? I do not know what is going to be done about it. I would be the last man to curtail the power and the rights of a minority in this House, but when that minority abuses its privileges and seeks to drive us, it is a serious matter. They say they control this House now. For eight hours you could hear a pin drop, while these fellows were reading the whole Library, and they do not think how much it costs the people of this country. The people will know it, and will hold them responsible. They tell us that we want to go on. If we spend eight hours discussing the word "Indian" to-night, when are we going to get through? It is all very well for them to say it is time to go home, but I hope the Government will not agree to anything of the kind, but will show that they and their supporters are anxious to get on with the business of the country, and let the responsiblity rest upon the shoulders of the Opposition.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman says that the word "Indian" has been discussed for eight hours, and that shows it was obstruction. He knows that this is a proposal to enfranchise a large portion of the population which has not votes now. I repeat that the discussion upon this important question has not been unduly prolonged. There has been no talking against time, no reading extracts, and the reference to the proceedings of the past few days is quite irrelevant. We have been proceeding with a fair discussion of this Bill; that discussion is, perhaps, not properly finished, but we are willing to allow the vote to be taken on this clause, on the understanding from the Government that we shall then adjourn.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The other evening I had something to do with an arrangement made by the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and I must say that the leaders of the Opposition were anxious to close the House at two o'clock, but they could not control their followers. I know that Sir Richard Cartwright and Mr. Blake were both anxious to close the House, but the member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) and a few of his friends would not allow it. Now, what are we to do? We are sitting here hour after hour. I do not think there is a gentleman on the other side who could make a motion which would be more considered than the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Sutherland), for he has insulted no one, and does not try to insult any one. I agree with the hon gentleman that this matter of enfranchising the Indians is a serious matter, but I think many things have been said which should not have been said. If the leaders on this side could make an arrangement with the leaders on the other side, it would be all right, but the leaders of the Opposition do not approve of thus prolonging the discussion. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken knows that no country can afford to allow an Opposition to drive a Government into a corner.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman has paid me a very high compliment, but an entirely undeserved one. I was not aware that I had power to prevent the leaders of the Opposition from agreeing to an adjournment, and I certainly did not try to interfere with them. This word "Indian" involves the whole question, and if we pass this paragraph we admit the whole Indian franchise. We are having the discussion now instead of having it scattered over the whole Bill. We have not been talking against time, at all events to-day. If my own remarks have been longer and less concise than was proper, it must be remembered that at this hour of the night my intellectual faculties are not as clear and my voice is not in as good order as in the earlier part of the day. Hon. gentlemen on the other side who cry "question" and "go on" simply want to burk discussion upon the matter, or at all events they lay themselves open to that suspicion.

Mr. HESSON. We feel our responsibility as much as the gentlemen on that side. We have given them all the time they wanted. If they have not made it clear to our intelligence yet, we will give them further opportunity. We have listened until patience has ceased to be a virtue. I am not content to adjourn the debate, in order to allow them to go to the Library and gather more books and occupy eight or ten hours more in discussing a word.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford). I moved this resolution in good faith. I wished to do so some time ago. The reason was, that several members on the Government side of the House, the other evening, when the scenes were going on, remarked to me that, if the Opposition had agreed to carry that clause, we might have adjourned at a reasonable hour. I believe that if we were to sit here on the understanding that the time should be made the best use of, and that we should adjourn at a reasonable hour, say two or three o'clock, the business would proceed very much faster. I believe that sincerely. The member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) talked about our driving the Government. That seems ridiculous, when they are two or three to one.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think any hon. gentleman on this side has any cause to complain, either of the action of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken or that of the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies), during this protracted and extraordinary discussion. I say, frankly and freely, that I have no fault to find with either of these gentlemen, except in this, that they have by their presence acquiesced in the course pursued by other hon. gentlemen. The hon. member for Oxford must know, if he has paid any attention at all to parliamentary tactics, that one-third of the members of the House can easily obstruct its business, in face of the decided opposition of the other two-thirds. In England, similar tactics to those adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite have been pursued by about twenty-five or thirty members, who have kept the House sitting for months doing nothing, owing to their obstructive tactics. I must confess I was a little surpised to hear the hon. member for Queen's say that the discussion to-night had not been unduly prolonged. We had a very able and eloquent speech from the leader of the Opposition, which was followed by one of an acrimonious character, delivered by the hon. member for Bothwell, and to which scarcely any one paid attention. These were replied to by the leader of the Government, and he was followed by the hon. member for Brant, in his usual able manner, and I frankly confess I thought then that the question had been exhaustively discussed; but the discussion has been carried on until nearly five o'clock this morning. Considering we have been on this Bill about fifty-five hours and have not yet passed fifty lines of it, it must be evident to every one that the discussion has been unduly prolonged; and hon. gentlemen who say it has not, are surely not sincere in their statement. We are just as anxious, if not more so, than the hon. member for Queen's, to return home and attend to our private duties, but when we hear in the lobbies of the House the declaration coming from prominent men on that side that this Bill shall not become law, even if we have to remain here six months, we are only pursuing the right course in allowing members of

the Opposition to talk as long as they please, and they should not find fault with us for not interrupting them. The assertion of the hon. member for West Elgin, that the members of the Government are attempting to burk discussion is on a par with everything we have heard for the last three days. If, since three o'clock yesterday, the committee has not risen, how can we be charged with trying to burk discussion? A gentleman in the Russell House was told by a member of the party opposite that the leader of the Government was supposed to be weak in health, and that the moment they got him into the House they would worry him until he would be obliged to give way. A more infamous policy has never been pursued, in the worst conducted Parliament in Christendom.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

Mr. CASEY. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has stated that a prominent member of this party made a statement in the Russell House, which he properly characterised as infamous.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not allude to you.

Mr. CASEY. I must say that in spite of his occasional little ebullitions of temper, the Minister of Customs is evidently a fair-minded man. In making this charge generally, against a prominent member of this side, he should either name that member or withdraw the charge.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. There is no point of order in what the hon. gentleman has raised. He has merely called on the Minister of Customs to name the person. This the Minister is not obliged to do unless he chooses.

Mr. CASEY. He must name him if he is a member.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I have given my ruling.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not out of order, and have the right to the floor.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I think the Chair ought to hear what is said on this side before undertaking to decide. The Minister of Customs charged a member on this side with having made an infamous statement. It is the duty of the Chair to call on the hon. gentleman to withdraw the charge or explain it. It is a reflection on all the members of the Opposition, and it is only fair that any one who is guilty of making a statement like that should be made known.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I have ruled that the Minister of Customs was not out of order in refusing to answer.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman must withdraw the statement, unless he did not refer to a member of the House.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not hesitate to repeat what I said. I said that a certain member of the House had used the expression in the Russell House to another gentleman, that they could not do anything with this matter as long as the leader of the Government was out, but as soon as they could get him into the House they could wear him out, on account of his supposed age and infirmity. I say a course of attack of that kind is infamous.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I rise to a point of order. The Minister of Customs has repeated the statement, that this outrageous and scandalous assertion was made by a member of Parliament. He has no right to make a statement of that kind, of a member of Parliament. If a member of Parliament said such a thing, he was guilty of an infamy of which no member should be guilty.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The statement of the Minister of Customs is not out of order.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not desire to prolong this discussion, but would simply say, on behalf of the Government, that we are very anxious not only to go on but to complete the business of the Session. We have had not only no assistance from the Opposition, but everything has been done to prolong the Session unduly. It is the duty of the Opposition to give a Bill of this importance a fair discussion and criticism, but certainly there is no parallel in the history of the country for the conduct of the parliamentary Opposition such as we have witnessed this last month. We had an exhibition of it in the Cattle Disease Bill and the Civil Service Bill, on both of which days were wasted in prolonged, useless discussions; and here we have been discussing this clause in the Bill before us for the last six hours without a single new idea having been advanced. We are now asked to adjourn, in order to enable hon. gentlemen opposite to repeat the same useless discussion. If that is the policy laid down by the Opposition, we may as well fight them out of it as long as we have physical endurance to do so.

Mr. DAVIES. Our proposition is not that we should now adjourn and renew the discussion at three o'clock on this clause, but that the resolution before the House should be disposed of finally and that we should then adjourn.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman does not quite agree with the hon. member for West Elgin, who said there were several other amendments to be made on this clause.

Mr. CASEY. Not on this clause.

Mr. WHITE. If I did not misunderstand the hon. gentleman, he declared there were a number of gentlemen who had amendments to make, but were physically incapable to make them now, and therefore he desired an adjournment. No doubt, if hon. gentlemen opposite wanted to discuss this Bill in a reasonable way, we could adjourn at two o'clock and resume the discussion the next day, as is usually done with other Bills. But statements have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite, that they intend to fight this Bill out through the Session.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. member for Bothwell said so to the Minister of Public Works, and the whole question which arises is, whether a minority in Parliament is to have the control of Parliament. Under our rules the fullest discussion is afforded, and wisely, I think—although in England they have found it necessary to make the means of preventing abuse—to the minority, so that they may not be prevented from that discussion by the vote of the majority; but the only question now before us is not really the Franchise Bill at all, but whether a minority in Parliament can manage to defeat a measure, by simply talking against time. I think the House should show that the majority has rights in Parliament as well as the minority, and that a Government measure shall be passed, even though the minority make up their minds to defeat it, as it has been declared that the intention is to defeat it by talking against time.

Mr. DAVIES. As to the apparent want of faith as to the question of woman suffrage, as I was a party to the settlement, I beg to inform the hon. gentleman that the question before the House was woman suffrage in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). And the "or her" was in the same clause.

Mr. DAVIES. The question before the House was that the woman suffrage in Quebec should be retained. The agreement was that the vote should be taken on that one point, and it was taken, and the hon. gentleman is wrong in saying the discussion was renewed on that section at all. It was as to refusing the suffrage to women in the other Provinces, which never had been debated or touched upon at all. I trust the hon. member will neither entertain the idea nor give currency to it in the House or in the

country that, in an arrangement made across the House, there was the slightest breach of faith, because there was not. It was understood by all parties that the discussion was confined to Quebec alone.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). That is nonsense.

Mr. DAVIES. And no reference was made to preventing discussion on the question whether women should have the suffrage in other parts of the Dominion. When the second section came up, the First Minister said that, after the discussion, he had decided, in deference to the view of the House, to take it out of that part of the Bill.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is not strictly accurate in his statement.

Mr. CASEY. It is the same in effect if not in words.

Mr. BOWELL. I quote from *Hansard*, page 1388. (The hon. gentleman quoted the remarks of Sir John A. Macdonald, Mr. Blake, Mr. Langelier, and Mr. Girouard.) If you look back to the first speech made by the leader of the Goverument in introducing the Bill, you will find that he made the statement that he would not hazard the Bill on the question of female suffrage, and that, if the House decided against that principle, he would not insist upon it.

Mr. DAVIES quoted the remarks of Sir John A. Macdonald, at page 1444 of the *Debates*.

Mr. CASEY. Before the vote it was an open question, but after the vote the Government distinctly abandoned the principle.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I do not think there was any breach of faith, so far as we were concerned, because the clause had reference only to the Province of Quebec. As to this discussion, hon. gentlemen must not suppose that members of this House are going to allow the debate to be confined to members who spring up in the earlier stages so as to prevent others from taking part in the discussion. So far, the discussion has been confined to about half a dozen members on this side. I know there are others who desire to speak, including myself. The hon. gentleman says we have discussed the word "Indian" for eight hours. That is not so. This interpretation clause covers a great deal more than the word "Indian;" it covers the rights of the Indians to the franchise. It is not fair, at this hour in the morning, to force those members who desire to speak to now discuss the question. One difficulty is, that Ministers have refused to answer questions put to them as to the meaning of particular sections and phrases. If you cannot get information when you ask it from the Government, you are practically working in the dark. This debate has been prolonged because hon. members have not seen fit to answer the questions which we have had a right to put to them. The Minister of Customs complains, and if the statement were true he would have a right to complain, that some members of the Opposition have stated that there was a disposition to talk on this matter all summer if necessary. I am not aware of any such statement having been made. We are bound to discuss this question fully. The member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) charges us with wasting the time of the House. I deny that. Until the last two or three weeks the only time that has been wasted has been solely by the fault of the Government. Everybody knows that for two months and a-half we did not do two days' solid work. If the Government desire to have the business of the country properly discussed and their measures properly analysed, it is not when the Session is in its dying hours that that can be done. The people have a right to complain of what has been done in Parliament, which is the fault of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. Is it not the fact that in the caucus it was charged against the Government that they were responsible for the delay? They were charged with it in their caucus.

Mr. BOWELL. How do you know?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Never mind.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not true.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It is true.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not true. You may have been spying around, or may have had some spies there, but no such complaint was ever made.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). How does the hon. gentleman know?

Mr. BOWELL. Because I was there, and had a right to be there.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Were you there all the time? The Government have been charged with delay in bringing down their measures.

Mr. BOWELL. You said it was in the caucus.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I do not care whether it was in or out.

Mr. BOWELL. That statement is just as true as the other.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). We have a right to have the debate adjourned from time to time, in order to give us an opportunity to analyse the provisions of the Bill. The hon. member for Monck says we have difficulties in the North-West. So we have, but we are not responsible for them.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, you are.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). We regret them, and the Government must take the responsibility when the proper time comes, and they shall have it, too. It may be said that a handful of men in this Parliament may obstruct the business, but there is nothing to warrant the hon. gentleman, during last night and this morning, in charging the Opposition with any obstructiveness. One member may be a little more discussive than another. We have not all got the logical, clear mind of the Minister of Customs, and if some speakers stray a little from the point under discussion, that is no reason why the debate should be forced to a close at once. There is another reason why the debate should not be adjourned now. A Government supporter declared in Parliament that this was a radical and revolutionary proposition.

An hon. MEMBER. Which?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). This Franchise Bill. If that was declared by a supporter of the Government, surely we are not to be called upon to pass upon every clause of such a measure at once. If any member of the Opposition, in or out of Parliament, made use of any such language as the Minister of Customs, he is unworthy of a place in Parliament. I have no hesitation in stating that if any member of the Opposition, in or out of Parliament, made use of any such insinuation or language as that of which the Minister of Customs accused him, he is unworthy of a place in Parliament. We are not fighting the battle against one individual but against the Government and the followers of the Government. If because the leader of the Government, for whom personally every one of us entertains the highest possible respect, whatever we may think of him politically, through advancing years has become weak physically, a member of the Opposition would attempt to avail himself of that weakness by protracting the discussion, in the hope that by so doing he would keep the First Minister in his place in the House, that member is unworthy of a place in Parliament. We do not wage war in that way, but with the Government as a whole.

Mr. BOWELL. There is scarcely a man on that side who has not asked, Why is not the leader of the Government here?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I know of no man, except one, who asked that question, and even if we did ask it, is it not reasonable on our part that we should desire that the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill, who really knows all about it, should be in his place to answer questions. A number of questions were put, and there was not a soul on the Ministerial benches who could answer them. If the leader of the Government is absent because he cannot stand the strain of the late hours, why should not the same rule apply to other persons. There are men here as aged and more feeble than the First Minister, and they have a right to be here during the discussion, and it is not fair that the discussion should be kept going at a time when they are unable to be present. If this proposition were similar to that adopted by the Ontario Legislature, in giving a vote to the enfranchised Indians who had accumulated property, independent of their rights to the reserve, I would at once concede the principle that they should be entitled to vote, but that is not the proposition of the Government. The First Minister said this Bill enfranchised all Indians, civilised and uncivilised, Christian and pagan, and we should have more time to discuss a sweeping measure of this nature than the Minister of Customs is disposed to give us.

Mr. RYKERT. The hon. gentleman has repeated the statement that we have delayed the proceedings of the House during the whole Session, and the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) said the other night that we did not get to work for something like two months. I want to lay before the House certain facts. I have made an analysis of the time the House has been in session since the Session began. I found that the House adjourned once between three and four o'clock, four times between four and five o'clock, four times at six o'clock, three times between eight and nine o'clock, twelve times between ten and eleven o'clock, seven times between eleven and twelve o'clock, fourteen times between twelve and one o'clock, four times between two and three o'clock, once between three and four o'clock, twice between five and six o'clock—in all fifty-nine sessions up to Monday, or 474 hours, averaging eight hours per day. One hon. gentleman has said that for the first six wesks we did not sit at all. During the last forty-seven days the House has not adjourned at any time before ten o'clock, but the average working of the House during this Session has been eight hours a day. In 1877 the House sat fifty-nine days, 418 hours, or seven hours daily. Certain hon. gentlemen, among them the hon. member for West Elgin, spoke no less than seventy-three times on one point. Hon. gentlemen opposite spoke about 100 times, so they will see that they have been the cause of delay in the discussion of this House. If they will consult *Hansard*, hon. gentlemen opposite will find that their speeches on this Bill occupy 258 columns, while those of the Ministerial supporters only occupy twenty-one.

Mr. CHARLTON. With reference to the remarks by the hon. member for Lincoln, I must say that as the Government measures were not introduced during the first couple of months of the Session, the time of the House was taken up with private legislation. The Bill we are considering was introduced at an early day of the Session, and it might have been printed and discussed at an early day, without loss of time, and had the Government brought this measure down then we would not have taken so much time in the discussion on the Budget Speech. There are, besides, a large number of important Bills which were to have been disposed of, such as the Insolvency Bill, the Court of Claims Bill, and a number of other Bills, which will have now to be held over, simply because the Government did not bring its measures down in time. The Minister of Customs asserts that the business of the House is now being obstructed, and informs us that a small fraction of the members of Parliament can seriously impede the work of the House. That undoubtedly is true, and in consequence of such obstruction the Government of England were obliged to adopt new rules in regard to procedure. Have we obstructed the House on this Bill for months?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. No; we have not. Are we a mere faction, or do we represent a party of this Dominion, a very large proportion of the voters in this Dominion? We do. We represent, possibly, a majority of the inhabitants of the Dominion. We are not a faction, like the Parnell faction.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Worse.

Mr. CHARLTON. We are the duly accredited Opposition—Her Majesty's loyal Opposition in this House. We have functions to perform. We have a right to criticise certain measures, particularly measures of this kind. To say that we were guilty of obstruction because, when we went into committee on the Bill, we asked for an adjournment at three o'clock in the morning, is an assertion the hon. gentleman ought not to make. This is a Bill which requires careful consideration; it is one of greater importance than has ever before been introduced into the Parliament of Canada; and although we have not proceeded far in regard to the wording of the Bill, we have been debating a number of the most important principles involved in it. We have discussed the question of woman suffrage so fully that there is no need to refer to it again. We have passed to the next most important provision in the Bill, probably—Indian enfranchisement—and the spirit in which the discussion has been carried on has been unexceptionable. It is not fair to say that we have been guilty of any factiousness at this stage of the proceedings. I will acknowledge that, at the previous sitting of the House, after the hour had arrived when we ought to have adjourned and the Government refused to adjourn, and showed a disposition to force a consideration of the Bill and trample upon the rights of the minority, the scenes in this House were not consistent with parliamentary decorum and dignity. But we are not responsible for that. We asked for an adjournment at the proper time, and we are asking the same thing to-day. We are willing to take a vote upon this feature of the Bill, and pass to other features, on condition that we have an adjournment. It is said that members have made boasts in the lobby that they are going to do this and that. I do not know what they may have said. There are indiscreet men, who may say, in an ebullition of feeling what is not a settled conviction, but the Opposition intend to discuss this Bill on its merits fairly, and they only ask that the Government shall give them adjournments at a reasonable hour. We pledge ourselves that our opposition will not be factious, that we will not talk against time and that our discussion of this Bill will be pertinent and legitimate. It is useless to expect that we can get throught the Bill in one or two sittings, but the desire of the Opposition is to discuss the Bill pertinently and fairly. My hon. friend from East Hastings (Mr. White) referred to an arrangement with which I had something to do, although I acted merely as a go-between, and after some time referred the hon. gentleman to a person higher in the ranks of the party than myself, as to an arrangement with regard to the second reading, and he instances, as a hardship and a breach of faith, the fact that that debate was prolonged till five o'clock in the morning. When talking with the hon. gentleman I said it was desirable to close the discussion about two or three o'clock, but I said it was almost impossible to control these matters to a minute or an hour. The fact was, however, that the discussion closed before many members who wished to speak had spoken on the subject. I wished to make some remarks, but I forebore to do so, and some other members were in the same position. This Indian question is a very serious one. The Minister of Customs says that

to the best of his belief we have determined to weary out the leader of the Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. Does our conduct indicate anything of the kind?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. How many hours is it since the leader of the Government left his place, and what member of the Opposition has referred to the fact of his absence? We have shown no desire to weary him. We recognise that, at his age, he is incapable of standing that strain upon his constitution that hon. gentlemen seem determined to impose upon the rest of us. It is a good reason for asking for the adjournment of this debate that the Minister who is reponsible for the Bill is not in his place, and that the very next question which may be referred to is one that demands his presence.

Mr. BOWELL. Just as soon as you reach it, he will be here.

Mr. CHARLTON. The House is not in a position to discuss it without him. How many Ministers have been in their places during this discussion? I came here at two o'clock and there was not a Minister of the Crown in his place.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, there was.

Mr. CHARLTON. Since I have been here, there have been only two or three—the Minister of Customs, the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Inland Revenue.

Some hon. MEMBERS. And the Minister of Militia.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes; I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. But we are entitled to ask for the presence of the First Minister, with such reasonable absence for rest as may be necessary. The hon. member for Monck says we have talked for eight hours against time. We have done nothing of the kind. We have spent eight hours in a most proper discussion of this Bill. I know that the decision arrived at by the members of the Opposition was that, until a reasonable hour for adjournment, they would proceed with the discussion, without any desire to obstruct the proceedings.

Some hon. MEMBERS. The decision was not kept.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the Government will meet us half way, we can proceed in a legitimate manner, which will meet with the approval of the country and of all parties in this House; but if it is to be insisted upon that the House shall sit night and day, and shall be prolonged beyond three o'clock, then the consequences cannot be averted. Of course hon. gentlemen have a very great majority. We are in their hands.

Mr. BOWELL. No; we are in yours.

Mr. CHARLTON. Of course they will pass this Bill.

Mr. BOWELL. We intend to.

Mr. CHARLTON. But we have a right to lay before the country our objections to it.

Mr. BOWELL. No one is preventing you.

Mr. CHARLTON. The member for Monck tells us that the Government have trouble enough without our troubling them further.

Mr. McCALLUM. The hon. gentleman is misrepresenting me. I did not say that the Government had trouble, but that the people of the country were at a large amount of expenditure in the North-West, and the Opposition were abusing their privileges by useless discussion and by reading the whole Library. I wish the people of the country were here and could get a glimpse of their actions.

Mr. CHARLTON. I re-echo the wish. I wish every voter could sit here and see the obvious animus of some of the measures which are introduced. I accept the explanation of the hon. member for Monck, but if he had said that difficulties beset the Government the assertion would have been true. We have no desire to take advantage of these difficulties. We regret that the condition of the country is such as it is, and we believe that the Government is responsible for a portion of it, at any rate—I do not refer to the North-West particularly, but to the financial and other troubles of the country. It is unfair, however, to claim that the Opposition are not warranted in taking the time which is necessary to point out what they believe will be a still greater calamity than any that has yet affected Canada, if this measure becomes law. Do you suppose that it is an object to the members on this side, who have no Government patronage, to keep this House in session for weeks? There is not a member on this side who is not sitting here to his own detriment and loss, and who would not be glad to shake the dust of Ottawa from his feet. We remain here only in the public interest and from a sense of duty. We have no desire to make a factious opposition to this Bill. We ask the Government to adopt a reasonable policy, and we pledge ourselves that our criticisms on this Bill shall be reasonable and proper. If the Government had taken us at our word, and agreed to an adjournment at half-past four, the discussion on this motion would not have taken place now. The hon. member for Kent tells us that he knows, and we ought to know, that our arguments will not convince hon. gentlemen opposite. That is tantamount to saying that there is no use at all in arguing the question, as hon. gentlemen opposite have already decided it, and the conclusion is a foregone conclusion with them.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). I said that the argument for adjournment would not convince me; I never spoke about the other argument.

Mr. CHARLTON. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement. There are cogent reasons for an adjournment, and I am sorry the hon. gentleman has made up his mind on that question. I do not know whether he has made up his mind to refuse an adjournment, owing to the character of the Bill or to the propriety and reasonableness of the request. I say it is unreasonable to insist that the discussion should proceed at this hour; the introduction of tactics of this kind always recoils on those who introduce them, and hon. gentlemen opposite will find that they will not derive any advantage in the end from the course they are pursuing.

Mr. WIGLE. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to plead for an adjournment, but we happen to know a little about it. I met one of their whips, Mr. Trow, yesterday afternoon, about six o'clock, and asked him if he had another book to read. He said: "I have no more books to read; I would not have spoken yesterday, for I have enough to do in my capacity as whip, were it not that I had to fill in the time," and he added: "This Bill will not pass the House, if we have to sit six months." Have we not, besides, every evidence to lead us to believe that is the intention of hon. gentlemen opposite. Did not the hon. member for South Grey speak three or four hours against time, without mentioning a single provision of the Bill, yet these hon. gentlemen say all they want is a fair discussion. Well, if they are going to fight this Bill out for six months, I say let us condense the six months into one solid month, and get through.

Mr. DAVIES. The language of the hon. gentleman is utterly uncalled for. I think he should have reserved what he had to say about the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow) until that gentleman was present. I would like to have the opinion of that hon. gentleman as to

whether he was speaking jocularly or seriously. The policy of the Opposition is to be taken from the statements of its leader, and not from anything any member of the party can say. When the hon. member says that we wish for an adjournment for the purpose of renewing the debate, he is entirely astray. I defy hon. gentlemen opposite to instance a case in parliamentary history where a proposal was made by members of the Opposition, at an early hour in the morning, for an adjournment, after taking a vote on the resolution in question, and which was refused. They are acting tyrannically, and their object is to gag discussion and prevent the Bill being discussed. They may succeed eventually in overcoming the physical ability of the Opposition to rise to their feet, but we will discuss the Bill as long as we are able to do it. Talk about sitting here six months! The member for South Essex (Mr. Wigle) knows that we do not want to sit six months, or three months, or two months, but we cannot go home and leave this Bill here. The members from the Maritime Provinces dare not go home and leave a proposition to disfranchise half their constituents, if it takes a month or six months, unless we resign our seats. The woman question, the Indian question, the Chinese question, Prince Edward Island and manhood suffrage, have all to be discussed intelligently and at length, and I hope not by one side of the House only. This ought not to be a party Bill. We are as much interested in it as you are. The hon. gentlemen need not hope they are going to rule this country for ever.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes; we do.

Mr. DAVIES. Then you were never more mistaken in this world.

Mr. TAYLOR. I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite have made the statement that there was no obstruction from their side of the House with a view to its going to the country. They did not suppose that the members of the House would receive it as being true. A leading member of that party, the member for South Perth (Mr. Trow), their whip, occupied two hours and a-half early in the evening reading an essay on women. After the statement which has been made as to what has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite, I think it is the duty of the Government to push this Bill through, and that it is unreasonable for the Opposition to ask us to accept their statements as in accordance with the fact.

Mr. BURPEE. The hon. member for Kent has told us that the members on that side of the House have made up their minds and have their course marked out. Members on this side of the House are not open to the charge of obstructing the business. Many members desired to speak on the woman suffrage question, and others on this Indian question, but the proposition to adjourn is a reasonable one. Not a minute can be gained by forcing the House to remain in Session after a certain hour in the evening or morning. The Government are forcing a measure which the country does not require and does not ask for, and the country will hold the Government responsible for an act of tyranny and will judge the Government accordingly.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). I did not say that we had made up our minds on the question before the House, but simply on the question of the adjournment.

Mr. DAVIES. It is the same thing.

Mr. BURPEE. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement. I have generally found him to be a fair-minded gentleman, and I am satisfied that, if the leader of the Government were called in now, he would not insist upon so tyrannical an act as is now being attempted.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I think the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) would have been more consistent if he had allowed the subject to close, and moved the adjournment, if it was proposed that the committee should proceed further. The member for Sunbury (Mr. Burpee) says there is an attempt to force this measure, which is not wanted by the country. This side of the House is not bound to accept the decision of hon. gentlemen on that side as to what the country wants or does not want. I have been some time in Parliament, and I have always understood that the duty of an Opposition is to criticise every measure of a Government, and to represent public opinion, as they understand it. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not the shadow of a right to say that any obstacle has been placed in their way in the consideration of this matter. The stronger side has been listening patiently to the weaker side, and is willing to go on.

Mr. DAVIES. Six o'clock in the morning.

Mr. COSTIGAN. If we are compelled to sit to late hours it is because it is forced upon us by the action of hon. members opposite. It is quite evident, by the expressions used in the corridors, by the statement of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that we should withdraw the Bill and the discussion would end; by the declarations of the Opposition press, that this Bill must not pass, and that the Opposition were going to stop here and obstruct its passage, that that is the intention of those hon. gentlemen. It has been asked why the Bill was not brought down earlier in the Session, but if it had been, we would never have had an opportunity of saying a word or taking a step upon any other matter this Session. The evidence of that is the progress we have made since this Bill has been before the House. They have not only read extracts from all the authors, and ransacked the Library, but, when that Library, of which we are all proud, was exhausted, the hon. member for North Norfolk read the notice paper, and I suppose the next thing will be the dictionary. Because the name of Indian is in the dictionary, the hon. gentleman will read it from one end to the other. When hon. gentlemen opposite say that they will appeal to the country, and expect the country to sympathise with them and condemn this side for tyrannising over them, they have very little to lean upon.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I believe it would be better if we would accede to the proposition of the hon. member for Queen's and adjourn the debate. I believe that in doing so we will take away a great deal of harshness and personality from the discussion, and I am quite willing that we should again test the good faith of hon. gentlemen opposite on this occasion. I had something to do with the last arrangement that was made, and I can say positively that the leaders were not to blame for the lengthy discussion on the second reading.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The hon. member for Algoma, as I understood him, expressed himself quite satisfied with the legislation of the Ontario Parliament in giving the franchise to Indians, and he appeared to have the idea that this Bill was of the same nature, but the Ontario Bill does not give the right to vote to the Indian to the same extent as the Bill we are now discussing. In Ontario the right is limited to those who are enfranchised, and who are not receiving money grants and annuity from the Dominion Government under the Indian treaty. I have no particular interest in this question, because there are no Indians in my constituency, but I may say that personally I am of opinion that the enfranchised Indians should be entitled to a vote. Under the Indian Act of 1876, as amended by the Act of 1884, the Government have the right to enfranchise Indians in various ways. If the Government are satisfied that the Indians are intelligent they have the power to divide up the whole reserve into as many parcels as there are Indians living on it, and the Indians thus become enfranchised. What we complain of, with regard to this Bill, is that it is not limited to enfranchised Indians, but its

provisions are extended to Indians of every class, whether Christian or pagan, civilised or uncivilised. When I first read the Bill my opinion was that only the enfranchised Indians were entitled to vote, but the First Minister declared that there was to be no restriction whatever. I have no objection, not only that the enfranchised Indians should be entitled to the franchise, but also that Indians who are not enfranchised, who have accumulated by their thrift and perseverance sufficient property to qualify them, should be allowed to exercise the electoral franchise. The Province of Ontario has gone as far as the circumstances of the case can fairly warrant us in going. This Government has gone a step farther. On what principles does the First Minister propose to enfranchise every Indian, whether christian or pagan-civilised or uncivilised? Under this Bill, the moment the Government see fit to grant representation to the North-West Territories, and without any further legislation, the Indians there will all be entitled to vote. That is a proposition that ought not to be submitted to Parliament. The hon. member for Algoma quoted some observations that I made a few days ago, and intimated that I was not in favor of expenditure on the Indians. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. We on this side are willing at all times that the public funds of the Dominion should be expended for the purpose of educating, Christianising, and civilising the Indians of the Dominion. We are enfranchising the Indian before we educate him or Christianise him. As I pointed out a few evenings ago, the word "Indian," as defined in the Indian Act, would include squaws, who would therefore have the right to vote under this Bill. I say that if this Bill remains untouched, the wife of the Indian will be entitled to vote. That is an extraordinary proposition. But it is a minor one. What I object more particularly to is to give the franchise to the Indians of the class to which the hon. gentleman has alluded. In the United States, where the franchise is more liberal than the hon. gentleman proposes to make it here by the present Bill, there has never been any proposition to enfranchise the whole Indian population. There the Indian is entitled to vote, but it is the enfranchised Indian, the educated and civilised Indian. This proposal goes further. Hon. gentlemen opposite pride themselves on drawing their inspirations from England, but I am not aware that in England people occupying the position that these Indians do here, that of being supported by the Government, enjoy the franchise. Every year we vote millions of money to feed and clothe those Indians, because they are the infants of the Dominion. How is it to be expected, then, that they will have sufficient intelligence to make a proper exercise of that great privilege which this measure will confer upon them. I would refer hon. gentlemen opposite to President Hayes' inaugural address, in which he lays down a policy of dealing with the Indians that it would be well for this Government to follow; and certainly, from the tenor of that address, nothing was further from the mind of President Hayes than that this right to exercise the franchise should be given to the Indians without restriction. There is no country on the face of the earth which has ventured to take the step we are now taking. I say it is an unwise step, fraught with evil consequences in the future. If we give the Indians the right to vote, we cannot refuse them the right to send their own representatives to this House; and should the Government decide to give representation to the Territories, how would the hon. Minister of Public Works, for instance, like to have seated among his colleagues or near him Pi-a-pot, or Big Bear, or Strike-him-on-the-back, or any of the other Indian chiefs, about whom we hear so much these days. Are hon. gentlemen opposite prepared to assume that responsibility? I am very much afraid, from what they say, that they are prepared to push through Parliament this Bill which the First Minister has seen fit to introduce, without giving one word of explanation as to why Parliament should be asked to enfranchise the uncivilised portion of the community, who may have the necessary property qualification, simply to gain party advantage.

Mr. HESSON. This Bill states plainly enough that the right to vote is given to any male person, including an Indian, and yet the hon. gentlemen have been trying, for fifteen hours, to prove that an Indian means a squaw.

Mr. DAWSON. I protest against the unfair and unjust manner in which the member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) has referred to the Indians. He represents them as mendicants, living on the charity of the Government.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I did not use those words.

Mr. DAWSON. The hon. gentleman said they were receiving relief, feed and clothing from the Government. The fact is, that the payments and the clothing are not given as a gratuity, but in payment for value received, in payment for lands which the Indians have ceded, and no Government can make them more or less. The franchise by this Act is the same for the Indians as for other people, and before the Indians can avail themselves of it, they must become civilised, they must have acquired property, and must live in fixed habitations.

Mr. CHARLTON. We have not occupied, as has been stated by an hon. member, for fifteen hours in demonstrating what the word "Indian" means, but we have spent about fourteen hours in discussing the propriety of giving votes to the barbarian Indians. We have offered no factious opposition to the Bill, but we have made a reasonable request to adjourn at three o'clock in the morning. It is brutal to keep here, at this hour, a gentleman whom I see before me, a man eminent in the republic of letters, the Clerk of this House, who shows by his haggard countenance the effects of being compelled to sit here in a state of illness. I ask if it is reasonable or proper to give the franchise to a wild Indian of the plains, who is now flourishing the scalping knife and the tomahawk, and ravaging our settlements in the North-West. Has he the love of country, and the pride in British institutions, which any man should have who exercises the right of suffrage? Is that man fitted to exercise the functions of a voter? Does he possess the intelligence which would qualify him to exercise the franchise? Does the Indian possess that degree of independence that will fit him for the discharge of the franchise? No; he cannot discharge the functions of an elector, because he is not an independent man, but is the ward of the Government; he is under the complete control of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. Take the statutes in relation to the Indians of this country, and you will find, in all the enactments relating to them, that that position of dependence upon Government officials, that position of tutelage appertains to almost every Indian in this Dominion. (The hon. gentleman here quoted from the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, 22 Vic., chap 9, sections 6 and 13.) Now, you will see that if an Indian fails of issue, the property does not descend to his relatives; the law of succession is abrogated in his case; and the child of the Indian is the ward of the Superintendent General. Even in the case of enfranchised Indians, in reference to the tenor in which they hold property and land, they are not treated as Indians, and the land escheats to the Crown, in the absence of direct descendants of the Indian. In the amendments to the Indian Act of 1884 the same principle runs through the entire Act—that of dependence upon the Superintendent General, that feature which demonstrates that the Indian is not in possession of the full rights of citizenship, that even then the enfranchised Indian is the ward of the Government. (The hon. gentleman read section 20,

and several succeeding sections.) Now, all this relates to the enfranchised Indians. I maintain that in reference even to giving the suffrage to enfranchised Indians, it would be a grave question whether we should give it to them under the provisions of this Act, which I have just read. It would be a grave question whether, in view of the obligations under which the agent rests to the Superintendent General, the power possessed by the latter officer was a power that would prevent the enfranchised Indian, in most cases, from exercising his franchise, unbiassed and uninfluenced by the officials of the Government. Now, the objections I have raised apply to the enfranchised Indians. But how is it with regard to the tribal Indians, to the barbarian Indians, to the pagan Indians? The great mass of Indians that come under the provisions of this Bill are not in the position that the enfranchised Indians occupy. They have not that degree of civilisation, that degree of intelligence, that degree of dependence upon themselves, that the enfranchised Indians have. On the contrary, the great mass of the Indians who will be made voters by this Bill are Indians living in the tribal relation, living within a nationality of their own, living under a government of their own, living under institutions of their own; and the great mass of them at this moment are either in open arms against the Government or in a state of active or concealed hostility. It is proposed to enfranchise Indians who are still maintaining tribal relations. But you cannot assimilate these Indians with the body politic, or make them homogeneous with our population; they are alien and foreign to us, and have no element, characteristic or qualification that will fit them to exercise the sacred right of the suffrage, which is the privilege and right of a free man. One of the great American poets has said:

"The crowning fact, the kingliest act of freedom, is a free man's vote."

Will the pagan Indian exercise that function in that spirit? No. He will be the poor, miserable recipient of the bounty of the Government, looking for blankets, beads, food and raiment from the Government, and he will vote every time for the party in power; and that is the reason why it is proposed by the party in power to enfranchise them, for the Indians will become their tools. Is this pagan Indian superior to the thousands of white men in this country, some of whom are under arms in the North-West, who do not happen to possess the property qualification this Bill requires? Or is he superior to the white woman, who possesses everything required for the franchise, except sex. Will you give to the naked, untutored barbarian a vote which we deny to our own sons and to our females, even although the latter possess the necessary property qualification? The proposal is a monstrous one, one which should be debated, not for fifteen hours, but for fifteen days, before we assent to such an outrageous proposition. With regard to citizenship, we may look to the example of the United States with some little profit to ourselves. In no State of the American Union is an Indian made a citizen and allowed to vote until he casts off his tribal relations. In the State of New York an Indian may purchase, hold and convey land, and, when a freeholder to the extent of $100, shall be subject to taxation, liable on contracts and under the civil jurisdiction of the courts, and a citizen. (Revised Statutes, sec., 169, Vol. 3, Michigan.) Every civilised male inhabitant of Indian descent, a native of the United States and not a member of any tribe. (Constitution, p. 56, art. 7, sec., 7309, Howell's Consolidated Statutes.) Indians can sue and be sued in like manner and with same effect as other inhabitants, and entitled to same judicial rights. In Wisconsin (Revised Statutes, 1878), Indians, when electors, p. 60, sec., 12. Persons of Indian blood who have once been declared to be citizens by Congress. Civilised persons of Indian descent, not members of any tribes. Game laws are not to apply to tribal Indians. (To show how the line of demarkation is drawn in the United States between tribal Indians and citizen Indians, the hon. gentleman quoted chapter 365 of the Consolidated Statutes of New York State, having respect to the Senecas). The Senecas, he continued, which form a portion of the Six Nation Indians, were a portion of the most intelligent and advanced of all the Indian nations on this continent. When the French and Dutch settlers came into contact with them they were the Indian power on this continent. They carried their arms to the Mississippi; they exterminated the Hurons, Eries and other tribes; they carried their arms to the Gulf of Mexico and to the Chesapeak Bay. They are far in advance in manliness and intelligence to all American Indians, except their brethren of the Six Nations in Ontario. Yet the Senecas are not considered fit to have the right to citizenship until they cast themselves aside from tribal relations and no longer are members of the Seneca nation. They must become freeholders and be liable to be sued on contracts, and be under civil jurisdiction, before they can exercise the right of the franchise and citizenship in New York State. The way of enfranchisement for Indians is purposely made difficult in the United States, and in Minnesota, Nebraska and Kansas there is no provision for such enfranchisement. Although the United States Government have dealt generously with the Indians, although their policy has been a liberal and humane one, yet the people of the Union, who have broken down all the barriers surrounding the suffrage and have given votes to the colored race, have found it inexpedient to enfranchise the Indians, except on condition that they abandon their tribal relations and become citizens. Under no conceivable circumstances are we warranted in going beyond this policy that has prevailed in the United States. It will be an act of more than folly, it will be an act fraught with dangerous consequences to the people. This indefinite provision with respect to Indians should be kicked out of this Chamber, for it is derogatory to the dignity of the people and an insult to the free white people of the country to place them on a level with pagan and barbarian Indians.

Mr. FISHER. The suffrage is a right which anyone, of whatever color, should equally possess, provided the basis on which they claim the suffrage is the same for all. It is one of the privileges of British subjects, whatever their color, to rank on the same level with other British subjects, provided they possess the same property and qualifications, When the ordinary Indian was placed in the Bill, hon. members naturally thought it was to provide that when the Indian possessed the same property qualification as the white man he should in like manner possess the right to vote. It, however, we have learned, is intended to include every Indian in the country who, by any imaginable ruse, may be considered in the light of an owner, occupant, tenant, or possess the income mentioned in the Bill. Many of the Indians in the Eastern Provinces are intelligent and fairly well educated and industrious people, and have amassed sufficient wealth to enable them, under the provisions of this Bill, to obtain the franchise. No one could object to those Indians being enfranchised. There are, however, large numbers of Indians of a different character, roving bands, who should never be given such power. We know that the Indians in contact with civilisation have always acquired its vices rather than its virtues; and in consequence they are fast disappearing from the world. They retain, in spite of civilising influences, the hunting and predatory instincts of their ancestors; they prefer to get their subsistence by means of hunting and fishing than by means of agriculture. Now, I think the Government of this country have given the Indians every reasonable facility for becoming a civilised and agricultural population. It has

supplied them with implements, seed and agricultural instructors. And what is the result? According to the Indian report, in almost every instance they have made but very little progress in agriculture. I am aware that in one of our large Indian reserves, near Montreal, though the Indians possess land and gardens and houses, and might raise sufficient produce for their subsistence, they nevertheless prefer to engage in boating, fishing and hunting. Now those Indians on their reserves occupy a peculiar position in regard to the franchise. The right hon. gentleman has alluded to the enfranchised Indians and to those that are not enfranchised, and he stated last night that if this clause was only to embrace enfranchised Indians it would practically embrace no Indians at all. I think that is the best proof possible that the Indians do not deserve the right of voting. If, after all the opportunities and assistance that the Government have given the Indians of this country to put themselves in a position to be enfranchised, hardly any of them have availed themselves of the advantages and opportunities, it shows plainly that they have no right whatever to claim any further opportunities in the same direction. But there is another reason why they should not be granted the franchise. By the Indian Act, if an Indian wishes to become proprietor of a small piece of land in his own name, he has to get a location ticket, which enables him to call that lot his own; but still it does not make him the real possessor of the land. In fact, he is only an occupant of the property, and would be held to be an occupant under this law. Under this law, a voter must either occupy property for his own use, or he must be able to obtain from it sufficient to enable him to live upon it. Under the Indian Act, however, the Indians who may come under the provisions of this Bill, as occupants, getting their subsistence from the land, still draw from the Government an annual allowance; and here is my fundamental objection to these Indians obtaining the franchise. It seems to me perfectly absurd that any individual who, *in forma pauperis*, comes to the Government and gets pecuniary assistance to enable him to live, shall be given the right to say who shall compose the Government and what its policy shall be. The hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) spoke of the Indians in Nova Scotia and of the school facilities afforded them. Now, it appears from the Indian report that the Indians have availed themselves to a very slight extent of the schools provided for them. (The hon. gentleman here read from the Indian report, relative to Indian schools in Nova Scotia.) When we learned from the First Minister the extent to which the Bill goes, and that he intends to invest the whole Indian population with the franchise, I confess, although I am loath to impute unworthy motives, that I could not help thinking it was done with the express purpose of obtaining control of a large number of votes. The provisions of the Bill all go to show that the hon. gentleman intends to obtain control, not only of the voters who may be Indians, but of the whole electorate. It is well known that the Indians will be under the control and management of the agents. A person who is interdicted has no control over his property, and is obliged to go to his trustee or guardian for every trifling favor. So will it be with the Indians, as regards the agents. If they should become enfranchised, they will naturally ask the agents how they are to exercise that privilege. The agent is sure to be a political supporter of the Government. If a Conservative Government is in power he will be a Conservative. If a Liberal Government is in power he will be a Liberal. These party appointments are a portion of our party system. The individual will thus have a party bias, and he will be able to throw the whole vote of the Indians on his reserve in favor of the Government, and if he fails to act as they desire, he is removed. Already there has been the sale and farming of votes of people employed in large establishments in return for legislative enactments which assist the particular industry. This Bill will add to this vicious system. In the North-West the Indians occupy a different position from that of the Indians in the east. They have more extensive reserves, and can all obtain the certificate of ownership that would enable them to vote. But these Indians have not even the semi-civilisation of the Indians of the eastern Provinces. They are practically nomads, spending a great portion of their time in the saddle. And what is their social condition? We find, by the Indian Report, that a majority of them are still pagans; not only are they pagans, but we find from recent events that they still have in them the savage and ferocious dispositions of ordinary barbarians. They are ready, on the slightest pretext, to return to their ancient habits of rapine, pillage and murder; and yet the right hon. gentleman proposes to give the franchise to these Indians, the most of whom are in rebellion against the Government. There is no practical difference between the Indians of Manitoba and those of the North-West Territory; and any Indians who may be enfranchised in Manitoba under this Bill are in precisely the same condition as the Indians in the North-West Territory; and as soon as representation is accorded to the Indians of the Territories, they will then obtain their enfranchisement under this Bill. (The hon. gentleman here read several extracts from the Indian Report.) This shows that after all the Government have done to help the Indians obtain their livelihood by means of agriculture, the Government is still obliged to furnish them with food. And it is such people as these, people like those who have to be supported by public charity in our large cities, that the Government propose to invest with the franchise.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). These Indians will not be enfranchised.

Mr. FISHER. They will, if they succeed in obtaining individual ownership of any portion of their reserves; and I have no doubt that the Indian agent will be quite capable of dividing up the reserves, for the express purpose of enfranchising these Indians, particularly if he thinks that they will vote for the candidate of the Government who appointed him to office. But the reason I object to these Indians obtaining the franchise on the conditions proposed by the Government is, that we practically give them far easier facilities than we do to the white population of the eastern Provinces. Now, I contend that a large number of the white people in the eastern Provinces are much more entitled to the right of the franchise than are these Indians; I allude to the great number of people who, by this Bill, have not the necessary property qualification as owner or occupant, a great number of whom live in our midst. Before semi-civilised or uncivilised Indians are enfranchised, every white man of full age, and being a resident, should have the right to vote. I can conceive of no ground for introducing this Bill, except the Premier's desire to obtain control, either for himself or for his own political creatures, of the votes of a large body of the people. If he desires simply to extend the franchise, why does he not extend it to all people of white race and Christian civilisation. He is unwilling to do so, because whites are not easily managed and led to the polls. Indians can have no possible conception of the rights and duties attaching to the franchise. It is true they elect their chiefs, but they choose them because they are good fighters or hunters; but it cannot be pretended that they could judge intelligently of the qualifications of candidates to Parliament. The Indians, if enfranchised, will hold the balance of power in many constituencies. The Conservatives carried many constituencies at the last election by narrow majorities, and the First Minister, no doubt, intends to make those safe. It is impossible not to impute motives to the hon. gentleman when the provisions of this Bill are examined, especially in view of the

manner in which he gerrymandered the constituencies. It required an all-night session to lead the people to understand the manner in which the hon. gentleman was trifling with the question of woman suffrage. This all-night session will have been valuable if the result is that the people shall understand the motives and actions of the First Minister in introducing this Bill. When they do understand it there can be no doubt that whenever the general elections may take place the hon. gentleman and the Government will be left in the minority.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. This measure is most revolutionary in its character and most sweeping in its provisions. We have no quarrel with the Government for endeavoring to extend the franchise to Indians when they possess the necessary qualifications for receiving that franchise, because we are just as anxious for the progress, intellectual development and material advancement of the Indian, as are hon. gentlemen opposite. What we object to is that this Bill is intended to give the franchise to Indians, without imposing on them a single duty that the possession of the franchise imposes on other classes of the community. It confers this privilege, while at the same time they are held in a state of tutelage, and they cannot exercise the franchise in an independent manner. No means are proposed for emancipating the Indians from Government control. They are completely under the control of the Government, and they must necessarily vote as they are told by the agents. In other words they must vote for supporters of the Government. (The hon. gentleman quoted from the Indian Act of 1880, showing the composition of the Indian Department and the powers given to agents.) He continued to say that under the Consolidated Act it was provided that an Indian should be in possession of a freehold before he can obtain the franchise. Now, it is proposed to remove all such restriction. All that was needed under this Bill was that an Indian should settle down on a piece of land, which, together with his personal belongings, should be of the value of $150, in order to qualify him to become an elector. It provides no means by which he shall exercise his vote in an intelligent and independent manner. (The hon. gentleman proceeded to read several sections from the several Indian Acts.) Now, just please note the effect of this clause. It holds the Indian in a complete state of terror. He cannot remove a sapling from the public highways, or a particle of the soil; he cannot remove a stone from the public highway, without subjecting himself to an enormous fine, which may be collected from him by the approval of the Superintendent General; yet it is proposed, under the present Act, to enfranchise the Indians while they are still held in a practical state of servitude to the Superintendent General. No proposition more monstrous has ever been proposed in any country where the English language is spoken. The Superintendent General has the right, practically, to place them in solitary confinement. That officer or the Minister of the Interior have it in their power, if the Indian is guilty of any of these little offences, and if he does not vote as the Superintendent wants him to do, the officials may order his imprisonment without any appeal. (The hon. gentleman continued to read from the Indian Act.) To persons suffering under great disabilities and disqualifications, it is proposed to hand over the franchise. In 1884 the Indian Act was amended. (The hon. gentleman read various clauses of the Act, and showed that an Indian cannot perform what is considered the most sacred rights of a man, namely, that of saying who shall receive and hold his property after death.) An Indian's will shall only have force, if, after his death, it receives the approval of the band and of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. If it does not receive such approval, it is provided that he shall be held to have died intestate. The clauses of the Act show that the Superintendent-General holds autocratic power over the Indians. The idea running throughout the whole Indian Act is to keep the Indians in a complete state of tutelage. Such provisions are no doubt wise; but in the view of all right-thinking people a proposal to change the law, without giving the Indians more liberty or imposing on them duties of citizenship, and to give them the franchise, is simply to place them as voters under the direct control of the Superintendent General and his agents. The proposition is a monstrous one, and such a one as was never before submitted to any Parliament in which the English language is spoken. By chapter 28 of the statute of 1884 it is provided that Indians who have made large advances in material prosperity can secure municipal institutions. But those institutions are just as much under the control of the Superintendent-General as are all other Indian affairs. (The hon. gentleman read clause 5, respecting the election of councillors, and pointed out that the Indian agent should preside at the election.) Under section 11 a councillor can be removed for immoral and other improper conduct by the Superintendent General. The practical working of this section, if the present Bill should become law, would be, that if an Indian councillor did not cast his vote and act in a manner to please the Superintendent General or his agents a charge could be brought against him, and if proved to the satisfaction of the Superintendent General, he could be dismissed from his office as councillor, without appeal. I think enough has been said to prove that this Act ought not to become law, that it is a disgrace to the age in which we live to propose such an Act, that it is an insult to the people of the country to bring such an Act before the representatives and ask them to make it law.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I deem it my duty not to allow this important measure of Indian suffrage to pass without making a few remarks. I believe the Government was wrong in not accepting the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). In fact, if it is just to grant the right of suffrage to all the Indians who now hold the same qualifications as the white men who are qualified to vote under the existing law, I think it is a very grave error to confer the same right on those Indians who are now under the guardianship of the agents and employés of the Government. It is evident, Mr. Chairman, that if that measure becomes law, the Government, through their agents and through the Superintendent of the Department of Indian Affairs, will control the vote of these Indians and may use their votes to elect candidates who will be supporters of the Administration. This question is not of paramount interest in the Province of Quebec, where there are but few Indians, but it affects several counties in British Columbia, Manitobia and Ontario, where the Indians are numerous. These Indians are under the guardianship of the Government. I do not think they are enjoying a sufficient amount of freedom to have that right of suffrage which is implied in this Bill. It is perfectly clear that when an Indian tribe depends on the Government for its maintenance that tribe is not independent enough from the Government to give a free vote, which will not be in favor of the Government. I will take the liberty of quoting part of a speech from the hon. First Minister, which he delivered on the 5th of May, 1880, while moving the second reading of the Bill to amend the laws respecting Indians. Among other things, he said:

"We have seen individuals of this race succeed, by means of education, but the exception proves the rule. The general rule is, that you cannot make the Indian a white man. An Indian once said to myself: 'We are the wild animals; you cannot make an ox of a deer.' You cannot make an agriculturist of the Indian. All we can hope for is to wean them, by slow degrees, from their nomadic habits, which have almost become an instinct, and by slow degrees absorb them or settle them on the land. Meantime, they must be fairly protected. The hon.

gentleman says this Bill should stand over until we have an opportunity of discovering or inventing some new system of civilising the Indians. I am afraid he and I would not agree as to the best means of doing so. I am afraid he would favor the dividing of the different reserves among the Indians, giving them deeds in fee simple, and leaving them to shift for themselves. That would be cruelty of the worst kind. I think this Bill is called for, until we can, by common agreement, come to some understanding as to some means of advancing the Indians in the scale of civilisation."

Thus, Mr. Chairman, we see by these remarks from the First Minister, that the Indians must be kept under constant guardianship. Until now all the efforts which have been made to civilise them and to educate them have been of very little avail. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) said last night, if I understood him properly, that he had known a great many Indians who were gifted with high intellectual powers, and just as capable of judging of politics as any white men. He quoted a conversation which he had with an Indian squaw of high merit. Well, Mr. Chairman, I cannot admit that. I will not say that, as an exception, there may not be Indians who might exercise the electoral franchise and vote as well, and perhaps better, than a good many white men; but it must be admitted that these are exceptions to the general rule. Besides, these intelligent Indians are already enjoying the rights of citizenship; they have no need of a new law to exercise the right of franchise. I said a while ago that the Indians who are under the control of the Superintendent of the Indians have not that independence which would permit them to vote with freedom; I will not say that they would be incapable of voting if they were free, but I maintain that the Indian Act of 1880 deprives them of all freedom, and does not allow them to vote, even if they had sufficient intelligence to do so. (The hon. member quoted section 20, paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Act of 1884, to further amend the Act respecting Indians, of 1880.) Thus, Mr. Chairman, we see that the Superintendent not only has the right to approve or disapprove a will made by an Indian in favor of anybody, but that he can also limit, at his own discretion, the extent of such a will, according as he will judge that the morals of the Indians widow, are good or bad. Here is a clause of the same Act, which shows what powers the superintendents have over the Indians. (The hon. member read the whole of section 27 of the above mentioned Act.) By this section, Mr. Chairman, it is seen that the superintendent is not only the protector of the Indians, but that he is also their judge. If they do anything contrary to the law he can send them to jail. Now, whoever knows the disposition of the Indians is aware that nothing frightens them as much as prison. They consider imprisonment as a disgrace, which in their minds is far greater than in the minds of white men. At a given moment, these superintendents may use that as a bug-bear, and manage them as they shall see fit. I understand that the Indians should, in a great measure, be controlled, and I approve of the provisions of the previous Act. But on the other hand, if we must admit that the Government is obliged to adopt stringent provisions to keep them under guardianship, we must also admit that they need to be led by the hand, which proves that they have not that degree of intelligence which is necessary to exercise the franchise in such an extensive manner. The superintendents have also other very extensive privileges on the Indians. The only proof I want of this fact is the following section. (The hon. member read the whole of section 99 of the above mentioned Act.) As will be seen by that section, the superintendent holds entirely within his hands the franchise of the Indians. It is he who will decide whether or not an Indian will be emancipated and put on the voters' list. We see, by what is taking place to-day in the North-West, that these superintendents are not always extraordinary men. These superintendents will have the power of manufacturing voters. In British Columbia, in the Province of Ontario and even in the Province of Quebec, if a Government candidate looses the confidence of the electors, all that will be necessary to do will be to cause Indian votes to be manufactured, and we may rest assured that the superintendent will think that those Indians who are Conservatives will be intelligent enough to have a vote. In those counties where there will have been a change of opinion if 200 Indian votes are needed to turn the scale in favor of the Conservative candidate, 200 Indians will be emancipated. I will take the liberty of quoting another clause, to show what powers are given to the superintendent. (The hon. member read section 100 of the above mentioned Act.) We see by this section that extraordinary powers are given to the superintendent, who may grant the patents to the Indians or withhold them. I shall read another clause, to indicate the extensive rights conferred on the superintendent; it will be the last. This clause is taken from the Act to confer certain privileges on the more enlightened bands of Indians in Canada, in order to make them familiar with the exercise of the municipal powers, which was sanctioned on the 19th of April, 1884. (The hon. member read section 5 of the said Act.) It is found, from what I have just read, that the superintendents will also control the elections of the councillors and chiefs among the Indians. From whatever standpoint that we may view this question, we see that the superintendents hold absolute power over the Indians. They give them their living and they lead them by the hand—they do what they like with them. Now, we cannot come to any other conclusion but the following: That they will dictate to the Indians how they shall vote; they will have over them such great power that the Indians will not recognise any possible masters or chiefs other than these people. Before voting they will consult the superintendents, as we know that these latter will be Conservatives, and it follows that it will be impossible for them to do otherwise than to vote in favor of the Government. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very unfair, and that it is a grave error on the part of the Goverment to insert such a provision as that with which we are now dealing in a Bill of franchise. It is quite unfair to give the right to vote to people whom the First Minister described, in 1880, as being incapable of exercising that right. He has stated that they needed to be kept under guardianship, and that they were incapable of being their own masters. On the other hand, it is quite unjust to give them the right of voting, because it is not they who will exercise it, because they will follow the advice of the agents of the Government. For these reasons, I deem it my duty to vote in favor of the amendment of the hon. member for Bothwell.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I move that the committee do now rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again. The proposition before the House is to bring in a large class of voters who, hitherto, have not been voting in the Dominion, and it will be admitted on all hands that any changes of this kind should receive full consideration. We have also before us a vast amount of other very important business, which will require the careful consideration of the members of this House. It is now nearly noon, and in order that the members may be enabled to deliberate upon the great questions yet before us, they should have an opportunity of getting that rest and refreshment which are essential to the preservation of their health.

Mr. MILLS. Do I understand that the First Minister assents to this motion for adjournment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I do not.

Mr. MILLS. I wish to make a few observations upon the merits of this particular question, and to point out some reasons why the House should take further time to consider this proposition. This proposition is really a revolutionary one; it is a proposition to make radical changes in the constitution of the Government, without the First Minister

ever having sought the opinion of the country, and without giving any intimation of the Government's intention, by which public discussion might take place and public opinion be ascertained. It is a most extraordinary proceeding to confer the franchise upon Indians who are residing upon reservations. It is extraordinary that this franchise should be conferred upon people who, it is admitted, are not qualified to exercise the ordinary rights of citizenship, as is attested by the whole policy of the Government in its dealing with the Indians down to the present time. I think that the rules and principles of our constitutional system are being invaded by the proposition before us. I believe there is not another representative body in the world where such a proposition would not be instantly rejected, and which no Minister would venture to submit to any other deliberative assembly. It just shows the moral condition which this House has reached, when such a proposition can be entertained by those who claim to represent the nation. Under the English constitutional system there are no limitations upon any system of parliamentary government. But it is a well recognised rule that no important changes shall be made in the constitution of the country without ample opportunity being given to the people to consider the proposed changes. All reforms are carefully considered by the two parties; they are discussed by the press; discussed in magazines and reviews; public opinion is educated upon these questions, and a conclusion is reached before they are touched in Parliament at all. Now, there are two ways in which men are governed in civilised countries—by force and by public opinion. It is by public discussion, it is by the controversy that takes place in the press and upon the platform, that opinions are formed, that the people are educated up to the support or to the rejection of any particular measure. I ask hon. gentlemen if they can find a single change made in the constitution of the English Government that has not been discussed again and again in the press and on the hustings, and made an issue at parliamentary elections. When the Reform Bill was introduced in 1831 and was rejected by the House of Lords, the King said, in dissolving Parliament: "I am proroguing Parliament with a view to its immediate dissolution in order that I may consult my people and ascertain whether the measure proposed by my advisers is a measure which meets with the approval of the nation." When it was proposed to deal with the Irish Church question, Mr. Gladstone submitted to Parliament certain resolutions. He was supported by a majority of the House, though he was leader of the Opposition. The Government for the time being were in the minority, and Mr. Disraeli objected to the question being proceeded with until the views of the nation had been given on it. Did Mr. Gladstone insist on proceeding because he was supported by a majority? He admitted the justice of the contention and he declared he would do nothing more than make that question an issue, in order that the opinion of the nation might be had on it. Let me call the attention of the House to this matter, because I wish to show the House and the country that the proposal of the First Minister is one which strikes at the very foundation of our constitutional system. Our constitution declares that our Government shall be similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom. I want to show that this is government wholly different in principle; that this is striking at the basis of our constitution, and that it is undertaking to establish a government here much like the government established by adventurers who occasionally come into power in Peru and Guatemala, and is not like government established under the British system. It has been a common thing for adventurers in Mexico and some of the South American States to legislate in order to keep themselves in power. Does any one here admit that it is a proper course to pursue? Must not public opinion have become seriously demoralised before a public man could propose such a course. Let me call attention to the observations made by Mr. Disraeli on the Irish Church question. (Extract from Mr. Disraeli's speech read.) The doctrine laid down by Mr. Disraeli is, that the Government are bound, before they propose any important change in the constitutional system, to consult the nation. I ask, has the hon. gentleman done it in this case? He proposes to deal with the subject wholly new. He proposes to give certain wards of the Government votes at parliamentary elections. He has simply considered the number of consituencies whose political complexion he can change by this Act. That is a consideration that would recommend itself to a President of Guatemala but not the Premier of a British Parliament. Let us look at the principle on which the electoral franchise is founded. It is based upon public spirit. We try to ascertain who are qualified, and when we see that men have possessed sufficient independence and economy to acquire a certain amount of property, that fact is judged to be evidence of fitness to exercise the electoral franchise. In every country where electoral institutions are established, or political privileges are conferred, they are limited by that principle. When is the franchise extended to a whole community, to all men who have obtained their majority? So soon as they believe that the young men have sufficient public spirit to enable them to exercise the franchise with care, attention, and something like disinterestedness, and with some exhibition of patriotism. Upon what principle is it, then, that Indians are to be enfranchised? The hon. First Minister informed me, in the earlier part of this discussion, that no one had a right to vote as a matter of right; that it was a question of expediency. So that when he said that Indians had a right to vote because they paid taxes on their blankets—which is not the case in a majority of instances, for they are furnished by the Government—and pay taxes on their groceries, which are not very large in quantity and not very costly, he was in error. The hon. gentleman did not admit any such basis of representation when he proposed to confer the franchise upon women. He said it was not a matter of right but of expediency. I contend that everyone in the community has a right to exercise the electoral franchise when the individual possesses the necessary intelligence and public spirit to enable him to do so. Do these Indians exhibit anything of that kind? They reside on reservations which are vested in the Crown. The hon. gentleman proposes to give to every Indian who has property or goods to the value of $150 a vote. That vote may consist mostly of the piece of land, for the shanty may be simply of birch bark. But whatever is done is done, not because he shows competency to exercise the franchise. This is an attack on the very foundation of our system of government; it is an attack which the Government have no right to make. I do not deny that this Act may be binding as a matter of law if it is carried through Parliament, but I deny most emphatically that Parliament can legislate on this subject without first having had the sanction of the country. Has this sanction been given? In what constituency has it been decided that the young men now engaged in defending the country are unfit to exercise the franchise, and those who are ready to take up arms against the country are incompetent to exercise it? That is what the hon. gentleman proposes. Let me read a few words on the right of legislators to deal with questions of this kind, made by one of the most eminent authorities who ever sat in a Parliament—I refer to Mr. Plunkett. (Quotation read.) The same doctrine is laid down by Locke, in his work on government (a quotation from which the hon. gentleman read). The hon. member continued: This Bill is a gross usurpation of power; it is a breach of trust. What are the Government endeavoring to do? Is it to legislate under the constitution as we have it? No. If it

was proposed to make a change they should have stated so, and have taken the opinion of the country upon it. But they have not proposed a change; the opinion of the country has not been taken; and this House has no moral competency to deal with this question in this way. What do we observe in British practice? That every important question looking to a change in the constitution of the Government, in order to adapt it to the changed condition of society, is discussed in the House of Commons, in the press and on the public platform, and made an issue at elections, and when the nation itself has approved of the change, then Parliament undertakes to give effect to the wish of the nation in that particular. Has Canada asked for this change, that the electoral franchise should be conferred on the wards of the Government, who are held by the law to be incapable of buying and selling the simplest article? That is the hon. gentleman's proposal, and in making that proposal the Government are guilty of a breach of trust to the people who have entrusted them to legislate under the constitution as we have it, and not make radical alterations in that constitution. Everyone sees that this is an attack upon the independence of Parliament. I go to the constituency of Bothwell and find that about 150 Indians would be given votes, all of whom are wards of the Government, and will be obliged to vote as the Superintendent General says. I go to the county of South or West Middlesex, and I find a still larger number. I go to West Elgin and find a large number there; to West Lambton and find a large number there. I go to Haldimand and find more than enough there to alter the political complexion of that constituency. I go to Brant and find the same condition of things. It is very near the same in North York, Hastings, North Ontario, South Bruce and Algoma; and I am only taking Ontario constituencies, though the same thing will be the case in other Provincas, though, perhaps, not to the same extent. I say here is a proposal to change the political complexion of the constituencies, by giving the electoral franchise to wards of the Government, without the sanction of the people and without their knowledge and approval. Hon. members on this side would not believe the extent to which the hon. gentleman's measure goes, until he made the statement himself last night; and hon. gentlemen opposite are not aware of the provisions contained in the Bill. It was covertly introduced, and it was intended to slip the Bill through the House without the knowlege of the members and without the knowledge of the country. The people are entitled to know what the constitution is. It is our business here to legislate under the constitution, not to legislate away the constitution under which we profess to act. I say the country has not had an opportunity of considering this proposition; and I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite; I appeal to them as Canadians, as citizens of this country, as men, to say whether they approve of this change in our constitutional system, whether they are prepared to admit that we should give the franchise to men who are wards of the Government, to men who can neither read nor write, who are paupers, so to speak, while we deny the franchise to a large number of laboring men in this country, men of intelligence and industry, who contribute to the wealth of the country? Are they prepared to exclude the young men of the country and confer it upon the Indians who are, to a large extent, dependent upon public charity in order that they may subsist at all? You have men who will be electors under this law, who would not live two years were it not for the aid they receive from the Government, while you deny the franchise to men who come forward and risk their lives in defence of their country. Now, I think there are good reasons why this measure should be postponed. Our system of parliamentary government is in great measure a system of compromise, a system of forbearance; and if the party in power chooses to use its power to the utmost for its own advantage, parliamentary government becomes impossible; and if the Conservative party of this country have not sufficient public spirit, have not sufficient magnanimity, have not sufficient sense of fair play, to induce them to reject a proposition of this sort and to act fairly, I say the time is very near at hand indeed when our representative system must come to an end. When the First Minister uses his power as an ordinary South American guerilla chief, it is clear that our constitution cannot much longer survive. Have we here a measure that has been demanded by the people, or approved of by them? Not at all. We have here a measure proposed in the interest of one man, proposed for the purpose of enabling him to maintain himself in authority. That is the object, and every man on both sides of this House knows that is the reason of this measure. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite: Are you prepared to take this course? Are you prepared to adopt a revolutionary course? Are you prepared to act the part of Janissaries of Constantinople and strangle your political opponents by a measure of this sort? I tell you that you will not succeed. There is a moral element in this country, outside this House, sufficiently strong to prevent the success of this iniquitous measure. If, however, the event proves that there is not sufficient moral sense in this country to reject and condemn such a measure as this, then it will be because the hon. gentleman has so far debauched public opinion as to render his success possible. I believe it is only necessary that this question should be fully discussed here, and time given to people outside to understand what is proposed, in order to make it impossible for hon. gentlemen opposite to support the proposition. The proposition is monstrous; it is so monstrous in its character that I cannot properly characterise it. It is a proposition which I trust those hon. gentlemen who support the Administration will condemn, and that they will have the courage to tell the First Minister that, whatever else we do, we are not ready to play the part of Janissaries or of Turks, instead of the part of free men, under a free Government, and in a free country.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think the length of time occupied in the discussion of this important question makes it necessary that those who have been talking all night should have some rest. Members of the Government and the right hon. gentleman himself should have gone to the North-West and endeavored to procure a settlement of the difficulties so as to prevent the shedding of the blood of our sons. I received a letter from an esteemed friend, who has a son wounded in the North-West——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tassé). I call the hon. gentlemen to Order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. member is speaking on a motion to adjourn, and on the motion to adjourn the rule is the same in committee as in the general House. In the general House, on a motion to adjourn, very great and wide latitude is always permitted, and it is perfectly in order to discuss the situation of the country. This has constantly been done. One of the great reasons that has led to the Government keeping this House 20 hours in session is the present condition of the country, and I submit that the hon. gentleman is perfectly in order.

Mr. RYKERT. Let the Chairman rule.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I have ruled.

Mr. McMULLEN. I regret to be obliged to make these remarks. I feel for these parents whose children have lost their lives in the North-West.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is not obeying my ruling. I ruled he was out of Order.

Mr. EDGAR. I appeal from your decision to the House. The rules of the House provide that in committee there shall be an appeal, on questions of Order decided by the Chair to the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Then make a motion to that effect.

Mr. EDGAR. Under our rules it is most distinct and clear, that questions of Order arising in Committee of the Whole are subject to an appeal from the decision of the Chairman to the House. This is provided by rule 76. If there is any language clear and emphatic it is, "that members of the committee who are not satisfied with the ruling of the Chair, who, of course, has not the experience of the Speaker, shall have the right to appeal to the House." I do not want to ask permission of the committee as to whether I have a right to appeal, and I therefore simply hand in a memorandum stating that I appeal.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I decide that the point of Order taken by the hon. gentleman is not well taken. The hon. member appeals from the decision of the Chair, as given in the case of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). The hon. gentleman should commence by moving that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That would be making a second motion to the like effect. There would be two motions of the same kind, and which would have precedence? The hon. First Minister knows it is out of Order.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly, the action for the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), is out of Order, and he must commence with the motion that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. LAURIER. The appeal does not itself involve the rising of the committee. What would become of the appeal, if the motion that the committee rise were voted down?

Mr. MILLS. It would be impossible to carry out the rule, if such a course had to be followed. The rule is not discretionary. It is absolute.

Mr. EDGAR. If the view you, Mr. Chairman, take is correct, what is the position? There is no appeal from your decision to the House, but simply an appeal from the committee. If the committee decide against me this question of Order will never get to the House. The rule might, therefore, if such a ruling is to be maintained, as well be struck out, there is absolutely no protection to the minority of a committee against the ruling of a gentleman who happens to be Chairman at the time. I am satisfied, if you will consider the question, you will see that is the case. If it is not the case, I should like to hear the opinions of members of the committee, and some authority that led you to act against the plain language of the rule of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. It cannot be that a question of Order should be decided more definitely, emphatically and absolutely and autocratically than by the Speaker of the House. When the Speaker is in the Chair, there is an appeal to the House under our rules. His decision is not final. Under your ruling, however, there would be no appeal to the House, but simply to the committee. If you have the right to decide that there is no appeal to the House, but simply to the committee, as to whether it should rise and report progress, what comes of the rule.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. In support of my view I quote chapter 15 of Bourinot, page 419, which says:

"If it be found expedient in either House to refer the point of Order to the Speaker, a member will move that the Chairman report progress, and ask leave to sit again that day."

Mr. BLAKE. That reference is not to this appeal. This appeal is one to the House, not to the Speaker. I know it is competent to move that the committee rise with a view of obtaining the opinion of the highest authority on a point of Order. It is in the discretion of the Speaker to give an opinion or not. I remember an instance in which a committee rose with a view to obtaining the opinion of the Speaker, but the Speaker declined to give an opinion, and the House went back into committee. We certainly are entitled to have the opinion of the Speaker given in this case. I know that in another Legislature it was the practice to obtain such a decision without debate. We have a decision on this case by your immediate predecessor, the Deputy Speaker. Last night there was a point raised before the Deputy Speaker, to which I objected, and we desired to appeal to the committee. He rose and delivered judgment, stating that I had no right to appeal to the committee, that if I was dissatisfied with his decision I should appeal to the House.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) The rule is:

"Questions of order arising in Committee of the Whole House shall be decided by the Chairman, subject to an appeal to the House."

As I understand the point of Order being raised, the business of the committee cannot proceed until the decision of the Chairman has been obtained. But the decision of the Chairman is subject to appeal, and though an appeal may be referred the business can go on.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I will quote May, to show that a motion must be made, in the first place, to report progress:

"On the 11th May, 1878, a member, having contested a ruling of the Chairman, moved to report progress, in order to take the ruling of the Speaker; but it was explained in debate, that there was no appeal to the Speaker, unless the committee desired the authority and orders of the House."

Mr. MILLS. The passage you have read to us, is a case of a committee desiring to obtain the opinion of the Speaker upon certain points. What is our rule? Is there any decision in English practice, showing how an appeal is made from the Chairman to the House?

Mr. LAURIER. I do not know what is the rule covering committees in England; but I find, in May, that the Speaker may resume the Chair, in many instances, without reporting progress. (The hon. gentleman read from May, p. 307 and 371.) Now, our rule is this:

"Questions of Order arising in committee, shall be decided by the Chairman, subject to an appeal to the House."

Mr. MILLS. It is clear that our usages, as well as those of the English Parliament, provide for two modes of proceeding. The one is an appeal to the Speaker, the other is an appeal to the House. In the case of an appeal to the Speaker the committee rises and reports progress and asks leave to sit again. In the case of an appeal to the House it is made as a matter of course. The appeal to the House is a matter of right, and cannot depend upon the views of the committee as to whether a report should be made or not.

Mr. BLAKE. I maintain there is no right on the part of any member of this committee to propose an appeal to the Speaker; there is no appeal to the Speaker under our rules. The appeal is to the House, just as the appeal from the Speaker's decision is to the House. But when the committee desires, as it may well desire to get the opinion of the Speaker upon any point, it has been ruled, and it is competent to the committee to pass a motion in order that the Chairman may report that fact to the Speaker, therefore, our appeal under the rule is not to the gentleman who occupies the Chair at all; it is to the House of Commons, just as the

appeal from the Speaker himself is to the House of Commons, you occupy in that regard no inferior position to the Speaker himself. You are not a subordinate officer whose decision is subject to appeal at all. Your appeal is subject to the same appeal as that of the Speaker himself. But there is a practice, not of an appeal to the Speaker, but of a case in which the committee finding that they wished to report, or that the Chairman has a doubt in his mind, and that it was desirable to get the opinion of the highest authority, then the committee report progress in order that the Speaker may deliver his decision.

Mr. LAURIER. I have not been able to find in the standing rules of the House of Commons of England any similar rule to our rule 75; that is to say, in England they have no rule whereby it is provided that there should be an appeal from the decision of the Chairman of committees to the House itself. Then if it be so, that there is no such rule in England as there is in our code, then all the authorities that can be found upon our books can apply to this case.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I rise to protest against the decision which has just been given. Should that decision be maintained it would be a glaring injustice, it would be going beyond all the elementary rules. It would be trampling upon the minority in this House, which minority does not intend to be trampled upon and will maintain and uphold its rights to the end. In the course of this debate people have tried and are still trying to stifle the voice of the minority, but whatever may be the oppression to which it is intended to submit us, there are men in this House who will not submit to it, neither morally nor physically. For my part, I am perfectly determined to do my duty in this House and not to give way to any influence. Therefore, I say, Mr. Chairman, that you cannot deny me the right of appeal, otherwise you would be depriving the minority of an absolute right. We have this right of appeal and we shall maintain it. On the other hand, if this right is denied to us, I will be almost glad of it, because it will be the consecration of an iniquity which, notwithstanding the rules of the House, the majority wishes to impose on the minority. Under these circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I ask you, before you pronounce on this question, to act with that calmness and sincerity with which a judge ought to give a decision on such an important matter, when the freedom of speech is in question, when the question is whether we have a right to be heard and to ask the House what are the rights which we have.

Mr. BLAKE. I would invite the attention of the Chairman to the position which I have taken with reference to rule 8:

"The Speaker shall preserve order and decorum, and shall decide questions of Order subject to an appeal to the House."

I ask you to consider what your position would be if you were Speaker of this House and decided a question of Order, and any hon. member contested and appealed to the House. Can you conceive that there is anything which could interpose between the absolute right of any member of this House to obtain a judgment of the House upon the question whether you were right or wrong in your decision. It is clear that your decision, if you are in that Chair, and that we are the House instead of a committee, is by the law of Parliament subject to an appeal. It is an appeal not of favor, not of prejudice, but it is an absolute right. It is impossible to conceive that there shall be greater power of preventing an appeal from the Chairman of committee to the House than from the Speaker to the House. The question is how can that appeal be accomplished unless a motion is submitted to the committee. The question is whether the appeal shall be made at the discretion of the committee or not. If that ground is taken, it gives to the majority the right of deciding the question as to the right of appeal to the House. Then it is no longer an appeal of right, but a matter of discretion within the power of the majority. One cannot imagine that the Committee of the Whole has more power in these matters than has the House when the Speaker is in the Chair. The majority in that case could not prevent an appeal to the House from the decision of the Speaker on the precise point of order. A single member has the right to make such an appeal and have a desision recorded. If you intercept a vote of the House by leaving it to the committee to decide whether there shall be an appeal or not, you intercept a decision by the House on the precise point of order. You prevent the question being put to the House, because a majority of the committee do not want an appeal, and you thus prevent a ruling of the Speaker being obtained on the point of order. Hon. members would, in effect, say "no" to the question as to whether there should be an appeal to the House, and having said "no" to that question, there would be no appeal. So it would be in the power of a majority of the committee to prevent that appeal to the House which rule 76 absolutely gives. The question is whether there is any insuperable obstacle to prevent the carrying out of the rule. I say there is none. You say, how can the committee suspend its operations, and the Speaker resume the Chair without a motion being made? But in the English House of Commons there are occasions in which the Speaker has resumed the Chair without the question being put.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think every one must see that it would be perfectly idle to talk of the right of appeal from the decision of the Chairman of the committee if we have to ask the consent of the majority of the committee to that appeal. I am not going into a minute discussion of the legal points; I take my stand on the plain words of a plain rule laid down for our guidance, which says we shall have the right of appeal from the Chairman of the committee to the House. It is not to the committee that the appeal lies; it is to the House itself. I call your attention again to the fact that this identical point, according to the statement of an hon. member, made in his place, appears to have been taken recently before the gentleman who usually occupies your place, Mr. Chairman, and he gave a decision in the matter. But however that may be, even supposing you were not disposed to agree with your predecessor, there can be no doubt whatever that it would reflect most grievously upon the fairness of our proceedings (and this is a matter in which hon. gentlemen opposite are interested, and in which they may be interested more than they expect within a short time) if it appears that, after formally declaring that an appeal shall lie from the decision of the Chairman of the committee to the House, this committee should decide that those express declarations of a clearly expressed rule were absolutely to go for nothing, and hon. members were to be deprived of the right of appeal. This is no mere technical question. The most important questions may arise to be decided by the Chairman of the committee. Amendments of the most important character have to be decided by him as to whether they are in order or not. I do not object to matters being ruled out of order. All I ask is that, if the chairman so rules, we should have the right to appeal to the House. There is good reasons for that. Our proceedings in committee are to a large extent *in camera*;—there is very little record of it; no votes are recorded. I honestly believe that so good a lawyer as the First Minister must see that our position is a just and fair one, and that the appeal must not be to the committee but to the House. It is most important that hon. members should possess this right of appeal without the consent of hon. gentlemen opposite being given.

Mr. EDGAR. It appears clear that there is an appeal from the decision of the Chairman of the committee to the

House. The only question that arises is as to the mode of getting the House together for the purpose of hearing the appeal. The Speaker must be in the Chair before there can be an appeal to the House. The Speaker has exactly the same right to go into the Chair now and call the House to order that this appeal may be taken, as he has to go into the Chair at six o'clock, because the rule simply says that he has to leave the Chair at six o'clock. There is no machinery provided for his taking the Chair.

Mr. WELDON. Our rule, which is more stringent than that of the English House, was framed in order to prevent the abuse of power by the majority. It is only a matter of justice that an hon. member should have the right of appeal not to the committee but to the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I think there is no such rule in the English House of Commons as we have here. There the appeal is of right, while here we have no such rule; therefore, whenever an appeal is made from the decision of the Chairman, the question must be submitted to the committee. But I am glad to be able to put into the hands of the Chairman a precedent taken from the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, in which there is identically the same rule as our own. On the 9th April, 1879, in the Legislature of Quebec, the House was in committee on a certain motion in relation to the Letellier matter. A question being proposed and a resolution being adopted, an objection was taken by Mr. Mathieu that the resolution was not in order. The Chairman ruled that the resolution was in order, and an appeal being made from the ruling of the Chairman, the Speaker resumed the Chair, and the Chairman's ruling having been submitted to the House, it divided, and the yeas and nays were taken down, there being yeas 33, nays 29. So that the ruling was sustained.

Mr. BLAKE. I submit that the real question in this case is, what is the highest law applicable to the case? The highest law is the ruling of the House. We have a point of Order on which appeal has been taken, and until the disposition of that appeal we cannot go farther. There is an inherent power in the Speaker to take the Chair when necessity demands. That has been proved by the quotations which the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) has read to us. In this case necessity demands it, because the appeal has been made to the House, and we cannot go further until that appeal is settled. It seems to me that proves conclusively that the Speaker ought to take the Chair, that you should state the point of Order to him, and that he should put the question to the House for the votes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That may be a convenient practice, but it has not been already practised. The cases which have been cited have been cases in which the Speaker, after the committee rising, takes the Chair; they are virtually instances of the action of the committee. But among these cases that have been quoted, in which that course has been taken, there has been no case on a point of Order. If there has been great confusion, amounting almost to personal conflict between members of the committee, when there is likely to be a scandal, or a complete suspension of partly decorum, then the Speaker, by virtue of his authority to keep order, takes the Chair and supersedes the committee, or suspends the action of the committee, and decides accordingly. But I did not hear there was any quotation, or any case, in which there was an appeal from the decision of the Speaker or the Chairman on a point of Order, or that the committee rose without there being a formal motion that the committee rise. The practice, as I have seen such cases frequently in my experience, has always been that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again, in order to dispose of the question of Order. I have never seen the Chairman superseded by the Speaker in order to decide a point of Order.

Mr. EDGAR.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the objections of the hon. gentleman are easily capable of being answered. I apprehend that the cases which have been spoken of are cases in which it is desired to do that which is the only thing that can be done in England, and which can be done here, namely, to take the opinion of the Speaker on the point of Order. I apprehend the cases are similar to those which have occurred in our own experience in this country, when it was the opinion of the committee that it would be convenient to take the Speaker's opinion on the point of Order. I quite agree that when the view is that when the opinion of the Speaker is to be taken, the proper course is to move that the committee rise, and then the question is reported to the Speaker who states his opinion. That is a course which it is competent to this committee to take, and it is the only course which it is competent for the committee of the English House of Commons to take, because there is no rule in the English House of Commons with reference to an appeal to the House at all. Now we are dealing with a state of things which does not exist in the English House of Commons. There is no right of appeal, as I understand in England, from the Speaker to the House, nor from the decision of the Chairman of the committee to the House under their rules. Then, the hon. gentleman admits that the practice is a convenient practice, but he says he can prove by precedents that it has not been applied to a question of a point of Order. Well, I shall show that there are much more analagous precedents than those to which the hon. gentleman has referred. But before I touch them, I wish to say that I have established my case if I can show that there were instances in which it was competent for the Speaker to resume the Chair, because, if I can show there is an inherent power in the Speaker to resume the Chair without the question being put by the committee, I maintain that the power must exist in a case in which the law and the rule of the House requires that course to be adopted. But it is not only in the case of disorder and tumult in the House, to so great an extent as renders it a mob, that the Speaker has resumed the Chair. The Speaker has resumed the Chair on many occasions. In the first place I find a case in the 1863 edition of May, page 376. (The hon. gentleman here read the instance from May). Now in our own case, public business has arisen in which the House is concerned, and the Speaker is bound to resume the Chair. What is the example given? (The hon. gentleman reads the example.) Of course it is not a precedent, because there is no rule which would invoke the possibility of such a precedent being established. (The hon. gentleman continues to read.) So that if we had arranged to hold a conference with the Senate and the time had arrived at which that conference should occur, there would be no necessity to put the motion at all, but the Speaker would resume the Chair in order that the business in which the House was concerned should be disposed of. The business we are now considering is one which the House must discharge, else you decide that the appeal is not of right, but in the power of the majority of the committee to refuse. If you admit that the appeal is of right, that the majority of the committee cannot refuse it, then there is a public business, instant and emergent, which precludes further operations in this committee, and which requires the House to act. Then there is a second instance given. (The hon. gentleman reads again.) There is the case which occurred in the Grand Committee as long ago as 1875. On the 17th February a member who, for disorderly conduct, having been ordered into custody, the Speaker resumed the Chair and ordered the Sergeant-at-Arms to do his duty. An instance had there occurred, not of violence, not of general tumult, but a member was so disorderly that the proceedings were interrupted. There was no motion made that the committee should rise, but the Speaker resumed the Chair as a matter of course.

Now, here there is an obstruction to the proceedings of the committee. The Chairman's decision as to this point of Order is not final, and it has been appealed from. How are we to know whether my hon. friend is to go on; whether he is to retract the phrases he has used as out of Order, or whether he is to continue the same line of observation, or what course is to be taken? You find again, therefore, that when a difficulty arises which interrupts the proceedings of the committee, the Speaker acts of his own authority. In less pressing cases it has been usual for the committee to report progress and the Chairman reports the circumstances. The emergency here is instant, because we have got this question of Order which has to be settled, and it may come up again at any moment. My hon. friend may be ruled out of order again, and an appeal may be taken, and so the whole course of discussion may be interrupted continuously until, once for all, the House itself has decided whether the line of observation which has been ruled out of Order, is out of Order or not. On the occasion of tumultuous proceedings taking place outside the House the Speaker took the Chair; the Speaker also took the Chair on account of a dispute taking place between two members in the committee; and also in cases when words were taken down in order to be reported to the House; also in cases when there was not a quorum to proceed with business. In all those cases the Speaker took the Chair without any action being taken by the committee. Those are instances which showed that the Speaker had resumed the Chair without any action being taken by the committee. In the present case the business of the House required that the Chair be resumed by the Speaker in order that the rules of the House might be applied and an appeal taken. I call on the Speaker, who is present and who has heard this discussion, to resume the Chair in pursuance of the authority vested in him, in order that the opinion of the House may be taken on the appeal from the committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The first point is that the Chairman can only leave the Chair by direction of the committee. It rests with the Speaker on his own authority in case a message from the Crown is received, of which he will be informed by his officers, or in case of disturbance, to resume the Chair. It is a serious action for the Speaker to take, and is exceedingly unusual. This matter, therefore, I think, rests with the Speaker, on being informed of the circumstance that there has been a ruling of the Chairman on a point of Order, he may, by virtue of his authority and of his own responsibility, resume the Chair and decide the matter. The committee will afterwards resume as a matter of course. The Chair will decide the point of Order, and the decision will be given.

Mr. BLAKE. We are very nearly at one at last. I, however, dissent from the opinion that it is a matter of discretion with the Speaker.

The committee rose.

The CHAIRMAN. I beg to inform you, Mr. Speaker, that a good deal of doubt has arisen respecting a point of Order. It is desirable that the spirit of the rule of the House should be carried out, and I have come to the conclusion to report the point of Order that there may be an appeal to the House under the rule. The point of Order that has been raised is this: The members of the committee were discussing a clause of the Franchise Bill, and it was moved by Mr. Paterson that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again. To that motion Mr. McMullen was speaking, but instead of discussing the matter before the committee, he was discussing the rebellion which now unhappily prevails in the North-West. I ruled the hon. gentleman out of order. Mr. Edgar appealed from my decision in the following terms: Mr. Edgar appeals from the decision of the Chair to the House on the point decided against the member for North Wellington. I have now the honor to submit the question.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is: When the committee were discussing the clause in the Bill relating to the electoral franchise defining the word "person," the motion was made that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again. The member for North Wellington was discussing that resolution, and alluding to or speaking about the rebellion in the North-West Territories when the Chairman called him to order. An appeal from that decision was made to the House. The question is, shall that decision be sustained?

House divided on appeal (Mr. Edgar) from decision given by the Chairman in committee.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Farrow,	McLelan,
Allison,	Fortin,	Massue,
Bain (Soulanges),	Gagné,	Mitchell,
Baker (Victoria),	Girouard,	Moffat,
Barnard,	Grandbois,	Montplaisir,
Benson,	Hay,	Paint,
Bergin,	Hesson,	Pinsonneault,
Billy,	Homer,	Pruyn,
Blondeau,	Hurteau,	Reid,
Bossé,	Jamieson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Burns,	Jenkins,	Royal,
Cameron (Inverness),	Kaulbach,	Rykert,
Campbell (Victoria),	Kilvert,	Small,
Carling,	Kinney,	Sproule,
Caron,	Kranz,	Stairs,
Chapleau,	Landry (Kent),	Temple,
Cimon,	Landry (Montmagny),	Townshend,
Cochrane,	Langevin,	Tupper,
Coughlin,	Macdonald (King),	Valin,
Coursol,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace (Albert),
Curran,	Macmaster,	White (Cardwell),
Daoust,	McCallum,	White (Renfrew),
Desjardins,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wigle,
Dickinson,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Wood (Brockville),
Dodd,	McGreevy,	Wood (Westm'l'nd)—76.
Dundas,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fleming,	McCraney,
Auger,	Forbes,	McIntyre,
Bain (Wentworth),	Gillmor,	McMullen,
Béchard,	Guay,	Mulock,
Bourassa,	Gunn,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Harley,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Holton,	Somerville (Bruce),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Innes,	Springer,
Cartwright,	Irvine,	Thompson,
Casgrain,	Jackson,	Trow,
Catudal,	King,	Vail,
Charlton,	Kirk,	Watson,
Cockburn,	Landerkin,	Weldon,
De St. Georges,	Laurier,	Wells,
Edgar,	Livingstone,	Wilson.—46.
Fisher,		

Motion agreed to and decision sustained.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) and the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) have not voted.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) has not voted.

Mr. BERGIN. The hon. member for Ottawa did not vote.

Mr. TASSÉ. I beg to be excused from voting, as I might be suspected of giving a vote not so impartial and unprejudiced as that of several other members.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have received the following letter from the Acting Secretary of His Excellency the Governor General:—

OTTAWA, 1st May, 1885.

The Honorable the Speaker of the House of Commons.

SIR,—His Excellency the Governor General having appointed Chief Justice Sir William Ritchie to be his Deputy, for the purpose of giving the Royal Assent to certain Bills, I have the honor to inform you that the Deputy Governor will attend at the Senate Chamber on this day at 3:30 o'clock p.m., for this purpose.

I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
CHARLES J. JONES,
For the Governor General's Secretary.

House again resolved itself into Committee on the Franchise Bill.

Mr. McMULLEN. When I was called to Order I was saying that I thought it was desirable that we should have an adjournment of the committee in order that the First Minister and the Minister of Militia might give their personal attention to the difficulties in the North-West, and in addition to that I expressed the regret that they had not endeavored to promote the business of the House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman has no right to refer to that matter, which has been decided.

Mr. McMULLEN. I merely wished formally to withdraw the words that I had uttered. I was proceeding to offer some observations to the House, and stating the reason why we should take an adjournment at this hour. Now, we are discussing a very important clause in that Bill, the clause with regard to the enfranchisement of the Indians and Chinese. I think this question is a very important one. When we consider that the most of these people whom it is proposed to enfranchise are up in arms against the authority of the Government, we ought to take ample time for the discussion of a proposition which may have such grave consequences. I trust the Government will now agree to an adjournment.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid if hon. gentlemen are deaf to the pathetic appeals of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) they will hardly be likely to listen to anything I may urge on the question of adjournment. However, I may take the opportunity of pointing out to them—although I am afraid it is rather like casting pearls before a description of animal I will not designate in this House—the utter folly and absurdity of the course they are taking. We have been twenty-three hours and a half in Session. Everybody present knows perfectly well, no doubt, that it was a pertinent and reasonable debate up to half-past two o'clock. I cannot speak later because I was not present myself; but there can be no doubt that although hon. gentlemen might have been justified, if there had been any attempt to obstruct or delay or speaking against time, to have protracted the sitting; but after such a set of arguments and speeches as was presented last night, it is nothing more than an exercise of the force of the majority to attempt to hold the House here uselessly and unnecessarily. There is nothing to be gained by that kind of tactics by hon. gentlemen except this: All the time this House is kept in Session public attention is being directed more and more to the grossly objectionable clauses of this Bill and to the attack made on our liberties and on those of our constituents. This kind of thing will do hon. gentlemen opposite no good. It has been tried again and again and has failed, as have all attempts to overpower a minority which is acting in the right. We have rights in this House, and our rights are simply these: The Ministry have the right to ask that measures brought down by them shall be fairly discussed; but we have the right to demand that we shall discuss them during only a sufficiently long period that average human strength can endure. I put it to hon. gentlemen opposite whether it is possible for hon. members to give proper attention during twenty-three and a half hours to intricate legal questions such as are constantly brought up in the paragraphs of this Bill. All these paragraphs are matters of great importance, having regard to the definition and description of the voters who are to be placed on the roll at the pleasure of the returning officers. I would not deem it of so much importance if those definitions were, as in the case of an ordinary statute, to come before the regular tribunals of the land, if they were to be settled in the ordinary course of things by decisions of the judges after hearing counsel on both sides in each particular case. But we know that all these clauses will be referred for interpretation to a couple of hundred gentlemen having no previous training, many of them being men in whom we have no confidence. I lay it down as a fundamental proposition that every hon. member concerned in this question has a perfect right to expect that the Government measure will be introduced at such a time that he will be able to be present during every portion of its discussion. That is only reasonable and fair. The whole theory of Parliament and of representative institutions is founded on that principle. We are representatives of our constituents. Our constituents have a right to be informed of what is passing here, and I intend to inform my constituents with great particularity and with appropriate comments as to what has taken place here. How are we to get an accurate account of our proceedings during twenty-three and a half hours? I put that question for the consideration of all fair-minded men, here and elsewhere.

An hon. MEMBER. Look at the *Hansard*.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I confess I am quite unable to give careful and proper attention during a twenty-three and a half hours' Session. I shall not on the present occasion, but before this discussion closes, call attention to the opinions of many medical men and other men of great experience, all of which go to show that the human mind cannot pay proper attention to a subject during a great number of hours consecutively. To hold protracted sessions at the present time is not justifiable. During February there were 12 days during which the average sitting continued during two hours, eight minutes and 30 seconds. During March we had 21 days during which the House had an average sitting of five hours. It is a lesson which hon. gentlemen opposite will do well to lay to heart, not to allow two and a half months to pass and do nothing. I have never known the business of the House to be so neglected, so little pressed forward, so little attention paid to it as during the present Session. No sort of exertion has been used by the Government to bring measures forward; no sort of energy has been displayed by them in bringing forward even the Budget, or in closing the Budget debate. We have scarcely passed more than one-seventh or one-eighth of the estimates, which are unusually voluminous and require an unusually careful discussion at our hands, because it is well known that the financial position of the country is such as requires the most serious consideration at the hands of Parliament and of the Government itself. That being so, the Government are responsible for the unusual delay and the protracted debate that has taken place over this measure. They knew perfectly well that of all measures they could introduce any measure which directly assails the constituencies would be the measure which would give rise to most debate. They recollect perfectly well what has been the course of similar measures in past times, and they know that if they wished to get their measures through honestly there was but one way, that was to bring them down early in the Session and to allow the House to discuss them in the ordinary course. They are gaining nothing by what they are doing now. It is far easier for us to protract the discussion in this fashion than it is for us to meet here daily and do our usual duty, and after several hours spent in rational

discussion, to adjourn reasonably close to the usual time for adjournment; and if I were on those benches that is the way I would undertake to put the measure through. There is nothing which so excites the public mind against a powerful majority as the evident attempt to stifle discussion, the evident attempt to prevent the true nature of the Bill from being exposed. Now they have given us the advantage. It is their fault, not ours, that we are kept here in this way. It is a striking commentary on all I have been saying to the House that at the present hour, when we have before us an important measure raising constitutional questions of the weightiest moment, there are barely members enough to form a quorum. We have not even the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill here; he has long since taken himself off to other quarters and other duties. No matter how valuable the suggestions which we may make, there is nobody here to receive them, because, although one or two Ministers are present, I did not perceive that they were paying that close and rigorous attention to the arguments of my hon. friends which I should have expected of men of their position and experience. Then there is another side to this question which hon. gentlemen would do well to remember, and I think the Secretary of State alluded to it. The reputation of the House is in the hands of the Government. Now the Government ought to consider, when they attempt to hold sittings of this kind, the moral effect on a great number of their supporters. It is surely desirable, as the hon. gentleman knows, that the proceedings of this House should be conducted with all possible dignity and decorum. Sir, I am bound to say that some of the scenes I witnessed two or three nights ago, and which I hear transpired yet later, have not been such as to raise the decorum and dignity of this House. The Secretary of State made an appeal to us on that very subject. I think he is quite right in saying that these very long sessions have a demoralising effect. In the first place, as he remarked, they lower the dignity of the House, and in the next place they, of necessity, disincline the House to attend to its legitimate business, and for these and other reasons I call upon the Government now, as the twenty-fourth hour of this session is approaching, to put an end to these proceedings, which are becoming little better than a farce, and which will not, in the slightest degree, advance their interests. We are representatives of the people, and we are simply asking that a reasonable opportunity be given us for discussing a measure of the first importance. We are willing to sit here as long as the constitution of the human body and the human mind will enable us to sit, and discuss these measures intelligently, say, twelve hours, or fourteen hours, or even fifteen hours, if the hon. gentleman wishes. Our request is simply that we get an adjournment necessary to enable us all to take the rest that we require. Now, what can be more reasonable? I have heard hon. gentlemen demand that again and again, when I sat over there and I must say that my hon. friend, the then leader of the Government recognised that, and always abstained, even under circumstances of great provocation, from attempting to make use of his majority except, I think, in one instance, which was alluded to the other evening. Now, I think the same measure should be meted to us. We kept the House in session, I admit, pretty late, but we never kept it in this unreasonable fashion; we never attempted to force measures at the point of the bayonet in this way. I think hon. gentlemen opposite would do well to imitate, in that and many other matters, the example that we set them. I am aware that they will have to indicate it in some respect pretty shortly. A good many of their proceedings are having the results which we have indicated for a long time, and they are beginning to understand by this time that they would have been infinitely better off, and this country would have been infinitely better off, if our advice had been attended to, and their measures had been taken up earlier. Now I am afraid it will be useless to advise them to proceed with this measure in a rational, humane, and reasonable fashion—humane to their own followers. They are making no headway, and they must see that they are not likely to make any headway. They are injuring themselves, they are injuring their health, and, I am afraid, the morals of their followers, or some of whom who are not accustomed to late sittings. However, it is not my intention to waste the time of the committee. I think the case is overwhelmingly clear that we ought to have an adjournment, and if there is no reasonable probability that the adjournment will be granted, I can only say that for the time being I shall take the liberty of adjournment myself.

Mr. WILSON. I have no doubt, judging from the past, that the party opposite do not intend to yield to the appeals that have been made to them in the interests of all the members of this House. It is very evident that no human constitution, however strong, physically and mentally, can endure for a long time that extreme strain which the members of this House are being subjected to. That being the case, I think that all will admit the request we have made for an adjournment, is a very reasonable and proper one, in order that we may obtain that physical rest and refreshment that will enable us properly to consider the grave question that is before the House. The proposition before the House for the enfranchisement of the Indians is certainly a very crude and ill-considered one. I do not think that any member of the Government could tell us how many of the Indians they are likely to enfranchise on any one of the reserves in the Province of Ontario. And when we consider that the Indians have never asked to be enfranchised, and no one else has asked it on their behalf, I think it will be admitted that no reason exists for passing this measure at all. It is not in the interests of this country that you should recklessly place the Indians in a position to exercise the franchise. I desire to draw attention to the doctrine laid down by Harrison in regard to those who should be allowed to exercise the franchise. (The hon. gentleman reads extracts from the author in question.) It is well known to the House that the Indians do not fulfil the qualifications demanded by the author I have quoted. I have no objections to Indians, sufficiently educated and qualified, exercising the franchise; but what we complain of is that they, being wards of the Government and under the control and direction of the Government, through the Superintendent-General, should be placed in a different position as regards qualifications from white people. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) made some reference to the Indians and to their enfranchisement. He inferentially suggested that one reason why the Ontario Government had changed to a certain extent its Act in relation to Indians was because the Indians were inclined to vote in a certain direction. That I say was not a reasonable inference to draw, because the Ontario Government had felt it right and proper to extend the franchise to those entitled to it. In view of the fact that it is proposed to admit such a large body of new voters, every opportunity should be given to obtain the facts and discuss the present Bill. The difficulty that has arisen is due to the late period of the Session at which this measure was brought down. Medical men will agree with me that it is wrong to hold these protracted sittings, and they are injurious to every individual, and may result in serious consequences. It must be remembered, moreover, that they are held for the sake of enfranchising a class of people who never asked to be enfranchised. This attempt to enfranchise a class of people who have not asked enfranchisement will not meet with the approbation of the country, as hon. gentlemen opposite expect it will; but when these hon. gentlemen go to the polls the people will say: We do not believe in that

sort of justice which enfranchises Indians when they do not ask it, and neglects to enfranchise our soldiers who are now fighting the battles of the country in the North-West. We are not satisfied with your actions; you have been unfaithful stewards and we will continue you no longer in office.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I believe that the motion now before you should be agreed to in the interest of the country, in the interest of Parliament and in the interest of every member of this House. We have already attempted a motion of this kind, a motion of adjournment, and it did not meet with any success; I hope that when this motion shall have been explained it will meet with the approbation of the hon. members opposite.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. (Translation.) Let us vote for it if it is a good motion.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) There are two motions, if I understand aright; there is, in the first place, the first motion which is before Mr. Chairman, and there is the subsequent motion, which proposes that the committee should rise and report progress. Perhaps one of the reasons why the hon. gentlemen opposite object to this motion is that the report which would be made by Mr. Chairman would not be quite in the same sense as ordinary reports; that is to say, the progress to be reported will not be of sufficient importance. But I think we might adjourn, so as to give it a shape which would be more interesting to the country and to the House. One of the main reasons for which I think we ought to adjourn this debate is that the time which remains to us between this and the end of the Session is too short, according to parliamentary practice, for us to discuss this Bill, unless the Government feel disposed to prolong the Session much beyond its ordinary length. Still, I think that the Government, with their wonted complacency, will be willing to dismiss us and allow us to go back to our private avocations. But as the Government do not seem inclined to adjourn, I will endeavor to give additional reasons to induce them to grant this motion. The main object of the clause which we are now discussing is to grant the right of suffrage to a numerous class of individuals in the country. I refer to the Indian people, to some of whom it is intended by some to grant the right of suffrage, while others would wish to have it granted to the whole of them, if, according to the general tendency of the age, we were to adopt universal suffrage. Now, if we examine the position of the Indian race in Canada, and even in the whole of British North America, it is easy to see that it is not a race which is capable of being civilised. The Indian to-day does not deserve by his mental faculties and by his usual occupations to have the right of suffrage as it exists under our constitution. I do not wish to leave aside a certain number of Indians, such as those who are living in a locality near Quebec—at Lorette. These Indians being settled near a centre of civilisation which is far advanced, have been able to acquire what I might call a certain knowledge of civil law, and to reap the benefits which are offered by the British Constitution; but their number is excessively limited, and in spite of all that has been done by the missionaries to evangelise them, it is a remarkable fact that throughout the whole of North America it has always been impossible to bring them to that state of civilisation which exists among the different nations of Europe. The Indian settlement at Lorette contains a population of 289 individuals. About forty of them take part in the local elections of the Province of Quebec, and it has been observed that they generally vote as one man, which shows that these Indians are directly under the control of the superintendent. It is known that they are dependent upon the Government for the allowance to their missionaries, and not very long ago they received presents and they are still expecting more. It is well known that they come to Quebec to receive their blankets and their shot guns. Therefore, I say that these Indians are in an absolutely dependent state, and that in all elections of which I had any knowledge since 1854, the Indian vote has been invarably given in favor of the Government. Can it be pretended that it would be a different thing to-day if the right of suffrage was extended to that numerous class, which is disseminated throughout the whole length and breadth of the country? The official returns show that there are in the country 131,952 Indians; but that return is not quite correct, because the Esquimaux race, who inhabit the polar regions, nor those who are on the north coast of Labrador, that part of the country which is completely unexplored are not included. Well it is evident that if universal suffrage was to be adopted, as it is the tendency of the age, the individual vote of each of these Indians would form a casting vote and might change, so to speak, the verdict of the white population. Therefore, I say that the proposition to give the right of suffrage to Indians is contrary to our usages and to the wants of the country, especially at a time when nobody has ever thought of claiming that right on their behalf. For my part, I would much regret that the quality of the voter should be changed, and I think that we should follow the English proverb, which says that we should "let well enough alone." Our system is working well; until now we have had no occasion to complain, and I believe that everybody would prefer the vote of one white man to the votes of five Indians. Well, such is the present state of the Indian. Is he susceptible of being brought to a more advanced stage of civilisation than that in which he lives to-day? I do not believe it. And we are asked to legislate for a race which is gradually disappearing from the country. I believe that that is a bad move. A glance over the map will show that the Indian population has been incessantly driven back. For a few years back the game has been insufficient to feed them, and as a consequence their number is diminishing almost daily. The Indian, by his very nature, is unfit to live in confinement. He cannot exist within certain limits; he must have space and free air. The liberty he wants is that of the great forests of America, and I say that when we legislate for that population we are legislating in a vacuum. That population which was formally sturdy and long-lived is only represented to-day by certain brave and daring individuals who are slowly dying of starvation.

ROYAL ASSENT.

A Message was delivered by René Edouard Kimber, Esquire, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod.

Mr. Speaker,—Sir William Ritchie, Deputy Governor, desires the immediate attendance of your Houses in the Chamber of the Senate.

Accordingly Mr. Speaker with the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

And having returned,

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Deputy Governor had been pleased to give, in Her Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:

An Act to provide for the appointment of a Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons.

An Act to provide for the taking of a Census in the Province of Manitoba, the North-West Territories and the District of Keewatin.

An Act respecting the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company.

An Act respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company and the Erie and Niagara Railway Company.

An Act to reduce the stock of the Federal Bank of Canada and for other purposes.

An Act for the relief of Amanda Esther Davis.

An Act respecting the Sault Ste. Marie Bridge Company.

An Act to amend the Acts relating to the Great Western and Lake Ontario Shore Junction Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Qu'Appelle and for other purposes connected therewith.

An Act further to amend the Act to incorporate the South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Canada Congregtional Missionary Society.

An Act to Amend the Act to incorporate the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Railway Company.

An Act for granting certain powers to the International Coal Company (Limited).

An Act for the relief of George Louis Emil Hatzfeld.

An Act for the relief of Fairy Emily Jane Terry.

An Act for the relief of Alice Elvira Evans.

An Act to amend "An Act to incorporate the Sisters of Charity o the North-West Territories."

An Act to incorporate the Pension Fund Society of the Bank of Montreal.

An Act respecting the Annuity and Guarantee Funds Society of the Bank of Montreal.

An Act respecting La Banque du Peuple.

An Act to authorise the Royal Canadian Insurance Company to reduce its capital stock, and for other purposes.

An Act to amend the Law respecting bridges, booms and other works constructed over or in navigable waters under the authority of Provincial Acts.

An Act to amend the Acts respecting the Department of the Secretary of State.

An Act to continue "An Act respecting the Albion Mines Savings Bank."

An Act respecting the Canada Co-operative Supply Association (Limited.)

An Act to amend the Act forty-fifth Victoria, chapter Seventeen, to encourage the construction of Dry Docks.

An Act respecting certain advances to the Provinces.

An Act to incoporate the Canadian Pacific Employees' Relief Association.

An Act to incorporate the Hamilton, Guelph and Buffalo Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada.

An Act respecting explosive substances.

An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.

An Act further relating to the Central Bank of New Brunswick.

An Act to comprise in one Act a limitation of the Share and Loan Capital of the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society.

An Act respecting the Huron and Ontario Ship Canal Company.

An Act to incorporate the Fredericton and St. Mary's Railway Bridge Company.

House again resolved itself into Committee on the Franchise Bill.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I believe that the motion proposing that the committee should rise, should be granted. We have been sitting for quite a number of hours and the mental and physical strength of the members of this House is somewhat affected. For my part, I do not complain, but there is one thing to which I will not submit as long as there is a little amount of life left in me, and that thing is the oppression of the minority by the majority. Nevertheless, as the majority has its rights as well the minority has its rights, we intend, on our side of the House, to defend our rights with all possible talent and vigor, by using the constitutional means which law and parliamentary practice put at our disposal. There are several reasons why we should have an adjournment of the House. The first, as I said a while ago, is the want of mental and physical strength which is necessary to continue these debates with advantage. If that motion was of little importance, and if it could be decided with haste or at random, as most of the questions, no matter how serious, are generally decided towards the end of the Session, I would say that we might pass over it without a lengthy discussion, by contenting ourselves with the opinion of a few members. But as the question is connected with one of the fundamental principles of our constitution, and as it is proposed to make a radical change in the franchise and qualification of the voters in this country, I believe that every member has a duty to perform, which duty is to examine on all sides the Bill which is now under consideration. We must study each clause in its grammatical sense and in its literal sense, so as to make a law so clear that there can be no ambiguous construction of it. For it is impossible for us to conceal from ourselves the fact that the statutory legislation in the various Parliaments of the country, and even in the Parliament of Great Britain, is so badly framed and so badly digested that lawyers never fail to find a door to get out of it; and, as they say in English, you can drive a four-in-hand through an Act of Parliament. To give a striking illustration in support of my statement, I shall mention the case of Judge Storey, an eminent jurist of the United States, who had been charged by the State Legislature to prepare a Bill on a particular point. He had studied and digested it with great care during six months; he thought that he had worded it so well that he thought proper to submit it to the House, to make it become law. The Bill did become law; but, strange to say, in spite of all the care he had taken to frame it, he states himself that a year after a case on the interpretation of that law came before him, and that, after having heard both sides of the question, it was impossible for him to declare in what sense he ought to decide. This example shows what great care should be taken in the framing of our laws. Therefore, I say, Mr. Speaker, that we want all our mental faculties to study every question which comes before us. The Bill which is submitted to us is of the highest importance, and of the most serious character, either if we consider it from a physiological point of view or from an economical point of view, with regard to the Indian race, which it is proposed should participate in the advantages of the election law of the country. As the Government do not want to grant the demand which we have repeatedly made to them to adjourn the sittings at proper hours, in order that we may recuperate our strength and do the legislative work which the public expect of us, I am compelled to continue my remarks. I shall explain another point of view which, I have no doubt, must meet with the approval of both sides of the House, and which will be useful for future Sessions. In making the following suggestion, I believe I am doing real service, not only to the members personally, but also to the House as a whole. I wish to say that we should have begun to study that question from the opening of the Session, and have continued the discussion from day to day, until everybody would have been satisfied that he understood the Bill which is now submitted to us; that he had been able to grasp all the probable consequences thereof, and would bear witness to himself at the end of the Session that he had passed such a Bill with a knowledge of the facts, in the interest of the country, and in order to better ensure its general welfare. Instead of following this useful course, what do we see? Within my own personal knowledge, for many years during which I have had the honor of occupying a seat in this House—and this is my fourth Parliament—I have always remarked that we followed a practice which is certainly contrary to parliamentary usages and which is far from being useful to the country, by waiting until the end of the Session to introduce Government Bills, so as to rush them through. This is what is vulgarly called the "slaughter of the innocents." By this means we kill all private Bills, and we limit ourselves to hurriedly passing the Government Bills. This practice is not only defective, but it is also an evidence

of a gross and guilty neglect on the part of the Government. One thing is certain, and that is, that towards the close of the Session the Bills are passed with wonderful alacrity, and that most of the members do not know what is taking place, and do not follow the debates which take place nor the law which is being passed. It is to obviate this evil that I have repeatedly had occasion to raise my voice against an abuse which is so deeply rooted that to-day it has become unbearable, and I believe in the Sessions which will follow the present Parliament the Government, whoever they are who will occupy the Treasury benches, will know, once for all, that they must bring their measures immediately after the opening of the Session, instead of exposing us to abuses such as those which we are witnessing to-day. I believe that the suggestion which I have the honor to make must be favorably received. Now, let us consider this qualification which is intended to be given to this race of Indians. I shall divide my remarks into three main points: 1st. Is it important to give them that right? 2nd. If we give them that right, can they use it? 3rd. Will they use that right in a manner which will be useful to the country? On the first point, I will say that if we throw a glance at history, we see that North America was formerly inhabited by numerous Indian races. These races, since that time, have decreased, not only in point of number but also in point of intelligence and of physical vigor. Moreover, the Indians we have now, if we compare them to the population which existed at the time of the discovery of America, do not show such a disposition towards civilisation that we should give them the right of suffrage. Through their nomadic habits they are unfit—or at least they have heretofore been unfit—to become an element in modern civilisation. Their natural instincts, propagated from race to race, and which, in medical term, is called *atavism*, are maintained within them in a peculiar manner and renders them unfit to become an element of any kind in civilisation, such as it is understood in the European and other countries,—unfit to till the land. This study, which I have had an occasion to make, on the habits of the Indian, shows that his intelligence is not developed to a sufficient degree to allow him to use his vote in such a manner as to render it useful to himself and to the country. As I said a while ago, with the exception of a few isolated Indians who are mixed up with the European race, they all lack this essential element of civilisation—the idea of tilling the land; they have kept the defect of their race, and I will give you a striking example of it, which I take from the report of the Superintendent of the Indians, and which contains the proof of my statement. (The hon. member read from page 35 of the report of the Superintendent of the Indians, the report of Mr. Guillaume Giroux, missionary, one of the inspectors of the Indian race). Therefore, that population is unfit to make any progress towards civilisation, and how is it that it is proposed to grant to these people, whose only wish is to go back to their nomadic habits, who only earn their living by small industries, how is it, I say, that we should venture to give them a right which they do not know how to appreciate, which they do not understand and which they cannot use? This point appears to me to be a final and irrefragable answer to the granting of the right of suffrage to Indians. It is true, a few isolated cases have been found, where Indians, through their contact with white men, had acquired a more advanced state of civilisation; but these are exceptions, and exceptions prove the rule. The Indian race is destined to disappear from the surface of the soil of British North America, and from that I draw the inference that it is improvident to endeavor to grant them the greatest and noblest privilege which is possessed by the citizen, that of electoral franchise. In order to show that it would be idle and useless to to grant this privilege to the Indians, I shall take the liberty of taking a glance at the entire race of the Indians in America, in order to see to which of them it would be possible to grant the privilege of voting. In examining the report of the Superintendent of the Indians, I find that we have 131,952 known Indians.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny.) (Translation.) Name them.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) I shall willingly yield to the demand of the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) if it is not made with a view to prolong the debate, but at all events I always wish to make myself useful to my friends, and I shall read this for him. (The hon. member read table No. 4, of the census of the Indian tribes of the Dominion, on page 183, of the Indian Superintendent's report.) Now, Mr. Chairman, what will we do with this population of 131,000 Indians which I may calculate by taking the average proportion of one male voter out of five persons as giving 60,000 voters to be added to the voters' lists of the different Provinces of the Dominion, representing about one-fifth of the whole electorate. I believe it would be introducing a very dangerous element in our constitution to suddenly call upon the Indians to exercise that right. When I say suddenly, I am not making a supposition which is not susceptible of being realised. For instance, if I had in my county some Indians fit to become voters, what would prevent me from buying for each of them a lot worth $200 or $300, and asking them to vote for me. What could be done in my county, could also be done in other counties. It will be very easy to manufacture voters, because the qualification will not be based on personal merit, but simply on property, or a sufficient income to be put on the voters' list. And is it this, Mr. Chairman, which is called a sensible and fair legislation? As was asked by my hon. colleagues who preceded me, is it possible to shield those Indians from the influence of the Government? I can affirm that the Indians of the Province of Quebec invariably vote in favor of whatever Government happens to be in power. Public interest requires that these Indians should vote in an independent manner, knowing what they are doing, and not that they should come and deposit in the ballot box a vote which would have been bought or wrung from them; otherwise, you take away from the electorate its true efficiency. You take away from it the quality it must have, in order to express the opinion of the people. For that reason, I will oppose, with all my might, the adoption of this Bill, and especially the section which relates to the Indians; while a numerous class of mechanics, farmers and factory operatives are deprived of that right of citizenship, no matter how sober, industrious and intelligent they may be. They are deprived of the right of voting, for the only reason that they do not possess the qualification required by law, or because their income is a few cents less than the amount which would qualify them to vote under this Bill. Therefore, I say, in conclusion, that it is a glaring injustice to prevent Canadians, who are native to the soil, to give their votes as they see fit, and to transfer that vote to individuals who are under guardianship, real wards who are incapable of making any bargain or to do any act of civil life. And it is to them that it is proposed to confer the most sacred right, the fundamental right of our constitution. No, Sir, I hope that the common sense of the country and the common sense of the House will prevent the adoption of an act which is hurriedly submitted to us, which is submitted to us on the sly, I may say, and at the last moment, to be carried by storm, if I may so speak. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you will pardon me if my remarks have been somewhat lengthy. Nevertheless, I reserve my right of renewing them whenever I shall desire to do so. I am invited to repeat in English the ideas which I have just expressed. I have no doubt that you have been just as pleased with my French speech as I was with the attention with which you have listened to me.

Mr. MILLS. I wish to call your attention to the reports which were made to the Superintendent General, by the various sub-agents or superintendents throughout the country, who were instructed to make enquiry as to how far municipal institutions might be introduced amongst the Indians, with a view to conferring some sort of simple municipal institutions upon them, whereby they would be able to make rules and regulations relating to fences, ditches, roads, trespasses of cattle, and other matters similar to those which are dealt with by the white population through their municipal bodies. The Superintendent General, the present Prime Minister, in reporting to His Excellency the Governor General, on this subject, makes the following remarks, which will be found in the Report upon Indian Affairs for 1880. (The hon. gentleman here quoted from the Report in question.) He then states the result of the answers which he received. (Quotation from the same report.) It is clear from this statement that these officers considered that the Indians were not sufficiently intelligent to enable them to work so simple a system of municipal government as it was proposed to give them, and if that is the case, how much less competent are they to judge of great matters of national concern—questions of banking and commerce, questions of a greenback or a gold system of currency, of protection or free trade, or of whether we should have reciprocity or not. Is it not preposterous to propose such a thing under these circumstances? Almost the same provisions which we have to-day, so far as Ontario and Quebec are concerned, for the enfranchisement of the Indian, we had in 1859, and still how many Indians have been enfranchised? Years ago the present Minister of Public Works, like other Superintendents General, gave considerable attention to this subject, and yet how many were enfranchised during those years. I do not think the hon. gentlemen found 50 out of the whole number of Indians in this country whom he considered fit to enfranchise. I do not think 100 Indians from that day to this have been enfranchised, and those men would be able to vote if they had the necessary property qualification, without the use of the word "Indian" in this clause at all. We know that there are amongst the white population people who know little of public affairs and take no interest in them, and you are proposing by this Bill to say that a large proportion of the white population are not qualified for the franchise, while at the same time you are taking in another class of the population, who are notoriously in the rear of the most backward of the white population, no matter what advance they make—you propose to confer the franchise upon the whole of these Indians who are admittedly incompetent to manage their own affairs. Take the case of the Wyandottes, perhaps the best informed and most intelligent of our whole Indian population. They have been enfranchised and they enjoy the same civil rights as the rest of the population; they have patents for their individual holdings, and yet how many of them have their lands free from encumbrance? I doubt if there is one, if you except Mr. Solomon White, the member for South Essex in the Local Legislature. I would like to ask the hon. member for North Essex if these men are well qualified to exercise the franchise. I do not object, if they have the necessary qualification, and if they were free from Government control, but if they are scarcely qualified, and are not prudent enough to protect their own property, how absurd it is that these men, who only possess property qualification because the Government has protected their property for them, should be given votes, whereas if you had left them free, they would not have been qualified to vote. They have the qualification to vote because you allow them the franchise on property which belongs to the Crown, and over which you have not allowed them to exercise control. I think it is a monstrous proposition, for which there is no defence, a proposition which points to one thing only, namely, that the Government propose to give them the franchise because they can deal with them as their own property. It is a proposition no less absurd than it would have been to have conferred the franchise on the slaves of the South, while they were still in a state of slavery. The proposal to give these men the franchise will not elevate the Indian, while on the other hand it will have the effect of degrading the great council of the nation, placing it in an unworthy position, and you are doing that to enable some followers of the First Minister to succeed where they otherwise could not succeed. Locke, in his great work on Government, declares that such a course of procedure is one which would morally emancipate the people from any observance of the law, and that any observance which the people might bestow, would be rendered on the ground of prudence and not of moral obligation. That is the condition of things which is existing here, and I ask members of this committee if they are prepared to degrade this House in that way, and to mete out to those who oppose them on political grounds, an injustice which they would receive with the strongest evidences of indignation if it were extended to them by others. I ask hon. gentlemen to deal with this question fairly, to consider our constitutional system, to have a respect for it, to exercise that forbearance which our system of government requires at their hands, knowing, as they must, that a course so unjust as this is one which never can in the long run enure to the benefit of those who seek to profit by it.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I am sure that during my long experience in Parliament I never have heard a more pointed or direct debate than that which was carried on up to two o'clock this morning, up to which hour I listened attentively to the discussion. Up to that time there had been fifty hours of actual sitting during this week, and I think therefore, that there was no just ground for refusing the adjournment which was asked for. Again has an adjournment been asked for, after 15 hours has been added to that sitting. Now, it is notoriously the fact that the condition of this room is exceedingly injurious to every one who is obliged to remain in it for any length of time. Two Sessions ago a memorial, very numerously signed on both sides of the House, was presented to the Minister of Public Works asking that the defects of this Chamber should be remedied, or that he should provide a suitable place for the transaction of the public business. The Minister seemed pleased with that representation, and considered that it gave him every authority to deal with the subject, but to-day we are sitting in the same gloomy dungeon,—a room in which no skilful agriculturist would confine his second-rate animals for the length of time that we have been here. The rays of the sun do not penetrate here, except disfigured by the stained glass through which they come—so much so that—I was going to say—the great Author of Light would not recognise it. It is well known to scientists and others that some of the deadliest poisons known to chemistry are extracted from plants that are shut up from the light, and it is not saying too much to say that the health of scores of people has been permanently injured by sitting in this Chamber. You may see in the face of every one who has been long accustomed to inhabit this room lines which indicate exhaustion. The exclusion of light and the character of the room seem also to have a tendency to bring men into a condition in which they can hardly tell right from wrong, and we have had several illustrations of that fact. Is it a proper thing for Government to carry legislation by physical force? I believe it is not. I do not think it is within the province of this Legislature to assume the power of inflicting corporal punishment. I protest in the name of humanity against this legislation by virtue of physical exhaustion. It is wrong in principle, and I believe it will be wrong in its results.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I desire to say a few words on this important matter of enfranchising the Indians. There are perhaps many features connected with this subject which are worthy of the consideration of any deliberative assembly and of the people of this country; but the people have not yet considered it, and I think it would be well that the subject should be postponed to a future Session of Parliament, so that the Government could in the meantime ascertain the true feelings of the people with regard to it. I heard the First Minister last night state that if this Bill becomes law the Indians of the North-West will be entitled to the franchise. In view of the present condition of the Indians in that country, it becomes this House to stop and consider calmly the gravity of the action they propose to take. If you give the Indians the franchise you must give them civil rights as well; give them the franchise without clothing them with civil rights is simply a delusion and a snare. But the Government appears to hope that by giving the franchise to people who are living on the bounty of the country, they will be able to influence them in their favor. It is an outrageous proposition; but it is in keeping with the whole character of the Bill before us. The Government have betrayed the people and lost their confidence, and they have to resort to corrupt means like this to strengthen them in their position. I shall draw your attention to some clauses in the Indian Act in order to show you what power the Government will have in compelling the Indians to vote for them under the provisions of this Act. (The hon. gentleman then proceeded to quote from the Indian Act.) I am glad to be able to say, Mr. Chairman, that I think you have striven fairly well to give us an opportunity of placing our views on record. As we are acting here for the people I think that we should have time to ascertain their views on this question. I say it would be a dangerous thing to free institutions to place the ballot in the hands of the Indians, while they are so much controlled by the Government, and I do not think you, Sir, would like to be placed in the position in which you would be placed under this Bill, if a change of Government took place, a thing which I consider is not only desirable but possible. This is a clause which strikes at the liberty of the people and is aimed at the seat of several members of this House. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) succeeded in overcoming the effects of the Redistribution Bill which was aimed at him among others, and now the Government think they will succeed by the votes of those who are their pensioners, and who are liable to be intimidated by them and their officials. I think it would be a misfortune to the House to lose the eminent services of the member for South Brant, as it would be to lose the services of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who is also aimed at by this clause—a gentleman who has made himself, by close study, so well acquainted with parliamentary history and procedure, and political and other economy as the hon. gentleman has. The Indian Act which I have read shows how these people may be intimidated by designing men, and I think any body of men who would introduce such a measure as this, may fairly be called designing men. In 1882 the Government endeavored to defeat the hon. member for Bothwell by the Redistribution Bill, and though they did not do it by the vote of the people, they managed to keep him out of the House for one Session by a returning officer. He was, however, returned by the courts, and they are now endeavoring to deprive him of his place by enfranchising these Indians. It appears, also, that the hon. member for North Bruce (Mr. McNeill), who had a seat carved out for him in 1882, sees danger looming up, and I suppose he is urging on the Government to enfranchise the Indians in his riding to make his seat still surer. I think the Government or party who act from such motives as these, are unworthy of public confidence. The Government should allow the people to judge by their record; they should have the courage of their convictions, and be willing to stand or fall on the merits of their policy. This Bill also strikes a blow at the seat of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson), who has occupied a seat in this House continuously for over twenty years, and who is a worthy and estimable man. These facts show the object for which the Bill was introduced, and I would ask if the supporters of the Government will be so actuated by party zeal that they will support such a measure as this. It is extraordinary that high-minded and fair-minded men, British subjects, should resort to such measures as these to keep themselves in power, and one would expect that a measure which strikes a blow at the independence of the people and the integrity of the House, as this measure does, would not be tolerated for a moment. By another clause of the Indian Act the Indians are not allowed to be taxed, and this is an anomaly which the political theorists on the other side of the House will have difficulty in reconciling; for why should you give the franchise to those who, by virtue of that franchise, will control the tax-payers of this country, while they do not themselves pay any taxes? Before you leave the Chair, I just wish to say that I shall conclude my remarks in the meantime, and will resume them at another stage of the discussion.

The committee rose, and it being six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into committee on the Franchise Bill.

Mr. MULOCK. I shall not address myself to the amendment before the committee, asking that the committee rise, simply because it is identical with an amendment which was refused at two o'clock this morning by hon. gentlemen opposite, who, instead of meeting the arguments which were urged in its favor, transformed this Chamber into a sleeping apartment, and were many of them sound asleep when that amendment was being discussed. It is sufficient for me to say that I ask for no adjournment. I ask for no concessions; I demand nothing from hon. gentlemen opposite, except the privilege, which was denied me in this House before, of addressing myself to the subject before us. The question is, whether or not the franchise is to be conferred upon a certain class in this Dominion, and whether that class are likely to be of service to the body politic. Hon. gentlemen may choose to sleep through the deliberations of Parliament upon that question; they may, in slumber, pass their measures; they may, with their revising barristers, try to gag the people; but there is an awakening power outside of this House which they will have to face. What is the meaning of a franchise? Is it not the very first idea that enters one's mind that it is an expression of free will? Does not that imply that the person who possesses that free will must be an intelligent man? Have hon. gentlemen for one moment thought of the condition of the people in whom it is proposed to vest this power? Have they looked at the statutes of this Parliament, passed by themselves, to find out what the opinion of Parliament is as to the character of the men whom it is proposed to invest with the most valuable privilege that any free man can enjoy? Parliament has declared by its statutes that the class of men hon. gentlemen now propose to enfranchise are not able to protect themselves in regard to their private dealings; then, how can they consistently invest them with the higher power of not only regulating their own affairs but those of others around them? I do not propose to group all the Indians under the same head. The fault I find in this proposition is, that it does group them all together, but that every Indian who is able to possess himself of sufficient property in the eye of the agent of the Government is to have a vote, and

that the intelligent and industrious Indians of Ontario, Quebec, and the other Provinces are to be degraded to the level of the robbers and murderers of the North-West. Now, I will refer you to a few sections in the Indian Act of 1880, to show you, first, the personal disabilities under which the Indian labors, and, secondly, his position of dependency. The Act forbids the Indian from purchasing intoxicating liquors, and imposes penalties on any person who sells such articles to him. It also denies him the right to dispose of his property after his death, or to mortgage or to hypothecate it in any way, and thus deprives him of rights and privileges which every white man enjoys. (The hon. gentleman proceeded to quote from the Indian Act.) He is treated as incapable of looking after his own interests, and yet it is proposed that he may exercise his vote to elect men to mortgage the whole property of the country to the extent of millions of dollars. Then, by section 77, an Indian is not liable under any contract he may make; he may incur debts but the creditor cannot recover, the reason being that he is not able to understand the value of money; and the law provides, as it does in the case of children, against his own improvidence, or against his being overreached by others. By another section he cannot sell, mortgage or dispose of his property in any way, and if he should attempt to sell it he can go into a court of justice and reclaim it. And yet it is proposed to give him power to sell our property through the Government. Until the statute with regard to the Indian is amended in those respects, I say you should not confer the franchise upon these people. They are treated as the wards of the country, and they can do nothing towards the education of their children, nothing in municipal matters, outside of their own family, without the sanction of the Government. By section 23 the Superintendent General has absolute power to remove Indians from their reserves by force or otherwise, and that without power of appeal. In the ejectment the agent of the Government is witness, counsel, judge and sheriff, and should the Indian attempt to return to his reserve he can be imprisoned. I dare say it would be satisfactory to some people to consider this House an Indian reserve, and put a law in force to eject persons from here at their will, and if these persons attempted to return, to put them in prison; but the law protects us. But I would ask how free and independent would the vote of an Indian be who has to decide between a candidate representing the Superintendent General, holding such powers as he holds, and another candidate, representing the views of the Opposition. The money which is received for the sale of Indian lands comes into the hands of the Government, and they may apply it as they see fit, in repairing roads or bridges, putting up schools, and so on. We have often seen in this House how constituencies of white people are carried by such influences as grants for railroads and other purposes, and if white people are amenable to such influences is it at all to be wondered at if the Indian will be still more susceptible to them, and still less capable of giving an unbiassed vote. By clause 72, when a chief dies and the succession runs out, the Superintendent General exercises very great powers over the election of a successor; in fact, he can make or unmake chiefs by the exercise of those powers. His agent presides at the meeting, receives the votes, and conducts the deliberations, and if the election suits him it is an election, but, if not, it is no election. Yet we are told that these Indians would be absolutely free men in their votes. Even in matters of education and religion we find that the Superintendent General is all-powerful. Let the Indians endeavor to establish a school or a church, to pass regulations for the suppression of intemperance, to protect their property from trespassers, thieves and robbers, to construct roads, bridges, fences or ditches, to erect and maintain public buildings, to establish regulations for recording the ownership of their property—in all these endeavors their acts have no force or validity in law unless they have received the sanction of the Superintendent General, who is to ask them for their votes. And yet we are told that they are capable of exercising an unbiassed judgment between the representative of the Superintendent General and his bitterest opponent. Why does the Government still treat the Indian as a child, unable to regulate the ordinary affairs of life? If the Indians of Ontario and Quebec, who have advanced some way towards civilisation, are so treated, on what principle is it now proposed to confer the franchise on the less civilised Indians of Manitoba and the North-West? What demand is there for this franchise? Legislation of this character should follow in the wake of public opinion, and should not precede it. Has there been any petition from outside the walls of Parliament for this legislation? Not one; and I say it would be better for us to attend to the prayers of the people than to originate measures they have not asked for. We have upwards of 25,000 white people in the North-West; and when we have petitions flooding this House for the representation of the white settlers of the North-West in this Parliament, and when there is a Bill before this House for that purpose, it is prudent to bear in mind that the legislation we pass to-day may come into force in the North-West by the legislation of to-morrow. And when this measure becomes law and the elections are held again, will it be a source of triumph to this country to find this hall occupied by men chosen by such an electorate as you propose to enfranchise? Who would like to sit here as the representative of Poundmaker or Big Bear, or Pie-a-pot or any of the other murderers there? You need not send pen and ink to these people to write their ballots with; they will write them with the blood of the people who have been murdered in that country if this measure is carried through. Yet we are told, by the decision of the point of Order to-day, that we should not hint at the North-West in the discussion of this measure. By it you are going to place a premium upon the practices of these people; you are going to give power to men who have made widows and orphans in this country, and you are going to endorse them in that conduct. You are going to place power in the hands of people who are not able intelligently to exercise it, in order that they may, under the influence of the Executive of the day, outweigh the votes of the free citizens of this country. I am glad to see that hon. gentlemen opposite have at this stage decided not to obstruct the public business, as they have been doing. We find that hon. gentlemen who were at first disposed to obstruct discussion on this side have now concluded to sit silently in their seats, and as no hon. gentleman has ventured to pledge his reputation or intelligence in favor of this proposition, I think it is fair to assume that they cannot advance a single argument in support of it, and are prepared simply to vote as they are told, or according to their own interests. For my part, I shall back my opinion by voting against the broad proposition to enfranchise every Indian between the Atlantic and the Pacific.

Mr. DAWSON. We have had a great deal of discussion for two or three days, all about the meaning of one word in this Bill. Instead of the Bill extending the franchise to all classes of Indians, I think it rather tends to curtail than to extend the franchise in that respect, and at the proper time I intend to move an amendment, clearly distinguishing what Indians, in my opinion, should have the franchise. I agree with the hon. gentleman who has last spoken, that Indians who are incapable of managing their own affairs should not have a vote; but if the Bill is carefully looked into it will be found that ample provision is made in that respect, for the voter must have a certain amount of property as owner,

tenant or occupant, or he must be a resident or derive a certain sum from some calling, trade or investment, and I say such Indians should have a vote. It is a mistake to suppose that the Indians are wanting in intelligence, whatever deficiencies they may be under, owing to their manners or habits of life; they are, on the contrary, an intelligent and quicksighted people. The hon. gentleman says they cannot count money, but I should like to see him try; he would find them quite capable of looking after their own interest in that respect. As to the Indians of Manitoba, of whom he speaks, those Indians, or what are called half-breeds, have exercised the franchise ever since Manitoba came into the Confederation. They are a mixed race, like a great many that are scattered all over Canada; and as to the Indians on the reserves, I do not think anybody proposes to give them votes, unless they are qualified according to this Act; and if they are, if they have property, and are intelligent enough to take care of their property, they should have a vote. I do not think it can be said that such members on this side as owe their election to the votes of these people whom it is proposed to enfranchise, members from Manitoba for instance, are not the equals of other representatives of the people in this House. I rose merely to point out that hon. gentlemen are mistaken in supposing that this Bill would confer the franchise on the wild Indians of the plains and forests of the North-West, in regard to whom they have been appealing rather to the feelings than to the judgment of hon. members of this House. I think the business of the House would go on much more rapidly if hon. gentlemen would proceed with the other clauses and see what their effect would be, rather than wasting all this time upon an interpretation clause.

Mr. BURPEE. I can see no good reason why the Government should have refused an adjournment after we have been sitting two or three consecutive days and nights, except that they are determined to wear out the weaker constitutions of this House. That may be a high-handed, but I do not think it is a high-minded proposition, and though they may be numerous enough to wear us out, I mistake the Liberals of this House if they submit without trial. I have not language to characterise this Bill as it deserves, but I say it is a most iniquitous and infamous measure. The hon. member for Algoma says we have spent a long time about one word, but that word represents fifty thousand Indians, of whom perhaps about ten thousand will be voters. If these voters were intelligent men, capable of reading and writing, if they had an individual stake of any appreciable amount, it would still be a large measure. But they are a class, the majority of whom are not intelligent, and few of whom can read and write, or know anything of the politics of this country. This is a question which every man in this Dominion has a deep interest in. If a measure containing nothing but the clause before us, to enfranchise the Indians of the country, had been brought into this House at a seasonable period of the Session, it would have taken weeks to have properly discussed it; yet hon. gentlemen say that we are obstructing the House in occupying a day or two in discussing it now. The enormity of the measure was scarcely known to members of the House until it was put into your hands. I venture to say that not a score of the members in the House understood the full effect of the measure until the right hon. leader of the Government explained that it included all Indians who had an interest in land. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) says they cannot vote unless they have a house. In looking over the report of the Indians of New Brunswick, I find that the agent in that Province describes a house as a little building of slabs, which a few Indians can put up in a couple of hours. I have seen these houses, and they are entirely worthless; when the Indians leave them, they burn them for firewood; and these are the houses that the hon. member for Algoma describes as property. According to the report published last year, New Brunswick had only 1,524 Indians; they are Micmacs and Amalacites. Of these, the agent informs us that about 1,100 are settled on reserves. To my certain knowledge they do not stay upon their reserves more than about a month in the year. They live by hunting, fishing, making baskets, and begging; they are paupers upon the public; and these are the people that this Bill proposes to enfranchise. A few of them live in houses, such as I have described, made of slabs and boards, that they pick up along the rivers; but most of them live in birch bark wigwams, which they move with them as they go from place to place. They are not intelligent people; it is the exception to find one who can read and write. These are said to be settled on their reserves, and these are the people to whom you propose to give votes to send members to this Parliament. Did you ever hear of a greater burlesque on the institutions of civilisation than to enfranchise people who know nothing whatever of the duties of free men? If I look at the measure fairly and honestly, I cannot comprehend it. I can imagine that the Government may wish to make a few more votes in a close constituency; I do not charge them with that; but I say there is no other explanation to be given of their conduct, that I can think of, and if that is the true explanation, I say it is infamous. The Indians I have described, I suppose, are a fair sample of the Indians throughout the Dominion. We can imagine the revising barrister going among them to enfranchise them. He finds by the report of the Indian agent that there are about 1,150 on the reserves; he will enfranchise at least one out of every five of that number; and he sets to work. Who will this officer be? A disinterested and fair-minded man? I hope he will; but the officers who have been appointed by the Government in the part of the Dominion from which I come are generally defeated candidates; and as we generally find more lawyers among defeated candidates than any other class of men, there will be no difficulty in finding enough defeated candidates to act as revising barristers. Under the Bill a revising barrister may go back to the county where he has been defeated, and by enfranchising thirty or forty Indians, if the vote was close, he may provide for his future election. Now, I do not intend to occupy the time of the House. I had not an opportunity, on the second reading of the Bill to speak on its general principles, and no other course is left to me than to enter my solemn protest against every section of it as it comes up, and this is section number one.

Mr. WATSON. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) say that the Indians of Manitoba are enfranchised. I have some knowledge of the Indians in that Province, and if they are, I have failed to learn it until now. He also states that the half-breeds are included in this clause. If they are intended to be included it should be so stated. He also states that Indians living on reserves are not entitled to vote by the Bill, as they are regarded by the law as minors. The hon. First Minister stated yesterday that any Indian who lived on a reserve and had a house and property worth $150 would be entitled to vote. There seems to be a difference of opinion between the hon. member for Algoma and the First Minister on that point, and I would like to ask the Minister in charge of the Bill at present if it is intended that an Indian living on a reserve, who is regarded by the law as a minor, is entitled to vote under this clause. The clause in the Ontario Act is very plain on this question, and if applied to the people of Manitoba it would be more satisfactory. I understood that the First Minister stated that the word "Indian," in this Bill, would include those living on reserves, while the hon. member for Algoma says it means half-breeds, and as the

First Minister is present, I would like to ask him for an explanation on that point.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. An Indian is certainly not a half-breed, and a half-breed is not an Indian.

Mr. WATSON. Is it the intention to enfranchise the Indians living on the reserves, who do not pay taxes to the municipality, but are the wards of the Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I answered that question last night.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) stated this morning that the hon. member for Queen's and myself, were not acting in good faith in the proposition we made to the House, but the hon. gentleman had no right to make that assertion. He also complained that the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) had consumed the time of the House needlessly, in reading long extracts, but as the hon. gentleman seldom speaks in the House, I am sure he was entitled to the courtesy he received. I would also remind the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Wigle), who addressed the House, that in the British House of Commons it is not considered to comport with the dignity of Parliament, to repeat in the House private conversations, and that the member who does so, and does not make ample apology, is not considered fit to associate with gentlemen, and I think that is a rule which it would be well to adopt here. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue says the House is not bound to accept the views of the Opposition. The Opposition do not claim that it should, but they do claim that they have certain rights, in the freedom of parliamentary discussion, to present their views amply, and that the course adopted by the Government was designed to prevent the discussion which this measure deserves. The hon. gentleman said that the reason this Bill was introduced so late was that if the Government had introduced it earlier they could not have got it through, which means that they withheld the Bill until the dying days of the Session, in the hope that they would be able to weary the Opposition and thereby force through this objectionable measure. The purpose of the Opposition is to discuss the Bill properly, and there is no desire to obstruct its passage, because the Opposition realise the power of the majority of this House, and that if they decide to pass the Bill it is useless for the Opposition to try to prevent it; but they feel it to be their duty to discuss it fully, before it does pass through the House. I think the proposition made with reference to the adjournment this morning was a reasonable one, and that it would have facilitated the progress of the Bill, while the Government, by not accepting it, are really those who are acting the part of obstructionists. We discussed this measure in a fair and temperate manner, after sitting here until half-past four, and I think the proposal to adjourn was not only a reasonable one, but was regarded as such by many hon. gentlemen on that side. The Government, however, refused it, and they hoped, by importing pillows from hotels, and taking their repose while hon. members on this side were presenting their arguments, to tire out the Opposition, and thereby bring the debate to a triumphant close. But they failed in their tactics, and it would have been an unfortunate thing, in the interest of fair play and honorable and gentlemanly conduct, if they had succeeded in their policy. The hon. member for Algoma says the tribal Indians cannot have a vote, but he went on to qualify his remark by saying that if the tribal Indians had the necessary property qualification it would be a great hardship if they were not allowed to vote. He says the Indians of Manitoba all have votes, and that they are half-breeds, but I apprehend that there are full-blooded Indians there, and I do not think that they have votes at present. The attitude of the respective sides of the House is suggestive. The attitude of the Government majority reminds me of an expression attributed to Boss Tweed, in his palmy days, when he had robbed the city of New York of millions of dollars to keep himself and his fellow conspirators in wealth and luxury. When his conduct was protested against he did not argue the matter, but he asked the people, in the most supercilious and dictatorial manner: What are you going to do about it? That is the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite. They sit in dumb silence—except for an occasional speech by the hon. member for Algoma, and others—they say in effect and in manner: Talk away, gentlemen; make your protests; but they are all useless, and what are you going to do about it? They have decided to pass this Bill; they have decided in caucus to pass this Bill. They have arranged it to suit their own purposes, and they will not deign to defend its provisions. The hon. First Minister who is in charge of this Bill, does not even deign to remain in his place in the House, to answer questions he ought to answer, while it is under discussion; but he leaves it to slip through, knowing that his supporters sit there silent, asking, by their attitude, what are you going to do about it? and saying, the Bill is going to pass. Yes, of course the Bill will pass. The party in caucus have settled on the provisions of a measure that will enable them to sap the very headsprings of the liberties of this people. It is a most outrageous measure—a measure which, if there is any virtue and intelligence left among the people of Canada, will be condemned by the electorate of this country. Where are the Indian electors who are about to be invested with the sacred functions of the franchise? They are making the night-sky of the North-West lurid to-night with the conflagrations of the dwellings of the settlers; they are murdering the settlers, and subjecting their wives and daughters to a fate worse than death. These are the bloody, vindictive barbarians that are to be invested by this Bill with the power of controlling the elections of the North-West Territories, when they are accorded representation in this House. I say there is nothing in the whole history of Canada or in the history of America so monstrous, so indefensible, as this proposition of the Government, to give these barbarians the right of citizenship. There has been such a thing as Indian civilisation on this continent; but we have nothing of the kind to-day among Indians who preserve their distinct tribal nationality. We have the native red man, with bloodthirsty and vindictive instincts, living on the plains of the North-West in an unalloyed condition of barbarism, and he is to be invested by this Bill with that sacred privilege that pertains to the free man—and not to all free men, for many white men in the country are denied the privilege that these red-handed murderers will have under this Bill. To show that these Indians are regarded by the law as not yet ready for civilisation or for the privileges of the franchise, I will refer to the Indian Acts which have been passed by this Parliament. (The hon. gentleman quoted a number of the provisions of the Indian Act of 1884.) There is hardly an act that an Indian can perform in his lifetime without the authority and permission of the Indian Superintendent General, who is, in fact, the dictator over all his proceedings, whether individually or in council. I dare say our Indian Act is a wise law; but it is not wise to give to people in that condition of tutelage the rights and privileges and responsibilities of free electors in the Dominion of Canada. We find, by the United States laws applying to the Indians of their territories, that they are in a condition of tutelage, and unless they renounce their tribal relations they are not considered citizens or persons, but aliens and foreigners. In Nebraska they are incompetent to testify, except in certain special cases; in Kansas they can only testify in cases of alleged sale of liquor to Indians; in Minnesota an Indian cannot

leave his reserve unless he has a passport; in Maine he is a ward of the Government, living on reservations and receiving bounties for the produce he raises. Under the law of the United States no Indian has the privilege of citizenship while he maintains his tribal relations. (The hon. gentleman quoted sections 2,071, 2,083, 2-11, 2,112-13-14-19 and 20). Now, Sir, I propose to examine briefly into the status and condition of the Indian, morally, intellectually and materially, to see whether we are warranted in conferring the franchise on Indians who maintain their tribal relations. I will read an extract from the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs of the United States, as to the duty of the Government in connection with the married relation among the Indians. (The hon. gentleman proceeded to quote from the report in question.)

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I cannot see that that report is relevant to the subject before the committee.

Mr. CHARLTON. My object is to point out the unfitness of the Indian in the United States for the suffrage, and I will show afterwards, from our own reports in Canada, what his condition is here.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I cannot see that that is relevant, unless you show that the Indians of the United States are the same people as those in Canada.

Mr. CHARLTON. I assume that the Dakotas and other Indians are the same, substantially. However, it is not of much consequence, though the report was brief and to the point, and I will pass to the reports from our own Blue Books. I think, however, Sir, you could have determined its pertinency better after hearing the nature of the extract.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I certainly think, as you are presenting the matter to the committee now, that it is not pertinent.

Mr. CHARLTON. We will suppose, then, that the Indians of Canada and the United States are distinct races, and do not possess the same characteristics, and that all I have said with regard to the laws of the United States is quite foreign to the matter. I hardly think, however, that the rule you have laid down is fair to me, as the American Indian is the brother of the Canadian Indian. I find in the report of the Manitoba superintendency for 1884, a great many facts in relation to the Indians. I will first quote what is said of the Grand Rapid reserve. (Quotation read.) So it appears that they are not provident enough to lay up a store for the winter, although they have excellent fisheries, and have to apply to the Government to supplement their supplies. I would ask if these men are better qualified to exercise the franchise than our free-born citizens, who do not have the necessary proper qualifications. I will now quote as to the Black River and Fort Alexander reserves. (Quotation read). These Indians gather together and receive the payment of their annuities; they are ready to make night hideous in drunken debauch, if whiskey can be obtained, and they are the class of men the hon. gentleman proposes to enfranchise and place on the same level with himself. I will now read what is stated in Mr. Macpherson's report. (Quotation.) These Indians gather together on their camping grounds, in order to join in wild saturnalia, gamble and waste their annuities, and indulge in their heathen rights and ceremonies. Surely, these are a nice class of men to allow to vote. I think the hon. gentleman should be ashamed of the proposition to enfranchise such barbarians. Here is what is said as to Yellow Calf's band. (Quotation.) I will also read from the reports with reference to Pie-a-pot's reserve, and the Pine River reserve. (Quotation.) I pass on to some observations made by the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West, with reference to the sun dance, a heathen religious ceremony. (Quotation.)

These quotations illustrate very fairly the condition of the Indians in the North-West. They are improvident; they are the wards of the Government; they are unable to sustain themselves, and are fed principally by the bounty of the Government; they are utter barbarians; and they are entirely unfitted for the rights and privileges as well as the duties of citizenship. Now, we may safely adopt, in this country, the rule adopted in the United States with regard to enfranchising Indians. The United States has had an experience of 100 years with the Indian, and the difficulties that have occured there with the Indians have not been due to a want of liberality on the part of the Government. Universal suffrage prevails in most of the States, and a very low property qualification in others, and their policy as to franchise is therefore a liberal one, and yet they have never enfranchised Indians who retain their tribal relations. We cannot, with safety, go further than they have gone in that respect, and we should require the Indians, before we give them the franchise, to surrender the tribal relation, to become individuals, amenable to the law, members of society, paying taxes and holding property in their own right. We have in this Dominion 131,000 Indians, nine-tenths of whom are barbarians, and two-thirds of whom are pagans. These tribes are separate nationalities; they have no pride of country, no desire to promote its interests, and they know nothing about its institutions. They are governed by ignorance and superstition, and are not fit to exercise the high duties, privileges and responsibilities appertaining to free citizens. They are neither independent nor intelligent. They are grovelling barbarians, sunk in the depths of ignorance, and depravity and vice, and as they are the wards of the Government, or of the Superintendent General, they would be his creatures, and his agents would practically cast their votes in the various districts over which he exercises control. The proposition to enfranchise them is a montrous one; it has no foundation in justice or reason, but must proceed from a desire to acquire and exercise an improper political advantage, to retain in power men who realise that if they went back to the same electorate that placed them in power they would not be returned again. For reasons which pertain not only to the present but to the future of this country for many generations—so far as the institutions of Canada are concerned—we should not entertain for a moment the proposal embodied in the Bill, designed to enfranchise the barbarians who, to-day, have lighted up the North-West with the lurid glare of burning buildings, who are brandishing the tomahawk and the scalping knife in that country, who are murdering the settlers and subjecting their wives and daughters to a fate a thousand times worse than death. Such a proposition is one which should mantle with the blush of shame the cheek of any man who would avow that he would support it.

Mr. KING. I, for one, think it was well that the proposition for the committee to rise at 4:30 this morning was not agreed to, as I think the speeches which have been delivered since that time have tended to show very clearly the nature of this Bill. Instead of only giving votes to Indians who acquired property by their own industry, it appears now that it is intended to enfranchise the Indians on the reserves, and though we have not many Indians in the Province of New Brunswick, I say that the proposition to enfranchise the 1,500 Indians there is an insult to the white settlers of that Province. I am glad to know that some defects which I pointed out previously in this Bill, as applied to New Brunswick, are likely to be remedied. I regret, however, that with the exception of one Government supporter from that Province—who is prepared to swallow the whole Bill, and who only spoke upon it a few moments—the members from that Province supporting the Government have not said a word, in the way of pointing out the merits or demer-

its of the Bill. If the Bill passes we shall not appeal to the same electors who sent us here, but in my case I calculate that the number of electors in my county will be decreased by some 400 or 500, in a total of 2,000; and if there were Indians in my constituency I would have to appeal to them, rather than the honest farmers and lumbermen who supported me in the last election. That this measure has not been properly discussed by the people, that it has not been fairly presented to them is shown by an article from an editorial in the St. John *Sun* of the 27th of April, from which I shall quote. (The hon. gentleman read the quotation.) I would like to ask if any hon. gentleman would say that that is a correct statement of the facts, because, as I understand, there is no appeal from the decision of the revising officer on matters of fact, and none in any case without his consent. As to the charge of obstruction which has been thrown out indiscriminately to members on this side, I do not think it can apply to hon. members from the Province of New Brunswick who sit on this side of the House, for the hon. member for Sunbury (Mr. Burpee), who has represented a county ever since Confederation, only occupied about twenty minutes, while I only spoke about the same time on the second reading, and I believe the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) spoke a short time. So far as the hon. members opposite, from the Province of New Brunswick, are concerned, I am prepared to discuss this question with them in that Province, and see what the opinions of the people will be as to the provisions of this Bill. It is proposed to give the Indians the right to vote. Up to the present time that right has been based on ownership, occupancy or tenancy, but this Bill goes much further, for I believe that under it there is nothing to prevent the Micmac Indians of New Brunswick, who are largely engaged in fishing, from voting under the fishery clauses of this measure. If an Indian has $100 worth of real estate and $50 worth of fishing tackle, I do not know why he cannot claim to be enfranchised under this Act the same as a white man. Now, I said that there are a large number of people in the Province of New Brunswick who will be disfranchised if this Bill should become law. The people most likely to suffer in that respect are the people who are more opposed to the policy of this Government than any other class in that Province; these are the fishermen and the lumbermen; and I think it very unfair that any means of this kind should be resorted to, in order to prevent these people from giving an expression of their opinions at the polls. It seems to me also that this Bill is a breach of faith with the people of the Maritime Provinces on the part of the Government of Canada. I do not hesitate to say that if the proposition had been made at the time the Maritime Provinces were invited to enter Confederation, that inside of 20 years from that time the Indians of the whole Dominion were to be enfranchised, to lessen the influence of the Maritime Province representatives in this Parliament—which I am sorry to say does not count for much at present—as most of these Indians belong to the western parts of the Dominion, the people of those Provinces would have hesitated before entering Confederation. What can be said of this Bill, if it has the effect of enfranchising 50,000 or 60,000 Indians in British Columbia, whose votes may swamp those of the white people in the Maritime Provinces? I think this measure ought not to be pressed through this House with so much haste, but the people in all parts of the Dominion, ought to be afforded an opportunity to exactly comprehend its provisions. It is true, we are anxious to go home; but it must be remembered that we were here eight weeks without doing anything, and now we are called upon to hastily pass a measure of this kind, before the people of the country have an opportunity to understand what its full bearings are.

Mr. PLATT. I think it is to be regretted that this course of forcing a continuous discussion of this measure, night after night, has been adopted by the Government. The character of the Bill is such, that the more it is examined the more startling are its various provisions discovered to be; and if anything is necessary to show that the people have not been able yet to comprehend its full bearing, it is the fact that, when the First Minister gave us an idea of the definition of the word now under discussion, it was received by the members of this House with a feeling of consternation. A proper parliamentary discussion is one carried on at such intervals as will give the people of the country an opportunity to fully understand its various provisions; and I am satisfied that the people do not understand the provisions of this measure. In fact, very few of the members comprehended the import of the feature we are now discussing until it was explained by the hon. First Minister. I see the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) smiling. No doubt he comprehended this clause; perhaps he had something to do with the framing of it. I do not know the extent of that hon. gentleman's popularity in a particular section of his constituency, but it seems to me that the smile he now wears comes from his anticipation of the pleasure that he will enjoy on some future day, when he, in company with the revising barrister of his own selection, will take a ride through the Tyendenaga reserve, and select his Indian constituents.

Mr. WHITE (East Hastings). I was laughing because I know that this Bill will not make any difference in the hon. gentleman's county. I might just say, so far as the Indians are concerned, that I do not know how many of them will have votes in my constituency. From as many as will have votes I hope to get them; but I am happy to say that I can carry East Hastings without the Indians.

Mr. PLATT. The hon. gentleman has correctly stated that the enfranchisement of the Indians will not affect the county I represent; but I am not here to consider measures simply as they bear on that county. I think it is our duty to consider the general effect of our legislation upon the whole country; and although there are no Indians in my county, there are electors whose relative influence in the country will be largely decreased by the enfranchisement of the Indians. Now, the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) has undertaken to enlighten the House as to the bearing of this clause, and as to how many of the semi-savage tribes of this country are to be given the franchise. There seems still, however, to be some difference of opinion between him and the First Minister. The hon. member for Algoma seems to have a class of Indians in his mind who have acquired wealth enough and are intelligent enough to become citizens. I believe it is our duty to break up the tribal relations of the Indians, as far as possible, and to induce them to attain the position of free citizens, like the rest of the people of this Dominion, possessing the franchise on the same terms, and no better. If we do that we shall stand some chance of making them citizens who will be worth something to the country. The hon. member for Algoma told us of an Indian who is worth $10,000, but who has not the franchise because he receives an annuity of $8 a year from the Government. When that Indian prizes a vote above the $8 a year he can get it. Any Indian of sufficient intelligence and means, who will consent to release himself from his tribal relations, and to give up the small annuity he receives from the Government, may become enfranchised; and I dare say there is no hon. gentleman in this House who will seek to withhold the franchise from such Indians. A few days ago we heard what was considered by many to be the strongest argument against the enfranchisement of women—that they, as a class, had never asked to be enfranchised. Where were the petitions, we were asked, praying

for the enfranchisement of women? If that argument was worth anything then, it applies with equal force to the case of the Indians. We were told by the First Minister that it was an outrage upon humanity that these subjects of Her Majesty, who live and die in this country, who own property, who raise families and who pay taxes, cannot vote. Well, there are a great many white people who live and die in this country, raise families and pay taxes, and who cannot vote, although they are in every way capable of exercising the franchise. This House has declared that our mothers, and wives, and sisters, no matter whether they pay taxes or not, shall not have a vote, and yet the franchise is to be conferred on these Indians who are incapable of exercising that franchise, who have not asked for it, who are in receipt of annuities from the Government, and who would be influenced by the agents of the Government. Let any one go through the reserves, even in Ontario, and let him say how many of these people he would consider sufficiently intelligent and independent to know anything about our system of government, or what are the duties and powers conferred on members of Parliament. I venture to say that there are in Ontario thousands of those men who do not know the difference between voting for a member of Parliament and voting for a school trustee. They will be completely at the mercy of those agents—the men who will be amongst them first, who will tell them the biggest stories and give them the most firewater to drink. The First Minister said that these Indians bought tea and tobacco and other taxable goods, but I venture to say that there are many females in this country, who are refused the franchise, and yet who buy as many taxable goods as a whole tribe of Indians. I say that this argument of taxation applies with tenfold force in favor of the enfranchisement of women, and against the enfranchisement of Indians; and it is a monstrous proposition that we should, in the same Parliament, refuse the same franchise to the women of this country and give it to the low and filthy Indians of the reserves. We know that, so far as the North-West is concerned, the country is looking forward to the time when other Provinces than Manitoba shall be established in that country, when other portions of the North-West shall be represented on the floor of this House, and the enfranchisement of those Indians will have the result of almost making Indian constituencies in that country. The right to vote will imply the right to be elected; and when that time comes, how many Indian representatives will we have in this House, and how many of them will be members of this Government? Is it not possible that Pie-a-pot or Big Bear, or Poundmaker, will be the successors of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, or that Blackhead will lead the Conservative party of this country? There will also be the possibility of these people coming here, and speaking their own tongues, and that we will have other languages established in this House. If they get the right to vote, there is no doubt that they will be able to have sufficient influence to bring about an Act of Parliament which would allow them to have seats in this House. I am sorry that the course of the Government has been contrary to what is the usual course in committee—that they abstain from discussing the provisions of this Bill, so that we should all have a full and perfect understanding of its import. I think it would have been somewhat more respectable and creditable if such a discussion had taken place, as is taken upon other measures in committee. Why should hon. gentlemen opposite be satisfied to swallow an important measure of this kind without discussing it? I have never had the honor to have a seat in this House, supporting a Government, but if it were a condition of such a position that I should decline or refrain from discussing a subject of such importance, I hope I shall never occupy so humiliating a position. One effect of the unusual manner in which this debate is being carried on will be that the country will become acquainted with the provisions of this Bill, and I think hon. gentlemen will find, when they return to their constituents, that they possess a great deal more information about it than if the measure had been allowed to pass through quietly. The fact that the Bill has taken such an unusual course shows its obnoxious character, and is the strongest argument for the Government not to carry it through hastily, no matter how few are the men opposing it. I trust that the Government will yet adjourn the House, and allow us the time to discuss it which the country demands at our hands for discussing a measure which the First Minister said a few years ago would require the whole length of a Session to be discussed. The attention of the people, I repeat, is being drawn to the matter, and they are asking why it is that, as usually has happened to this Government, so many weeks were spent in the early part of the Session, without anything being done, while these important measures are brought on at a time when we expected to leave for our homes.

SATURDAY, 2nd May, 1885.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I regret that the Dominion Government did not see fit to adopt the fair and reasonable proposition which was made to them. We have always been willing, on this side, to allow fair and reasonable progress to be made with this Bill, at a reasonable time and after a full and exhaustive discussion of its principles and details, and we are still willing to do so. The fault of our having sat for nearly thirty-six hours, without interruption, is not due to the Opposition, but to the Government, and had they agreed to the proposition from this side, greater progress would have been made with this Bill. They are responsible for the time that has been wasted and for the public money which has been expended by keeping the House in session so long. Here we, on this side, are comparatively helpless; we are numerically weak, and we are to some extent at the mercy of hon. gentlemen opposite, and there is only one way in which we can protect ourselves when hon. gentlemen attempt to force obnoxious legislation upon the country, and that is by discussing all the principles contained in that legislation as exhaustively as we can, under the circumstances. Every portion of this Dominion is affected more or less by this legislation. It is radical and revolutionary legislation; and being of that character, I do not think it is unfair that we, on this side of the House, should ask the Government not to force its discussion at an unseasonable hour. Now, it is said that we have had abundant opportunity to consider every provision of this Bill. That cannot be the fact, because the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), who is largely interested in the enfranchisement of the Indians, has been evidently unable to understand this clause up to the present moment. He declares that it only gives the vote to Indians who are enfranchised, and who have, by their industry, acquired the necessary property qualification, although it is quite clear to anybody who reads the Bill carefully that, as the hon. First Minister himself has declared, it extends to all classes of Indians, whether they are enfranchised or not, and whether they are civilised or savage. Now, we know perfectly well that some of the supporters of the hon. gentleman, when they heard his interpretation of this clause, expressed their astonishment that the Government should have ventured to submit to Parliament a Bill of this character. And it is not to be wondered at. We know that some countries have adopted various kinds of fancy franchises; but I am not aware that any Minister ever proposed this kind of a fancy franchise—a franchise that appears to be based on the proposition that the more ignorant and barbarous a band of Indians are the more they are entitled to

a vote. As I have stated before, if the proposition had been to give votes to Indians who, by their own intelligence and industry, have acquired sufficient to give them the necessary property qualification, I am satisfied that no person on this side of the House would object. We believe in educating the Indian and training him up in the way of civilisation and peace; but what we do protest against strongly is, that the Government have not limited the franchise to that class, but have extended it to all, whether Christianised or pagan, civilised or uncivilised. I will read what the hon. gentleman said last Session with reference to the condition of the Indians of British Columbia. (Quotation.) The hon. gentleman depicted the barbarous custom of the potlach; and yet it is the class of people who engage in these orgies that he proposes to clothe with the franchise. Is it surprising that night after night we should protest against enfranchising men of that class? It is clear, from the reports of these agents to the hon. gentleman, that these Indians are not fit to have the franchise; and why, then, force this Bill upon Parliament? Would it not be a proper and honest thing for the hon. gentleman to say at once, when his attention is called to these facts, that he never intended to enfranchise the Indian tribes of Manitoba, the North-West and British Columbia, who are still on the reserves, and are in an uncivilised and pagan condition? I believe that course would be one which, with a few exceptions, would have gratified his own followers, because I do not believe that there is an hon. gentleman in this House desirous to have these Indians enfranchised, except the few who have Indians in their constituencies. I will now quote from the report of the hon. gentleman, submitted to Parliament this Session. He says, speaking about the Indians in the neighborhood of Regina: (The hon. gentleman here read quotation.) Here is a band of Indians who are in rebellion against the sovereignty of this Dominion, who are well armed with Winchester rifles, and against whom he found it necessary to send the mounted police, and still he proposes to enfranchise them. Further on he says: (Quotation). It was stated during this discussion that these Indians were not the paupers of the Dominion. In 1884 we voted a large sum in Supply to maintain the Indians—the amount they were entitled to get as the interest on their rights, surrendered to the Government through their lands—but the hon. gentleman found it necessary to supply them with additional quantities of flour and other articles, so that they were practically the paupers of the country, living on the bounty and charity of the Dominion. Now, by the law of England, persons who receive the bounty of the Government, or are dependent upon the Government, have not the franchise, even if they have the sufficient property qualification. The hon. gentleman speaks of the Wyandottes in these words: (Quotation). Now, I do not think anyone has any objection to giving the franchise to such Indians as these, who have proved themselves worthy to enjoy it, and the moment the hon. gentleman can satisfy Parliament that the Indians of Manitoba, the North-West and British Columbia, have settled on their own separate holdings, and become citizens of this country, like the Wyandottes, I believe Parliament would be willing to sanction their having the franchise. Perhaps the secret of the hon. gentleman's desire to enfranchise the Indians, wholesale, is contained in this clause of his report. (Quotation.) What connection these Indians have with Prince William of Orange, one does not quite clearly understand, or why they should be mounted on white horses and wear scarlet cloaks. It seems, however, that they are made Orangemen and Young Britons, that they have lodges on their reserves, and perhaps it would not be uncharitable to suggest that one reason why the hon. gentleman seeks to enfranchise them is, that they are Orangemen who generally vote in one way. Speaking of Indians who are not far from us, on the limits of the western boundary of Ontario, the hon. gentleman describes them as indulging in heathenish rights and ceremonies, which tend to keep them degraded, and yet these are the men he proposes to enfranchise. The hon. member for Algoma tells us these—some of whom are in his county—are intelligent men, quite capable of exercising the franchise. The First Minister says they are degraded and indulge in heathenish practices. No doubt the hon. member for Algoma feels confident that their vote will be secure in his favor, and takes that as an indication of their intelligence. The First Minister goes on to report that the Indians are entirely dependent on the Government for support. Can it be imagined that they will therefore give a vote freely, that they will not feel compelled to support the men who feed them. The report then proceeds to deal with other bands, and in each case the same tale, the same description, is repeated. They are entirely dependent on the Government. They are degraded, and barely susceptible of improvement. With respect to the schools in the North-West, the reports are exceedingly unsatisfactory. In many cases the parents refuse to send their children to the schools, and, so far, the expenditure of large sums of money, with the view of educating the Indians, has failed to accomplish that object. It is only when we find some devoted missionaries spending their lives in the band that we have the slightest evidence of education in moulding the Indian mind. All this goes to show, in the strongest possible light, the want of judgment on the part of the Government in undertaking to give the right to vote to these people. It is quite clear in Ontario. The result, in a political aspect, will be to the advantage of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Is it possible they have really come down to this: that the Government, with their majority of seventy-three in this Parliament for the last three years, and with their success in the bye elections, have to resort, for the first time in the history of Canada, to this scheme, for the purpose of strengthening their political influence in the country. According to the Indian Report, there are a dozen constituencies in Ontario alone in which the vote of the Indian population would change the political aspect of those constituencies. In Haldimand the Indians, if enfranchised, will have a voting strength of 120; in Brant they will have 600 votes; in Middlesex their voting power will be considerable, and so on throughout various counties. I do not know how they are going to vote, but it is evident that they will be guided altogether by the influence brought to bear on them by the agents of the Dominion. I do not know what the political ideas of those agents may be, but whatever they may be it is almost an absolute certainty that just as the agents think politically so will the Indians. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite to pause before giving this power indiscriminately to the Indians; I would ask them to limit it to those to whom it is limited in the Ontario Act, and not place in the hands of people who continue to live in the tribal community, as their progenitors did a hundred years ago, who have independent sovereigns of their own and their own councils, whose allegiance to this country is a subordinate allegiance, who are uneducated, and ignorant of any of the political questions of the country, this great privilege of exercising the franchise, which should only be granted to those who are in the full exercise of all the duties and responsibilities of citizens.

Mr. DAVIES. I rise to renew the suggestion that I made previously, with reference to the continuance of the debate. I wish to put myself fairly on record in this matter, so that hereafter if the Opposition are charged with obstructing business, it will be seen the charge is baseless. After a continuous sitting of thirty-six hours, the interpretation clause might be passed, and if the Opposition continue to speak it is because the Government refuse to give the assu-

rance that they will not rush the whole Bill through to-night before we rise. We are willing, on the assurance from the Government side that they do not wish to force through the enacting clauses of the Bill, to pass the interpretation clauses and adjourn. No one will declare this is not an honest, fair offer. It was made early this morning and refused. What progress have we made since? Would it be reasonable now to take up the enacting clauses of the Bill and carry them at this late hour; half-past one, after having sat continuously thirty-six hours, and when most of the members are in bed. We are willing to do everything to further the progress of the business of the House, but we want it to be put on record that at 1.30 a.m., after a sitting of thirty-six hours, the Government will not give any assurance that they will not force through the whole Bill this sitting. It is unjust, unfair, and and an act of tyranny. As long as the Opposition are composed of flesh and blood they must resist it, and if they did not, they would fail in their duty to their constituents. Hon. gentlemen on this side are willing to stop further discussion and go on with the business, if the Government do not wish to press the enacting part of the Bill further to-night. I want that to go on record, so that, in the future history of this Parliament, when perhaps that will come up and the Opposition will be charged with obstruction, we will be able to refer to it as an offer we made twenty-four hours ago, and which we repeat now, and it is because of the non-acceptance of this offer that the House is being detained here, at the sacrifice of the health of hon. members, and in a manner that reflects very little credit on the Government side, exhausting the Opposition until our physicial strength is almost gone, simply in the hope that, at a late hour, they will be able to force the Bill through, when members are not in their places. It is a position that cannot be defended, and the silence of the Government benches shows that they know it is indefensible.

Mr. CASEY. It would be unreasonable to expect that we could get further than the interpretation clause this week. We all know there is important business to be done next week, besides this Bill, and it is only justice to give members some rest before they attack the business of next week. Of course, on subsequent paragraphs of this clause there may be some discussion, but I should think half an hour would finish the whole of it, if it were understood that an adjournment would then take place.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was not here at half-past four this morning, but I am informed that the offer of hon. gentlemen opposite was that if this side of the House were disposed to adjourn they would allow the word "Indian," or the paragraph in reference to it, to go through. That was refused, and properly refused. Hon. gentlemen say, later on, during the discussion to-day, that if that had been accepted that paragraph would have been adopted, and we would have been much more advanced, because at three o'clock we could have taken another portion of the clause. Nevertheless, the hon. gentlemen who would have been then satisfied with the passage of that paragraph, when they had said all they had to say about the word "Indian," took from half-past four till now to discuss that word "Indian." Therefore the responsibility of having taken twenty-three hours additional to discuss a word that they admitted they had already sufficiently discussed, of having consumed that time of the House and the money of this country, rests upon hon. gentlemen opposite. Since the 16th or 17th of April they have had this Bill before them, and if you refer to *Hansard* you will find that they have had three-fourths, if not four-fifths, of the discussion. They cannot complain that they have not had fair play and plenty of time to discuss the matter, but the country will know that, up to this moment, they have prevented the passing of one single clause of the Bill, only—I must say it, because the country will say it, and history will say it—only to waste the time of the country and of the House. Surely in five or six hours they could have said all they desired to say on the word "Indian," but they have repeated themselves hour after hour; they have read the Indian Bill five or six times to-day, one after the other, and the responsibility must rest upon them. I am sorry that hon. gentlemen have put me in the position of stating that, but I am bound to claim what is right and true, that the responsibility of the waste of time rests upon them. They have dragged on the discussion, and now they offer to pass the remainder of the clause, after proposing two or three words of change, as the member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) has stated, provided the House will then adjourn. Hon. gentlemen know that during all this day they have had negotiations going on, and that the answer made to them has been: If your side of the House desire to make arrangements of this kind, let your leader be in his place, and our leader will be here, and let the arrangements be made openly before the House and the country, with the authority of both sides. That we were ready to do, and that we are ready to do at this moment. We have no desire to drag on the discussion. Our mettle is not stronger than theirs, but thank God it is as strong, and we intend to remain here as long as hon. gentlemen wish to continue the discussion. But it is not fair to the Government, to the House or to the country, to drag it on in this way. We have been, I suppose, thirty-four hours here discussing only the one word "Indian," and all the discussion has been on the side of hon. gentlemen opposite. For the last twenty-four hours we have not had one speech. They have had all the discussion, and they will try and make the country believe that they require twenty-four hours to express their views of one word. The country will not believe that, but will believe that hon. gentlemen have wished to interrupt the proceedings of this House and to prevent the passing of this Bill; that they, the minority, desire to impose their will on the majority. Representative institutions require that the majority should rule. We are not disposed to give up our rights as a majority, but we are disposed to hear everything that hon. gentlemen have to say, and if they have a good suggestion to make, let it be made in the proper way, as we used to make suggestions in reference to Bills before the House. But do not let them try to prevent the business of this House being proceeded with; do not let us continue for twenty-four hours on a word which they said they had discussed sufficiently twenty-four hours ago.

Mr. CHARLTON. No.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes. Hon. gentlemen have stated that all day, and have reproached us with not having acceded to their request to pass that word at that time. But they said: As you did not do it, we will discuss it again. Was that for the purpose of letting the country or the House understand that word better? No; it was to prevent the Bill going on, to prevent the business of the country from being carried on. That was the object and nothing else, and the country will know it, and the responsibility will rest upon hon. gentlemen opposite. Perhaps they will find, before they are much older, that their acts in this House have been noticed outside, that the time expended by each of them has been noted outside, and that that will go to the country, and that the country will know that each member has expended so much of the time and money of the public. Each member must take his responsibility. The Government are ready to take their responsibility. If they are in fault the representatives of the people know what they have to do; but between that and preventing the business of the country from being carried on is as great a distance as between right and wrong. I repeat that we are ready to have our leader here if they have theirs there.

Mr. DAVIES. Notwithstanding the energy of the hon. gentleman, I think he will find a great deal of difficulty in shifting from his own shoulders the responsibility which, it is quite evident, he now sees rests upon them. He refuses to accept the offer which has been repeated now, and which was made twelve hours ago.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). What is the offer?

Mr. DAVIES. That this unseemly effort of the Government to force the whole Bill through should cease; that they should be contented with passing the interpretation clause; that after thirty-six hours' sitting it is tyrannical and improper to try to force that through. Twelve hours having been expended upon a question which involved practically a revolution in our constitution, we propose that a division should be taken, and that we should then adjourn. They indignantly rejected that. They were bound to keep the Opposition here until they were physically exhausted, and then they hoped to rush their Bill through holus bolus. We have been thirty-six hours in session. Although several hon. gentlemen have something to say on the question, they are willing to facilitate the business of the House by passing the interpretation clause, if they can get any assurance from the Government. The hon. gentleman does not say that the Government will not force it through, but he said they have the physical force to do it. The threat he held over our heads was, that if we let the debate fag they would force the Bill. The country is watching you, he said, and the country will take a memorandum of the time you are talking. We are not ashamed of that. We know the proposition he has made is distasteful to the better men on his own side, and that he cannot carry it through without amending it; and does he think, because he holds out a threat to keep us here till Sunday morning, that we will fail in our duty, and allow him to force the Bill through? What boots it whether the leader of the Opposition is in his place or not? He is in bed, taking needed rest. Why should he not be? Is that a charge against him? It is trifling with the question to insist that he should be here. The responsibility rests upon the hon. gentleman, and he knows it. Let it be made public. If we are kept here longer, let it be known that it is because he will not adjourn; because he holds the threat that they have more physical power than we have, and that he hopes we will be exhausted. If it comes to that, we will not. Sunday morning may dawn, but he will find that he will not pass his Bill through. We have sufficient moral force and sufficient energy to resist the act of a tyrannical Government.

Mr. GUILLET. Louder.

Mr. DAVIES. I wish my voice could ring through the hon. gentleman's constituency.

Mr. GUILLET. It did.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman knows that this is an act of tyranny, and that it is unfair to force it. The Government will not give the ordinary courtesy, always given the Opposition, of stating how far they intend to proceed with the Bill, as is customary in the English House of Commons, and has always heretofore been in this. No, they refuse to do this; and the hon. gentleman who is leading the House now (Sir Hector Langevin) said they would take advantage of our physical weakness, because we were inferior in numbers to the Government side.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. What I said was, that I had no doubt that hon. gentlemen opposite were very strong, but that I did not think we were less strong than they. The hon. gentleman wishes the House to understand that we declared or hinted our intention to rush the Bill through and not give time to the Opposition to discuss it. We never said or hinted that. The hon. gentleman will see that if the clause of which he speaks had been passed yesterday morning we could have taken up the next clause; and if hon. gentlemen opposite thought fit, they could have gone on discussing that clause during the whole night, as they have done this one. They could have given the same intelligence and physical force to the discussion of that, as they have to the word Indian; no one could prevent them. But hon. gentlemen opposite refuse; they want to keep discussing the word Indian all the time. To say that we intend to rush the Bill through, is to say that we intend to do something which we are unable to do, as long as hon. gentlemen opposite are not willing.

Mr. CHARLTON. The Minister of Public Works carefully conceals the fact that upon the very first occasion on which this House went into Committee of the Whole on this Bill it sat until two o'clock, and the Opposition then asked for an adjournment. The Government refused, and in doing so they were guilty of a tyrannical act. It is tyrannical to ask this House to sit after two o'clock, unless under the pressure of immediate necessity. To that hour the discussion was perfectly legitimate and no time was lost; but the House was kept in session until ten o'clock the following night. At the outset of this debate the Opposition had reason to complain that the Government intended to force the measure through by sheer physical endurance. We resumed the discussion yesterday, and no candid man will assert that up to four o'clock this morning the discussion was not legitimate and proper. Again the Opposition asked for an adjournment and again it was refused by a tyrannical majority. The Opposition pleaded that if an adjournment were granted the Bill could be brought on at three o'clock in the afternoon, and the discussion would proceed from day to day, without waste of time and without impertinent and improper discussion. We asked that the sittings should last until two or three o'clock each morning, pledging ourselves that the discussions would be proper and to the point. That demand was refused, and the evident intention was that the Bill should be forced through. We have resisted the accomplishment of that purpose and defy the tyrannical Government to effect it. I venture to say that if our proposition had been accepted we would have been through with the interpretation clause of the Bill, containing seventeen sub-sections, which we have not yet touched. We do not stand here as did the gladiators in the Coliseum at Rome, called out before the Emperor to lay down their lives; we are not prepared to bow down and say: "Great Cæsar, we who are about to die, salute thee." We do not feel that we are about to die, and we defy the Government to attempt to stifle proper and legitimate discussion upon the most important measure ever introduced in Parliament. We defy them to do their worst. I charge upon the Government the responsibility for this unseemly prolongation of the debate; I charge them with the manifest purpose of keeping the House continuously in Session from day to day with the object of exhausting the physical force of the Opposition, and forcing through this iniquitous Bill, without a proper discussion being had of its provisions. Notwithstanding the attempt of the Government to thwart discussion on this Bill—a Bill more iniquitous in its character than any ever introduced in this House—by a continuous sitting of the House, we are determined that all its provisions shall be fully discussed before the Bill is allowed to become law.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The proposition made yesterday morning at 4:30 was not that we should pass the whole interpretation clause, but the particular sub-section upon which we are now engaged, that relating to the word Indian, and that we should come back at three o'clock and go on with the discussion of the other portion of the Bill. The proposition now is, that we should pass the word Indian and the other portions of this interpretation clause and then

adjourn before going into the enactment clauses. That is a vastly different proposition. What I point out to hon. gentlemen opposite, who say that this majority proposes to trample on the minority by its physical force, is that we have been anxious for a vote on the word Indian all along. If there has not been a vote it is owing to the obstruction of hon. gentlemen opposite. Yesterday morning statements were made on this side, and not contradicted on the other that a determination was arrived at by several gentlemen in the party opposite, who profess to speak for that party, to prevent the passage of the Bill this Session, by the exercise of their right of speaking practically against time. Whatever hon. gentlemen opposite may say here, they cannot pretend to believe that the discussion, since 4:30 yesterday morning, has not been against time. The hon. member for Queen's yesterday morning admitted that up to 4:30 the discussion had been reasonable and fair, and implied that if an adjournment was not allowed, further reasonable discussion could not be expected. For the thirty years past in which I have watched the proceedings of Parliament from the gallery and in the House, I have never seen a Parliament which could boast of so many gentlemen in its ranks, able to talk by the hour, apparently even intelligently—at least some of them—discussing the question before the House by the aid of statutes, books from the Library, and all those means which are taken by hon. gentlemen whose object is to speak against time. The hon. the First Minister is within the precincts of the House, and will be in his place whenever a new clause is reached, to give any explanations on it that are necessary; but when there is a manifest determination to lose time it cannot be expected that he should continue in his place after the discussion on any point has practically become exhausted. We have only got to the second or third sub-section of that interpretation clause, and we have been engaged in the discussion of it the whole of the week, practically night and day. If hon. gentlemen want to put themselves right before the country they have the power. They talk about opposing physical power to physical power. Everyone knows that the Opposition, in a case of this kind, have an enormous advantage. They can leave eight or ten here, let the rest go to bed, and change that every night, and with such eights and tens as they have, they run no risk, and can take up the time in moving amendments and motions to adjourn. I am perhaps giving them a hint, but we saw last night that that is the course they are pursuing. We can claim that we are endeavoring to vindicate the principles of our parliamentary system, to prevent a deliberative assembly being brought into contempt by saying that we shall not permit a policy of obstruction, such as that which has been opposed to this measure. No one will pretend to say that any Government would even suggest the idea of rushing a Bill of this kind through at one sitting. On the contrary, if hon. gentlemen desire to put themselves right their true plan would be to allow this vote to be taken, go on with the interpetation clause, as I understand they are prepared to do, and then, when the enacting clauses come up, if the Government refuse to adjourn, I presume the powers of resistance on the part of the Opposition would be as great as they are now, and they would be able to say that the Government had refused them reasonable concessions and would be in a position to say they were not fairly treated. The member for Norfolk says they pressed us to adjourn at two o'clock in the morning, that negotiations went on between the two sides, and that, notwithstanding that, we kept the debate going on. We know that negotiations went on. We know that that hon. gentleman agreed that we should adjourn one morning at two o'clock, that a vote should be taken, and that we should then adjourn.

Mr. CHARLTON. I made no such agreement. I made no agreement of any kind whatever. I stated to the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) that in all probability we could reach a conclusion of the debate at about two o'clock, but that we could not accurately say when the debate would close, as several gentlemen might wish to speak, and the debate did last till five o'clock. Even then, the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), myself and others, were unable to make the remarks we had intended; and the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) stated last night that the arrangement was carried out in good faith.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I heard the hon member for East Hastings this morning, and I did not understand him to say what the hon. gentleman has stated. I understood him to say that the arrangement, as far as the hon. gentleman was concerned, was carried out, but not that the arrangement was carried out between the two sides of the House. While the discussion was going on, we saw that the gentlemen who were leading in this policy of obstruction were moving around, one after the other, and suggesting to members on that side that they should keep the House, and that after an agreement had been arrived at, after it had been assented to, and after it was perfectly understood that we should take a vote and adjourn at two o'clock. What the country will understand is, that we are stopped at the word "Indian," which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) declared, at half-past four o'clock yesterday morning, had been already discussed.

Mr. CASEY. No.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I am speaking of the hon. member for Queen's. Several gentlemen on the other side rose and said they had speeches to deliver, and they have since delivered them; but in the estimation of the hon. member for Queen's and of hon. members who were prepared to forgo the delivery of the speeches and take the vote, on condition that we should then adjourn, the subject had been sufficiently discussed, because surely they will not say that they consented to adjourn the discussion of a clause which had not been sufficiently discussed. They will not profess to say that.

Mr. CASEY. Yes; we do.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). They said they would take the vote at that hour, on condition that we would adjourn, and the reply was that we would go on with the next paragraph of the interpretation clause, that with regard to the Chinese, that the First Minister would be in his place, and that, if negotiations were to be had, they should be had with the proper authority. If hon. gentlemen want to put themselves right they should pass the interpretation clause, as they say now they are prepared to do. The presumption therefore is, that the discussion has, for all intelligent purposes, gone on to a sufficient length, and if an attempt is made to go on with the enacting clauses, they can make their arguments in regard to that point. This side has no power to force a vote, and the fact that no vote has been taken cannot be thrown upon gentlemen who are anxious to vote and who have not spoken for nearly thirty-nine hours, in order that the vote might be taken.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister of Public Works must have felt there was something wrong when he showed so much excitement. He threatened us with the publication of the number of hours we have occupied, and the amount of public money which our speaking has cost. I say: Come on with your statement. I am not ashamed of it. If anybody ought to be ashamed of the course of the discussion, it is hon. gentlemen who have sat with their thumbs in their mouths and have not said a word. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) said he had sat here for thirty-six hours and had not made a speech.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I did not say anything of the kind. I said the House had been sitting for that length of time.

Mr. CASEY. He said he had not made a speech on it.

Mr. WHITE. I did not say so.

Mr. CASEY. At any rate, he did not make a speech.

Mr. WHITE. I do not desire to have your reputation.

Mr. CASEY. I consider that allusion is simply impertinent. The hon. gentleman has been in this House a much shorter time than I have, though he may have been before the country more prominently as the editor of a newspaper; still his position in the House is not of as long standing as mine.

Mr. McLELAN. Thank God it is not.

Mr. CASEY. Well, at all events, I do not sit in the same cabinet with men whom I have condemned as "steeped to the lips in corruption." I hope the member for Cardwell will wait to hear what I have to say. "He who fights and runs away, may live to fight another day," but an hon. gentleman who makes an attack and refuses to listen to the reply will not gain a reputation for parliamentary courage. Hon. gentlemen opposite are waiting until we get tired out. They are ready to have the vote and we are ready for the discussion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. CASEY. We are going on. Hon. members will have as much as they want. The Minister of Public Works refuses to make any promise that we will not have to go on with the rest of the Bill, and his henchman from Cardwell, who has some faint hopes of sitting beside him some day, repeats the same thing. It does not matter whether the leader of the Opposition is here or not. The members who have spoken on this side have given voice to the opinions of the Opposition. We cannot get a single admission from hon. gentlemen opposite that the discussion is to stop at any point. They might as well put their thumbs to their noses and stick their fingers out, as act in the way they are doing in answer to a reasonable request from this side. The statement of the hon. member for Cardwell, that we have the advantage in a physical struggle, is mere rubbish. What is it for him? Does it tire his great intellect to sit in his chair and listen to this discussion? If it does, he can go to some committee room and write an editorial or read a paper. Even the gentleman who is charged with the conduct of this Bill does not sit here all the time, but walks off to his own room and has a snooze. The wear and tear is suffered by members on this side, who have to carry out their own duty and that of hon. gentlemen opposite as well. The hon. member for Cardwell said he had never, in all the time he had witnessed the proceedings of Parliament, seen hon. gentlemen who could talk by the hour, apparently intelligently, with such facility as hon. gentlemen on this side have done in this Session. I can repay the compliment by another much more *à propos* with respect to hon. gentlemen opposite, for during the fourteen years that I have been in this House I have never yet seen gentlemen who could equal hon. gentlemen opposite in their ability to abstain from any discussion on an important measure before the House, and yet preserve such an intelligent expression of countenance as these gentlemen exhibit. I never before saw a party so self-absorbed and capable of keeping in their own minds what information, if any, they possess.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I was somewhat surprised at the exhibition of temper we had from the Minister of Public Works, for it is rarely that hon. gentleman loses his self-possession. He was trying to shift the responsibility of delay on to this side of the House, but judging from his irritation he did not succeed entirely to his own satisfaction. He cannot make us responsible for that delay. From the moment the First Minister moved the second reading of the Bill, hon gentlemen opposite have attempted to force it through, by insisting on the discussion proceeding at untimely hours, despite all our protests. He said the Government were going to lay aside all other business, no matter how important, including the Estimates and the Canadian Pacific Railway legislation, in order to force this Bill through Parliament. What is that but coercion? And the people will justify us in resisting this attempt. The hon. the Minister of Public Works spoke of negotiations between members of both sides. All I can say is, that no such negotiations were authorised by the Liberal party. My hon. friend proposed, yesterday morning, that a vote should be taken on the word Indian, and that the House should then adjourn, but the Government refused. My hon. friend repeats that proposition, and the Government still refuse to accede to it. They want us to consent to a division on that proposition and leave ourselves then to their tender mercies. They threatened us, unless we consented to a division on this clause, that they would sit until Sunday, and now they have the assurance to tell us that the responsibility for delay rests on our shoulders.

Mr. FLEMING. A reference to the facts of the case will show on whose shoulders the responsibility rests for delay. The day before yesterday the House met at three o'clock, and the question now under discussion came up. The leader of the Opposition, after the six o'clock recess, made a speech of some length on the Indian question. At ten o'clock we saw there was a determination on the other side to sit the night through. We saw hon. gentlemen opposite bringing in their pillows, with the evident intention of passing the night in the House. What was their object? The Indian question had only then been discussed for two hours, so that their object could not have been simply to get through that part of the Bill. No; they came here with the ostentatious determination to push on this measure as far as the physical endurance of their own supporters and the numerical weakness of ours would allow them. They tell us now we are responsible for the lengthy sitting of the House; but to refute that statement we need only point to the fact that after this question had been but two hours under discussion hon. gentlemen opposite deliberately resolved to sit here all night. The proposition is now made, that this paragraph and the subsequent ones of the interpretation clause shall be permitted to pass, and the House then adjourns. Is not that reasonable progress? But to that proposition hon. gentlemen opposite refuse to consent. In the definition of the word Indian is contained the whole gist of the Indian question; and on the interpretation clauses there would be but little discussion, and perhaps a formal amendment or two to make them more clear. If hon. gentlemen, therefore, would accept this proposition, by which reasonable progress will be made, they would find a disposition on this side not to interfere with the passage of the Bill after reasonable discussion; but if the Government insist on pursuing the course they have adopted, they will find this side of the House determined to resist this tyrannical mode of procedure.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I am very glad to have an opportunity of placing on record my protest against the course the Government is pursuing with regard to this measure. I should be happy to endorse the views of the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) in regard to the fair treatment of the Indians. In the neighboring Republic the treatment of the Indians has not been what it ought to have been, and they have been gradually driven backwards by the advance of whites from one place to another, until little has remained for them, except the frozen regions of the North

or the waves of the Pacific. It is not strange that after such treatment all that was natural and amiable in his character should have been trampled out, and that there should remain nothing but a deep-settled hatred. Other races, perhaps, would have been more vindictive and perpetrated greater cruelties under similar circumstances than has the North American Indian. All that remains of them on the other side of the line are a few wandering tribes that inhabit the plains. How different might have been the result had the treatment indicated and asked for by the hon. member for Algoma been practised on that side of the line. How different would it have been had the humane treatment of William Penn been acted up to by the other colonies. What amount of misery would have been saved to the settlers of that country, and what amount of treasure would have remained unsquandered. Happily, on this side of the line, at all events in modern times, a different policy has been pursued—that indicated by the hon. member for Algoma—and the result has been most marvellous. In no place was the white man more secure than in the Indian wigwam; upon the vast plains of our North-West, unguarded and unarmed, he felt as secure in the vicinity of the Indians as he did in his own dwelling. The result of humane, considerate treatment is written plainly in the history of the Hudson Bay Company. Although they exacted considerable fur from the Indians for a consideration, their treatment of them was always kind. No rule was better understood among the employés than that they should, under all circumstances, treat the Indians with kindness, and that any promises made to the Indians should always be kept, for if there is one thing an Indian values more than another it is truth. This treatment marked the intercourse of the Canadian Government with the Indian, for a long period, but it became most unfortunately changed, and the result of the change is seen to-day in the disturbance in the North-West. We have turned over a new page in our history, and that page is already stained with blood. Does the hon. member for Algoma imagine that he is acting humanely in giving the franchise to the Indians? If he does, I entirely differ with him. It is not a question of humanity. Did not the hon. gentleman, a short time ago, positively and pointedly refuse to extend the franchise to women? On what principle is the hon. gentleman inhuman to the ladies? I cannot imagine that he is, but believe his opposition is due to his opinion that to give the franchise to women would interfere with their proper position, that it would be a burden instead of a benefit to them. This, I believe, to be exactly the case as regards the Indians. What idea has the Indian of our Government, of our constitution? How is it possible for the Indian to understand our system of government, so that he may be able to exercise in an intelligent manner the right to vote? I do not want to depreciate the intelligence of the Indian, but we must treat him as we find him. The Indian is in an exceptional position, and while he remains in that position, a ward of the Government, it will be doing him an injury rather than a benefit to give him a power which neither by training, education nor instinct he is able to appreciate and to wisely exercise. He is not subject to municipal regulations, he is not called on to pay taxes, he cannot be called upon to perform military duty, he is not bound by contract obligation, and in every respect he occupies an entirely exceptional position as compared with the white man. Why, then, should he be called upon to assist in making laws by which he will not be bound. I fear very much that the policy which has characterised the neighboring Republic in regard to the Indians has, to a certain extent, crossed the line. The correct policy under which the Indians should be dealt with is—food, not starvation; care, not neglect; truth, not trickery. I am perfectly convinced that it is not the Indian who wants to vote, but that it is the Superintendent General who wants the vote. In several constituencies it is expected that this vote can be brought to the assistance of the supporters of the Government. Has it really come to this, that the Government can no longer trust to the white man? Have they lost confidence in the breed? I mean the thoroughbred; they have recently lost confidence in the half-breeds. Are they now going to put their confidence in the Indians? Is the object of the revising barrister to get possession of the ballot box, and place an Indian guard over it? Is it only in the hands of the Indians it is safe? I shall not discuss the point as to whether the white man has reason to loose confidence in the Government, but we may take it for granted that the Government has lost confidence in him. They think it is no longer safe to rely on the white man, and are seeking protection in the wigwam. Well, if they will give the Indian food enough, if they will give him a quantity of good beef and not supply him only with salt pork, which has brought on him the disease of scurvy, that of late years has created considerable mortality among the Indian tribes, the Indian, no doubt, will treat the Government well, but they may not get his vote after all. The First Minister appears to have a doubt as to the advisability of this Bill, and seeks to shelter himself behind the Premier of Ontario. Does not that present rather a laughable picture? No doubt the hon. gentleman has reason to have some confidence in the enactments of the Ontario Legislature, judging by the results of recent appeals, but on referring to the Ontario Bill it will be seen that it is not so sweeping in its provisions as this one. The whole principle underlying the Ontario Bill is the assessment roll, and the assessment roll does not touch the Indian reserve at all. No hon. gentleman on this side objects to giving the Indian the franchise when he has put himself in the same position as other voters, when he has conformed to the principle of uniformity, which we are told is the great feature of this measure. In this measure the assessment roll is only a means of information, for the revising barrister can take any other information he chooses, and can we doubt the kind of information he will receive? If it be desirable, in his view, to have an Indian placed on the voters' list, there can be no doubt that he will get, outside the assessment roll, any information he desires, which will give him the color of a pretext for placing him on the list. This Bill strikes a fatal blow at the principle of uniformity, which the First Minister declares to be the great object of this measure. A man who pays no municipal taxes at all and is not subject to military duty, and is not to be bound by contract, is to be placed on the same footing as one who is subject to all these obligations. I believe this Indian franchise has been forced upon hon. gentlemen opposite, not for the benefit of the Indians or for the benefit of the Dominion, but as a party necessity. Very few measures introduced by the Opposition are allowed to become law, and those introduced by the Government come from the caucus in the railway committee room, where the legislation really takes place, which this House merely records. The only way I know of stopping this measure now is to run it through this threshing machine in such a way that, when it comes out, its best friend will not recognise it. I hope the machine will be kept running long enough for that purpose. I once heard the present Premier say that it mattered very little to the hard-handed artisan who governs. I believe that is true; but it matters immensely in what manner the Government is conducted and by what means it is sustained. I believe the measure under consideration is wholly a vicious one, one which must be met with the most strenuous opposition on the part of the representatives of the people. I believe it to be clearly our duty to avail ourselves of every constitutional means to defeat a measure of this description, and I have no doubt that the Opposition, in the course they are taking, will meet

with the approval of the great majority of the people of this country.

Mr. DE St. GEORGES. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, at this late hour of the night, I do not intend to make a long speech. Besides, if I judge by myself, the House must feel tired after the long sittings which we have had here since the beginning of the week. I regret that the hon. Minister of Public Works has not acceded to the demand which has been repeatedly made to adjourn the debate, because it would have been easier to discuss this important question which is now submitted to our consideration. I do not see why the Government are in such a hurry to press the adoption of this law, and it seems to me that there are other questions which are more urgent than this one, and which might be discussed. I shall mention, for instance, the settlement of the Pacific question of which the press has said so much, and the Budget, only a few items of which have been voted. Nevertheless, as the Government seem to be intent on urging the adoption of the Franchise Bill, I will make a few remarks on the provisions of that Bill. The present Bill certainly contains good provisions, but I cannot approve of the clause which we are now discussing and whose object is to give the right of suffrage to Indians. I am not in the habit of upbraiding the Government for being too liberal, but on this occasion I think I may safely say that they show rather too liberal a spirit as regards the Indian people. I see that the promoters of the Bill have completely forgotten to give the right of suffrage to the workman, to the sailor, or mariner, to the lumberman, and to the sons of mariners and tenants. Have not these individuals as much right to vote as the Indians? The reason, I fancy, is that the Indian has the immense advantage of being a pensioner of the Government, of being under the thumb of a salaried superintendent, and to receive his food and his protection from the Government through the medium of this superintendent. I do not wish to charge the Government with having inserted this clause, which gives the right of suffrage to Indians, for the purpose of making of them electors who will always support Government candidates, but I believe that, perhaps without being aware of it, they will succeed in manufacturing for themselves voters who have no property, and who are less entitled to a vote than any of the persons to whom I referred a while ago. I will now endeavor to prove, in the first place, that the Government are making a great mistake by taking away from the municipal councils, the preparation of the voters' lists, and secondly, that the absolute and almost illimited powers which they give to the revisers, will give rise to great inconveniences; that they are substituting to a system which gives satisfaction an expensive system, which will give rise to all kinds of abuses. Until now, the Provinces themselves have regulated the qualification of voters, and we do not see that that system is bad, and that it is necessary to change it. The proof that the system is good, lies in the fact that very few voters' lists have given rise to contestations, and I am glad to bear testimony to the fact, that the councillors are chosen among the most intelligent and the most honest of men, and that, with very few exceptions, we never had occasion to complain of the municipal councils or their officers. Our country people are essentially honest and are anxious to be worthily represented. I say, moreover, that if this Bill becomes law the people will strongly resent the insult, and will, in proper time, express their opinion on the subject. I may be told that there have been abuses. It is possible. When the municipal councils are too strong, no matter to which party they belong, they have a tendency to abuses; but there is a compensation inasmuch as these abuses take place in both political parties. It is impossible to find a perfect system for the preparation of the lists, but the present system is just as perfect as it can be. Municipal councils are like Governments—they are liable to mistakes; but there is the guarantee of the responsibility to the people who may supersede them at will. For the same reason that our constitutional system cannot be replaced by an autocratic Government, the powers of the municipal councils ought not to be replaced by that of one man, of an autocratic reviser. I may be told that this man will give fair play. Perhaps so, perhaps not. History tells us that men clothed with absolute powers did not take advantage of it; but instances to the contrary are much more numerous. This reviser may be a conscientious man, but his interest will be to favor the Government who appoints him; and it is a dangerous position for a man to be obliged to choose between his interest and his honesty. Let us admit that this man would be honest—the system itself is so defective that it will be very difficult for him to give fair play. But if he does not give fair play what shall we do? Is there an appeal from his decisions as there would be in ordinary cases? The Bill expressly says that there will be appeal only on questions of law and only with the consent of the reviser. Now, I ask it in all sincereness, if that official agent does things which are contrary to law, do you suppose that he will allow the plaintiff to go before a tribunal who will revise his unjust decision and who will expose his bad faith? It seems evident to me that he will refuse in most cases. And who would pay the cost of that appeal? It would be the appellant himself. Besides, the public will have to pay for double lists, and will have to put up with much more difficulties than heretofore as regards the preparation of those lists. It will be a very serious affair for the electors to have to travel sometimes twenty-five or thirty miles, at their own cost, to have the lists revised, and to cause their names to be entered when they have been omitted, or to cause the names of those who have no right to vote to be struck off the list. (The hon. member read the clauses of the municipal code which deal with the mode of revision and preparation of the voters' list, and appeal therefrom.) I ask myself, Mr. Chairman, where is the necessity of appointing a reviser when we have the municipal councils to prepare the lists, and when we have an appeal before the Superior Courts or before the district magistrates? In the present Bill we find not only an encroachment of the central power but a whole organisation in favor of federal centralisation, and that without any need of it being felt. Thus, Mr. Chairman, apart from the inconveniences which I have just mentioned, there is a danger for the rights and privileges of the different Provinces of the Dominion. Under the Act of Confederation, the relative representation of the Provinces is based on the whole population and not on the number of voters. Whether qualification is high or low, whether we have universal suffrage, whether the wives and the sons of farmers are allowed to vote, or whether the wealthy are the only persons admitted at the ballot box, the Province of Quebec will always have sixty-five members. Now, if our Province prefers to lower or to elevate the property qualifications, what reason would the other Provinces have to prevent her from doing so? The number of our representatives is fixed by law and cannot be changed, neither could the proportion of our representatives as compared to that of the other Provinces, since that representation is based on the total amount of population, that is to say, it is determined by the census and not by the election laws. It is just as evident as possible that the Local Legislatures are better qualified than the Dominion Parliament to judge of the mode of suffrage which suits each of the Provinces, and the Provinces should be left at liberty to choose the mode of suffrage which suits them. If a Province sees fit to draw nearer to or to wander away from the democratic principle, or if on the contrary the people of that Province consider that the interests of property must be secured in preference to others, they ought to be allowed to suit themselves, and adopt either of these two principles, without the

interference of anybody. Now, I would have something to say with regard to the practical application of the principle enunciated in this Bill, that the property should be the basis of the qualification of voters. Property has not the same value in all parts of the country, and cannot represent the same interests in public affairs. For instance, is it to be supposed that a $20 rent in a country village does not represent more wealth and superior education than a house-rent of the same value represents in Toronto and other cities? Let us add the difference of valuation in the different Provinces. To be qualified, Mr. Chairman, a farmer must own a property of an area of 20 acres. But there are properties of 10 acres which yield more than some properties of 100 acres; the whole depends on the manner in which they are cultivated. For instance, farms situated in the neighbourhood of large cities, where vegetables and such products as are of easy sale are raised, cannot be compared to remote farms where the yield must be confined to cereal crops. In pronouncing against this Bill, I represent the opinion of the great majority, not only of the Province of which I am one of the representatives, but of the whole country, and if there should be an appeal to the people on that question, the unanimous declaration would be that if this Bill has some good points, it has also very bad points, and that the good points do not compensate for the bad. I will now deal with another part of the Bill, that which relates to woman suffrage. If Sir John, in a moment of attentiveness towards ladies, thought that he would render himself popular among the fair sex by causing to be adopted the clause which relates to woman suffrage, I believe he made a mistake. Women prefer staying at home to taking part in political affairs. They understand very well that they would have to pay dearly for the privilege of voting and they foresee the consequences thereof. In fact if they are allowed to vote, they will soon be eligible, and they will have to deal with public affairs and they will have to fulfil all the duties connected with the right of citizenship. After having heard all the speeches which have been made on this important question of woman suffrage, I cannot help coming to the conclusion that most of the members from Ontario are in favor of it, while the members from Quebec are against it. This difference of opinion is a very strong argument against the expediency of establishing a uniform law for all the Provinces in the Dominion of Canada. For my part I believe that the ideas and opinions of the whole people of the Province to which I belong are against woman suffrage. That opinion has been expressed by all the newspapers whether Conservative or Liberal. In fact, as regards social tendencies, the provision which relates to woman suffrage offers more than one feature which is contrary to public sentiment. The right of suffrage would be given to unmarried women or widows, two provisions of a radical nature. It would be a fine sight indeed to see persons of the fair sex, being over 21 years old, qualifying themselves to vote, taking an active part in politics, and attending political meetings. And if they can do all this why should they not be elected? Why should they not become Ministers? This proposal would involve these consequences and many others. A woman would much prefer to live in peace near the fireside and to make her family happy. What does she care for the affairs of the State? What does she care for the elections, the contests or the hustings, the fights and the murders which too often cast a gloom on a fleeting triumph? The hon. Premier does not know these troubles; his obliging or interested friends having always managed his elections for him. If you wish to reckon up the dark days of a woman, of a wife, of a mother, her days of restlessness, count up the election days. How many times within my short political experience have I not heard wives and mothers ask me with tears in their eyes and almost in a reproachful tone of voice: "Will there ever be an end to these elections? What makes you have such frequent dissolutions of Parliament? Why are there so many elections? Would not one in every ten years be sufficient?" Do you not think, Mr. Chairman, that if such a woman had a right to vote on this question she would vote ten times if it was possible? And every woman would do the same. If it was in order to please the ladies that the hon. First Minister inserted that clause in the Bill, he has made a bad move this time; if he doubts it, he who is omnipotent in this House, he who forces the adoption of any measure, through the immense majority at his disposal, —if he doubts it, I say, let him pass another law to ask the women what they think of it and I believe that the result will be that he will change his opinions and that he will refrain in the future from taking any such means to show his attentiveness to ladies. I may be told that women may refrain from voting just as a great many male voters unfortunately do. But who can tell if with the radical ideas of the First Minister we will not soon have compulsory votation. Then the woman will be dragged to the poll, or if she does not go she will be obliged to pay a more or less heavy fine, or perhaps will be condemned to imprisonment should the law provide for such a punishment. The suppositions which I am making belong to an order of things which are really possible. With that prospect in view, I may say that woman is far from desiring the adoption of the Bill which is now before us. Later on she would be elected to the municipal council; it is a consequence, but must not she accept the burdens as well as the honors? It would be very pretty indeed to see a municipal council presided over by a woman, but that would not be as fine a thing if that same person—sometimes and most always, I have no doubt, a pretty girl—if that same person, I say, was obliged to accept the position of road inspector, rural inspector or drain inspector. The question has not been raised as yet, but if we accept the Bill such as it is proposed, we are taking a step in that direction. I do not think that the theory of woman suffrage will ever become popular among us. The press of the country is against it, especially the press of the Province of Quebec, and to illustrate that fact, Mr. Chairman, I shall read a few extracts from the Conservative newspapers which are published in the Province of Quebec. [The hon. member read articles from *La Minerve*, of the 24th April, 1884; *Le Monde*, of the 19th February, 1884; *Le Journal de Québec*, of the 27th of February, 1884, and *Le Canadien*, of the 26th of February, 1884.] Mr. Chairman, I believe I have shown what is the opinion in the Province of Quebec with regard to that Bill, and I believe I am expressing the opinion of the people of my Province when I say that all or nearly all the electors are opposed to the adoption of the Franchise Bill, such as it is framed. I shall vote against that Bill, because it is an encroachment on provincial rights, and because I think that the preparation of the voters' lists and the choice of the mode of suffrage should be left to each of the Provinces.

Mr. GILLMOR. Nothing could justify this protracted Session except the opposition that is due to a Bill of so iniquitous a character as this one. It is an outrageous attempt to take an unfair advantage of the Liberal party. The Minister of Public Works complains that the Liberal party will be held responsible for this. If the Bill could be defeated, even if it takes three weeks to defeat it, I would be quite willing, for my part, to assume the responsibility. The Bill before the House is objectionable for many reasons. It interferes with the provincial franchises. It will entail a large additional expenditure, and is not in accord with the wishes of the people. As regards the enfranchisement of the Indians, if the Government wish to enlarge our electorate they can do so in a much better way. We have in this Dominion 300,000 white men who are not enfranchised

—the workingmen and the young men who have arrived at mature age, men who have had a good education, and who are the hope of the country, and if the franchise is to be enlarged these are the men who should be brought within its scope, and not a number of poor aborigines, who have no idea of our constitutional system, and occupy a position altogether different to that of the workingman. I have looked over the report on the Chinese question, and I give the Government credit for having treated that question fully and fairly and well. I am not a very good party man constitutionally, and I think it is quite useless to occupy time unnecessarily, but I believe the Government should not enfranchise a class who are not capable of exercising the franchise intelligently. I cannot resist the conviction that it is only for party purposes that the Government has resorted to this proposal to enfranchise their own wards, who are under the control of the Indian agents, who dole out to them the money which is voted for that purpose. I consider this measure so objectionable that, if I believed it were possible to defeat it, I would stand here for any length of time. Hon. gentlemen opposite are not satisfied with a majority of two to one, but desire to make themselves still stronger.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). I desire to protest against the mode in which the Government have undertaken to proceed with this measure. We have been here over three months, and it is rather late in the Session for the Government to proceed with such an important Bill. During this week we have put in more attendance than was required by the Government during the first month of the Session. Every Session there is the appearance of a systematic attempt on the part of the leader of the Government to delay important measures till the end of the time which we should devote to their consideration. With regard to this measure, I can form no other opinion than that its inception and carrying out is not so much conceived with a view to advancing the interests of the country as in the interest of gentlemen on the Treasury benches. Hon. gentlemen opposite see fit to utterly decline giving expression to their opinions in any form on the question under consideration. They appear to think that our functions as a deliberative body ought to cease, and it is important, so far as legislative representatives institutions are concerned, that we should consider where we are drifting. Are we simply here to do the will of the Government of the day, and not to debate the questions that come up before us. If that is what we are here for, we had better go quietly home, and give the Government no more trouble with reference to any measures they may propose. As regards the enfranchisement of the Indians, I do not see any justification for introducing this measure. I have not heard that the Indians are anxious for enfranchisement or desirous to take any part in the administration of our institutions. In fact, from the evidence of the agents in charge of various reserves, nothing is more remote from the mind of the Indian than any such inclination. That is further evident from the fact that although we have an Act providing for the enfranchisement of Indians, under certain restrictions, very few have taken advantage of its provisions, and those who have done so have acted against the strongly expressed wishes of their tribes. In fact, the sentiment of the Indian bands is altogether opposed to the enfranchisement of any of their members. I have no objection to seeing the Indian enfranchised. I think the enfranchised Indians ought to exercise all the rights and privileges of ordinary citizens, but I do not think the Indian should be given the right to vote unless he is prepared to take all the responsibility of citizenship. The Government propose to depart from this principle, by providing that the Indians shall be entitled to be placed on the voters' list, while they still remain in the tribal community, and are in the eyes of the law minors. (The hon. gentleman quoted different clauses of the Indian Act.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that there do not appear to be twenty gentlemen present.

(The Clerk counted the committee, and announced that there were twenty-four present.)

Mr. BAIN. The provision to include the Indians did not appear in the interpretation clause of the Bill which was introduced last Session. I think the Indian franchise has been a recent happy thought on the part of some individual who is interested in building up the influence of the Government in certain localities. Is it not a perfect farce to expect that an Indian placed under the authority of an agent will exercise an unrestricted choice in voting for any candidate that may solicit his vote. How can we expect that an Indian who is the member of a band isolated altogether from our representative institutions, whose views and ideas are utterly alien to ours, will take a reasonable interest or have any adequate conception of the political questions of the day. Our institutions are entirely repugnant to his ideas of right and wrong. He feels hampered by the various legislative enactments that, in the interest of good government and the well-being of society, Parliament sees fit to impose; and if by any possibility the majority of our electorate should be of that class which it is now proposed to add to the electorate, the result would be a complete disruption of our present social and constitutional system. We know, of course, that no such result will happen, but at the same time the Government are giving the right to vote to a class who would only be too glad to see such a result brought about I am as anxious as any other individual for the welfare and advancement of the aboriginal population. If there is one thing more sad to contemplate than another, it is the gradual extinction of the race that in former years inhabited the whole area of the Dominion. It has always been one of the greatest social problems of the day how the Indian could be advanced and assimilated with the civilised population, and past experience has not yet shown any successful means of accomplishing this end. Near my own constituency I can point to one of the oldest tribes in this Dominion, churches in this Dominion erected by the society for the propagation of Christian religion among Indians, and from the time it was erected has never flagged in efforts for the welfare and promotion of the Indian community; and under its efforts, the Indians, have made considerable advance, but still cling to their tribal system and refuse to assume the reponsibilities and duties of citizenship. I can only come to the conclusion that this is an effort to lift certain men out of this Parliament, whom it was unsuccessfully attempted to lift out by the Redistribution Act, passed before the last general election It is repugnant to the first principles of justice to introduce into the franchise such a dangerous element, and it is clear that it is intended to affect the constituencies of several hon. gentlemen in which there are Indian reserves, and in which those Indians will be subject to the influence of the Government agent. If the Government wanted to extend the franchise they could have done so by giving it to the wage earners and the workingmen, instead of giving a vote to these minors, who take no interest in our institutions, and are entirely under the Government. It makes no difference to the Indians whether the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government is in office or the leader of the Opposition; a change of Government does not affect them on their reserves. To carry out the object of this clause and leave no doubt as to the intention of the Government, I will suggest that another clause be added providing, that each Indian agent should send to the Superintendent General a list of the Indians in the band under his charge, and that the Super-

intendent General in return send to the agent a sufficient number of ballots, with instructions to work them in favor of the Government candidate, and deposit them in the ballot box. The step the Government is now taking is a retrogressive step; they are introducing a disturbing element into our representative institutions, an element that does not share, in any way, in the rights, duties and responsibilities of citizenship; and I would be recreant to my duty did I not protest vigorously against this retrogressive movement on the part of the Government. We are justified in coming to the conclusion that the action of the Government, with regard to this Indian franchise, is with a view to injure their political opponents. I suppose hon. gentlemen do not expect to remain in power for ever, and this will allow whatever party holds office to practically control the votes of these people. This provision, if it is adopted, will be a standing disgrace to those who have placed it on the Statute Book. It is the introduction, for the first time, of the principle that a man may exercise the franchise without having any of the responsibilities of citizenship.

Mr. CASGRAIN. My opinion with regard to this Indian franchise is, that if we are to give it to them at all we should give it to them as communities and not as individuals. In this way we should only be going back to the system that prevailed in England in early times, when the House of Commons was elected by communities and not by individuals. It is almost impossible to convert Indians into civilised men. I remember some time ago visiting a settlement of the Ojibeway Indians on the north shore of Lake Huron, called Gordon River. They were provided with Catholic and Protestant missionaries, with houses, gardens and other conveniences. But notwithstanding all that was done for them, some of them preferred to make themselves bark wigwams and dwell in them, rather than inhabit the houses constructed for them, so difficult is it for them to give up their savage modes of life. It is a singular fact that the Indians of British North America are far inferior to those living in more southern latitudes, as is evidenced by the remains of what few arts have been practised by the savage tribes of the two sections of the continent. It has been demonstrated that South American Indians had our astronomical year when America was discovered. No ability of that kind is possessed by the Indians within British possessions. They have made no progress of recent years, in agricultural pursuits. Even the Indians of Lorette, who have owned their lands for two hundred years, have made no advancement, although they are in the midst of civilisation. Their guide and superintendent recently reported that they had made no discernable progress in the cultivation of the soil this year, giving as a reason that the land was one mile and a half from the village. It is apparent that the Indian cannot be brought to cultivate the soil, that it would be useless to extend the franchise to him, except in the few exceptional cases where he become a freeholder and obtains a stake in the country.

Mr. WILSON. The right to vote is a sacred trust, placed in the hands of the electorate, with the object of giving them an interest in the administration of public affairs. It is the bounden duty of those enfranchised to exercise it with the greatest intelligence possible. The Government are, however, proposing to enfranchise a class who are unable to rise to the necessary standard of qualification. The voting power has been withheld from Indians up to this time. No reason has been advanced why a change should take place now. It is not contended that they are more intelligent than heretofore. We are at present under a cloud, on account of the action of some of these tribes in the North-West, and yet we are asked to offer them a reward for their transgressions. The Government are not in a position to know how many Indians would become voters. It cannot be supposed that their enfranchisement would be in the interest of the State, but rather in the interest of the present Government, whose political power would be strengthened thereby. It was stated on the floor of this House that if you gave women the right to vote you must necessarily give them the right to be elected as members of this House. It will be the same with the half-breeds; if you give them the right to vote you must necessarily give them the right to be elected members of this House; and what is more likely than that, hereafter, we may find the savages of the North-West sending Pie-a-pot or some other chief as their representative to this House. We, on this side of the House, contend that the franchise ought to be granted to women. Now, on what principle do you think it is right or just that you should refuse the vote to ladies, and give it to Indians? Shall it be said that in the year 1885, in the Legislature of the Dominion of Canada, it was solemnly declared that the fair ladies of this country, those whom we hold so dear and appreciate so highly, in whose society we feel so much pleasure, and whom we desire to be always near us—that you should refuse the vote to these ladies, while you give it to the Indians of the North-West? I feel there could be no greater blot upon the Statute Book of this Dominion than legislation of this description. When you send an instructor among the Indians and try to educate them, the attempt is generally a failure. I will guarantee that if you will look over the report concerning the Indians on the reserves, that in the constituency of the Minister of Customs you will find that the greater portion of their farms are leased to the white men. Their habits are the habits of the Indians generally, in spite of all that has been done to civilise them.

Mr. BOWELL. They have so much land that they cannot till it all.

Mr. WILSON. Could my hon. friend tell us how many acres each of these Indians have? Will he tell us how many votes he expects to obtain from the enfranchised Indians of East Hastings? Is that one of the reasons we are asked to enfranchise these Indians? Is it in order that the hon. member may feel his position more sure when the next election comes around? I will guarantee that if you go to his constituency you will find a large number of white men who do not receive a sufficient salary to enable them to vote on their income. There are young men engaged as school teachers, teaching the young idea how to shoot. We find them debarred from voting. Now, on what principle do you refuse the vote to intelligent school teachers while you give it to Indians, who are wards of the Government, and who have to be supported in part from the public funds? Will hon. members of this House quietly sit by and allow this crying injustice to be done to the noble profession of school teaching, from one end of the Dominion to the other? Does the Government pretend to tell me that the enfranchised Indians are more competent to cast their votes than school teachers? Perhaps it may be because the present Government feel they are much safer in their tenure of power if they can put votes into the hands of those who are not competent to exercise the franchise intelligently. It may be that, they feel their situation would be more secure, and that in view of their past record, they would be more likely to get back to power than they would be if the franchise was left exclusively in the hands of intelligent white voters. I feel it is my duty to serve the State first, even if I drop on the floor from exhaustion. I am going to stay here and do my duty, and raise my voice against the crying injustice that is being perpetrated. As long as my voice shall last, I will defend the Dominion of Canada. I will speak out in the interest of those school teachers who are being left out, while the Indians are being brought in.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, in rising at nine o'clock in the morning in a House which has been sitting without interruption for over thirty-six hours, I believe I am in duty bound to protest against the Government, who refuse to consent to the adjournment. I maintain that it is practically impossible to discuss such an important measure as this after such a protracted sitting. This measure is one of the most important which have been submitted to Parliament since 1867. A few days ago, when the hon. First Minister presented this Bill to the House, the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) rose to protest against the conduct of the Government who introduced a measure at such an advanced stage of the Session. The hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) took occasion to remark that a great many important questions were on the Orders of the Day, and he mentioned, among other things, the Estimates, the tariff, all the motions of non-confidence which the Opposition was going to make, and a number of questions which it is useless for me to mention. The First Minister said: Sessions are not necessarily limited to three months; they may even last four or five months. There is one thing against which we must protest, and that is that we are really deprived of the freedom of discussion, when the Government compels us to sit here during two or three consecutive days, at every hour of the day and night, and they are not giving us what they promised us a few days ago, when we were told that we would have full liberty of discussing the measure now submitted to us. We must not forget that a measure of this kind cannot be discussed in two or three days, and the leader of the Government admitted it when he introduced a measure of the same kind, or rather when he withdrew it, in 1873; he gave as a reason for doing so that a whole Session would be needed to discuss such a measure as that. Mr. Chairman, we have only been discussing this measure for about ten days, and some of the Conservative newspapers, and some of the hon. members of this House, are crying out that the Liberal party is a party of obstructionists, who will not allow the business of the House to be carried on, and we are already compelled to sit here night and day. That will not prevent me from doing my duty. I have a certain number of objections to make to this measure, and I shall make them, notwithstanding the advanced stage of the Session, and notwithstanding the fact that we have been sitting for three days. My first objection is that the measure is inopportune and should not have been introduced in Parliament. In fact, this measure has never been asked for by public opinion. It is impossible to find, in any newspaper in the country, or, at least, in any newspaper in the Province to which I have the honor to belong, any demand whatever for this election law. There has been no public meeting, nor any petition presented to Parliament asking for a franchise Bill. And yet in England a measure respecting electoral franchise has never been introduced without having been strongly urged by public opinion, and unless it was perfectly established that such a measure was absolutely necessary. This measure should never have been introduced without previously having been submitted to the people at the general elections; and why was not that done at the elections of 1882? The reason is very simple. It was because it was known that that people were perfectly satisfied with the election law of 1874, and that they did not wish to alter their electoral franchise. It is not the people who ask for this measure; it is the Government who wish to use it, in order to ensure the election of their supporters who would not be elected without that. In England, a Franchise Bill is not a party measure; true, it must be introduced in the name of the Government, but both parties are called upon to contribute to its improvement. The Liberal party and the Conservative party in England worked together in 1868 to frame a law as perfect as possible, and the same thing took place last year with regard to the Reform Bill. The same course ought to be followed here, and I say it is a shame for a Government to have recourse to such means to ensure the election of their supporters. A very strange thing, and one which ought to have struck, it seems to me, every member who has the sense of justice, is that this measure was introduced without any explanation whatever on the part of the Government. There is not one Minister, not one Government supporter in this House, who has proved, in a satisfactory manner, that we need such a law, that this law is just and that it may be of advantage to the country. The only reason, or rather the only pretext, that was given to introduce this measure, which affects the rights and privileges of the Provinces, was that a uniform law was needed for the whole Dominion of Canada. But this is not the first time that uniformity was spoken of in the House of Commons. Formerly, in 1867, uniformity was spoken of occasionally, but at that time it was spoken of to show that under Confederation no uniformity was needed in legislation. And that was the basis of Confederation. The object of Confederation was to do away with this uniformity which was a cause of discord under the Union of the two Canadas. Why should we need this uniformity of franchise? We have no uniformity with respect to many other points; we have no uniformity for the administration of justice. The Province of Quebec has its own way of administering justice, the Province of Ontario has also its own mode of administration, and so with all the other Provinces. Until now, nobody has complained; on the contrary, we know that it is in the interest of the Provinces to have no uniformity in the administration of justice. Why should it not be so with regard to the electoral franchise? I believe not only that this uniformity would not be beneficial, but that it would be a cause of discord for the Dominion of Canada. Uniformity, Mr. Chairman, is the great principle of legislative union. In England they have a uniform law, but it must be remarked that they have also a legislative union and not a confederation, as we have here. Uniformity has always been the pretext which has been invoked to centralise everything into the federal power. This principle does not certainly come from the Conservatives of the Province of Quebec, but it is forced upon them by the Tories from Ontario who are supporting the First Minister. To have uniformity in a great number of cases, it is necessary to give up the rights and privileges which the Provinces have enjoyed up to this day. I can understand very well that the First Minister should be in favor of that principle, because he has always been in favor of legislative union. The First Minister is called the father of Confederation in our Province, but it is through derision that he is called by that name, for if we have Confederation today it is against his will, and we owe that form of government to the alliance which took place between George Brown and Sir George Etienne Cartier. The hon. First Minister has always tried to give us legislative union, and to encroach upon Local Governments. The first act of encroachment which he has committed was that of the dismissal of the Hon. Letellier de St. Just. Indeed, whatever may be the opinions entertained, on the question of what right the Lieutenant Governor had of dismissing the De Boucherville Ministry, there is one fact on which there can be but one opinion, and that is, that by dismissing Mr. Letellier the present First Minister has encroached upon the rights of the Province and taken the first step towards legislative union. That first step was taken after a great deal of hesitation, but since then we have made very rapid strides towards centralisation. Another interference of the Government in the political affairs of the Provinces has been the disavowal of the Rivers and Streams Bill of the Province of Ontario. And a little later on we have had the License

Act of 1883. I am not a jurist, and I cannot discuss a question of that kind from a legal point of view. It is possible that the Privy Council may decide that the Federal Government has the right of granting licenses for the whole Dominion of Canada, but whether it has that right or not, I say that Government cannot grant licenses in all the Provinces without infringing upon their privileges, if they do not infringe upon their actual rights. The same is true about the Franchise Bill. Whether the Government have a right or not to pass this law, I say that if they do not encroach upon provincial rights they encroach upon private rights, and for us French Canadians who are a minority in the Dominion, there is no practical difference between our encroachment upon our privileges or an encroachment upon our rights. The basis of Confederation is the representation by Provinces. Each Province has a right to send a certain number of members here: Ontario 92, Quebec 65; each Province has its fixed number of representatives. Whether the Province of Quebec, Mr. Chairman, elects her members under one franchise or under the other, is perfectly immaterial. Whether the Province of Ontario elect her members by woman suffrage or by universal suffrage, or by any other kind of franchise, it is also quite immaterial to the representation of Canada. The members will be no less efficient, no less patriotic, and they will be no less anxious to promote the interest of the whole Dominion. Well, what we do ask is that each Province should have the right to elect its members of the Dominion Parliament in whatever manner it may deem proper. If in the Province of Ontario, there is nothing in the creed, in the ideas, in the aspirations of the population, which is adverse to universal suffrage or to woman suffrage, we do not want to deprive that Province of her rights and privileges, but we ask that the rights and the creed of the Province of Quebec shall be respected, and that woman suffrage or universal suffrage should not be forced upon us.

Mr. CHAIRMAN ruled that under cover of the motion that the Chairman do rise and report progress, which is equivalent to a motion to adjourn, the amendment proposed to the Bill alone could be discussed, not the whole Bill.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) All I say is for the object of proving that we ought to have an adjournment, in order to take a rest and to be able to discuss the Bill more attentively. Indian suffrage is an encroachment on the privileges of free men, and of white men. It is a principle which is not acceptable; and if this suffrage, which is not based upon property but only on land which, in fact, do not belong to the Indians, is granted, I say it is an encroachment upon the rights and privileges of the civilised electors of the Dominion at large. I would like to know by virtue of what principle the present Bill has been prepared. It contains the most radical principles, such as woman suffrage and universal suffrage. On the other hand it contains the most reactionary ideas. For instance, is there anything more reactionary than Indian suffrage, more autocratic than the principle under which the preparation of the voters' lists is left in the hands of the Government?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. member must limit himself to the question before the Chair.

Mr. MULOCK. I contend that the same arguments are permissible on a motion that the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again as are admissible on a motion that the matter be referred to Committee in the first instance. When a discussion takes place on a motion to refer, the whole state of public business is allowed to be discussed. There is a wide difference between the latitude of debate allowed on the motion that the Speaker leave the Chair and on the motion simply that the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. RINFRET.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) When I mentioned a while ago, the reactionary principles contained in this Bill, I indicated Indian suffrage in the first place. Indeed, it is not to the Indians that the right to vote is given; they are simply instruments in the hands of the Government officials; they are under the guardianship of the Government, and they could not, if left to themselves, exercise the right of suffrage, they have not the necessary intelligence to do so. I will conclude my remarks by saying that such a radical measure, a measure which contains such subversive and such reactionary principles should not be passed in this House, and I believe that the leader of the Government will, some day, have reason to repent for having passed that measure which will not do him as much good as he expects.

Mr. FISHER. I regret that hon. gentlemen opposite should still appear to think that they will wear us out in this debate. The question of physical endurance is one which might be applied as an argument to the stoical Indians, whom it is proposed to enfranchise, but not to intelligent electors. When we began this discussion in the early part of the week, hon. gentlemen opposite made use of an extraordinary species of argument, in order to meet our logical and carefully considered statements, and that was the argument of howling, shouting and roaring, the argument of drowning our voices with unearthly noises that came from the benches opposite. Within the last couple of days, however, that argument has been abandoned, in consequence, I believe, of strict orders given by the leaders. Having found that they could not howl us down, that the more they howled the more rest they gave us, they have resorted to the expedient of trying to weary us out by simple silence. But I do not think that will succeed any more than the first argument did. They accuse us throughout the land of obstructing the business of Parliament. But who are responsible for these prolonged sessions? I say they are responsible, responsible for the injury done to the health of hon. members of this House, who will suffer from these prolonged sessions. The Opposition in this House are merely doing their duty, in trying to direct the attention of the country to this measure; they are merely doing their duty, in trying to explain to the country the provisions of this measure. I contend that in consequence of the fact that in this country we have not, unfortunately, a public opinion sufficiently active to watch the proceedings of the Government as they require to be watched, the introduction of a measure of this kind requires extraordinary action on our part; it requires extraordinary action to weaken that public opinion to a due sense of what is going on. Unfortunately, in this country, the people seem to think that when, at a general election, they have entrusted a certain number of individuals with the control of their political destiny for so many years, they have nothing further to do till the next general election comes around. Now, in reference to conferring the franchise on Indians, I find that this Bill will create a great deal of confusion, when you come to decide what Indians are to have the right to vote. (The hon. gentleman quoted extracts from the Indian Act, and proceeded to show that location tickets did not give Indians any rights over the land, except as occupants; that they did not give the Indians any proprietorship in the land, and consequently they did not own property which might give them the right to vote.) Nevertheless, under this Bill they would be covered by the word "occupant," and would be accorded votes, although they are practically paupers living on the bounty of the Government.

Mr. JACKSON. I have just returned from the country, where I have spent a few days in my native county. While there I was interviewed very extensively in regard to the Franchise Bill. People were very anxious to ascertain what were its provisions. In trying to explain the Bill I told the people that one particular clause provided for the extension

of the franchise to Indians. This seemed to excite them very much. In the county I represent there are no Indians located, and so the people know very little about their habits. They are very much excited over this proposal, coming, as it does, at a time of trouble in the North-West. Not being much acquainted with the Indians and Indian questions, I refer to the annual report of the Department. It is a very valuable work, and although copies are distributed among members, the facts it contains are not generally made known to the public. In Ontario there are 16,892 Indians. (The hon. gentleman read the lists of locations, with the numbers at each.) I may point out that the Six Nations, who are stated to number 3,230, will come in the counties of Haldimand and Brant, if they are enfranchised, and if they vote on one side they will be able to carry the elections in both ridings. My constituents are very anxious to know the habits of these Indians, and the only way we can ascertain their habits is by referring to the report of the superintendents. (The hon. gentleman read from the reports of several superintendents, showing the extent to which the Indians availed themselves of the educational facilities afforded by the Government, and the state of agriculture among them.) Some of the reports I find are very favorable to the Indians, showing that they had made a fair degree of progress; but on the whole, this class of our population was not at all fitted for the exercise of the franchise. The Government should take measures to prevent the Indians anticipating their payments, and using their money in dissipation, which leads to subsequent suffering. (The hon. gentleman next read a special report to the Indian Department by E. C. Wilson, in regard to the home for Indian children at Sault Ste. Marie.) I can bear testimony to the fact that the land in that locality is rocky and barren, and not calculated for cultivation to any large extent. Indians will, no doubt, have to be assisted there, in order to make progress in farming. The report speaks favorably of the progress made by the children. It goes to show that Indian children are advancing, and that if proper measures are adopted, they can, in course of time, become educated. But the franchise should not be extended to Indians until they have become thoroughly educated, and they have not arrived at that position yet. Nevertheless, I admit that Indian progress is making favorable strides, and that if perserved in it may amount to something in the end. One of the agents mentions that the Indians are addicted to drunkenness and are not exactly honest; that they steal horses. I know that white people have been known to steal horses, so in that respect they are not much behind their white brethren. In regard to drunkenness, it appears that when Indians are allowed to have liquor it deprives them of their reason. Mr. Drapeau, another Indian agent, mentions, in his report with respect to schools, that the great difficulty is the non-attendance of the children during a portion of the term, and this is a matter to which the attention of the Government should be directed. The only manner in which the Indians can be improved is by having the children regularly attend school. This agent also mentions that drunkenness is on the decrease—which is a very satisfactory statement. Mention is also made of the fact that the Indians obtain remunerative employment in lumbering camps. I am a lumberer myself, but I have never employed Indians, and am not aware as to whether they are able to do manual labor as well as white men. The agent also mentions that some of them have had contracts on their own account. If that be the case, it shows decided progress. Again, mention is made of the fact that it is difficult to get the children to attend school regularly. (The hon. gentleman next quoted from the report of Lieut.-Colonel Powell, Indian Superintendent, writing from Victoria, British Columbia.) He reported that the Indians were committing depredations, and that unless something was done by the Government the agents would have very little influence. In British Columbia it seems the Indians have not been so well treated as the Indians in Ontario. The advantages of Indian schools should be extended to that Province, because with the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway Indians might ultimately travel east. The statement is made that the white population of British Columbia is in a state of agitation in regard to the Indians; and this report is dated 1884. The Government should take some steps in order to try and reconcile differences, because delay may be attended with evil effects. One step in this direction has been taken by the Government, by the appointment of a stipendiary magistrate at Metlakatla. The Chinese have superseded the Indians in regard to certain kinds of labor, such, for instance, as laundry work and berry picking, which was formerly done by Indian squaws. All these things have made the Indians discontented, and I hope the Government will see to it that that discontent is not allowed to extend. There are other parts of the Dominion, however, in which the Indians should be looked after. One Province is that of Prince Edward Island, from which complaints come.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I had reason to believe that the Government would have consented to the adjournment of the debate. However, I have been disappointed, and it is now evident that they are making use of their majority in this House to tyrannise over the minority. We have now been in Session for over three months, and what is the result of the labors of the Government during that time? Yesterday we went to the Senate Chamber where the representative of the Governor General assented to the Bills that had been carried through this House. What were those Bills? I find there were five public Bills and five Government Bills—five Bills only, in over three months, on the part of the Government. There are thirteen Ministers, not quite half a Bill apiece. Three months, and a few lines to each Minister fills the Bill. It is asking a great deal of the loyalty of their supporters to support a Government that are not able to do more than that in over three months. All these Bills were of a comparatively unimportant character, while the Government have kept the most important measure that was ever brought down to Parliament in abeyance until a period in the Session when Parliament usually prorogues. Can the Ministry give any good reason to their supporters why they should delay the important Bills? Now the Government, in the measure before us, propose many innovations. They propose to take the franchise away from a good many people who now enjoy it, and to confer it upon Indians who never asked for it, and who do not know how to exercise it. It becomes this House and the country to consider very carefully the condition and character of the Indian tribes, those who are at present without civil rights and who are living upon the bounty of the Government. Upon this point we have the testimony of the First Minister, and the testimony of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs; and I propose to draw your attention to the views expressed in the Indian report in regard to the condition of the Indians, so that you may be able to judge whether they are in a condition to exercise the franchise. (The hon. gentleman proceeded to read numerous extracts from the reports of Indian agents as to the condition of the Indians, and showing their dependence upon the Government.) He said: These are the people who possessed no rights as freemen hitherto, and who are now to have the ballots placed in their hands—and for what purpose? For the purpose of maintaining in power this Government that are unable to remain in power without resorting to such methods as are proposed in this Bill. (The hon. gentleman went on to read from the report respecting the state of education among the Indians.) In speaking of the attempt to give local government to the

Indian tribes, the First Minister states as the result of reports received from his officers, in reply to a circular that the Indian bands in the respective districts are not sufficiently advanced for the proposed change. Yet, the Government now propose to place the ballot in their hands and give them power to take part in the general government of the country, while it is admitted that they are not qualified to have municipal government or the management of their own affairs. The truth is that the Government proposal is simply one by which they hope to continue in power. There has been a good deal of discussion going on in the country as to where the Indians obtained their ammunition with which they are killing our volunteers, and killing even the clergy. We are able from the report of the Indian Department to see where the Indians obtained that ammunition.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I observe that the hon. gentleman proposes to discuss a question not before the House. If he does not refrain from doing so, I shall call him to order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am discussing the Indian question and I shall read from the annual report of Indian affairs for the year 1884. It is a report presented by the First Minister, and we would not like the reflection cast that there is a clause in that report which should be suppressed. That would be almost an insult, which I should not like to see offered the Premier by the Deputy Speaker of this House. (The hon. member then proceeded to read from the report a clause with respect to failure of crops on the Indian reserves in the North-West, and stating that the Department had purchased among other articles, ammunition and twine, so that the Indian might be able to supply themselves with fish and game during the winter.) This is the way in which the Indians obtained their ammunition in the North-West.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman has proceeded to discuss how the Indians obtained ammunition in the North-West, after my warning him that he had no right to do so. I think the hon. gentleman is entirely out of order; he had no business after my warning to proceed to discuss that question. I ask the committee to sustain me in ruling the hon. member out of order.

Mr. LANDERKIN. No doubt your ruling, Mr. Chairman, is constitutional, and I bow to it. But I should like to know what business the First Minister had to give ammunition to Indians and take away rifles from our volunteers. However I have gone through with that matter and it is no use further discussing it. I am satisfied the people of the country and the House now know where the ammunition came from. The Indians are always wanting something. The bands on the Grand River wanted seed; those at Strathroy wanted blankets. (The hon. gentleman went on to read from the Indian report, to show the dependent condition of the Indians, upon which he based an argument against granting them the franchise. From the Caughnawaga agency it was reported that in some cases the Indians were so lazy that the wives had to support their husbands.) I think it would be a much better idea to give the squaws a vote than the Indians in this case. They have to support their husbands when they are idle. It would be a much more gallant thing for the Premier to give the franchise to the Indian females than to the male Indians. Why, these people are neither more nor less than brutes. They expect their women to support them; and, for the Premier, who professes to be in favor of female suffrage, to give the ballot to these is an absurd thing. Again, the agent says that the Indians at this agency think themselves entitled to appropriate the lands of their neighbors. It seems that they are communists. Does the Government propose to confer the franchise upon communists? The Government proposes to confer the franchise upon Indians who will steal, who will get drunk, who compel their wives to support them, and who are communists.

Mr. POPE. You are not up to snuff over there this morning.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The Minister of Agriculture appears to be vegetating this morning. He appears to be pretty well up to snuff. I think it was the Ottawa *Citizen* that said he was born in heaven. If he was born in heaven, he should not come here and make such a loud noise in sneezing. I think they had better take the Secretary of State out to his cattle ranche, and give him more room.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Shall this motion be adopted?

Mr. LANDERKIN. I was going on to speak in regard to another matter. If you cannot, Mr. Chairman, keep order we shall have to get another Deputy Speaker who can.

Mr. WOODWORTH. That is an insult.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have been insulted very grievously.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The hon. gentleman has made a statement here that is most insulting to this committee and to the Chairman. He said: If the Chairman cannot keep order we shall get another Deputy Speaker who will. Those words should be retracted and apologised for before the hon. gentleman proceeds further with his speech.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Withdraw.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If there is anything wrong about that I will withdraw it. If it is right for hon. gentlemen opposite to take snuff and disturb the discussion so that I cannot be heard, I bow to the Chairman's decision.

Mr. WOODWORTH. That is not a withdrawal. It is adding insult to injury. I asked whether the hon. gentleman should not withdraw the words complained of before he proceeded.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman withdrew the words, or I would not have allowed him to proceed.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The hon. gentleman says he will withdraw the words if it is right for hon. gentlemen to do so and so, and act so and so.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I did not say anything of the kind. The hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about. If I have said anything to interfere with the peace of mind of the Chairman, and anything contrary to the dignity of the House, I will retract. I should like to say that hon. gentlemen opposite who are disturbing this debate should apologise for their unseemly conduct. If ever I do wrong I am ready to apologise, and I do not consider it to be a dishonor to make an apology to anyone. I never offended any man knowingly. If hon. gentlemen opposite persist in their unseemly conduct, I say it will become your duty, Mr. Chairman, to look after them and see that the dignity of the House is preserved.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The hon. gentleman says that if he has said anything to disturb the peace of mind of the Chairman he will withdraw it. That is not a withdrawal. He has made a statement which is insulting to this committee. We ask the withdrawal of that statement. It is not the Chairman's feelings which are insulted; it is the committee which is insulted. The hon. member says if the Chairman's peace of mind is affected, he will withdraw his statement. That is not a withdrawal; and I ask the hon. member to act up to his profession and withdraw the statement.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The hon. member did withdraw the remark.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I also say that the hon. gentleman withdrew his remark as regards the Chairman; but he did not withdraw his remarks as regards hon. gentlemen opposite, and that he is not compelled to do.

Mr. MILLS. I hope the hon. member will be allowed to proceed with his speech, because if hon. gentlemen opposite persist in disturbing the proceedings of the committee we shall have to call in Mr. Speaker that order may be restored.

Mr. LANDERKIN. There is very little use making a gentlemanly apology before some hon. gentlemen.

Mr. WOODWORTH. That is another insult to the committee. The hon. gentleman intentionally insults hon. members.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I intend to insult no one. If there is anyone so ungentlemanly as not to understand my remarks I do not address them to him. Now, at Seven Islands agency 40 bushels of potatoes were sent to the Indians to sow. But they ate them, and said the Queen was very good to send them. (The hon. gentleman continued reading from the reports of different Indian agencies contained in the report to the Department.)

Mr. McCRANEY. It is not very often I trouble the House, but this question is of such vast importance, that I feel it my duty to condemn the course of the Government in bringing down this measure at this late hour of the Session. This Session has now lasted over three months; we were here six weeks before anything was done, and all the business that has yet been done, could have been done in those six weeks. Now, Sir, the action of the First Minister in bringing down this measure was, to me, entirely a mystery during the whole of these three months. For my own part, I did not believe he would bring down this Bill at all, but he finally made up his mind to do so. The longer I look at this Bill, the more monstrous it appears to me. This Bill has a hundred sides to it, and every side of it is more infamous than the other. I think without any exception—and I have read considerable history of the civilised nations of the world—that there has not been a more infamous measure proposed in any civilised country for the last two hundred years. I have in my hand a cartoon of *Grip* which describes the situation exactly. It is entitled, "A bird's eye view." It says: "Why not have the revising barristers do the voting directly, not indirectly?" Above it is the First Minister with the words "Alexander III, revising barrister of Russia." Now, Sir, that is the effect of this measure. The First Minister is the revising barrister. Not a single gentleman opposite has attempted to defend this Bill. I have myself spoken to a number of intelligent supporters of the Government on this question, and not a single one of them has attempted to defend it. Why do they not defend it? If it is British justice, British fair play, why do they not get up like men and defend this Bill? They cannot defend it. It cannot be defended in this civilised country. Sir, I say myself, as an indepenent supporter of the Opposition, that if the hon. gentleman whom I support were to bring down a measure half as bad, half as vicious, I would walk out of this House, or walk over to the other side of the House. I would not be guilty of such a thing. Now, Sir, we have a passage in Scripture which speaks about a strong man armed; when one wants to spoil his goods he first binds the strong man, and then spoils his goods. Now this is what the Government are trying to do with regard to the Reform party. They are trying to tie the hands of the Reform party, and then telling them to go and fight. They are putting a rope around their necks, and then they are telling them to run. This is the inevitable effect of this Bill. I have had the honor of a seat in this House for some years; I was here during a portion of the Administration of the Mackenzie Government. Although we have had some pretty bad measures brought down to the Parliament of this country during the last ten or fifteen years, yet I am free to say that, not excluding the Pacific Scandal, or the Gerrymander Bill of 1882, I think this Bill is without any exception the most infamous of the whole lot. I have seen the condition of the Indians in almost every State of the Union and in our North-West. To think that this Government ignores our noble young men and our intelligent women to give votes to dirty, filthy, lousy Indians is beyond my comprehension. I do not wish to say anything against intelligent and Christian Indians, of whom there are some, but I think hon. gentlemen opposite can have no conception of the degredation of the Indian's condition. This Bill is un-British, it is a step backward in our institutions. If such a Bill were introduced into the British House of Commons, the Government introducing it would be hurled from power. I say, and I say it advisedly, that large numbers of our intelligent young men have left this country because they were denied the franchise, on the grounds that they did not pay taxes; yet it is proposed to give Indians votes, although they do not pay taxes. The Government expend over $1,200,000 a year on our Indians, to clothe and feed and look after them. There is another reason why the Government are anxious to push this Bill through. We have now five new Provinces in the North-West. The question of their representation has already been before the House, and it is probable those Provinces will shortly obtain representatives. If the Indians are permitted to use the franchise we shall be having some of their chiefs down here as members of this House. We shall have Poundmaker, Blue-Quill, Bob-Tail, and the rest of them. The whole thing is too ridiculous, and I hope the Government will at least see that the clause respecting Indians is struck out of the Bill. I desire to read an extract from a letter I have received from a lady on this franchise question. The lady writes:

"How any man can hesitate for one moment in making up his mind on this subject is more than I can understand, to think of such wretches as some of these scamps daring to get up and publicly question the ability of the woman of property to exercise the franchise, or expressing his doubt as to whether or not they would exercise it for the public good, while the fact is it is almost a profanity for some of them to mention the word woman. As well might a mud-puddle question the right or ability of pure water to cleanse or refresh and invigorate. As well might the vilest and most ignorant Hottentot or Indian question the ability or right of an Oxford professor to exercise personal liberty aright. Are my comparisons far fetched or unjust? I think not, considering the character of some of those fellows who so speak. Shame on them."

Those are the opinions of some of the ladies of the country. I concur in those opinions. I have witnessed the disgraceful feasts of Indians on the Pacific coast, no one can help but express abhorence at them. Yet it is the intention of the Government to enfranchise those Indians. Until such times as Indians are free men they are like children. Who is the parent in their case? It is the First Minister. I do not say that this Government is worse than any other, but under any Government the Indians will be compelled to do what the Government pleases, or supplies will be stopped. It has been repeated time and again that this Government possesses the confidence of the people. If so why resort to such a dishonorable measure as this. Surely the Government do not want to remove the few remaining members on this side of the House—the members for Brant, Bothwell, Middlesex, and the rest. Yet this would seem to be the deliberate intention. The whole Bill is most unfair, most dishonorable. (The hon. gentleman read a number of sections from the Indian Act in order to show the extent to which they are under the control of the Superintendent-General.) I have only to say that I look upon this measure with the utmost horror. In all my experience I have never known any legislation so repugnant to my feel-

ings as the measure it is now proposed to pass. I have myself witnessed the idleness, the dishonesty and the immorality of the people whom the Government now ask us to invest with the franchise, and I say the proposition is a monstrous one. This is an age of advancement. This is a Christian country. And, Sir, the people of this country will not stand such legislation. I say that God reigns on this earth, and he will not permit such legislation. Right is right, and fair play is fair play. I say that God will not permit such kind of legislation to prosper, and if the Government of this country think they will keep themselves in power by a piece of such iniquitous legislation as this, they will find themselves greatly mistaken.

Mr. WATSON. It seems that hon. gentlemen opposite are determined to put this Bill through without any explanation, but I cannot sit still in this House without offering my protest against it. I consider this clause conferring the franchise on Indians ought to be wiped out of this Bill. I hoped that the Government would see fit to accept the amendment moved by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) which would give the franchise to every Indian who had made such progress in civilisation as would entitle him to it, such progress as we all hope they will make at an early day. I think by conferring the franchise upon those who are sufficiently advanced, it will make them feel a certain degree of responsibility, and so become good citizens. I find that hon. gentlemen opposite simply sit in silence and attempt no answer to the arguments advanced against this clause, and they offer no explanation as to what this word "Indian" in the clause is meant to include. I do not believe they thoroughly understand what that word means, and I propose to give them some information upon that point. I propose to give a description of some of the Indians living in the Province I have the honor to represent. From all the reports we have of those Indians I do not think the First Minister who has charge of that particular Department could suppose that the Indians to whom he wishes to extend the franchise, are fit to receive it. I know personally a number of those bands who will be qualified to vote under this Bill, and I am strongly opposed to the franchise being extended to pagan Indians, who participate in the sun dance and torture themselves. I should be only too glad to see the franchise extended to Indians so soon as they are able to give an intelligent vote, when they hold certain property in their own names and are amenable to the municipality in which they reside and are liable to pay taxes. But this Bill provides that Indians living on reserves who have a bit of land which, together with the house, is worth $150, shall have the franchise, they being the very people in regard to whom the settlers are calling for arms to defend themselves. The Indians, moreover, cannot buy and sell articles, and if you buy from them you are liable to a fine of $100. They are simply minors. I was a little surprised after the speech made by the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), in which he stated that the Indians living on reserves were minors and cannot vote, at the reply given by the First Minister. Evidently the hon. member for Algoma and the First Minister do not understand Indians in the same terms. I believe the hon. member for Algoma was perfectly right in his statement. Still the First Minister refused to make any other explanation than that an Indian living on a reserve should have a right to vote if he had a house and lot worth $150. It has come within my own personal observation that an Indian band in Manitoba is living on other people's land. The band under Chief Yellow-quill have given the people in the West considerable annoyance. They have settled about thirty miles west of Portage La Prairie and claim the land, although it has been patented by this Government to settlers. About two years ago there was very nearly bloodshed on account of the settlers trying to eject the band from those lands. Under this clause the members of that band will be entitled to vote on other men's property. They occupy the lands and cultivate a small portion of it, which is known as the Indian garden. They have moved from their reserve at Swan Lake. The agent at Portage La Prairie gives some idea of the habits of these Indians whom it is proposed to enfranchise. The general character of a large number of the Indians is not of the best. A great number of them are very immoral. Some of the Indians to whom this privilege of voting will be accorded are those who participate in the most disgusting customs and who traffic their females with the whites for purposes of prostitution. These are the people whom the First Minister intends to enfranchise. The thing is to be abhored. (The hon. member then proceeded to read extracts from the report of one of the Indian superintendents respecting the condition of the Rossin River band, in which he spoke of the drunkenness prevailing among them.) The present Indian Act of 1884 set out plainly enough who should be enfranchised, and I trust the First Minister will adhere to that Act. It is not necessary to say anything with respect to the influence which will be wielded by the Government officials in charge of the Indians. I do not care what party is in power, difficulty will arise. Probably not a dozen Indians in Manitoba of the age of 21 can read and write. In a few years when the young Indians are grown up they will be educated and be able to give an intelligent vote; but when that time comes they will separate themselves from the bands and live like white people. The Indians further west, whom it is proposed to enfranchise, are not such people as we would desire to be enfranchised. We see them at the present time making use of ammunition furnished them by the Government, as means of procuring sustenance, to slaughter our young men in the far west. Especially is it undesirable at this particular time when trouble is prevailing in the North-West and when thousands of our young men are there for the purpose of suppressing rebellion, that we should enfranchise the Indians. It is a measure which the country will not stand, and the voice of the country is already raised against it. This debate has been continued all on one side. If hon. gentlemen opposite think we are mistaken as to our interpretation of the position, why do they not rise and make the necessary explanations. I hope the First Minister will amend this clause so as to clearly define who are to be electors. The word "Indian" has a very wide meaning. The hon. member for Algoma thinks that a half-breed is an Indian, and said that the Premier of Manitoba is an Indian. Such a view may be taken in Algoma; but in Manitoba one of the greatest insults that can be given to a half-breed is to call him an Indian, and I have seen almost riots occur on account of this name being inadvertantly used. It is therefore clear that this word "Indian" should be more clearly defined. A man who votes should be amenable to the laws of the country. He should be assessed, and he should pay taxes on his property. I think the Ontario Act meets the case, for it provides that an Indian who is receiving his yearly allowance from the Government may be entitled to vote in municipal matters. I think that is fair and there will be no wrong done. But put up an uncivilised Indian, a pagan Indian, to kill a white man's vote, is ridiculous, and the people will not stand it. If a band of 40 or 50 Indians came up to the polling booth in Manitoba and attempted to kill the votes of an equal number of white men who pay the taxes, who build the roads and bridges and support all the expenses of the Government, it would raise a rebellion in that country.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wish once more to appeal to the House to adjourn the session of this committeee. It is of the utmost importance that the members and officials of the

House should preserve their mental and physical strength for the important duties yet before us. We all deplore that our hon. Finance Minister is incapacitated from business by severe sickness. It is reported that he will soon be called to another position, and will be appointed Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of New Brunswick. Now I think there is not a member of this House that will grudge him that promotion and that dignity and leisure to which a life-time devoted to the public service fully entitles him. Common report says, whether correctly or not, that the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) will be his successor. Now I want to submit for the consideration of the Committee that, when the hon. gentleman assumes the onerous duties of that responsible office, he will need have all his mental faculties and all his physical powers to conduct the finances of this country which are at present in a desperate state. Then there is the Deputy-Speaker whose duty it is to take the Chair in Committee of the Whole House —he also requires rest. I can say what I would not say before his face without flattery (he being absent at the moment) that members on both sides of this House, so far as we have observed his conduct in the Chair, will unite in saying that he conducts the business of the committee with ability, courtesy and skill. I see he is becoming exhausted, and is forced sometimes to retire. Then there is the Clerk of the House, who is so thoroughly well qualified for the position he fills, and who is so valuable an authority on Parliamentary procedure—all these gentlemen absolutely require rest at this moment, and for these reasons I urge upon the committee the propriety of adjourning. Another reason why I ask for an adjournment is, that the clause giving the franchise to Indians is one of such a revolutionary character that its consideration ought to be deferred. Now, the Liberal members of this House are all anxious to confer the franchise on Indians just as soon as they are fit to exercise it, but we contend that the great mass of them are not yet in that position. The Consolidated Indian Act already makes provision for enfranchising Indians who have attained to a certain degree of property qualification, and, if that Act is not sufficient to include all who are thus fitted, then let it be made broader. Then I submit that it will be a moral impossibility for nine out of the ten Indians who will be enfranchised under this Act, to understand how to use it. There are two languages in which the politics of this country are discussed, and how many Indians understand either of them? Consequently how can they understand the political question, or the principles of the candidates for whom they will be required to vote. Another difficulty lies in their want of intelligence. When a man comes up to vote he must be able to read the ballot so as to know whom he is voting for; but, as far as the Indians are concerned, we know that in not one case in twenty amongst the Indians of the North-West, will the enfranchised Indian be able to read his ballot, or to know where he should make his mark. Why, Sir, it would be almost an impossibility for the Indian agents or instructors to teach the enfranchised Indians sufficiently to enable them to understand even the meaning of the franchise. Lest the revising barristers should be unable to carry the Government into power, it has been decided to give the Indians votes, which they will exercise under it according to the wishes of the Indian agents. The hon. gentleman proceeded to read extracts from the reports of Indian agents in the Province of Nova Scotia. Those reports, the hon. member said, showed that in view of the distribution of the Indians throughout the different constituencies they would prove very useful to the Government as giving them a solid body of Indian votes in the different ridings. In Ontario it would have the effect of defeating, in all probability, the members for Haldimand, South Brant, West Lambton, Bothwell, and myself, for I have no less than 1,345 Indians in my constituency. In the North-West the Indians are becoming more and more dependent on the Government, in consequence of the departure of the buffalo and the scarcity of game; and consequently they would be in no sense independent as regards exercising the franchise. I submit that this measure is revolutionary in its character and sweeping in its provisions, and it should not become law.

Mr. AUGER. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I did not expect to speak on the suject which is now before the House; but as the motion for the adjournment of the debate was not agreed to, I deem it my duty to say that it would be about time for us to go back home and rest ourselves. Mr. Chairman, you ought to understand all the importance of the Bill now before us, and for this reason, it is absolutely necessary for the members who are called upon to discuss this Bill, to be fully prepared. In the first place, Mr. Chairman, we must spare our strengh, for we have more important measures which will soon be brought down, and I trust that the majority who hears me and the Minister of Public Works, will take into consideration the fact that the Opposition is not numerous, but that it is not lacking in importance, and that it is necessary at least to spare the health of its members. I believe it is their duty to note the fact that we are not all as strong as the Minister of Public Works, who enjoys very good health. That gentleman ought to consider that there are some among us who are weaker than he is and who have not the advantage of sleeping in their seats as he does, for I believe it is there he takes all his strength; he sleeps while the House is in Session. I believe this sitting has lasted long enough. We have been sitting for two days. I was here yesterday morning at about four o'clock when a motion similar to this was made. There was a long discussion, the Opposition offered to allow the adoption of the clause concerning persons. The Government in their wisdom, refused to do it. Well, are they better off to-day? Members of both sides of the House are tired out; for although the hon. gentlemen opposite have not said anything they also must feel tired. I believe the Government would do an act of justice by not compelling the House to sit permanently, and I trust that they will see their way of allowing this motion of adjournment to be adopted. I trust that they will not take advantage of their majority to kill the Opposition. For, after all, we are not having justice. If the hon. members opposite were willing to discuss as we do, we would then be on an equal footing, except that they would have the numbers in their favor. But, Mr. Chairman, you must have observed that they do not think it proper to reply to us, notwithstanding the fact that we have raised serious objections. The gentlemen who support the Government seem to think it unworthy of them to reply to us. I dare say, however, that there will be a tribunal before which they will be obliged to answer. It will be the people who will call them to account for their conduct. It is easy to see that it is not the Opposition who is obstructing, because yesterday morning we offered to allow this clause to be passed on condition that the House would adjourn, which was refused to us. We deem it our duty, as members of the Opposition, and as representatives of the people, to defend the interest of the people. We deem it our duty to stay in our seats to prevent the adoption of that measure, or at least to record our protest in order to show our people that we have done our utmost to prevent the passing of that iniquitous law. Mr. Chairman, this Bill is so monstrous that even those who are supporters of the Government are opposed to it to-day. We see that in the newspapers of the Province of Quebec. Take *La Verité* for instance, which says that it is an anti-social and anti-Conservative Bill, that it is too radical. The other newspapers say the same thing. *La Vérité* even says that all the bishops of the Province of Quebec are against that Bill. Mr. Chairman, if those who support the Government

in all other measures, think this Bill is anti-social and anti-Conservative; if the clergy pronounces against it, is not that a proof that its importance is such that the members should argue for or against it in the House? I believe that we could be more easily convinced than these gentlemen, if they give us good reasons in favor of the Bill. This measure is an innovation which uselessly changes an established state of things; which introduces in the electorate a new class of persons, and yet they will not deign to give us a word of explanation. One thing which shows that it is an innovation is, that the Indians who are not emancipated, as the negroes or white men, will have a right to vote, provided they submit to the conditions of the electoral law. Why should that difference be made in favor of the Indians? It is an injustice on the part of the Government. I believe I understand the reason of this—I may be mistaken—I believe I understand that the Government dare not to go back before their electors, and that they are compelled to create new voters for their own use. In the Bill which was introduced last year, it was proposed to manufacture new electors by means of the revisers. It was thought, at that time, that there might be danger to go before the people, and even before these electors which were to be manufactured by the revisers appointed by the Government. What are the Government doing to-day? They are calling the redmen to their aid. If the emancipated Indians were the only ones to be admitted to the right of suffrage, we could have nothing to say, for they ought to have the right to vote like ourselves. But why should we grant that right to those who are not emancipated, who have no right to hold property, who are under the paternal care of the Government, and fed by the Government? We are going to give the right to vote to persons who are to-day in arms against the country, who have rebelled against the country, and who are to-day killing our sons and our brothers. We are going to enfranchise people who are not civilised. I believe all these reasons are sufficient to compel us to oppose this measure. And it is bad policy on the part of the Government to keep us here, hour after hour, day after day, without having the right to adjourn, in order to force the adoption of this measure. If the Government adjourned this sitting to resume it on Monday, perhaps, Mr. Chairman, that they would succeed in passing this measure. But do they think that we will give up the fulfilment of our duty? No, Mr. Chairman, if it is needed we will die at our post, we will do like the noble soldiers under Leonidas, who defended the pass of the Thermopylae, and who, notwithstanding the fact that Xerxes' army could crush them as to numbers, stood faithfully to their post. Well, we will do the same thing, and the public will give us the credit of doing it. But at the same time the party who is now in power and who wishes to pass such a measure will be called to account. All we ask is a fair, honest and enlightened discussion; a discussion which will lay this Bill, just as it is, before the people; for, Mr. Chairman, we must not conceal from ourselves the fact that it is proposed to give the right to vote to people who are not civilised and refuse it to those who are civilised. For instance, an honest person who owns a property valued only at $149, an intelligent man, who works for the good of his country and to raise his family honestly, will not be entitled to vote. And yet this workingman, this intelligent man, when we have disturbances in the North-West, shoulders the musket to go and defend his country, and the right of suffrage will be denied to him. There is another numerous class of people in the Province of Quebec: the school teachers, who spend their lives in teaching and moralising the people; this Bill does not give them the right to vote, because their salary is not high enough. And yet this right is to be granted to an Indian, to a man who knows nothing about the principles of civil government; who cannot even be appointed municipal councillor; to a person who cannot be a witness in court and who cannot own a cent's worth of property in his own name. Mr. Chairman, the more we think of this subject, the more we are anxious to know the reasons which may have induced the First Minister to comprise this class of people in his Bill. For these people were not included in the Bills which he introduced in this House in 1883 and 1884. Why did the First Minister include them in his Bill? There are many suppositions. Several hon. members to whom I have spoken of this, and who have Indians in their counties, seem to have found out the reason. It is even said on this point that if the Bill is passed, the election of the hon. member for Brant will be endangered, but I do not believe that. Therefore, I say, that if that right is granted to people who are not civilised, the public will take notice of it, and the civilised people will vote for those who have stood up for their interests. What would you say, Mr. Chairman, if a redskin was in your place, or in the place of the Minister of Public Works, or in the place of the First Minister? If you give the right of suffrage to Indians, they may influence the election of members and cause laws to be passed which would shield them from punishment on account of their rebellion in the North-West. The motion of adjournment should be granted after this long sitting. We have done nothing during the first months of the Session, and now that it is drawing to an end, the Government bring down the Electoral Franchise Bill. We see in the newspapers that a measure concerning the Pacific Railway is to be submitted to us. We have before us a Bill on insolvency, and we are kept here losing our time and expending the public money. The Minister of Public Works laughs when I speak about public expenditure, but I fear that when he gives an account of his conduct to the people, he will not laugh quite so much. The public keeps his accounts; minor expenses are perhaps overlooked but the millions which the Government are spending uselessly are kept account of. I appeal to the Minister of Public Works to ask for an adjournment, because it is him I love best, and he appears to me to be willing to grant the motion. He is one of those who have ever been ready to do their duty; he is always ready to answer politely all questions that are put to him; in many respects he is very estimable; I know he belongs to a very good family; he is well-bred and I am sure that he will do the right thing for us. I do not agree with him on all questions, and on this question of electoral franchise I believe he is a little too radical, and that he is supporting a measure which is anti-social and anti-Conservative. If we adjourn now the Minister of Public Works will have time to reconsider the Bill, and he will probably see his way in advising the First Minister to amend it or withdraw it for the present Session, in order to secure the adoption of more important measures. I will not say any more for I think I see in the eyes of the Minister of Public Works that the motion of adjournment will be adopted, and with that hope I shall resume my seat.

Mr. IRVINE. It is the custom of this country to make a short day on Saturday in order to be prepared for Sabbath. It has been the custom of this House from its conception not to hold a session on Saturday. Why that rule has been departed from in the present case I fail to understand. During the first month this House sat only 65 hours; and now when three months have elapsed we are kept here day after day, and night after night. I cannot tell for what purpose. I feel very unwell. I cannot tell whether the reason of my feeling unwell is being kept here constantly day and night, but I find there are many other hon. members who are also unwell. When there are only 40 or 50 present out of 200 members of the House there is evidently something wrong. What applies to me with respect to keeping the Sabbath day does not, I fear, apply

to the Ministers, except perhaps to the Catholic members. If I am informed correctly, it is very seldom some of the Ministers are ever seen in places of worship. This should not be so. If this country is to prosper and to be honored by Him who honors all nations who serve him, we should have respect to the ordinances of the Sabbath. I do not understand why the Government should have wasted one month at the opening of Parliament, and only kept the House sitting during 65 hours, if it is necessary to carry through a measure such as that now under discussion. Now, Sir, I have no interest in this squabble, for this reason: that the Government cannot enact a law, nor can they appoint a revising officer, that can make any change in the constituency I represent; and if they wiped the whole Liberal vote out of my county I am confident, and have the best reason to believe, that the Conservatives of that county would not send a man to this House to support the present Administration. I have received letters from my Conservative constituents, stating that they condemned the wasteful policy of the Government as well as the Liberals. There is in my county an earnest love of country. It has been said that some of the people of New Brunswick are annexationists, that they would like to see the Confederation, which we established in 1867, thrown to the winds. I can tell you, Sir, that if that feeling exists in my county, and it does to some extent, it is owing to the way in which the affairs of the country have been mismanaged. I have the best possible reason to believe that both Conservatives and Liberals in my county have no other intention than to build solidly and well the foundation laid in 1867; but, remember, if that foundation is shaken, if the structure is rent, it will be the fault of the gentlemen who have been governing this country for the last few years. I am surprised, in view of the way we have been treated, that the east and the west are not at each other's throats, as well as the Indians in the North-West. It is a matter of surprise to me, because our people have been dealt with most unjustly, the Government of this country have not kept their obligations with the people of the Maritime Provinces any more than they have with the Indians. Now, I think the Government ought to give us an adjournment so that we may be prepared to keep the approaching Sabbath day. Sir, we ought to have an adjournment so that we may be able to keep awake to-morrow when we go to church, so that we may be prepared to worship the Most High and not go to sleep in our pews. Well, in reference to enfranchising the Indians, I care very little about it. I am not particular whether you enfranchise all the men, women and children, so far as it will affect my county. What the people of my county want, both Tory and Liberal, is an economical Government. I would be in favor of universal suffrage if that system would elevate the character of our Government, morally and intellectually. I think when the Government wasted the first month of the Session and kept Parliament working only 65 hours, I think this is a criminal act. I do not know but that hon. gentlemen opposite should be indicted when the constitutions of hon. gentlemen are being broken down. It is an offense against the person, against every principle of right and justice.

Mr. FLEMING. I have not had an opportunity of expressing my views upon the question now before the Chair, The matter, however, is of such importance—it is so great an innovation upon the electoral franchise of the country, that I do not think I could justify myself before my constituents if I did not express my protest, and the reasons for my protest, against the proposed enfranchisement of the Indians of this country. If it was an enfranchisement of the Indians in the true sense of the word, in the sense known to the Indian Act, then there is no one who would give it a more hearty support than I would. But this is no enfranchisement of the Indians. The purpose is not to emancipate the Indians from the disabilities under under which they lie by the law of the land. The purpose is not to give them any rights they do not now enjoy as other free-born British subjects do. The purpose is not to put upon them the responsibilities of free-born British subjects. The purpose is not simply to give Indians votes. The purpose is to enable some one to vote in the Indian's name. The purpose is to enable those that control the Indians under the statute law of Parliament, by the Superintendent-General and his officers in the various constituencies, to strengthen the Government. That is the purpose, and that alone is the purpose of this Bill. The purpose is not only to do that, but to strike a blow at some hon. members sitting in this House. It is to enable the Government to take into their hands a number of votes of persons who are dependent upon and who are subject to their control, the votes not of free men but of those who are less than minors under them in the eyes of the law, who are under tutelage and who are under the guardianship and control of the First Minister, to use those votes in the different constituencies in order that some members now sitting here by the free votes of free born British people shall not be enabled to be returned to this House. We know that is the purpose. We have only to look to the past. We know that previous to the elections of 1882 a similar attempt was made to exclude hon. members now sitting in this House and others who were then sitting from the possibility of returning here as representatives of the people. We know that the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) was one of those struck at by that Act, who was singled out for the purpose of being excluded, if possible, from his place in Parliament. Is it because that hon. gentleman does not ornament this House? Is it because his talents are not creditable to this body? Is it because his character is such as to render it desirable that he should be excluded from this House? His character is such that he is held in high esteem not only by members of this side of the House but by hon. gentlemen opposite and by the general public, not only in his own Province but in the whole Dominion. It is not then because of his character that an attempt is made to exclude him. Is there any other reason why it was intended by the Gerrymander Act to deal a blow at the hon. member for South Brant. There is not a man in this House who dare rise and declare what was the true intent and purpose of that Act of 1882. But that Act failed in its operation. The hon. member had two townships with large Reform majorities taken away from his constituency and had a Tory township added. He was thus placed in the minority of several hundred votes; but the people of his constituency knew his worth too well, admired his talents too much, and possessed too much patriotism to allow him to be defeated. Hon. gentlemen opposite were thus disappointed in their purpose, and the hon. member for Brant sits here to represent a constituency that was gerrymandered by hon. gentlemen opposite an honor to the people who have honored him with their confidence. But he is not to escape. There is a large Indian reservation within the constituency which the hon. gentleman represents, and if hon. gentlemen opposite failed to carve up the constituency and cannot add a sufficient number of Tory townships, then there is another way by which they hope to effect their purpose, and it is by giving votes to the Indians on the reservation in that county.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman himself wanted to have that done.

Mr. FLEMING. I will return to that point in a moment, and will show what the hon. gentleman said. The purpose of the Government is manifest. If it was to give men who are free a voice in the election of members there would be no objection raised. But it is not to give free men the franchise. The right hon. gentleman knows that if he had done

what the hon. member for Brant wanted him to do, namely, to have made the Indians free men, not under the control of the right hon. gentleman and his agents, they would have had votes in that constituency. But the right hon. gentleman refused to do what the hon. member for Brant asked. Here is what the hon. member for Brant said, in 1880, on the debate on the Indian Act:

"Then the Bill does not provide for the enfranchisement of the Indians. According to them the rights, responsibilities and privileges of citizens is, I think, the only solution of the Indian question, more especially the only solution which affects the more advanced tribes, on whose behalf and with respect to whose circumstances I am more particularly acquainted. Any change that has been made in the law is only in the direction of still more firmly fastening the shackles of tutelege upon them, a change tending to keep the Indians in their present condition. I speak on behalf of three thousand Indians, among whom six missionaries have been laboring for the past thirty years, and who have twelve public schools and an industrial institute. The solution of the Indian problem can only be found in wiping out the distinction which exists between the races, in giving the red man all the liberties and rights enjoyed by the white man, and entailing upon him all the responsibilities which attach to those rights and privileges."

The views expressed by the hon. member for Brant in 1880 are his views in 1885. The hon. gentleman who introduced into this House the Gerrymander Act of 1882, in order to defeat a number of members of this House, will not be slow to exercise the influence he possesses over those Indians in order to carry out the purposes of this Bill. Sir, in no language that would be parliamentary could I fitly express my indignation at this attempt to decapitate a number of the prominent gentlemen on this side of the House. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), though elected by a majority of the people in his constituency, was deprived of his seat in this House during the first Session of this Parliament and a large portion of the second Session, owing to an alteration the Government made in the law so as to give them the appointment of the returning officer, and another hon. gentleman was sitting and voting here during that time in support of hon. gentlemen opposite. My hon. friend is now to have his head cut off through the operation of this Bill. The free-born British electors of the county of Bothwell may elect him, and no doubt they will; but the Indians of his constituency, many of whom can neither read or write, are to receive votes, and such of them as are under the control of the Superintendent-General are to be enabled to exclude my hon. friend from his seat in this House. I am amazed that any men could be found to stand up and support an attempt so gross to violate the rights and privileges of the free people of this country, and to hand those rights and privileges over to those who control the votes of persons who are not free. But the measure itself is only worse than the way in which it is attempted to be pushed through this House. Last Monday the hon. Prime Minister came into the House and declared that this Bill should be put through at the expense of all other public business. That was a declaration worthy of the patriotism which the hon. gentleman boasts of! Is this a measure demanded by the public interest? Have we not for 18 years existed peacefully in this Confederation without this measure? Has there been a demand from any section of the people for it? Is any public interest to be served by the passage of this measure? If public interest means the party interest of hon. gentlemen opposite, I can understand that there is. But there is no public interest at stake in connection with it; it is a party measure and a party measure only. It is a measure introduced for the purpose of preparing for the next general election. It is a measure intended to stifle if possible the public opinion which is now running strongly against hon. gentlemen opposite. And yet the hon. gentleman came down and said that all public business must be put aside until this measure is carried through! The interests of the country might suffer, the credit of the country might suffer, the Government might not have the money necessary to carry on the public affairs of the country; but all these considerations were to be set aside in order to have this measure pushed through in the interest of the party the hon. gentleman leads. On Thursday this House met, and is still in Session. The definition of the word "occupant" was under consideration until about six o'clock on that evening, when the definition of the word "person" came under consideration, and the hon. member for Bothwell moved the amendment that is still under discussion, proposing to limit the word "Indian" to the enfranchised Indian. After eight o'clock the hon. leader of the Opposition made an address to the House at considerable length in opposition to the Government's proposal; the hon. Prime Minister himself followed at some length; and at the hour of 10 o'clock what did we see? We saw hon. gentlemen opposite come into this Chamber with pillows, which they ostentatiously shook in our faces in order to show us that they had come here determined to sit us out, and to push this Bill through at unseasonable hours. Did we not see couches carried into various rooms of this House early on Thursday? Did we not see every indication that the Government intended that this prolonged session should take place before it did take place? And yet we are told that we are responsible for this long session—we who are not provided with all these luxuries, and who are so weak in numbers. It is too thin, and the country will tell them that it is too thin! Hon. gentlemen opposite provided themselves with all the comforts that they could command. They retired for refreshments from time to time; they brought bands of music into the building for two nights; they had their dances going on to keep up the amusement. We have no such enjoyments; we had no couches in the rooms of the building to which we could retire; we had no band of music at our command to enliven the small hours of the morning; and yet this small Opposition are occupying the same position that they did at six o'clock on Thursday, and not one step of progress has been made by hon. gentlemen opposite in their attempt to carry this Bill through the House. Sir, it ill becomes the hon. gentlemen on that side of the House to talk about obstruction—hon. gentlemen who came in here with their beds at 10 o'clock on Thursday night, for the purpose of trying to push the Bill through at such unreasonable hours. Sir, it was an attempt on their part to bully the Opposition, but an attempt which the free men on this side of the House resented with the indignation with which free men always resent an attempt upon their liberties.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Encore.

Mr. FLEMING. I am glad to see that hon. gentlemen are giving us some attention; perhaps we will yet be able to convince some of them of the iniquity of this measure. I do not suppose the hon. member for Hastings (Mr. White) will be subject to conversion, because he has an Indian reservation in his county.

Mr. WHITE. I was here before you, without it.

Mr. FLEMING. Yes, and by a mighty close squeeze.

Mr. WHITE. I will squeeze here when you will not be able.

Mr. FLEMING. The hon. gentleman has a band of Indians in his county——

Mr. WHITE Yes, and a good one, too.——

Mr. FLEMING—subject to the control of the Prime Minister.

Mr. WHITE. They are as independent as you are, and as intelligent.

Mr. FLEMING. They are the wards of the Government. They are not free men in the sense that we are free men, nor have they the rights or the liabilities that white people have. They are subject to the control of the First Minis-

ter and his servants, and the hon. gentleman knows that the small majority he got at the last election is of such a doubtful character that he urged the First Minister to give votes to these Indians, hoping they will send him back, and hence he laughs.

Mr. WHITE. I got elected to this House independently of the First Minister and independently of the hon. member for East York, and I can get elected to-morrow independently of them.

Mr. FLEMING. The hon. gentleman will be sure of being elected when he gets the Indian vote, and that makes him laugh.

Mr. WHITE. Cannot I laugh?

Mr. FLEMING. Yes, the hon. gentleman has good reason to laugh, though his laugh is not as musical as some I have heard.

Mr. WHITE. You would give a good many dollars if you could laugh as heartily as I can.

Mr. FLEMING. Hon. gentlemen do not seem to know the difference between enfranchising the Indians under the Indian Act, and making them voters under the present Bill. Why are the words "including Indians" put in this paragraph of the interpretation clause? Why are they necessary? The First Minister asked facetiously the other night: Is not an Indian a person? But if an Indian were a person in the eye of the law, these words would not be necessary, for, under the Indian Act, an Indian is "a male of Indian blood reputed to belong to a particular band." It defines a person to be "an individual other than an Indian," hence the necessity for the First Minister to include the Indian specifically. The word "person" includes colored men, it includes Englishmen, Irishmen, Germans and other classes, but it does not include Indians, and hence the wording of this paragraph. These bands are settled on reservations in different parts of the Dominion. The First Minister said the other night in reply to a question, that certainly it was intended to give the right to vote to Indians on reservations, and he said it was intended also to give the Indians in Manitoba, the North-West and British Columbia, the right to vote. He was asked if Poundmaker and Pie-a-Pot would be included in this Bill, and he said: Certainly they would, and he volunteered the information that Scratch-him-on-the-back would also be included. Is the country ready to adopt so radical a change as that in the electoral law? When the hon. gentleman introduced his Bill on previous occasions he did not include such a proposition; this is the first time he ventures to propose that the Indians under his own control shall have votes. Why has he introduced it this year? Is it not because since that time there is a tide bearing against the hon. gentleman and his party, from one end of this Dominion to the other, that will sweep them at the polls, if the free voice of the people is allowed to express itself—will sweep them from the power which they have been exercising for years to the detriment of this country.

An hon. MEMBER. What evidence is there of that?

Mr. FLEMING. No more evidence is needed than the proposal included in this Bill to give votes to those Indians who are under the hon. gentleman's control and tutelage. The hon. gentleman tells us he intends that the Bill shall include Poundmaker, and Yellow Quill, and Pie-a-pot, and all those other worthies who are now exciting the admiration of the free people of this country! Are the people of this country prepared for such an innovation on the law, that the controlling influence in many of the constituencies shall be in the hands of the Indians subject to the control of the First Minister? A more monstrous proposition was never made to any Parliament, and the party must be hard driven who have to take such a position. Enfranchise Poundmaker, whose hands are reeking with the blood of our free people in the North-West! Enfranchise Pie-a-pot, whose band are now threatening to scalp the white settlers in the neighborhood of Qu'Appelle! There is no language that we can possibly use, Parliamentary or otherwise, which will properly characterise the infamy of such a proposition. The hon. gentleman said he was only following Mr. Mowat, and that hon. gentlemen on this side are admirers of Mr. Mowat. When he said that we on this side admire Mr. Mowat, he spoke the truth, although he speaks it rarely. But the hon. gentleman, in saying that he followed in the steps of Mr. Mowat, is not correct. We admire and respect Mr. Mowat; we know his ability, and we know his knowledge of constitutional law from several cases which have occurred in recent years. By his law he gave those Indians who are free men the right to exercise the franchise, and if the right hon. gentleman had declared that he would have accepted Mr. Mowat's Bill, there would be no discussion; or if he had accepted the measure proposed by the hon. member for Algoma, in the direction of Mr. Mowat's Bill, there would have been no discussion on this subject. But the hon. gentleman does not intend to follow Mr. Mowat because he is incapable of following him, because his purposes are not the same as those of Mr. Mowat, because he does not intend to include merely the free Indians, but the thousands of Indians who are scattered over this Dominion, who are subject to his control, who have not the rights or liberties or the liabilities of free born people—these are the reasons that we are here protesting against such a measure as this. The hon. gentleman says the country will hold us responsible for the obstruction we are offering. Well, Sir, I am prepared in my constituency to assume all the responsibility of obstructing such an infamous proposition. The people in the country will say that we would be justified in anything we can do, in order to retain the franchise in the hands of those who are free to exercise it; they will justify us if we stand here all summer, day and night, in resisting the hon. gentleman's attempt to stifle free discussion in this House. The people of this country who have sons and daughters and brothers and sisters scattered over the North-West subject to the rage of Poundmaker, whom the hon. gentleman intends to enfranchise; subject to the terror of Pie-a-Pot, to whom he intends to give a vote—I say the people of this country will praise the patriotic band who are determined to resist this attempt on the part of the Government. I would have felt myself recreant to the duty I owe my constituents and my country, I would have gone from this city ashamed of myself if I had not raised my voice against so monstrous a proposition as that. The hon. gentleman says he is following Mr. Mowat. If he had followed Mr. Mowat's advice during the last few years, he would have occupied a higher position in the estimation of the people of this country than he does to-day. If he would follow Mr. Mowat in enfranchising free Indians, he would received the support instead of the condemnation of this side of the House. I have said that hon. gentlemen opposite do not understand the difference between an enfranchised Indian and one to whom the right to vote is given. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not read the Indian Act. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) the other night, in reading the extract from the speech of my hon. friend from South Brant in 1880, to which I have referred, fell into that error. He knew nothing whatever of the subject he was attempting to discuss and to become witty upon; and the hon. gentlemen about him who were applauding did not know what they were applauding, or they would not have made such a public exhibition of their ignorance. An enfranchised Indian is one who has the rights of citizenship conferred upon him, and is no longer subject to the tutelage of the Superintendent-General; but it is not upon the free and responsible Indian that the vote is intended to be conferred by this Bill. The purpose

of this Bill is not to enlarge the rights of the Indians, or to make them more free than they are to-day. If the Indians were free, like the white people of this country, the hon. gentleman would not be so anxious to push this measure through. It is because they are so completely under the control of the Prime Minister as their Superintendent-General that he and his supporters are so anxious to push this measure through, for they know that with the machinery the hon. gentleman possesses he can to a large extent control the votes of these people. Am I wrong in saying that the Indian is not a free man, subject to the same liabilities as other citizens of this country? Sir, the law of the land is as plain as daylight; and if hon. gentlemen opposite would only read that law under a sense of the responsibility that they owe to the people they represent they would rise *en masse* and declare that the hon. First Minister should not push this measure a step further. Let us go to the law, and see what is the difference between the enfranchised Indian and the Indian to whom it is proposed to give the vote. The enfranchised Indian is an Indian to whom letters patent have been issued. They must be issued with the approval of the Indian Superintendent General. By the Indian Act:

"(*j*). The expression 'enfranchised Indian' means any Indian, his wife or minor unmarried child, who has received letters patent granting to him in fee simple any portion of the reserve which has been allotted to him or to his wife and minor children, by the band to which he belongs, or any unmarried Indian who has received letters patent for an allotment of the reserve."

And section 88 declares the effect of such letters patent, as follows:—

"From the date of such letters patent the provisions of this Act and of any Act or law making any distinction between the legal rights, privileges, disabilities and liabilities of Indians and those of Her Majesty's other subjects, shall cease to apply to such Indian, or to the wife or minor unmarried children of such Indian as aforesaid, so declared to be enfranchised, who shall no longer be deemed Indians within the meaning of the laws relating to Indians, except in so far as regards their right to participate in the annuities and interest moneys, and rents and councils of the band to which they belonged."

Now, I proceed to prove from the Indian Act that these men, to whom it is proposed by this Bill to give the highest right that belongs to a free people, are not free; and we intend that hon. gentlemen opposite shall stay here until we have given them a full opportunity of knowing the full extent of the responsibility they will incur from passing this measure when they go before the people for their verdict. I will read a few sections of the Act to show the subservient position these Indians occupy under the first Minister as Superintendent General. While an Indian lives he has no control over any of his property or his private affairs; and when he dies, he cannot make a will like other people. After the Indian is dead, the Superintendent General does not cease to exercise his influence over him, though it will not perhaps be from that elevated position from which the hon. First Minister said he expected to look down upon the Canadian Pacific Railway. He may make a will, but section 20 declares:

"Provided the said will, after his death, is consented to by the band owning the said reserve, and approved of by the Superintendent General."

Then by section 30:

"The Governor in Council may make such regulations as, from time to time, seem advisable for prohibiting or regulating the sale, barter, exchange or gift, by any band or irregular band of Indians, or by any Indian of any band or irregular band, in the Province of Manitoba, the North-West Territories or the District of Keewatin, of any grain or root crops, or other produce grown upon any Indian reserve in the Province of Manitoba, the North-West Territories or the District of Keewatin; and may further provide that such sale, barter, exchange or gift shall be null and void, unless the same are made in accordance with regulations made in that behalf."

These are the people who are to be entrusted with the franchise—people who have not the right to buy and sell their own bread, unless in accordance with the regulations of the Government. They are not free to sell in the open market, and more than that, no man is free to buy from them.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Where is that.

Mr. FLEMING. That is on the reserves of Manitoba, Keewatin, and the North-West Territories, as I have already stated.

Mr. WHITE. They have the right to buy and sell in Ontario.

Mr. FLEMING, I will read the clause again (quotation).

Mr. HESSON. I myself have witnessed the Indians in Manitoba selling fruit and other articles on the trains. I would ask if such a regulation was ever made.

Mr. FLEMING. The hon. gentleman is feeling uneasy. I know he has been in the North-West.

Mr. HESSON. I have asked a simple question, will you answer it?

Mr. FLEMING. The hon. gentleman does not know the statute law of the country. Have I not been reading the law on the subject?

Mr. HESSON. I ask if the order was passed, read it again?

Mr. FLEMING. I would have to read it one hundred and twenty times for the hon. gentleman to understand it. That is the trouble; they have no apprehension of what the law is, and though we may read, and expound, they are the blind who will not see. No one is free to buy from these Indians; by sub-section 2:

"Every person who buys or otherwise acquires from any such Indian or band, or irregular band of Indians, any such grain, root crops or other produce, contrary to any such regulations, shall, on summary conviction before a stipendiary magistrate, police magistrate, or two justices of the peace, or an Indian agent, be liable to a penalty not exceeding one hundred dollars, or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months, or to both."

The hon. gentleman for Perth (Mr. Hesson) asked me if any regulation had been passed with reference to this Act, and we know it was only the other day that the Government received petitions from some Indians in the North-West asking that they might be permitted to sell their surplus produce.

Mr. HESSON. That was the North-West and not Manitoba.

Mr. FLEMING. The same Act applies, and the same control is exercised over the Indians all over the Dominion. I will now quote section 72:

"The Superintendent General may stop the payment of the annuity and interest money of any Indian who is proved, to the satisfaction of the Superintendent General, guilty of deserting his family; and the Superintendent General may apply the same towards the support of any family, woman or child, so deserted."

The hon. gentleman said the other night that he was only in the position of a trustee, but I would ask what trustee has any right to withhold the moneys in his trust, at his own discretion. The hon. gentleman is not a trustee, but he is in the position of a father with reference to the Indians; they are minors and children under him, and we know the hon. gentleman too well to expect that he will withhold annuities from those who vote in favor of the Tory candidate, or that he will be too liberal with those who would have the temerity to vote for the Liberal candidate. I will now read section 74.——

Mr. SPROULE. Question.

Mr. FLEMING. The hon. gentleman says "question."

Mr. SPROULE. It is not the Indian Act we are now discussing.

Mr. FLEMING. Is it possible that we are speaking to people who do not understand the subject before the House?

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has been reading clauses of the Indian Act, and I ask whether that is pertinent to the question or not.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think it is relevant to the question.

Mr. FLEMING. I was proceeding to refer to another disability of the Indians when the hon. gentleman interrupted me with a point of Order which must have amazed every hon. member in this House. Sir, you can see the necessity of this long discussion. Hon. gentleman do not yet understand what subject is before the House. How is it to be expected that we can enlighten the ordinary people of the country, that they will understand the effect of this Bill, when an hon. member sitting in this House and listening to the discussion, has not got the slightest comprehension of the matter before the Chair. We must go on. There is a public necessity for us to go on. The interest of the people demand that we should go on for we cannot permit hon. gentlemen sitting in this House to remain in blissful ignorance of the matter before the Chair.

Mr. SPROULE. Give us information.

Mr. FLEMING. Why, Sir, I am burning with the desire to give him information; I am overflowing with the milk of human kindness in the way of information. If the hon. gentleman will point out to me any way in which I can make him understand that we are discussing the right of the Indian to vote, I am willing to devote myself for a month or two during the summer in endeavoring to convey information to him. I trust I shall not require so long a time with other hon. gentlemen as with the hon. member for Grey; I trust that his case is unique.

Mr. SPROULE. Your success has not been very great yet.

Mr. FLEMING. If it has not, it has not been from the weakness of our efforts or the lack of necessity for them, but is rather owing to the material we are working upon. Perhaps I may now quote section 74:

"The Superintendent General may, whenever sick or disabled or aged or destitute Indians are not provided for by the band of which they are members, furnish sufficient aid from the funds of the band for the relief of such sick, disabled, aged or destitute Indians."

From this it appears that the whole fund is at the disposal of the Superintendent General, who is not responsible for its disposition to the Indians owning the fund, but only to Parliament; he can distribute to whom he likes —to the sick, the destitute, the lame, the halt, and the blind, as he thinks proper. And these are the persons to whom the hon. gentleman proposes to give the franchise! The Indian is not subject to the same laws as the white people of this Dominion; and yet the Government are endeavoring to push through a Bill, the sole purpose of which is to give them control over a large number of the votes of those people who are not free, in order that they may swamp the voice of the free people of this country, and in order that the honest verdict of the people may not be recorded against them. That is the kind of a measure that the Government are trying to force through by physical power, not by force of intellect. Sir, they have failed; they must fail; in a free country like this, it is impossible that an attempt of this kind can succeed. We on this side of the House are not physically strong, and we are less in number than they are; but what physical strength and intellectual power remains to a free man on this side of the House he would be unworthy to possess if he did not exercise to the full extent to prevent the Administration from introducing into the electorate of this country an element so dangerous to the peace and welfare of the whole people of this Dominion. Sir, what are the rights that as free men we boast of? What are the rights that have been handed down to us by illustrious ancestors? They are the rights of free men, the right of owning our own property, and controlling our own affairs; and are those rights to be interfered with by a class who have no such rights? Is the voice of the free and independent electors of the noble county of Peel, which I have the honor to represent, to become ineffective because some gentleman is to be elected by the votes of those who are not free? Sir, speaking for myself individually, feeling the responsibility of the position I occupy, feeling that the honor of a free people has been entrusted to me to vindicate in this House, feeling that my own sense of honor, my own sense of patriotism, my own sense of self-respect, demand that I should resist the oppressive measure that is now being forced through Parliament, I declare before this House and before the country, feeling the full responsibility of what I am saying, that I will continue, with all the powers with which God has endowed me, either intellectual or physical, to resist this encroachment upon the rights of the free people of this country—this endeavor to stifle their voice in the councils of this country by the voice of those who are not free, but are subject to the control of the Government of the day.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). The important question that has been discussed by this House for 50 hours now is such that I think every gentleman who has the honor to occupy a seat here should express his opinion upon it. It is a question which, as has been well said by the previous speaker, affects the freedom of the entire people of this Dominion. The measure before us is one which strikes at the root of all the liberties we as British subjects possess—liberties which have been handed down to us by those who in other fields of action had to spend their blood to secure them. The question has been fully and ably discussed by the hon. gentlemen who occupy seats on this side of the House, and I will be as brief as possible in anything that I may have to present on this occasion. The first consideration that strikes me in connection with this measure is the course the Government have pursued in introducing it. We have the hon. the First Minister coming down and introducing it at a late period of the Session, and we have his declaration that it would be taken up and put through before any other measure should be considered. We have the declaration of hon. gentlemen opposite that they came here to attempt to stifle discussion—to cry down the voices of the independent representatives of the people who occupy seats on this side of the House. We know what their conduct was which commenced on Monday and terminated on Tuesday night. We know that they indulged in the most unseemly noises; we know that they occupied themselves, not in endeavoring to comprehend the question before the House, but in indulging in noises that would disgrace the most disgraceful house in the city of Ottawa. They refused to hear the opinions of men sent here to express the opinion of the people, on this important question. But what a change has come over the scene! They found that their ribaldry, their songs of merriment and their disorderly conduct would not do. They found that this noble band that sits on this side of the House, though small in number, were determined that they would not be put down in this free House, elected by the free will of the people of this Dominion. They held a caucus, and the fiat went out from the leader of the Government that silence was henceforth to be the order of the day, and at the next session of the House we saw that their course was changed. They came here with their pillows, and went to sleep within the sound of the voices of the speakers who were discussing this question; they provided themselves with beds and couches; and a gentleman who ought to know better, a man who has occupied a seat, not only in this House, but in the Local House of Ontario, was actually engaged in dancing the Highland fling, while this important measure was being

discussed in Parliament. An hon. gentleman beside me asks who were the drunken crowd.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order, order.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. He asked me. The hon. member for East Grey asks who were the drunken crowd. I could tell who were the drunken crowd, but I will not do so; perhaps he knows. But that there was a drunken crowd, I am prepared to say; I will not say whether it was in this House or out of it. I believe I might say there were some in this House.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to insinuate that hon. members were disorderly or drunk in this House? If he has made use of such an expression. I must ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. All right; I will withdraw it.

Mr. BOWELL. Or I will insist upon its being taken down.

Mr. MACKENZIE. If it is to be taken down, it must be done immediately after it is said.

Mr. BOWELL. I was not interrupting the Chairman while he was speaking.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is perfectly right that this expression should be taken down, because it will go to the country through the press. Insinuations are made about men who do not drink a drop of spirituous liquors of any kind, and I think it is time we should understand whether such falsehoods should go to the country or not.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he knew of hon. gentlemen in this House being drunk. If he said that, I would ask him to withdraw the expression.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant.) I did not say that. Now, I was going to say, Mr. Chairman ——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman will mind the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I understood that I complied with the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I did not understand so.

Some hon. MEMBERS. He withdrew.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. As I was going on to say, there are some remarkable things in this discussion which are worthy of being noted. A good deal of ability has been displayed by some men on the other side of the House on previous occasions in discussing questions in the interest of the Government. How is it that there is this perfect silence on this particular question? We all know that it is a very difficult matter for the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) to keep his seat when discussions are going on here; but he has maintained perfect silence during the whole of this discussion. We all know that it is very difficult for the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) to keep his tongue quiet in this House; but he has been perfectly silent. We all know that the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has frequently discussed questions before this House; we all know his eloquence and ability as a pleader before the Privy Council in Great Britain; but how is it that with all his learning and education, he has not opened his mouth to take part in this debate? We all know that the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott) is an important member of this House; we all know the legal lore which he brings to bear upon the discussion of legal points that occasionally come under the consideration of the House. Why has he been silent? Why has the melodious voice of the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin), the Surgeon General of the Government—whose eloquent tones in introducing the Factory Bill thrilled the whole House—not been heard on this important measure? We want to know why the hon. Minister of Agriculture has kept silent; he might have told us at least that "there ain't nothing to it;" but he has kept his seat. We want to know why the hon. member for King's, New Brunswick (Mr. Foster), the silver-tongued orator from the shores of the foamy Atlantic, has kept his tongue quiet? We want to know why the hon. member for Kings', Nova Scotia (Mr. Woodworth), who at one time had a gravel pit that cost this country $9,000, has maintained silence? We want to know why the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), who stands in the front rank, always ready to defend whatever the Government brings under the notice of this House, has remained silent? Why do not those members who come from the Pacific slope raise their voices in defence of this measure? Why have we not heard from the member for Victoria, B.C. (Mr. Shakespeare), the descendent of our own immortal Shakespeare? and from the member for New Westminster (Mr. Homer), whose name is historic, and whose namesake of ancient times was famous for his erudition and poetic eloquence? And why is my hon. friend from Hamilton silent? We want to know where the other member for Hamilton is, on this occasion. Then the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has not said anything, and we all know he is so eloquent that, when he rises to address the House, he at once clears the reporters' gallery, because his eloquence is so strong that they cannot stand the pressure.

Mr. SPROULE. You were asleep in the smoking room when I addressed the House.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. No, Sir, the noble band on this side of the House have not been asleep, when they were on the post of duty. We have been working to uphold the dearest rights ever given to the electors of this country, and we have not had time to sleep. Hon. gentlemen opposite are the men who have slept at their post of duty, and I tell them that the electors will take them to task for their neglect of duty. But I would like to ask why the gentlemen on the Ministerial side have been silent so long, after the row we had on Monday or Tuesday last. It must have been that the order went forth that they were to maintain silence, in the hope that the Opposition would become exhausted and that they would be able to force this obnoxious and iniquitous measure through the House, without an opportunity for its discussion. I have understood, and I believe it to be the fact, that many of the men who sit in the House in dumb silence, are not aware of the provisions of this Bill, and many of them have stated that it is not the intention to enfranchise the tribal Indians—the savages of the plains. And yet we have been told by the First Minister that when the North-West is divided into Provinces these Indians on the reservations will have votes. I cannot conceive of a more outrageous proposition that could be presented to this House, or such an outrage upon the public opinion of this country—as that these Indians, from whose depredations the North-West is now suffering, should be enfranchised—men who have already shed the blood of some of the best of our sons who have gone up there to maintain law and order in that country. We all know that there are mourning hearts throughout this Dominion at the present time, for the loss of life which has taken place there, and now we have the audacious proposition of the Prime Minister that these Indians shall have votes, while this Bill does not give the franchise to the men who are quelling the insurrection there. We are ready to give the vote to Indians who are properly enfranchised under the Indian Act; we wish to see the Indians elevated and educated so as to become fit subjects of Her Majesty and of the Dominion. This is what

is being done under the provisions of Mr. Mowat's Bill, and the right hon. gentleman was not correct when he said he was following in Mr. Mowat's footsteps. What is the object of the Bill? We all know that the Indians in the North-West are taking the scalps of the white people there, and this Bill is for the purpose of scalping Reform members who have seats in this House. The hon. gentleman is after their scalps in a cowardly fashion. I say this is not manly warfare—it is Indian warfare in the truest sense. It is just possible that the hon. gentleman in giving these Indians votes is providing a place for himself, or other members of his Government who may be defeated in their constituencies, at the next general election. What a glorious representative the Indians of the North-West would have in the person of the leader of the Government! It would be a soft place to secure his election, because the hon. gentleman could compel these Indians to vote as he pleased; and no doubt they would be delighted to hail as their representative the man who has been decorated with the tawdry tinsel given him by the mother country; he would make a noble chieftain to lead them out in the plains of the great North-West, or in this Parliament. I believe that this measure is being passed with the same purpose and intent which actuated the right hon. gentleman when he passed the Gerrymander Bill, and when he obtained money from Sir Hugh Allan to corrupt the electors of this Dominion. He knows that there are constituencies in Ontario and in the other Provinces which can be affected by the Indian vote, and he hopes to attack the seats of hon. members on this side of the House, or to secure the seats of his own supporters, by influencing that class of voters. But, Sir, I believe that there is an over-ruling Providence in the affairs of this country as well as in the affairs of all other nations. I believe there is a limit to the corruption which a Government may pursue, and to the tactics they may adopt in the direction of perverting the free will of the people. I believe there is a time coming when they can go no further, and I believe that time will come when the next general election will take place. I believe that the next House will be composed of men who will represent the free and independent electors of Canada—men who will come here untrammelled and unfettered, and who will not sit behind the leader of any Government, and back him up in solemn silence in anything he attempts. I am satisfied that just now the people are being aroused with regard to this matter, from one end of the Dominion to the other. I am satisfied that they are being roused to the highest pitch of indignation, as is shown by the letters which pour in upon us from every part of the Dominion.

The committee rose.

ABSENCE OF THE SPEAKER.

THE CLERK. I have to inform the House that I have received a letter from Mr. Speaker, in which he asked me to inform the House of his unavoidable absence during this sitting, in consequence of the serious illness of a member of his family.

It being six o'clock, the Deputy Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into committee on the Franchise Bill.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). When the House rose I was stating that the people were aroused at the enormity of the attempt which was being made to subvert their rights, and the Opposition are comforted and strengthened by the letters and telegrams which are coming to them from all directions, encouraging them to make further efforts to prevent this legislation from being placed on the Statute Book. The subject is almost an inexhaustible one; we have debated it for a week at a serious disadvantage, by reason of the silence of the Government and their supporters—I say the subject is almost inexhaustible and we might debate for weeks upon this one word "Indian." I find by the report on Indian Affairs that there are 131,952 Indians in the Dominion. I shall make a few quotations from this report, in order to show that these Indians, except such as have been properly enfranchised, are not men who should have the power to vote. Is it proper that these Indians, who live on the bounty of the people of this country, who are paupers, who are regarded by the law as incapable of regulating their own affairs, should be entitled by their votes to swamp the votes of the free and independent people of this country? I say no greater outrage was ever attempted to be perpetrated in the Dominion of Canada. Why not pass an Act of Parliament at once, to say that the agent of the Government on every Indian reserve in the country shall have power to cast the votes of all the Indians in the reserve for whatever candidate he sees fit. It would be more straightforward than the course proposed to be taken by this measure. Now, I will not make any further quotations. Does any one who reads the report of the Indian Department, or who reads the Indian Act, think that any injustice will be done to the Indians by leaving them in their present state? The Premier of the Dominion has still time to retrace his steps and recall this Bill. It has not been asked for by the free and independent electors of this country. It has not been asked for by the Indians themselves; and it is an insult to the white population of the entire Dominion that this concession should be made to savages, to men who are infants, to all intents and purposes, who are wards of the Government, and who are in no way entitled to be placed on a level with the free citizens of this Dominion. The arguments which have been put forward in support of the views of the Opposition are incontrovertible. The fact that not a single man on that side of the House has dared to get up in his place while this debate has been going on and attempt to justify the step which the Government have taken is the best proof that could be given that our position is incontrovertible. The hon. First Minister cannot defend the Bill himself. He dare not defend it, because there is no defence for it. His followers have not defended it, because they have been whipped into subjection. They have had their mouths shut. And I say it is an outrage upon the people of this country that this measure should be forced through in silence at this stage of the Session. I call upon the Government to retrace their steps and withdraw this Bill. If they do no more, they should drop this word "Indian." There is time still for them to repent of the evil which they are seeking to do; and I hope that to-night we shall have an exhibition of true patriotism from the Premier and his followers, and that they will act upon the advice of the Opposition, and withdraw this obnoxious measure. The interest of the Government, if nothing else, demands that that should be done. After three months of waiting we are just about where we were when this Session began, and who is to blame? Certainly not the Opposition. We have been ready and anxious to do business, but the Government have not brought down their measures in time for consideration. I say that now they ought to submit to the intelligent arguments which have been advanced by the Opposition in this debate. I say that the intelligent electors of the country have been insulted, and will continue to be insulted, if this word "Indian" is kept in the Bill, and if the rights of the people are trampled on, as they are, by every provision of this Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. I think we are passing through one of the most painful periods that has ever been experienced in the history of the Canadian or English Parliament. We

have been enjoying for the past week the painful spectacle of members of this House deliberately endeavoring to obstruct the work of this House. We have been sitting here listening attentively to the arguments of hon. gentlemen who profess to have a burning anxiety to have their views placed on record with regard to this Bill. Sir, these men have been writing a page in the history of Canada which will be a lasting disgrace to them, until the last man of them has left this present stage of action, and when they are gone it will redound to their discredit as long as Canada has a Parliament. They say that they wish to lay their views before the people of this country, and yet, I take the case of the *Globe* newspaper, and I find that it devotes a little less than two columns to twenty-one of the speeches which we have been compelled to listen to. Does that show that they are anxious that all this trash which we have had thrown upon us as argument should go before the people of this country. I think the fact that the *Globe* has devoted so short a space to their labored efforts will be a very strong argument in the country against the conduct of these hon. gentlemen, and I say there is not an important paper in the reading room which is reporting the trash to which we have been subjected during the last fifty hours. It is said that they are not allowed an opportunity of debating this question, of putting their views on record, and yet, when we sit still and allow them to say what they like, they are not contented, and they hurl across the floor at us every epithet which malignity can invent. Because we sit quietly and listen to their arguments we are twitted with being dumb supporters of the Government, with being an outrageous majority, a malignant majority, a brute majority, and; in view of such expressions, I would like to know if there is any meaning in that passage of the rules which states that no hon. gentleman is allowed to use offensive words, if it does not cover the epithets which have been applied to us from that side of the House. Is there any hon. gentleman who has listened to these epithets hurled across the floor, hour after hour, who can say that his feelings have not been wounded, if he has any feeling? These base and malignant insinuations have been hurled across the floor at members and supporters of the Government, and I feel that great injustice has been done to those who have been so treated, and that the rules of Parliament have been constantly violated. For my part, I cannot understand the interpretation of the rule, unless it applies to check a great deal of what we have been subjected to in this Parliament during this last week. They speak of an ignorant majority—that taunt is thrown across the floor at the Government, as if those men had been taken from the slums of society, and yet these taunts come from a class of men whose education, if we may judge by what we see, was obtained in schools which would be a disgrace to any place outside of a fish market. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Fleming) treated us to their stock in trade of what they call arguments, though they do not deserve the name, for if they were arguments they would be reasonable, they would be acceptable, they would be logical and courteous, and there would be some parliamentary decency in them. But their arguments are the very reverse of all that. The hon. gentleman says they are obliged to speak so many times to try to give the country information, to try to convince members on this side of the House. Is not that an acknowledgment that they do not possess the ability they claim, when they are obliged to speak so often, in their efforts to enlighten the country; and while that is the case, it is a fact that the reporters are asked to abridge those arguments, because, if not, they would look disgraceful to the *Hansard;* and I say that there is being reported such trash that the press of the country would not deign to place it before their readers because, they know what the result would be. I say that if there was a fair and full report given of the speeches which have been made by these hon. gentlemen on this one measure, there is not an intelligent constituency to-day in the wide Dominion of Canada which would send them back to this House. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen what this Parliament is for? Is it a place where members come to play, and to obstruct the legitimate work of the Session? Or are we here to legislate for the country's good? Is it for a small minority to say that they are going to rule the large majority which the Government have at their backs in this House? What are deliberative assemblies for, if they are not to be ruled by the majority? What is the object of a Government, who are held responsible to the country for the measures they pass through, and are expected and supposed to pass, when they have a majority at their back? If there is a disposition on the part of the Government to prevent a free expression of their views, I could see some reason for their hurling across the House the epithets they have hurled; but when we allow them full opportunity of expressing their views they apply all kinds of offensive expressions to us, and say that we have not the intelligence to defend our position. They speak about hon. members carrying beds and pillows into this House, but I would like to ask if there is one hon. gentleman who will get up and say that he ever saw a bed carried into this House. I know I have been here for seven years and I have never seen it. It is said that we are sleeping around these rooms and acting in a most disgraceful manner, and when we sit still the same thing is said to us. When we listen to everything they say, no matter how unfair or how irregular, we are taunted with being stupid, with being guilty of unseemly conduct. The press of these hon. gentlemen have also taken the matter up, and they say that members supporting the Government come in, night after night, drunk and disorderly; that they cannot conduct themselves as men. Well, I have been here for some time, and I do not think that I ever saw a body of 211 men gather together who conducted themselves with so little rowdyism, so little drinking, as the members of this present Parliament. I say it is disgraceful to hon. members to use such language as these hon. gentlemen use; it is a disgrace to the paper which makes these statements, or to the reporters in the gallery who make them, who are here by the courtesy of the House, and to report fairly what passes, without endeavoring to throw base insinuations against the members of this House. If these hon. gentlemen had the courage to back up their insinuations, to name the party they mean, then that man could come forward and defend himself; but they do not do so, for that would not answer their purpose; that would not make the charge as malignant as they can make it by way of insinuation. For fifty hours—the longest session of either this Parliament or the English Parliament—we have been discussing one clause of a Bill. We spent hour after hour on the question of women franchise, which was said to be fraught with such great constitutional principles, and yet hon. gentlemen had their minds made up before three of them spoke as to which way each man would vote upon it. Yet they went on and occupied this time, not with arguments to convince the people of this country, not to be reported in the pages of *Hansard*, because such a report would disgrace the worst member who was ever in this House, but, Sir, simply to obstruct the business of the House. Now, what is a Canadian Parliament for? Has it not the inherent power to control its own legislation, so that the business of the country may be proceeded with? Or is it to be converted into a play house, a toy house, at great expense to the people of this country? We have been sitting here for fifty hours, at an expense of at least $200 an hour, on one clause, and though they have each given us five or six speeches on the subject, they have not been able to enlighten the country or this House. They say that they will continue to keep this up, and it is not for the

legitimate purpose of convincing the country, because the reporters are ashamed to report what these hon. gentlemen are saying; and if they did, these hon. gentlemen would never be sent back to this House. I have taken down a few of the beautiful names which have been applied to us during the last few hours. We are called a "whipped-in-majority;" we "dare not open our mouths;" we are "an outrageous majority;" we are "dumb;" we belong to a class of animals that ought to be able to speak, but are not able to speak. We are said to be sitting here "stupid," almost as if we were inebriated with something. We are "ignorant;" we are a "partisan majority," supporting the Government; a "brute majority," who use brute force. Is that courteous language to be applied to an hon. member? are those the amenities of debate allowable in a Parliament? What has become of the rule which says that hon. members are not entitled to use offensive language towards one another? They have read the Indian Act four or five times, beginning with the leader of the Opposition, and followed by the hon. member for Norfolk, the hon. member for South Grey, the hon. member for Brant; and the report of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs has been treated in the same way. We have had the history of the Indians, almost from the time of Christopher Columbus, down to the present day. We have not only had their history, but their physiological construction, and the peculiarities of their nature—in fact, anything and everything, whether relevant or irrelevant to this question, has been made to do duty in place of argument. One of their organs says to-night that if the Government are going to force through this Bill—what any Government would do, with a majority at its back, as they are responsible for the legislation they carry out—they are prepared to sit here all summer and debate it. We are discussing one clause of a measure such as has been passed time after time, with one-hundredth part of this debate. I say the Bill in the Toronto Legislature passed through with one-hundredth part of the discussion which has been taken up on this one paragraph. It took only part of two days, and still it embodied— —

An hon. MEMBER. Read it.

Mr. SPROULE. An hon. gentleman says read it, but I am not so fond of reading as they are, and I would sooner use the time by stating what is relevant to the subject, and not waste the time of the House in discussion which is merely intended for obstruction. They have legislated on the Indian question, and the franchise question, and have gone over the whole ground, without any of that facticious opposition which we are experiencing from their hands this last week. I say that the Government are only doing what any Government is entitled and expected to do, that is, to legislate in the interests of the country. The British North American Act gives them the right to pass this law; it was held by the fathers of Confederation that it was right for this Parliament to pass such a law, and why then should they not do it? No exception is taken to our constitutional power to pass such a law, but because it is offensive in some respects to the feelings of hon. gentlemen, because it does not fall in with their views of what is right and wrong, they have adopted these obstructive tactics. Now, if the obstruction was confined to this Bill alone I could hold them excusable in some degree, but we had it before. We had it in the Civil Service Act; we had it in the Bill of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, with reference to the infectious diseases of animals, and upon every important Bill during the last three or four weeks of this Session. The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) said to-day that the Government passed through three months of the Session, and what was left as a record of their work? He says the Government only passed through eleven Bills in those three months. Well, I have looked at the *Canada Gazette*, and I find that thirty-nine Bills were passed, so that he was not giving a fair exposition of what work the House has done. Another hon. member said that we wasted four weeks of the Session, but I can tell him that there are 450 pages of *Hansard* largely taken up by speeches of Opposition members, representing those first four weeks of the Session. The Finance Minister, in his Budget Speech, spoke about four pages every hour, and if you take that average, it shows that there were at least 112 hours of solid debate in this House, and yet he says that we did nothing; that we came here and had prayers read, and then adjourned. Now, if this sort of thing is to continue longer I can only say that, in my opinion, the Canadian Parliament will become a farce, and that we will be doing—not what our constituents sent us here to do, but we will be deliberately squandering the public money. I hope that hon. gentlemen will see that the child's play, the disgraceful scenes, and the senseless obstruction, which have been going on, will come to a close at an early hour, and that we will go to work and do the business which the people sent us here to perform.

Mr. EDGAR. At last the long and sullen silence of the Government ranks has been broken. For some inscrutable reason the hon member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has been put up to answer the arguments that have been advanced against this Bill. We have heard no better arguments from the other side in favor of this Bill than we have heard from the hon. member; and we have heard no stronger argument in their press than he has given us. Let any hon. gentleman examine the Conservative press in this country, and do they find one line in defence of this proposition to enfranchise the Indians of this country? Neither the Government supporters in the House nor their organs in the country have attempted to defend it. We have the hon. gentleman getting up here now and, with the air of a turkey-cock, lecturing the members on this side of the House on their manners, if you please; on their want of education—educated in schools fit for fish-wives, he said.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not say that; I said their conduct would be a disgrace outside the fish market.

Mr. EDGAR. I noticed, during his speech, that he spoke of the base and malignant insinuations of the Opposition; he used the word "malignant" six times in lecturing us. It is clear that since the beginning of this debate somebody has been lecturing the Government supporters on their manners; because two days ago we could hardly be heard on account of the din, the noise, the roaring, the shouting, the singing, the slamming of desks, the hooting and howling of the other side of the House. The hon gentleman asks, what is Parliament for? That is what we want to know. I tell him that Parliament is not merely to register the decrees of the Government without discussion. Parliament is not called together to keep the present majority always the majority, to keep the present Executive always the Executive, as is proposed by this Bill. If there ever was a revolutionary measure introduced into any Parliament it is this one. The idea that by legislation the Government of the day should undertake to retain the power for all time to come! Sir, I object to a revolutionary measure of this kind, during a great crisis, when this country is struggling to crush out a formidable rebellion. We are fond of looking to England for precedents, and I would like to know what precedent there is, when the English Government had brought in an important Reform Bill, when the country was in the midst of a foreign war, or in the midst of disturbance of any kind. And yet there never was in the English Parliament a measure introduced of so sweeping a character as this one. We have had four general elections since 1867, and there seems to have been no necessity for this Bill before. It has been put off until the end of the Session, and until the country is in the midst of a rebellion. Have we nothing to do in

this House but to discuss this measure? We have been here three months, and have hardly touched the supplies. We find by the notice put upon the Orders that we are to be called upon at once to discuss the great question of affording the Pacific Railway Company more aid. Is not that something to occupy the attention of this House during the latter days of the Session, without our being forced to discuss this measure? When important revolutionary measures of this kind are proposed in England, they give plenty of time for discussion; and even when they go on *de die in diem* they do not keep the members of the House sitting all night and all day. Now, take a very recent case in England, which occurred in 1882, when an important measure was under discussion—when a measure was proposed to amend the rules of the House in a very important particular. The House of Commons took over thirty days to consider it. The House sat from day to day. I looked at twenty consecutive sittings, and in only one case was the House called upon to sit as late as a quarter past one in the morning. The sittings did not average more than eleven o'clock. That was the way the Government treated the House in that matter. What sort of treatment have we received. Instead of adjourning at a reasonable hour, to give members a fair opportunity of discussing this measure, we have been forced to remain over fifty hours in session, the longest sitting ever forced upon a House by any parliamentary Government. What can be the object of the Government in deciding to push the Bill now? It is because of the intense interest manifested in the North-West affairs, that the Government suppose this extraordinary measure can be carried through without public attention being called to it. It was held back for seventeen years, and the Government think there never was such a chance of slipping such a measure through Parliament as there is now. More than that. After a three months' sitting most of the important business is still unfinished, and members are naturally inclined to allow Bills to go through without discussion. Why has this expedient been resorted to—to prevent discussion? If there ever was an audacious attempt against the liberties of the people this is one. It is not against one party. It is against the Reform party to-day, but it may be that the Conservative party will suffer to-morrow. It is neither party, but the whole people, who will suffer by this legislation. The whole population are to be garroted by the Government of the day, whatever party is in power. The forms of freedom are to be gone through, but they are to be prostituted for the purposes of despotism by this Bill. We have seen that done before. When Napoleon III appealed to the people of France with the plebiscit, he went through the form of appealing to the people, but he took care, by means of his officials and military force, that the verdict should be in his favor, and the plebiscit was a mere mockery. Just so will the people go through with the electoral machinery. I am afraid the Government are bold, on account of the success of their former measures of an analogous character. The Redistribution Bill was to some extent like this. It struck the Reform party below the belt, as this does; but it only struck one Province in the Dominion. This Bill strikes at every Province in the Dominion, by taking away from the Provinces the right to create their own electorate. The disguise is torn off, and in all its nakedness and in all its nefarious design this Bill stands exposed on this Indian clause. The country will not for a moment tolerate the Bill, so soon as it understands this question. It is not possible that when our sons are risking their lives fighting Indians, and while Indians are massacring white settlers, the people will think Parliament is doing its duty by giving to those very savages votes with which to swamp and outvote the white people of this country. Especially will this appear evident when it is pointed out that the effect of the Bill will be to override the choice of a majority of the white population, by the Government controlling these poor unfortunate wards of the Crown, the Indian vote, in particular constituencies. I wonder if the Government have considered the effect of this measure upon the country. No doubt they have considered the effect of the Bill on parties. Ontario, of all the Provinces of the Confederation, has been loyal to Confederation, and has been long-suffering and law-abiding; but I do not think that Ontario will much longer, when such legislation as this is proposed, be entitled to that claim. Discontent exists in nearly every Province except Ontario. The Government seem to think they can place whatever burden they choose on that Province; but I will caution the Government that they are, in this case, going a little too far. The strain, I believe, will be greater than Confederation can stand, unless they pause while there is yet time. I believe there is a feeling aroused, in Ontario especially, on this subject, which will be infinitely more serious, as regards the existence of Confederation, than anything that has happened hitherto. Even in the Province of Quebec a number of the leading organs which support the Government on general questions do not approve of this measure. In spite of these facts the Government are seeking to force it upon the country, in order that the Province of Ontario, chiefly, may be garroted before the next election comes on. In doing our duty to our country we have held this measure in our grip this whole week; we have held it up before the country in all its nakedness and hideousness, and we believe the country will thank us for having taken this extraordinary course.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). It is certainly an admission from the hon. gentleman at this late hour, not to be expected after all the indignant protestations we have heard from them during this long discussion, that the Opposition have taken an extraordinary course. Up to now, hon. gentlemen opposite have argued that their course has been a most orderly and parliamentary one, one that ought to be resorted to by a minority of the House whenever they think the occasion demands it. Now, however, though late in the day, we have the admission that the course is an extraordinary one. There was no necessity for the hon. gentleman to tell us this, for everybody is convinced of it; and when the time comes for the country to pronounce on this course, they will declare that it is both extraordinary and reprehensible. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been trying to lead us to believe that they had no opportunity of discussing the Bill, but their conduct is, in this respect, completely at variance with their utterances. So little anxious are they to discuss the Bill that they have offered two amendments to the original motion, that this interpreting paragraph, relating to the word Indian, be adopted, and the last of those amendments, is an amendment to adjourn. Does that show any desire to discuss the Bill? After discussing an amendment twenty-four long hours, and finding nothing further to say on it, they move to adjourn the House. What was the object of that motion? It was to give them latitude, not to discuss the Bill, but to discuss everything else. They attempted to talk, on the strength of this motion to adjourn, of the North-West troubles and the fiscal policy of the Government, and the condition of the country—of every thing else, in fact, but the Bill; and whenever they could find a small opportunity, on a point of order being raised, they would keep up an argument on that point for hours, not to discuss the Bill, but simply to waste the time of the House. It is more than thirty hours ago when a proposition was made by an hon. gentleman, authorised to do so on behalf of hon. gentlemen opposite, to allow this clause to be voted upon, and yet for the thirty hours since then they have been discussing this same clause which they declare had been intelligently discussed, and on which every body

was prepared to vote. In making that proposition, however they said they would make it conditional. They said: We, the minority, the Opposition, will dictate to you, the majority; we have discussed this paragraph for twenty-four hours; and after having prevented the business of the country going on during that time, we will charge you with obstructing business. The Government replied, as they should, that, under the circumstances, they would not be dictated to. On whom, then, does the responsibility fall for the continuance of the discussion thirty hours longer. It falls undoubtedly on hon. gentlemen opposite. It was then ripe for receiving a vote, but because their condition was not accepted they delayed the vote some thirty hours longer. Believing that the word "Indian" would give them greater attitude for speech-making than the other paragraphs, they determined to prolong the discussion on that paragraph as long as they possibly could. This afternoon we could see the looks of exultation on the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite, because they had succeeded in keeping this House for a whole week in useless discussion. I say useless discussion, because it must be to them a foregone conclusion that the measure will be adopted whenever the vote will be taken. When they could do nothing else, they asked for a count out of the House, and yet these are the men who attempt to throw the responsibility of obstruction on this side. Let me say here that I know of no whip being applied to the shoulders of the members on this side to prevent them from speaking. I, in common with others, thought the discussion going on on the other side was useless, and therefore that it was unnecessary to answer it, and for that reason we have kept our seats: but beyond that, there was nothing that influenced me in not speaking on this Bill. We are not, Sir, men who only know what we hear in this House; we are not men to be guided only by such evidence as we hear from the desks of hon. gentlemen opposite, or from the desks of hon. gentlemen on this side. We must take the evidence of what we hear outside of this House, and make up a line of circumstantial evidence, that will lead us to a conclusion. From the time the second reading of this Bill was asked down to the present time, what have we been led to infer? That before this Bill was passed these hon. gentlemen opposite would keep the House here for three months; and the other night, when they proposed to let this clause pass and then adjourn the House, what was their object? I do not desire to be offensive to any of those hon. gentlemen; but would I be going too far to assume that, as there are 63 paragraphs in this Bill, they intended that it should take a day to pass each paragraph, and consequently 63 of the sitting days of this House to get through with the Bill? Am I correct in assuming that? We do not hear much in this Chamber, but I think I have heard it outside, that it would take one day for each paragraph to pass. They complain that the Government has not allowed full discussion, while they have been discussing this one for 31 hours continuously, with no good result following.

Mr. MILLS. That is a mistake.

Mr. LANDRY. It may be a mistake in the eyes of hon. gentlemen opposite, who may think they have gained a great victory. But what greater light has been thrown on this Bill by their discussion than rested upon it before? Whom have they convinced by the arguments they have used? I know of no one. It may be that some of their own followers were wavering, and they have convinced them, by keeping the discussion up long enough, because they are now again a solid phalanx. But we know that some of them did vote with this side of the House on some questions, and they may have thought that their ranks were breaking, and in that way they may have accomplished something. But when they say that a good purpose has been served, will they say that they have convinced anyone on this side of the House? I do not think they will say that. A whole week has been lost, and hon. gentlemen are in about the same position as they were before this discussion began; and when hon. gentlemen talked of gagging, I ask, have they been gagged? Which one of them has been gagged, I wonder—the man who has talked for three hours, or the one who has talked for half an hour, and then stopped of his own motion. You cannot satisfy the Opposition; one day they complain that we speak too much, and another day that we do not speak enough. A few moments ago, in a very vehement speech, the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Fleming) stated that the members on this side came here on Thursday evening, having prepared themselves to spend the whole night here. Surely the hon. gentleman must have known, from the tactics adopted on Monday night and Tuesday, that there would be long session; and, would he blame hon. gentlemen for making themselves comfortable? Was there nothing discomforting in listening to those speeches hour after hour? It was not done by bringing couches into this House; I wish that denial to go to the country; but, would the hon. gentleman blame hon. members on this side for making themselves comfortable, so as to let hon. gentlemen opposite go as far as they liked and say what they wished on this Bill? Possibly, some hon. members on this side thought that it was so tedious to listen to the speeches of these hon. gentlemen that they required pillows to enable them to keep their patience; and I say it boldly, it is difficult for the majority in the House of Commons to keep their patience, with what has been going on during the whole of this week—to keep their patience over the process, which has the tendency and the effect, if it has not the motive and the object, of actually obstructing the proceedings of this House. I ask, again, in whose hands is the legislation of this country confided—in the hands of the Opposition or in the hands of the Government. I say it is in the hands of the Government, which is supported by a majority of the members of this House, and has the confidence of the country; and I believe the constitutional course for an Opposition to take, with reference to anything of which they do not approve, is to discuss it in a reasonable way, to enter their protest against it, and let the Government take the responsibility, and then leave the country to judge. It is for the country to judge, after all. It is not for the minority to decide whether this is a good measure or not. It is not enough for them to say: That is a bad measure, and we will take every means in our power to prevent its passage; we will abuse the rights and privileges which we have given to us by the constitution and by the rules of this House, for the purpose of baulking the measures of a Government which has the confidence of the country, and which received a renewal of that confidence in 1882. And yet they have the hardihood to say now, as they did before the elections of 1882, that the Government dare not go to the country and face the electors whom they faced before. But another word, and I have done. The reason I have spoken to-night is simply that I was not going to sit here and listen to the abuse and to the exaggerations of the conduct of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, without entering my protest and contradicting the assertion that we have been disorderly, or have gagged hon. gentlemen opposite in any way, or prevented them by any means from discussing the measure before the House. I say that is not correct, Sir; it is true, as I have seen it done in this House while I have been here, and it is done in other Parliaments, when members make themselves tedious by speeches that are not interesting or that are upon a subject that has been already discussed at full length, it has been the practice to make some disorder to limit the discussion—perhaps to whistle or to talk aloud. It is

true that, in the beginning of this debate, when we found that the Opposition had adopted the tactics of obstruction, for the purpose of prolonging the debate unnecessarily, we, on this side of the House, did make a good deal of noise; but the moment the Opposition complained that we were trying to gag them, we said: We will keep still and give you an opportunity. Since then, there has been perfect silence on this side of the House. As to evidences of excitement that have been referred to by hon. gentlemen opposite, I think they have been quite as visible among hon. gentlemen of the Opposition as on this side, although I do not think there has been, on either side of the House, anything discreditable to Parliament. A great point is endeavored to be made against the Government in respect to enfranchising the Indians; and hon. gentlemen opposite pretend that the Government are guilty of a great crime in giving them the franchise. Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite have long been asserting that the Government was showing an undue preference for the rich men against the poor; that they neglected the low and humble; but to-night they talk in an opposite strain, and find fault with the Government for paying attention to the poor and the lowly. Sir, I say it matters not what nationality a man belongs to, whether he be Indian or negro, if he possesses the same qualifications for the franchise that a white man does, he ought to receive it. This Bill does not propose anything else. Why try to create prejudices against the Indians at this particular moment? I believe that were it not for the existing troubles in the North-West we would not have heard so much about the Indians; but hon. gentlemen opposite are taking advantage of these troubles to inflame the public mind against the Indians. Why should not the Indians have the franchise as well as anybody else, provided they stand upon the same footing as others? If there is any prejudice against that race, it is the duty of the Government to try to wipe it out by means of legislation; and I say there is no nobler duty, there is no higher duty, for a statesman to perform, than to come to the assistance of the lowly and the humble, who are surrounded by prejudices, and try to assist them and lift them up. It is unworthy of a statesman, because there exists some prejudices against the Indians on the part of the ruling races, to take advantage of those prejudices for the sake of gaining a party advantage. All this Bill proposes to do is simply to place the Indians on an equal footing with other men, and to give them equal privileges whenever their conditions are equal. That is the interpretation I put upon the Bill, and I believe the country will so understand it. While we refuse to give them the same privileges as we give white men, does such a policy not tend to keep them down? Does it not tend to keep them in that humble and lowly position? The sooner we, by legislation, give them a helping hand and raise them to a higher level, the better it will be for them and the better it will be for this Dominion. In view of these facts, I think there is no harm in adopting this clause of the Bill and enfranchising those Indians who are equally qualified with white men to exercise the franchise. If it should be found, after a few years' experience, that they do not exercise the franchise in a proper way, then we can change the policy and adapt it to circumstances. But let us give them a trial, at any rate; if they do not use the franchise properly, we can take it away from them. Now, it is asked: Why this undue haste in pressing this measure upon the country? I will tell you one reason, in my opinion, why it should be passed this Session. We have two years before us before the next general elections, and if we find, after one year's experience, that the Act requires to be amended, whether as regards the revising barristers or otherwise, we shall have another Session in which to amend it before the elections come around. If we find there is any friction in its operation, we can remedy the evil at our next Session. No harm can be done by the lists lying in the office of the revising barristers for a year, as they will not be used; and if any errors creep in, if it is found that this Bill requires amendment, we will have time to remedy the imperfections before the next election. The Indians, in the meantime, who may make application to have their names put on the list, can do so, and if it is found that some are on the list who are not entitled to the franchise under the law, next winter we will be in a better position to amend the Act and make it more nearly perfect. There is another still stronger reason why we should pass this measure now, and that is in order to settle the question whether the Government or the Opposition are going to rule this House—whether the majority or the minority are going to control the legislation of this Parliament. If the rules of the House permit, if the constitution of this country permits, that legislation should be in the hands of the Opposition, the sooner that is understood the better, and the sooner the Government give up their functions the better. I do not wish to speak harshly of the Opposition, but I do say that I am prepared to support the Government in taking vigorous measures to ensure that the will of the majority shall control the legislation of this Parliament. The Government represent the majority of this House, who represent the majority of the country. The country has put them in their present position, and they must be considered as representing the will of the country, and therefore are justified in pushing this measure through. If it be such a bad Bill as the Opposition contend, let them appeal to the country. If they think they can convince the people that the Bill is as bad as they say, they will have an opportunity of doing so; but, in the meantime, I think we should pass this measure, and I shall vote for the clause being adopted.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent).

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman who has just sat down is one of whom I have formed a rather high opinion from his utterances in this House. I would only venture one or two criticisms on his remarks. During the larger portion of his speech he did not discuss the question which is before the committee, but contented himself with speaking in defence of the conduct of the majority in compelling this committee to sit for three days and two nights. In the closing part of his remaks, however, he did give some views with reference to the question before the committee, and in those utterances he has furnished the committee with the clearest and most palpable proof of the absolute necessity that existed that this question should have been discussed till the present time, and that it requires more discussion still. He is a gentleman of intelligence, a member of the legal profession, who I am told is not unlikely to be raised to the bench of his native Province at no distant day—and I have heard members from New Brunswick, who are not in political accord with him, say that they would consider the bench would not be lowered if he occupied that position—and yet he has manifested to the committee a degree of ignorance that I think no one should possess when called upon to give a vote upon this question. He has asked why we should withhold from the Indian, when he is in the same position as any other citizen of this country, the rights of any other citizen. The question is a proper one, and no man who would withhold those rights would be worthy of a place in Parliament; but the whole point is contained in the fact that the Indian is not in the same position as other citizens of Canada. The very paragraph we have been considering declares that an Indian does not stand in the same position, because it says that the word "person" shall mean any male person, including an Indian. If there was not a distinction, that addition would not be necessary. The First Minister knows that if the words, "including an Indian," were not in the Bill, no unenfranchised Indian would have the right to vote, and he desires that Indians who are not enfranchised, who

are not their own masters, who are under the control of the Government, who have not the civil rights, liberties and obligations of other citizens, shall also have the vote, and for that reason he puts in those words. The Indian Act defines what an Indian is.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). Does that apply to anything but the operation of that Act?

Mr. PATERSON. Certainly.

Mr. LANDRY. If our law should say that a person that would kill his fellow man was guilty of murder, and an Indian did that, would he not be guilty of murder?

Mr. PATERSON. This Act is not to be inconsistent with any other Act; that is expressly provided.

Mr. LANDRY. That interpretation is for that Act only.

Mr. PATERSON. Let me take the member for Kent on his own ground. Let the First Minister simply adopt the view of the hon. member, and all he has to do is to strike out of this clause the words, "including an Indian." My hon. friend says Indians are included under the term "person." Then leave out those words, and the whole matter is disposed of. That is all I want, and all the Liberal members have been contending for. But the hon. gentleman will find that the First Minister is not willing to drop those two words, because, if he did, the unenfranchised Indians could not avail themselves of the provisions of the Bill which is now passing through the House. I think the hon. gentleman must admit that there is reason why this question should be more fully discussed, so that members of the committee who are not as intelligent or as well versed in law as the hon. gentleman himself, may have the means of ascertaining precisely what the full scope, meaning and intent of the paragraph under discussion is. I will assume no superior knowledge, but I have felt bound to give special attention to the laws relating to Indians, because 3,000 of the race dwell in the riding I represent, 3,000 people who have my hearty best wishes, and of whom I can say that the dearest desire of my heart is that they may be elevated to a higher plane than they occupy now, and that they may be entitled to all the rights and liberties given to every other citizen here. Acting with such feelings, I have, from my first entrance into Parliament, given great attention to the Indian Act and all that it means and comprehends. For that reason I make this explanation, so that the committee may be willing to accord to me probably a greater knowledge than is possessed by other members who, having no Indians within the bounds of their constituencies, have only listened to debates and have not cared to thoroughly understand it. What is the position of Indians in this country? It is said sometimes they are the original owners of the soil. That is true, with respect to our North-West Indians and to Indians in many of the Provinces. It is not true with respect to all Indians in this country. The Indians that dwell within the bounds of my own riding are not the original owners of the soil of Canada. During the revotutionary war they were true to Great Britain and fought in defence of the British Crown, and when they found themselves, at the termination of the war, deprived of the reserves they held in the neighboring Republic, the British Government gave them a tract of land, six miles wide, on both sides of the Grand River, from its source to its mouth. From time to time they have surrendered portions, which have been sold to settlers and the money formed into a fund, which the Government administers. That fund amounts to something like $800,000, which the Government has invested, the proceeds of which are paid to the Indians semi-annually. They reside on a portion of the reserve. Therefore, you have Indians here under two different sets of circumstances. But in each case, whether they came here from the United States, as those Indians did, or whether, as is the case with Indians in the North-West and in other parts of the country, they are the original inhabitants of Canada, they occupy a different position to other persons who come into this country or are born here. The former are citizens; the latter are outside of citizenship. A negro or a German may come to Canada and become a citizen, on taking the oath of allegiance, and can manage his own affairs. But the Indian is not allowed to manage his own affairs. Indian lands are held in common and the band is under control of the Government. Any citizen can buy and sell freely. The Indians in some Provinces are not allowed to do so, and they have no title to the land. When the Indian question came up for discussion in 1880, and when the First Minister introduced his Bill, I made a speech, an extract of which has been read to the House. The hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), evidently laboring under the same idea as the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry), thought that my utterances in 1880 were different from those I addressed the other night on the present Bill. That arose from a misapprehension, and the hon. gentleman was entirely mistaken. On the former, the Minister was introducing a Bill which contained an enfranchising clause, giving the Indians the right to enfranchisement, and on that Bill I made the remarks quoted. Those were the sentiments I held at that time, and those are the sentiments I hold now. They grow stronger, and I declare that the only solution of the Indian question on this continent is: So soon as possible to lead the Indians up to, not attempt to drive them (for Parliament should force no measure on the Indians), but lead them up to a desire to assume all the responsibilities and claim all the rights of other men. I was pointing out to the First Minister on that occasion that instead of making the enfranchising clauses easier, so that Indians might more readily avail themselves of them and thus become citizens of this Domion and exercise the same right, the hon. gentlemen was restricting those rights and making it more difficult for them to become citizens. I hold that position now. A great deal of misapprehension has arisen from the terms used during this debate. It has been stated that it was not a right thing to enfranchise Indians, as the First Minister proposed to do in this Bill. That is not a correct expression, with respect to the operation of this Bill. It does not enfranchise the Indians—remember that. The Bill of the First Minister has nothing to do with the enfranchisement of Indians. They are entirely different from all other classes. When we bring in a class that has not hitherto enjoyed the suffrage, we say that such a class is enfranchised. So they are, because they possessed before all the rights, privileges and responsibilities of other citizens, except that one right to vote. But, with the Indians, it is entirely different. You may give them the vote, but you do not necessarily enfranchise them. If this Bill passes, the Indians will have the right to vote, but they will not be enfranchised. They are Indians still. They are under the same absolute control of the Government as they were before. The same Indian laws apply to them. If they leave their reserves, and go to another country, and remain there for five years, they have no further rights to their reserves, and will no longer share in the annuity money. If this Bill passes, the Indians of Manitoba are committing a criminal offense, even if they sell the produce they grow, unless it is in conformity with the rules made for their guidance by the Department of the First Minister. If that law passes, if any man purchases goods from an Indian in Manitoba, he is liable to a penalty of $100, when the Indian has a vote, just as much as he was when he had no vote. The Indian is not enfranchised by giving him a vote. Lead the Indian up to a desire for enfranchisement, and make it easy for him to obtain enfranchisement, and the rights and liberties possessed by other citizens of this country. I shall not read the enfranchising clause of the

Act, but you will find it in the Consolidated Statutes, on page 573. Briefly, the provisions of that law are these: That if an Indian desires to avail himself of the enfranchising clause, he makes application to the Superintendent General, who sends the application to the local agent of the band, with instructions to tell the applicant forthwith to secure a statement under oath, made by some clergyman, or stipendiary magistrate, or two justices of the peace, that they know the Indian, know him to be a man of good moral character, and to have been so for some years previous. As soon as that certificate is obtained the council of the band is summoned, and the local agent of the Superintendent General lays before the band the fact that a certain member of the band has applied for enfranchisement, that he has secured the nesessary statement, and he tells the band that they have now thirty days in which they can make any statement under oath which they please, that would go to show that the Indian is not deserving of enfranchisement. At the end of that time, if any affidavit against the Indian is lodged, the local agent sends it, as well as the affidavit made under oath, of the clergyman, magistrate, or justice of the peace, to the Superintendent General, who looks at them, and determines from the evidence before him whether, in his judgment, the Indian is fit to be enfranchised or not. If he thinks he is, he gives him a location ticke and he enters on a period of probation. He allots him a certain portion of land, with the consent of the band, and that portion is the proportion he is entitled to, by dividing the total acreage of the reserve by the total number of Indians upon it, and giving the man and his family their share of the land. He dwells on that land for three years, and is called a probationary Indian, and at the end of three years—it may be longer, at the discretion of the Superintendent General—but not before the end of three years, if he gives evidence of being able to conduct his own affairs, then the Superintendent General grants to him letters patent, conveying that land to him; and even then, under a late Act, he is subject to a restriction which was not embodied in a previous Act, that he cannot sell or aleniate his land. I will read one clause of this enfranchisement Act, which will show clearly the distinction which it lays down between Indians and other residents of this country. (Clause quoted). Now, you see clearly the position they occupy. The Indian, after three years probation, after proving himself worthy, receives letters patent from the Government, making him an enfranchised man, and removing him from the control of the Superintendent General—making him free to make his own bargain like other men. It requires all that, in the judgment of the First Minister and of this House, before the Indian can have given to him the rights of enfranchisement. You may pass a Bill to enable him to vote, but he is no more enfranchised, no more a free man, than he is at the present time. I desire that the advanced Indians of this country may be led up by kindness, and not driven by force, to the desire to relinquish the tribal habits, and make application for enfranchisement—to give him every liberty we possibly can give him, and when you have given him that, give him with it, as you are bound to do, the right to vote. But the proposition of the First Minister is not to enfranchise the Indian; he is to leave him in the state of tutelage, the state of minority, which he occupies now, with the management of his affairs not in his own hands, but in the hands of the Superintendent General and his agents. Under these conditions, without any liberties, without any power to control his own affairs, you propose to give him a vote. Against that proposition we raise our warning voice. You propose, with one stroke of the pen, to give a vote virtually to all the Indians. Educated and uneducated, barbarian and civilised, you give to the lowest and most degraded of them the same right to vote that you give to the intelligent Indians who belong to the more advanced bands, such as I have in my own Province. In the enfranchisement clauses, on page 573, section 82, of the Dominion Act, it is provided:

"The sections next following shall not apply to any band of Indians in the Provinces of British Columbia, Manitoba, and in the North-West Territories, or the district of Keewatin, except in so far as the said sections are, by proclamation of the Governor in Council, from time to time, extended to any band of Indians in any of the said Provinces or Territories."

Thus, the right hon. gentleman provides that even the privilege of asking to be enfranchised shall not be given to the Indians in Manitoba or British Columbia, because, in his judgment, they are not sufficiently advanced, even to warrant their asking for it. Are we to be told now that we are discussing a question in which no principle is involved, and are merely speaking against the Indians? No; if the hon. gentleman's proposition were to elevate the Indians, to give them greater privileges than they now enjoy, he would have no more ardent supporter than myself; but it is not a privilege to give to a man, whose affairs are managed by the Government of the day, who is not at liberty to buy and sell his own produce without the sanction of the Governor General, the right to vote. That right may be given to these people, but it will be but a piece of machinery which the Government, if disposed to use their influence, can work in their own behalf, and the votes pretended to be given the Indians would be virtually the votes of the Government given in their own favor. The hon. the First Minister cannot believe in his own heart that these men are capable of intelligently exercising the right of the franchise. What do the reports of some of his own agents in the Province of British Columbia show? On one reserve it is stated that there is but one respectable Indian in the whole lot, and it is intimated that the Indians there traffic in the virtue of their own wives and daughters. Yet, they would have the right to vote under this Bill. Read the report of the Superintendent General and some of his agents of the British Columbia Indians, and then mark the kind of people to whom it is intended to give the right to vote. Read the reports, and see how completely some of these men are dependent on the Government, dependent on them for bounty, fed by the Government, and then ask me if we are safe in giving them the right to vote, when that vote is absolutely controlled by the Government of the day? We are forced to the conclusion, a conclusion distasteful to hon. gentlemen opposite, but a reasonable conclusion, that this provision is not made with the desire to elevate the Indians, but that the Government may exercise the power they have over these bands, scattered in many different counties, to weaken the little band of opponents that stand against them in this House and strengthen the seats of some hon. members opposite, who feel that they are insecure without this aid. I have only one remark to make in conclusion, and that is that if the member for Kent (Mr. Landry) desires to be true to the position he has taken he will vote for the resolution of the hon. member for Bothwell, which provides that the Indians who are enfranchised, who occupy the same position as other classes of the community, should have the same civil rights and liberties as are given to other classes, but that those who are not in the same position, those who are minors, under the control of the Government, may not have the right to vote given to them until such time as they are removed from Government control and have the power to manage their own affairs.

Mr. FOSTER. By this time I should suppose that hon. gentlemen opposite, having been allowed the fullest latitude for discussion for almost a week, should have had ample time to debate this question to their hearts' content. Giving full credit to hon. gentlemen opposite for all the ability they possess, and there is, no doubt, a great deal of ability

on that side of the House, we must believe by this time that upon the single clause which has been under consideration for a week, almost everything that could be said on it, from their point of view, has been brought to the attention of the committee. I have purposely declined to take any part in this discussion, so far, for two reasons. I like honest, fair discussion, and whenever a question is before the committee or before the House, which is being fairly debated, with with the object of arriving at a sound conclusion, there is no one who likes better to take part in or listen to such a discussion than myself; but at a very early period of the debate I became convinced that the discussion was proceeding, on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite, not so much for the purpose of bringing out all there was in the issues involved, so as to come to a conclusion, as for the sake of taking up the time of the House, in order not to come to a conclusion. I, therefore, determined to refrain from taking any part in the debate, until these gentlemen had all the time to make themselves heard, all the latitude for discussion that the most exacting among them could demand. Having treated them, in common with gentlemen on this side of the House, with courtesy and consideration, having paid attention to them for hour after hour of these long and arduous sittings, I think we deserve a little better at their hands than to be taunted across the floor with being whipped-in supporters, ordered to silence by the Government, with having no sense to see what was in this Bill, and no powers of argument to meet the alleged arguments advanced by that side of the House, but, like dumb-driven cattle, having nothing to say on the subject at all. Sir, I will never say to any body of gentlemen sitting on the opposite side of the House to me that they do not possess, on the average, equal intelligence with the hon. gentlemen with whom I happen to be associated for the time being. I say that these epithets and insinuations are not arguments that have any weight in this House or that count for much in the country; for, although we may think that we, being legislators, occupy a high and mighty position here—and we do occupy a most honorable position—we may as well come to the conclusion now, as later, that the people of the country are, man for man, just about as intelligent as we are, and that if clap-trap does not go down in this House it is not likely to go down any better in the country. There has been talk about meeting the electors. I go through my county every year and hold fifteen or twenty meetings in the most public places; and I will welcome any one of these gentlemen to come down and stand with me before the electors of my county—and they are intelligent electors—and discuss the principles involved in this Bill, where it is not simply a partisan press which conveys the impression to the people's minds, but where intelligent people, looking into the faces of the two gentlemen who address them, and hearing statement and answer, can judge for themselves where the right lies, and what the principles of the Bill really are. The hon. gentleman who last spoke taunted my hon. friend from Kent, N. B. (Mr. Landry), with not having discussed the Bill. Now, Sir, of all periods in the parliamentary history of this country, and of all times in the history of this Parliament, it came with very bad grace, at this time, from the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) to taunt any hon. gentleman with not discussing the question closely or logically. Sir, after a week of talk, during which, if one half hour was given to the close and logical discussion of the question, twenty half hours were given to keeping as far away as possible from the question, it was not a very pertinent or very honest thing for the hon. gentleman to taunt us on this side with not closely discussing the question. However, there was one good result of the two speeches given—one by my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the other by my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Landry). The hon. member for South Brant has not, since the beginning of this debate, confined himself so closely to the question under discussion as he has done since he heard the speeches of my hon. friends. There has not been so mild and courteous a speech made in this House, with reference to that question, as the one made by that hon. gentleman, until just at the close, when he evidently thought that a little of the thunder and lightning that has been flying all the week was necessary. If he had cut off the last two and a-half minutes of his speech it would have been a model of parliamentary courtesy and of intelligence in the discussion of the measure before the House. Now, Sir, I wish to refer to two or three statements that were made by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), who treated us, however, to no discussion of the Bill, for during the half or three-quarters of an hour that he spoke he hardly touched the question at issue. When my hon. friend from Grey was saying something about their arguments failing to convince the House, I noticed that the hon. gentleman sitting in his seat said, "no; we do not propose to convince the House;" and his remark was greeted with a cheer by those who sat nearest to him. Then, whom do they hope to convince? My hon. friend pointed out very clearly that they cannot hope to convince the country, for their own papers—and I give them credit for it—give very short and meagre reports of these so-called discussions which have been going on all week. How do they expect the people to be convinced? It cannot be by hearing their voices; it cannot be through their papers; it cannot be through the *Hansard*, which get out into the country some ten or twelve days after the the debates take place, and are very sparsely distributed. Then why do they speak? Not to convince the House or the country. That is not their object. The hon. member for Bothwell let the cat out of the bag the other night, when he said: Withdraw your Bill, and then the business of the country can go on.

The hon. member for West Ontario commenced in that courteous way which is so peculiar to him, and for which I suppose he has found a seat in this House. He talked about lecturing hon. gentlemen on this side of the House on manners. What was the first lesson on manners that he gave when he arose? In attempting to reply to my hon. friend from Grey, he said he had been "put up" to say a few words. I say it is quite possible for my hon. friend from Grey, or for any one supporting this or any other Government, to get up and say what he wants to say like a man, without that imputation being put upon him, as it is for any member supporting the leader of the Opposition to get up and say something that is not dictated to him, but is the utterance of his own thought. The hon. member for Bothwell cheered very lustily at that. Whenever a statement is made about whipped-in supporters of the Government he always has his cheer at the tip end of his tongue. I wonder what is the difference between getting up and speaking as a whipped-in supporter of the Government, or as a whipped-in supporter of the Opposition. Has the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) ever got up to vote against the dictates of his leader? I can tell him of one occasion on which his coat tails streamed out of that door, when he could not vote for his leader, but had not the independence to vote against him. It may be permitted, as a species of clap-trap, for the hon. gentleman to talk about the whipped-in and driven supporters of this or that party; but he knows as well as I do that these great measures of policy on either side are supposed to be about the average sentiment of those who support either party, and are arrived at from a canvass of the opinions of hon. gentlemen supporting each party. I noticed, when the hon. member for Grey was saying that such proceedings of obstruction, as these seemed to be, would make of Parliament a farce; I noticed that the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) looked joyful and clapped his hands, and a chorus of "hear, hears," went up from him

and his friends. I would like to know if that is a part of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite—to make of this Parliament a farce? to disgust, if possible, a portion of the people with it, and add to the discontent which the member for West Ontario said existed all over this country?

Sir, he asks the question: Is this Parliament here to register the opinions of the Government? I will answer that question very shortly. In one sense Parliament is here to register the opinions of the Government; in another sense it is not. If the proposition is that Parliament is simply to shut its eyes and stop its ears and, when the thirteen members of the Cabinet bring down their measures, to swallow them, without the opportuuity of accepting or rejecting them, then Parliament is not here for any such purpose. But if the question is whether Parliament is here to register the opinions of the Government, who are put in power by the majority of the people, and who have the confidence of the people, I say that Parliament is here for that and no other purpose. And when a body of men in minority set up their will against the representatives of the people sent here to support a Government, I think that gentlemen who propose that are proposing something which is against the genius of our government, and we might as well give up all responsible government if that is to be the rule. I give the Opposition right to full and free discussion, but when they have fully and pertinently discussed a measure, when they have taken up the issues involved in a manly and fair spirit of criticism and investigation, applied according to fair rules, I say when they go one single step beyond that it is not criticism but it is obstruction, and that is against the genius and the spirit of our constitution. The hon. member for West Ontario said we ought not to bring in such revolutionary legislation, because there is a rebellion in the North-West. He said an English Government never would bring in such measures when there was anything like a war going on. But have we not seen a franchise measure brought into the British Parliament within a few months past? During that time a very serious and, what threatened at one time to become a most complicated war, was going on in the Soudan and in different parts of Africa. We did not hear, however, that Mr. Gladstone withdrew his Bill; and we did not hear that anyone arose in the British House of Commons and proposed to Mr. Gladstone to withdraw that Bill for the reason that a war was going on.

The hon. gentleman states that this Bill has the forms of liberty, but that it is meant for despotic purposes. Now, what are the forms of liberty under which despotic purposes are concealed? I hold that the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) is bound, if possible, to make clear the despotic purpose in any measure that is brought forward by a Government with which he is not in accord. It is an easy thing to brand a measure as despotic. If you can get the people to believe that it is despotic then you gain your object. The measure is founded at first upon an Act of Parliament, it is put into operation by men of intelligence, who are sent here by the country, with the eye of the country upon them. The measure is to establish a franchise. The assessors' lists are the bottom of it—the substratum upon which it is built. Then come the revisors, with all possible publicity that can be given, and then comes the appeal from the revisors. There you have legal testimony, there you have legal decisions, and all this is open to the people, with a publicity which cannot be made any greater. Do purposes of despotism generally lurk in measures and proceedings such as these? I think not. I challenge the hon. gentleman to go through that Bill, clause after clause, and say where the power is taken from the people, where the courts of law or legal proceedings interfere with the will of the people. The hon. gentleman told us that there was discontent in all the Provinces. I ask, calmly and earnestly, if this is a time in the history of the country when hon. gentlemen should talk about discontent in all these Provinces? When we are face to face with a rebellion in which the blood of brave men, our brothers and those who are dear to us, is to be shed, is it the best policy that hon. gentlemen should assert discontent in all portions of the country? But he went further, and he threatened this free Parliament. Ontario, said he, has been loyal; she has been long suffering; she has been a good member of Confederation; but I will not vouch for the length of time that she will remain so if this Bill be passed into law. Is that the kind of legislation we are to have here? Is that the kind of legislators we are to have here? to threaten Parliament with secession if what they think is right is not given and what they think is wrong is not immediately taken back? I will not bow to any demand of that kind, and that hon. gentleman takes more than his shoulders can carry when he attempts to represent, in this, the Province of Ontario. Here sit hon. gentlemen from Ontario as intelligent as that hon. gentleman, from as independent constituencies, elected by the free choice of the people, and without forcibly displacing any other men to make room for them. The man who goes out into Ontario or into any other Province and threatens to unfurl a rebel flag will be the man who will find his level pretty quickly. Yet, here is a gentleman who had the assurance to turn to my hon. friend from Grey, and say: You have been put up to speak, have you? I wonder who made it possible for that gentleman to get into a position where he could be put up to speak—wandering from county to county, and city to city, like Japhet in search of a father, finding no people who would take him up of their own accord; by-and-bye, an hon. gentleman whom we all admired, who was just as able and just as honest as my hon. friend, is got out of the way, and the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) is got into a position to put himself up. People who live in glass houses should not throw stones; and if he had as long a head as the gentleman whom he succeeded in that way, he would have thought twice before he levelled a taunt at my hon. friend from Grey. If this Bill is passed Ontario will rebel, will it? There is a depth of fervent loyal sentiment in Ontario to-day, which will take the member for West Ontario at his word, and give him a most emphatic rebuke—when he threatens Parliament with the rebellion of an integral part of Confederation—and yet, it is of a piece with the hon. gentleman, and many of his associates. Who is it that countenanced secession in the city of St. John?

Some hon. MEMBERS. The Tories.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it? Then my hon. friend who sits for the county of St. John countenances secession? But of course he is not a Tory. In the city of St. John one of the political friends of the member for West Ontario is the only man, I am thankful to say, in the Province of New Brunswick, who runs an annexation sheet. He favors secession. In the Legislature at Halifax, a long motion for the dismemberment of the Union was brought in. Who brought it in? One of the members in accord with the member for West Ontario. In the Legislature of Quebec, when the North-West rebellion was at its beginning, who is it that brought up the motion of censure and of reprehension of this Dominion in its integrity, but one of the gentlemen at present in political accord with my hon. friend from West Ontario? What is the Club National doing in Montreal to-day and what is its political complexion? and yet he says to-night, with all this background of discontent, I am here to say—I know Ontario and I know that if you pass this Bill, I cannot vouch for the allegiance of that Province.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Who signed the annexation manifesto?

Mr. FOSTER. Which annexation manifesto?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Half a dozen of them.

Mr. FOSTER. You should know.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Enquire of the present Minister of the Interior.

Mr. FOSTER. If you do not know who signed it, you probably know who would like to.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). You know all about it.

Mr. FOSTER. It is generally the case that the bravest men do the signing, while the less brave stand behind and pull the wires. I leave it to the hon. gentleman to say to which category he belongs. He has been very anxious to know why we have not been saying anything in this debate. He has been puzzled and annoyed because we did not discuss this question. I suppose the reason is, that we knew what we thought was sufficient to guide us in our voting. We have studied the Bill, we knew it was useless to let light in upon the other side of the House, and we were willing to sit here and see if we could be convinced by their arguments. We have listened to them, and I fail to see any who show any great signs of being convinced. For myself, I desire to say that I shall discuss questions in this House when I think it is my duty to do so, and that neither taunts nor requests, nor anything of the kind, coming from any gentleman in this House, will make me speak, unless I consider that there is something to be gained by my speaking. But they are not satisfied whether we talk or not, and one of the chief grievances of the member for Peel (Mr. Fleming) was that some gentlemen actually brought pillows into the House. Peel and pillows seem to go closely together. They say: Why are we obstructing this Bill? Because you brought pillows into the House. That is a good argument. I recommend the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Fleming) to take that argument down to his constituents, to go through the constituency with it next summer, and when he is asked: Why did you keep up the long obstruction? He can reply: they brought in pillows. Pillows in that case were only a sign of something else. Of what? We supposed on this side of the House that we were to have an all-night session. And we were right. I know, and hon. gentlemen know as well as I do, that they were prepared for an all-night session before they saw any pillows, or any sign of pillows on this side of the House. I just wish, for a moment or two, to place my opinion on this Franchise Bill before the House, and the position which it seems to me has been taken by those who have been discussing the Bill. Every man is free to make up his opinion on this or any other measure that comes before the House.

Mr. CASEY. Has he?

Mr. FOSTER. That is, if he has a mind to make up. I was not alluding particularly to my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Casey). If the hon. gentleman objects, I will except him from the category, with pleasure. Every hon. member, I say, has a right to make up his own opinion upon a measure, and he has a right to express that opinion; but at the same time we are human beings, and we have a certain form of government under which we carry on our affairs. That form of government is what is known as responsible government. In 1882 the people came together at the polls, and they elected by an overwhelming majority one party to take charge of the administration of the affairs of this country and take the dominant part in its legislation. And when they elected them, they said this to the members they elected: We will trust you for the next five years; go to the House, conduct its affairs, carry on our legislation, and when the five years are up, come back to us and we will do—what? Hold the minority responsible? Not at all. But we will hold you, the majority, responsible for the manner in which you have administered public affairs. So I say it is the dominant party for the time being possessing the confidence of the people, which is responsible for the administration of public affairs. Hon. gentlemen may say: They have not the public confidence. But you can go on no other theory than that they have the confidence of the country. It is that dominant party which must take the chief part in legislation and the whole share in moulding the policy of the country. You reverse things entirely when the minority say: No; you do not represent the people; if you do anything we do not like we will stop here till next October in order to prevent your measures going into operation. How? Not by argument or by destructive criticism, but by the simple force of wearing out the majority, if possible, and so preventing legislation. I say that if that is the rule which is to be adopted you may as well throw away responsible government first as last, and do away with all the responsibility of the dominant party, which is supposed to have the confidence of the country. I said we were human beings as well. What do we hear and see, for we cannot keep our ears and eyes shut. We hear on the street and in the corridors the threat made that this Bill shall not pass. We take up the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite and we see the threat repeated, that this Bill shall not pass. In the Ottawa organ and in the Toronto organ of yesterday and to-day it is stated that the members will sit here through the summer rather than allow this Bill to pass. We do not have to go to extra-official sources, for the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said as much, implicitly, if not explicitly, when, after hours and hours and days and days of what seemed to us obstructive tactics, he flung the words over to this side of the House: Take away, withdraw your Franchise Bill, and we will let the business go on.

Mr. MILLS. I did not say that; the hon. gentleman is mistaken as to what I said.

Mr. FOSTER. What did you say?

Mr. MILLS. The hon. member for Northumberland, I think, mentioned a number of things that might be done in order to facilitate business; and after he had repeated his list, I added: Withdraw the Franchise Bill.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman has made his explanation, and I do not think there is a single member in this House who will not say that his explanation carries out what I said.

Mr. WOODWORTH. His statement was this, and I remarked it at the time——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I rise to an explanation.

Mr. MILLS. I say that my explanation was precisely what I stated.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I am speaking to a question of Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. WOODWORTH. There is no member who interrupts the House more than the hon. member for Bothwell. He has interrupted the hon. member for King's with a statement. I say, in the face of this Parliament, that that statement is not correct.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a voice on that side of the House. It makes little difference as to the exact words in which the hon. member made his statement. The meaning of the statement, if it had any meaning, though the most reasonable view might be that it had not, was: Take away your Franchise Bill, and then we will go on with those other matters that the hon. member for Northumberland spoke of. But the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) followed up that statement, when he said, from his place, not many hours ago, that he would sit here till September or October, I am not certain which, in order that this Bill should not pass.

Mr. KIRK. I made no such statement as that it should not pass. What I said was: That I was willing to sit to October, as I am.

Mr. FOSTER. We will give the hon. gentleman all the length of rope that explanation will afford him. Then we had the member for one of the Wellingtons, who stated explicitly—I hope I shall not be contradicted this time——

Some hon. MEMBERS. He is not here.

Mr. FOSTER. I took his words down—that he did not want to take up the time of the House, but he was simply acting under the directions of his leaders. During his repeated speeches he confessed that he was acting simply according to the directions of his leaders. You may put these things together; what the party organs say, what you hear in the streets and corridors, and what is stated in the House, and the actions of the last two weeks, and I say members cannot help feeling that the Opposition is declaring: We will not let you carry measures which you consider to be for the benefit of the country; we will stay here all summer, in order that you shall not do it. And I say that that is not the proper spirit for a minority, or even for a majority, to take in this House. So much for that question.

It is stated that this is an interference with provincial rights. If hon. gentlemen think so they have a perfect right to hold that opinion. There is not one, however, who gets up in his place, and holds the opinion that it is unconstitutional for this measure to pass, and therefore that Parliament is attempting to pass anything outside of its jurisdiction. Put these two points together: The party which holds the confidence of the people, if there be any proof of the confidence of the people being held, is the party sent here for five years to carry out the legislation of this country and conduct the administration of affairs; it, in its matured judgment, comes to the conclusion to pass a measure which is within its own constitutional right, without cavil or doubt, and which measure seems to be somewhat distasteful to certain members of the Opposition, at the time in a minority. Now, on that ground they have thrown out the challenge and the threat that they will keep this Parliament in session all summer through, if necessary, and that legislation which is obnoxious to them shall not pass. Now, I have every respect for each man's individual opinion, and I will have every possible respect for the opinion of men in the aggregate occupying seats on the Opposition benches, but I say that they ought not to believe that their own opinion is so infallible, that they are so much in the right, that they can take the responsibility of blocking what the men who hold the confidence of the country think is necessary and expedient legislation; and that after they have fully discussed it, after they have made their voices heard, after they have made their views and wishes known, then they should allow the responsible party in the House to take the responsibility of passing that measure, and let them and the people reckon with this responsibile party when they go to the polls. Now, it seems to me that there is no other proper way in which this can be done, and when we get obstructive tactics by a minority, no matter of what political stripe, when these tactics hold out week after week, in the attempt to defeat the will of the people, as expressed by their chosen representatives, I say that is subversive of all principles of responsible government, and a thing which cannot be tolerated in this Dominion; and in the face of that threat, openly made, repeated day after day in this House, I say, as one member on this side, I am willing to sit here all summer and all winter, too, if it be necessary. Now, the next hon. gentleman rising on that side will say I have threatened—that I have made a threat to the Opposition. I have made just what I have made, and hon. gentlemen can make out of it whatever their fertile imaginations choose to prompt them to make out of it. I have simply stated my reasons for the right of this Bill, and its passage through the House—my reasons, in a constitutional point of view, and in those other points of view to which I have alluded, and I say, with those views to back me, that these constitutional principles shall not be violated by a minority which proposes, by sheer force, to prevent legislation which those having the confidence of the people think it expedient to pass.

Now, the whole brunt of the discusion so far has been upon two questions—the question of woman suffrage and the question of the enfranchisement of Indians. It is with reference to the woman suffrage that I shall take up just a moment, and by a single sentence express my opinion with reference to it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOSTER. You say the Indians ought not to be enfranchised, and you make a comparison between the Indians whom you say this Bill will enfrancise and the gentle and sweet women of our country; you say it is an outrage that the Indians should be enfranchised and that the women should not. Now, I hold as strongly as hon. gentlemen opposite can, and just as honestly as hon. gentlemen opposite do—not more honestly; I do not say that—just as honestly as my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), and his honest countenance tells me that he holds it honestly—I say I hold as honestly as he does in favor of the complete enfranchisement of women, married, single or widows, who have an equal property qualification with men, when once you fix the conditino of a franchise by a property qualification. But I say, too, that I believe in enfranchising the Indian. I believe that the Indian who earns a living for himself, the Indian who has real property, who occupies a home, who has a salary or income, who is looking forward to that greatest boon which men in a civilized country can claim, and which men in a savage country can aspire to—the boon of full and perfect citizenship—I say I could not, in justice to history and my own convictions, deny the right of the franchise to that man. Hon. gentlemen opposite get up and they thunder away for hours and hours, in a futile attempt to mislead the country into the thought that every savage Indian in the Great North-West is, forsooth, to be enfranchised, and made a voter under this Bill; that Pie-a-pot, and Pat-him-on-the-back, and those other Indians, with whose names hon. gentlemen are suspiciously familiar, shall have votes. One hon. gentleman even let his fancy—no, not his fancy, but some peculiar and hitherto abstruse faculty, which has lain dormant in his mind since 1882—he suddenly let it loose this afternoon and in most chaste, eloquent and courteous words, he devoted about an hour of his talk to the leader of the Government, as to how fitting he would be to become the representative of those wild hordes of Indians in the North-West. Now, that may have been very clever, from the hon. gentleman's standpoint; very *a propos* from the peculiar cast of ability which he possesses; very much in the line of the hon. gentleman's antecedents, and of his constitutional qualities of mind; but, at the same time, it was not just in the best of taste, in a parliamentary debate, to indulge in any such remarks or make any such comparison. That hon. gentleman knew, and if he did not, I pity the lack of intelligence which could not know—he knew as well as that he is sitting there that it is not the intention nor is it in the power of this Bill to enfranchise the wild hordes of savage Indians all over the Dominion, whom they have been talking about. But when there is an Indian who holds real estate, as he must in his own right——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. FOSTER. Who holds real estate, as he must, or who is a tenant——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) has engrossed a good deal of attention in this House, has had his say, and for two mortal hours I sat in my seat last night listening to him, as he spoke, and spoke, and spoke, and I tried to find out what he said; I tried to lodge all that was pertinent, and I think I have, and you could lodge it all on the point of a needle. I did not interrupt him, and so I say that the Indians to vote must have the qualifications, as a white man must have the qualifications.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no other intention, and if hon. gentlemen had not a political purpose to serve you would never hear them coming to such extravagant conclusions as that all the wild Indians in the country are to be enfranchised by the Bill. We are here simply defining the persons who come under the term Indian, and when the appropriate qualification clause comes up, it will be time enough to amend it, if, by any possibility, the wild Indians to whom hon. gentlemen opposite refer are included in it. Having read this Bill through I fail to see where it allows those savage hordes of Indians to become enfranchised; but if, when the qualification clauses are reached, it is shown to my satisfaction that such is the case, I will join hon. gentlemen opposite in preventing any such possibility occurring. Hon. gentlemen opposite have spoken of the Indians as the paupers of thewhite people,as the analogues of the workhouse poor of Great Britain. I take exception to that description. Long before the white men came to this country, who lived on these wide plains, who hunted over these mountains, who fished on these lakes, lords of all these lands and all these waters, but the ancestors of the same red men whom hon. gentlemen opposite to-day call paupers, living on the charity of the white men? We have taken from the Indians their fishing grounds, we have taken their hunting lands, we have encroached on their reserves; the time has come when, in the march of civilisation, even the buffalo have left the great plains, and it is not upon the bounty doled out by the white people that the Indians are living. It is but an infinitesimal part of their own rights, which they have surrendered to us, that we return to them. I am not the man to stand up here and taunt the red men with being paupers on the bounty of the white men, and still less to say that when the Indian proves himself honest, earnest, wage-worthy, and, as a man, aspires to the right of manhood and citizenship, the best and dearest right to which a man can aspire, he should not be given the franchise. I believe that a Franchise Bill of this nature is within the power of this Parliament. I believe that in the British North America Act it is expressly pointed out as one of the powers which should be taken and exercised by this Parliament. It is not a shadow of an argument to say that because we have not exercised that power hitherto we should not exercise it now. That kind of argument would be the death blow to all progress. The time has now come, as we knew it inevitably would, some time in the history of the country, when Parliament should exercise this power which was expressly pointed out as coming within its jurisdiction at the time Confederation was formed. The exercise of this power is not an infringment on provincial rights. If we attempted to fix the franchise in any Province for its own legislation, that would be an act of tyranny, an act outside the jurisdiction of this Parliament; but to say that we shall not fix, in this broad Dominion, irrespective of the Provinces, a basis of the franchise upon which members to this Parliament should be elected, is to say something that to my mind has no foundation in common sense. As to the question of expediency, there is ground for difference on that, but when I see how intensely anxious hon. gentlemen on the other side are, lest the revision of the voters' lists should be properly and honestly made, I cannot help coming to the conclusion that they are afraid they will lose by that honest and impartial revision something which hitherto they have been able to keep. This Bill may be objected to on the ground of expense, but there can be no doubt that it is clearly within our jurisdiction. No man can say anything against a revision which begins with the assessors' list, which is carried out with the utmost publicity before a competent legal revisor, and with the assistance of competent legal help, and then goes before a tribunal as high as the county judge on questions of both law and fact. I say it cannot surely be contended that any honest man has anything to fear from such a revision of the voters' list. It is not worthy of argument that to say that because the revision will be made by county judges and revising barristers, who may be county judges, and who, in the main, I believe, will be county judges——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOSTER. To say that because that is the case there will be any harm done to the Indian; but it is a guarantee to the Indian, that when his vote shall come to be revised by a county judge as the ultimate court of appeal he will get his rights. Now, I have but one simple statement to make, and it is that I think the sooner these 160 gentlemen, coming from all parts of the Dominion, get down to the fair, honest work of legislation, so much of which remains to us, and stop these obstructive tactics, which have been adopted in other Parliaments, and which have been of no credit to them, but which, happily, have never yet, in our Canadian Parliament, attained, until the present time, such force and strength as they have attained elsewhere—the sooner we set ourselves to the work of legislation that we have before us the more shall we heighten our own self respect, and gain the respect of the country at large.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Chairman, as it is now approaching Sunday morning, and as I do not suppose it is the desire of the House, unless it be the particular wish of hon. gentlemen opposite, to continue the debate after twelve o'clock, I rise to say a few words. As I understand, on Friday morning last, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) moved an amendment to this paragraph of the second clause. It was discussed from Friday morning until this morning, about ten o'clock, when the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), desiring, apparently, to have some rest, and desiring that the members of the committee should have some opportunity of considering the arguments that had been used in favor of the proposition, and in favor of the amendment, moved that the committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again. We are bound to suppose that the hon. gentleman was sincere in making the motion; we are bound to suppose that his friends who spoke on the same side were anxious to carry that motion; we are bound to suppose that they thought there should be time for reflection, for consideration of the arguments on both sides, and for rest; yet, strange to say, every hon. gentleman on that side who spoke afterwards refused to allow that motion to be put. Again and again did the Chairman try to put that motion, and for the purpose of allowing it to be discussed not a single gentleman on this side of the House said a word; and yet one member after another on the Opposition side rose and spoke for the purpose of preventing the putting of the motion of the hon. member for South Brant, that the committee rise and report progress. What was the reason the hon. gentlemen did so? We know from the speeches that were made, which were not directed to the question, that we had spoken long enough, and that it was time to go to rest. But after the amendment was put they argued on the original question, so far as the argument

was directed to the question of the Indian franchise. They spoke as if the hon. gentleman's motion that the committee rise was out of place, out of time, ill-considered, and that we should still go on to discuss the question; and for thirty-six hours, until the last two hours, hon. gentlemen opposite prevented the Chairman from putting the motion, which he tried again and again to do, and prevented the committee from coming to a conclusion upon it. If that motion had been lost, then the discussion would have gone on to the motion of the hon. member for Bothwell. But there was wilful obtruction, you see; and that it was obstruction was admitted, because—I did not happen to be here, but it has been reported to me, and I have no doubt it is the case—not one, but several gentlemen, threw across the floor that they were willing to carry the paragraph and the whole clause on certain conditions. They had no right to make such a proposition, unless the whole question was fully discussed. They were bound to fully discuss it. They were not doing their duty to make such a proposition, unless they felt that it was fully discussed, because the other proposition, the compromise thrown across the floor was not accepted. If it had been accepted I have no doubt the vote would have been taken on the paragraph. And yet, for a whole night and a whole day, these gentlemen have been discussing this simple Indian question, although they themselves were willing to vote on the clause twenty-four hours ago. After all, Sir, what is the question? The question is simply whether an Indian is a person. Now, the hon. member for South Brant rested very strongly upon the Indian Act. Well, as I said when the discussion on this clause first came up, I do not believe there was any necessity for putting in the word Indian at all. The definition of Indian in the Indian Act is simply this: That for the purposes of that Act, and for the purpose of construing the Act, an Indian meant so-and-so; but it is only for the purposes of that Act. An Indian is an Indian, a red man, whether enfranchised or unenfranchised, whether savage or civilised, whether educated or uneducated; and the definition in the Indian Act has no reference at all to this clause; and without the word Indian there, when it says that a person shall mean any male person, it would include the Indian as well as it would the African, the Chinaman, the American, or any individual who is a man at all. The only reason why I put in those words was that it might otherwise create a confusion in uninformed minds; it might bring up the question in uninformed minds, as uninformed as the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), who might make a mistake, and might suppose the interpretation of the word "Indian," in the Indian Act, would apply to a subsequent Act passed for a different purpose, with a different object, having no connection with the Indian Act or the provision sthereof. But for the purpose of avoiding the possibility of misconstruction, the words "an Indian" were inserted as an amendment, as an afterthought; because I was afraid that it might be held, as the hon. gentleman was inclined to hold, and I think still holds, that this subsequent Act would be governed by a previous Act, with which it had no connection. Now, Sir, as has been said by my hon. friend who spoke last, this long discussion is in the wrong place. It is *a propos de rien*. It was simply on this interpretation clause; it was simply declaring that an Indian was a person. If a contrary argument were used, if the hon. gentleman contended that by the Indian Act an Indian was not a person, see what would follow. We have an Act in the Consolidated Statutes declaring that any person who, by malice aforethought, kills another, is guilty of murder. But if an Indian was tried on a charge of murder he would have to be acquitted, according to the idea of the hon. gentleman, because an Indian is not a person. The Indian Act declares that a person means everybody but an Indian, and therefore if an Indian murdered a man he cannot be found guilty. Because the law says, that any person who commit murder must be tried and convicted for murder, and be hanged; but the Indian Act says that an Indian is not a person; therefore he must go scot free. That is the argument of the hon. gentleman. Therefore, Sir, the whole of this discussion is waste of time, a criminal waste of time, a useless waste of time; and a waste of time deliberately planned, deliberately followed, for the purpose of wearying out, aye, wearying out the majority, as has been stated, and stated truly; and it can be proved, with the deliberate purpose of practising upon my supposed infirmities and my advanced years.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It can be proved, and if it be seriously denied, the proof can be produced out of the mouths of hon. gentlemen who sit on that side, that the plan was deliberately made to weary me out. It is a great compliment to my powers, to my position; it is a great compliment to me in every way, and I feel the compliment. But I do not think that it will redound to the credit of hon. gentlemen opposite, or any of those who entered into such an unworthy plan, such an unworthy strategy, such base tactics, in the minds of the people of this country. I state it again, that it can be proved by indisputable evidence, on the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, that was a part of their tactics. But it will go to the country, and they will find, perhaps, that from poll to poll, from hustings to hustings, from platform to platform, they will find this ignoble system of political strategy thrown in their teeth by the manly electorate of the Dominion of Canada. However, Sir, it will soon be twelve o'clock. I fancy the practice must be this: As you, Sir, in the absence of the Speaker, hold the double position of Chairman of Ways and Means and of Deputy Speaker, you will have in some *pro forma* way to call some other hon. member to take your place as Chairman of the committee, and the committee will rise and report progress, and he will report to you in the chair. We will carry now, at twelve o'clock, the resolution of the hon. gentleman and those behind him, who would not allow it to be put twenty-four hours ago.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Ha, ha.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They laugh, but is it not so, Mr. Chairman? If you could speak, Sir, if you could say yes or no, I would ask you whether you did not, again and again, try to put the motion of the hon. gentleman, and your attempt to put that motion was defeated by one hon. member after another getting up and repeating the same speechss over and over again. We must raise the committee, and I hope, Sir, that we will rise for the purpose of resuming this interesting discussion at three o'clock on Monday.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has stated that we have been for a great many hours discussing a motion to adjourn, and then preventing the putting of that motion. But the hon. gentleman has, as has often happened before, in the course of his argument, himself disproved his argument a little later on; because he stated that propositions, suggestions, had been made; and I myself heard an hon. gentleman ask, many hours after that motion was put, whether he would consent to an adjournment, and he said "decidedly not." We found it impossible to procure assent to that view from hon. gentlemen opposite; and if this discussion continued it was for that reason alone that it continued; and the House nor the country can be convinced that we have been preventing, I do not say the putting of the motion, but the carrying of the motion. The hon. gentleman says that there was a wilful attempt at obstruction, because there was a statement made from this side of the House that the discussion might cease upon the Indian question at this stage, on conditions, which conditions simply were that

progress should be reported, and he says we had no right to suggest it. The hon. gentleman also said, and we know it, that there were other opportunities for resuming discussion. Of course there were. But the hon. gentleman said we had no right to make a suggestion of that kind, no right to make a stipulation of that kind. But the hon. gentleman says, a little later: This is not a fit time to have the discussion at all, but upon the enacting clauses; therefore an opportunity would have arisen for us, if the discussion had then been closed, to resume it upon the enacting clauses. Then the hon. gentleman says: The question only is whether an Indian is a person. The hon. gentleman was asked, at the very opening of this discussion, whether he intended, as, by the introduction of the word "Indian" in that clause, coupled with the other clauses, would appear to be the result of his Bill, to give the vote to the tribal Indian living on his reserve, by virtue of his location ticket; and he said yes, that was his object. And because that was his object and intention, my hon. friend from Bothwell put the amendment in your hands, limiting the class of Indians who were to be entitled to the franchise—not with reference to their other qualifications, not with reference to their occupation of lands, and so on, but with reference to their being qualified citizens, enfranchised persons, like the rest of the male population of the country. That was the object and that has been the issue; and the hon. gentleman still, by his observation and attitude while I speak, shows that he understands that is the issue. That is what we are fighting about. We have been fighting for this long time upon the question whether an Indian, under his control, his ward, an Indian to whom he can give or refuse the right to vote, or take it away—whether that man shall be enfranchised by his Bill. That is the question which we have been fighting about. Then the hon. gentleman says it was only for fear of a doubt, for fear of a confusion that might arise in an uninformed mind, a futile doubt, he says, a doubt that no one ought to have considered, that he put it in; but he stated that he was taking a leaf out of Mr. Mowat's book in putting it in, not that it was because of a doubt, but that it was because Mr. Mowat had enfranchised the Indian.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I did not say that.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, he did. He said he was humbly following in Mr. Mowat's footsteps. So the hon. gentleman gives different versions as to his motives and his objects, and his intent, upon different occasions. Then he said it was and afterthought which made him put it in; that he had not intended at first to put it in. What created the afterthought? We heard the reason the other day—Mr. Mowat's Act; that is what created the afterthought. Then he said the long discussion was misplaced. I say it was not misplaced, having regard to his declaration. The moment we found that the hon. gentleman's intent and the object of the Act with that word in was to produce that result, our right was to discuss it. It is upon the declaratory clause, the dictionary clause, the interpretation clause, that we have settled the great question of woman franchise.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; by his request. He requested that the principle of woman franchise should be discussed upon the interpretation clause, but he says it is improper to discuss the question whether Indians should be admitted to the franchise on the interpretation clause. The woman can be disposed of at that stage, but the Indian is a subject too dignified to be dealt with in that way. The hon. gentleman says it is a criminal waste of time to weary out the majority. How could the minority, one to two, particularly while we were doing all the fighting and hon. gentlemen were doing all the sitting and the sleeping, weary out the majority? The notion is ridiculous. We have contended that it was their duty to bring this measure forward for discussion early in the Session, and to bring it into committee early in the Session, to give us time to discuss it, with intervals for consideration, with reasonable adjournments for rest, with opportunity to get the feeling of the country upon it, to adopt the very view which I read from the hon. gentleman's speech in 1867 or 1868, that a reform Bill would be properly the work of an entire Session; and yet we know that the Bill was moved to be put into committee on the 25th day of April, within four days of the expiration of the three months which the hon. gentleman has frequently stated would be the normal time of a complete Session, with five-sixths of the Estimates to be attended to, with Ways and Means to be attended to, with the Canadian Pacific Railway resolutions to be attended to, with the Chinese Restriction Bill to be attended to, with the consolidation of statutes to be attended to, with the Court of Claims Bill to be attended to, with the Insolvency Bill to be attended to, with the North-West affairs to be attended to, with the finances of the country, in their present grave position, to be attended to; and three days afterwards he told us that we were to sit day in and day out to the exclusion of all other business, until this Bill was passed through the House. The hon. gentleman proposed to do that by virtue of a process of sitting to most unreasonable hours, and it is as a protest against that measure of discussion, which is unfair to the minority, unreasonable to the country, and unapt for the proper discussion of a question, that we have acted. He says it is a part of our tactics to weary him out. I deny it. I agree with him that, if that were a part of our tactics, it would be a base and unworthy method. I agree with him that, if, which I deny, that was any part of our tactics, it would be futile. He has every facility for resting, and we are glad to know that he has been resting, so that he is ready, as we are quite ready, if necessary, to go on next week.

Mr. BOWELL. He did not take any more rest than you did.

Mr. BLAKE. I said so, and I think the hon. gentleman was quite right. I am not going to infringe upon the hour, upon the stroke of which we have arrived. I say that was no part of our tactics, but that our course was to insist upon liberty of discussion, to insist upon popular rights, to insist upon the rights of Parliament, to insist upon our right to have free, full and ample discussion, which, at this time and under the circumstances and conditions which the hon. gentleman desires to impose upon us, as to the discussion of the Franchise Bill, he has rendered and is rendering absolutely impossible.

Motion that the committe rise and report progress (Mr. Paterson, Brant) agreed to.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12, midnight (Saturday, 2nd May.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 4th May, 1885.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—RETURNS.

Mr. BLAKE. I call the attention of the hon. gentleman, in view of the fact that notice has been given of resolutions respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, that certain infor-

mation with reference to that company has not been laid before the House, as was done on former occasions when discussing the affairs of that company in connection with the contract, and in connection with the action taken last Session. I would also call attention to the fact that a considerable number of the returns were ordered by this House with reference to the affairs of that corporation, and immediately concerning the motion of which notice has been given, early in the Session, and that to a great majority of them no answer has been made.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. MILLS. I would say to the Government that I have received a communication from the North-West, in which I have been informed that the commissioners who have been appointed, and who have been engaged for some time, have issued a quantity of scrip to heads of families and others, the same as was done in Manitoba, and that the half-breed scrip has been sold in large quantities for the purpose of obtaining arms and ammunition, and that some of the persons who have sold that scrip are joining Riel at Batoche Crossing. If that is the state of feeling, I think it would be well for the Government to decide whether or not the commission shall continue to issue this scrip, if it is to be applied to such a purpose.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The commissioners have sat at Qu'Appelle and Regina, and they have issued orders and some scrip have been granted. It may be that some of the scrip may have been used for the purchase of arms or ammunition—it may be for a legitimate purpose or it may be for an illegitimate purpose, but I may say that the news from Qu'Appelle and Fort Qu'Appelle is of the most satisfactory character, as to the tone and spirit of the half-breeds there, and under these cicumtances, as the hon. gentleman has asked the question, I think I would ask the Minister of Militia to read a telegram he has received.

Mr. CARON. This is a telegram from Colonel Turnbull, who is in command of the cavalry:

"TOUCHWOOD, NORTH-WEST TERRITORY, 3rd May, 1885.

"To Hon. A. P. CARON, Ottawa.

"Have ridden all around important Indian reserves with Indian agent. No fear of any rising, and all Riel's runners have left without success, so crestfallen that I expect to hear of considerable desertion from the rebel camp. All the supplies on this road perfectly safe. Arrival of the cavalry has given confidence to all the settlers along the route, who intend coming in a body to call upon me and thank the Government for the prompt protection given. On the information I have heard, Riel suffered much greater loss than generally supposed, and I do not believe the end is far off—a fortnight at most. The Cavalry School are in excellent health and spirits. Horses rather overworked, but that cannot be avoided. Great praise is given to everyone for the excellent arrangements throughout the expedition, and anyone who grumbles, is not fit to be a soldier.

"J. P. TURNBULL."

Mr. BLAKE. I am sure we are all gratified to hear the telegram which has just been read. I observe by the papers a statement that another portion of the forces has been called out—the Montreal battery—and perhaps the hon. gentleman would say whether that is so, what the strength of the battery is, when they leave, and for what place?

Mr. CARON. The brigade commanded by Colonel Oswald has been called out for the purpose of garrisoning Winnipeg. Hon. gentlemen will understand that it is very important, just at the present, that Winnipeg should not be left without troops. The order has been given to move, and the brigade is now preparing, and I expect will move in a day or two.

Mr. BLAKE. I also observe a statement in the papers that a large number of recruits for the North-West Mounted Police have been enlisted, and have gone to the North-West; and I think I saw by the papers that they have arrived at Winnipeg. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would state what addition to that corps has been made, and whether they have arrived at Winnipeg.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I believe they have arrived. The number I am not quite sure of. In anticipation of the circumstance of the vote that has been asked for the augmentation of that force, recruiting has been going on, and I will inform the House later the number of recruits that have already been got.

Mr. BLAKE. Men and horses, please.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Men and horses.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 138) for the relief of George Branford Cox—(*from the Senate*).—Mr. Beaty. On a division.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY—IMPORTATION OF RAILS.

Mr. MITCHELL asked, 1. Did the Grand Trunk Railway Company in the early part of 1881, or at any time that year, enter at the Custom House, Montreal or St. Johns, Province of Quebec, or any other port in Canada, 2,000 tons or thereabouts of railway rails from the United States, by mistake as steel rails and therefore free from duty, and what time was such entry made? And was the entry made before or after the rails passed into Canada? 2. Did the company on subsequently discovering that such rails were iron and not steel and therefore subject to a duty of 15 per cent., correct such entry by representing them as iron rails? 3. Did they pay the duty on such rails as iron rails, and if so, when was such corrected entry made and duty paid?

Mr. BOWELL. There was no entry of iron rails made by the Grand Trunk Railway Company at the port of Montreal; but in 1883, an importation of rails was made by the Grand Trunk Railway Company at the port of St. John, Province of Quebec, consisting of 2,243¾ tons, which were entered, and which paid duty there as iron rails, at the rate of 15 per cent., on the 31st of July of that year. These rails were received in a very rusty state; and as some doubt existed as to whether they were iron or steel, the question was referred to Mr. Hannaford, chief engineer of the Grand Trunk Railway Company at Montreal, who replied that they were iron rails, and they were entered accordingly, and a check was sent to pay the duty.

THE VOLUNTEERS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. SMALL asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to recognise in some substantial manner the services of the volunteers engaged in the North-West?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government will give their full attention to that question hereafter, when they think it will be the proper time and when the opportunity is given.

THE PUBLIC DEBT.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, The net amount and the gross amount of the public debt of Canada on April 30th, 1885.

Mr. BOWELL. The gross amount of the public debt of the Dominion of Canada on the 30th April, 1885, was $257,291,043.72. The net debt of the Dominion at the same date was $192,202,186.41.

THE HALF-BREED COMMISSION.

Mr. ROYAL asked, Whether proper and effective means have been taken to inform the white and half-breed population of Prince Albert, Grandin, Stobart and Duck Lake of the issue of the commission to Messrs. Street,

Goulet and Forget, and of the nature of such commission? What were these means? At what date have these means been taken?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Instructions were sent to the Lieutenant Governor of the North-West on the 15th of February to give the information sought for in this question; and I have no doubt he has communicated it to all points.

THE AFFAIR OF DUCK LAKE.

Mr. ROYAL asked, Whether a report has been received from Crozier, the officer of the Mounted Police in command at Fort Carlton, District of Alberta, N. W. T., concerning the affair of Duck Lake on the 26th March last? If such a report has been received, will the Government lay the same upon the Table at the earliest moment for the information of the members of the House?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No report has yet been received from Crozier or from the commissioner, Col. Irvine. This report, when received, will be laid before the House.

STATION AT ST. ROMUALD D'ETCHEMIN.

Mr. GUAY asked, Whether the Government ever promised to establish a regular station at St. Romuald D'Etchemin, county of Lévis, on the Intercolonial Railway? If not, whether it is their intention to establish one soon?

Mr. POPE. I am not aware that any promise has been made, but it is the intention of the Government to have a flag station placed at that point.

DUTY ON WOOLLEN RAGS.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the Government intends to propose legislation, with a view to carry out their pledge, that imported woollen rags shall be dutiable?

Mr. BOWELL. That matter is now under the consideration of the Government.

THE EVACUATION OF CARLTON.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Has any further report been received as to the evacuation of Carlton, and when?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There has not.

SETTLERS CLAIMS—PRINCE ALBERT DISTRICT.

Mr. BLAKE asked, At what date were the reports of the Land Board on the claims of settlers in the Prince Albert District, made on or about April, 1884, and lately laid on the Table, approved by the Minister? At what date was such approval communicated—(1) To the Land Board; (2) To the local agent; (3) To the parties concerned?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is impossible to ask that as a question. Returns can be obtained giving the information required.

HALF-BREED PLOTS, SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. BLAKE asked, From whom and in what years, were the several reports received from different officials as to the plots occupied by the half-breeds on the Saskatchewan and in its neighborhood?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a matter also which must be brought down on a motion for returns.

HALF-BREED SETTLEMENT—UNDISTURBED OCCUPATION.

Mr. BLAKE asked, When and through whom were the half-breeds told individually, under the direction of the Government, that no one of them would be disturbed in the occupation of his settlement? Has the Government a report of the performance of the order to make this statement?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All the agents have been instructed to inform the half breeds that they will not be disturbed, and not only have they been so informed by the agents, as I have no doubt, but in all the principal places surveys have been conducted for the purpose of conveying to them their land, and they were informed by the agents, and no doubt the agents were so instructed, that the mode of survey would not in any way interfere with the laying out of the lands granted in the past.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has not given the date.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no particular date. When an individual half-breed made an application he was so informed.

HALF-BREEDS—INDIAN RESERVES AND HOMESTEADS.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Through whom and when were the half-breeds of the Territories told as a whole, under the direction of Government, that if they desired to be treated as Indians there are most liberal reserves to which they could go with the others; but if they desired to be considered white men, they would get 160 acres of land as homesteads? Was any reply received to this intimation? From whom? And when? How and when did the Government learn that the half-breeds were not satisfied with the above proposal and wanted to get land scrip as well as their homesteads?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Indian Act contains provisions by which half-breeds desiring to do so, and being otherwise qualified, might have become enrolled as Indians. The Dominion Lands Act enables those who were not enrolled as Indians to obtain entries for homesteads and pre-emptions, the same as white men. Indian agents and agents of Dominion Lands have standing instructions to explain the provisions of the law to all concerned. In many instances, half-breeds have been enrolled as Indians, and in many instances half-breeds have obtained entries for homesteads and pre emption. The Government never learned from any source that they were dissatisfied with these provisions of the law. The scrip to be issued is in extinguishment of the Indian title of those who have not been enrolled as Indians.

HALF-BREEDS OF TERRITORIES—SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Were any, and if so, what steps were taken towards the settlement of the claims of the half-breeds of the territories to be dealt with similarly to those of Red River, between the Sessions of 1879 and that of 1882? At what time were such steps taken?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman will move I will bring down the returns.

SITTINGS OF HALF-BREED COMMISSION.

Mr. BLAKE asked, At what point has the half-breed commission held sittings? How many claims have been presented so far as the Government is advised? How many have been allowed, and how many reserved?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The commission has held sittings at Fort Qu'Appelle and Regina. The commission have reported on 138 claims. The Department has no means of knowing how many yet have been presented. All the claims reported to the Department so far have been allowed.

KIT SERVED OUT TO MILITIA.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Were the Guards, of Ottawa, the 65th and the Toronto Infantry School corps, or either of them, and if so which, served out with boots, moccasins, forage caps and tuques, or any of these articles? Were the Queen's Own and the Tenth Grenadiers, or either of them, served out with any and which of the above articles? Had the Government received any information as to the worn-out condition of the uniforms and knapsacks of one of the Toronto corps?

Mr. CARON. The company of Guards from Ottawa were supplied with boots and forage caps before leaving for the North-West. The 65th were authorised to procure boots in Montreal and did so. Tuques and moccasins have not been ordered by the Department to any of these corps. 600 pairs of boots were, at Col. Otter's own request, before he left Toronto, sent to Winnipeg for the Queen's Own, the 10th Royals, and the Infantry School corps. None of the other articles mentioned were applied for. No information has been received by the Department as to the worn out condition of the uniforms and knapsacks of one of the Toronto corps.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Were the Ottawa Guards supplied with boots before leaving Ottawa?

Mr. CARON. Yes.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I understood it was by private subscription.

Mr. CARON. They were supplied here before they left.

LICENSE INSPECTORS.

Mr. GUNN asked, When is it the intention of the Government to pay license inspectors appointed under the Act of 1883?

Mr. COSTIGAN. That question is now engaging the attention of the Government.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

(In the Committee.)

On amendment of Mr. Mills:

That the following words be added after the word "Indian," "who has been enfranchised under the Indian Act and has had conferred upon him the same civil capacities as other persons who are qualified to vote under this Act."

Mr. MILLS. I desire first to refer to something which fell from the First Minister on Saturday night, and also to something that fell from the hon. member for King's, New Brunswick. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) made a very violent attack on gentlemen on this side of the House, but, as his observations were rather in the form of scolding than argument, I do not think it necessary to say anything in reply. The hon. member for King's, New Brunswick (Mr. Foster), laid down a series of extraordinary propositions which I do not think he has very seriously considered, and which, I am sure, he will find no authority, under our system of Parliamentary government, to support. He assured the House that it was the business of this House to register the wishes of the Administration, that that was its function, and that an Opposition being in a minority had no right to put forward any views in opposition to the views of the majority.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. FOSTER. I made no such statement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. MILLS. He said he was here to register the decrees of the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that. The hon. gentleman states a part of what I said without stating all, and thereby creates a false impression of what I stated.

Mr. MILLS. I am stating the views of the hon. gentleman as I understood them at the time. I have looked for the *Hansard*, but the number is not yet out, and, if it were, I would repeat the precise words of the hon. gentleman. But the hon. gentleman's proposition would mean that a view brought forward, a measure brought forward by the Government, that never was before the country at all, that public opinion had not been expressed upon, that the public were in the dark about, because it was brought forward by the Government, was bound to be supported by the friends of the Administration. In fact, according to the view he laid down, if the First Minister were to propose to annex this country to the United States, it would be the bounden duty of hon. gentlemen on that side to support him.

Mr. FOSTER. I stated no such thing.

Mr. MILLS. I am stating it as I understood him, and as I believe he stated it.

Mr. FOSTER. I suggest that, as the hon. gentleman's understanding is so mistaken, he should wait until the *Hansard* is before the House before he discusses it.

Mr. MILLS. Every one on this side of the House understood him in the same way. Perhaps the hon. gentleman had not seriously reflected upon the observations he was making, but that was the effect of the views he put forward.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MILLS. I so understood it. I do not admit that. I stated at the beginning, and it is what I have all along mentioned, not only in this discussion but always, that it is the business of an Administration, in every matter relating to the constitution itself—because, while under our system, we may not have all the alterations of the constitution brought within the purview of Parliament, our system is federal and there are some matters which we have not the power to change, in other respects it is in the same position as the Parliament of England—not to interfere in matters of this kind without the consent of Parliament, and the hon. gentleman was no more called upon to support the proposition of the Government than he was to support a proposition coming from this side of the House, when it was not one upon which the opinion of the country had been taken. He also said it was our business to accept this measure as it was presented by the Administration, to abdicate our functions as a Legislature, and that it would be time enough to suggest any change when the effects were discovered. I do not so understand my duty or that of any hon. gentleman on that side. I consider it the duty of the representatives of the people to consider carefully and with serious attention every measure and every paragraph of every measure, which is brought forward, to reject that which we believe to be wrong and to support that which we believe to be right. The proposition before us is to enfranchise the Indian population, whether they are emancipated from Government control or not, so long as the property in their actual possession is sufficient, if it were purchasable property, to be estimated of the value required according to the provisions of this Act. A great many gentlemen have not, I think, seriously considered the effect of this measure, and I believe that the gentlemen from British Columbia are not aware that, if it passes in its present form, the Indians who reside upon reservations, whether they have location tickets or not, if they have the amount of property in their possession which

is required to enable a white man to vote, will be also entitled to vote. The First Minister stated on Saturday that this was a mere dispute as to a definition, that he simply proposed to say that an Indian was a person, and that we had had three or four days' discussion on that point. But the third and fourth sections of the Act provide that every British subject over twenty-one years of age, being a male, and being the owner or occupant of property of a certain value, is entitled to vote. This would include Indians, and I agree with the First Minister that, to exclude Indians from that provision who are resident on their tribal reservations, it would be necessary to provide that they shall not be included, but he proposes to insert the word "Indian" here in order to remove all doubt, and to make it clear that all Indians, whether enfranchised or not, whether upon reservations or not, so long as they fulfil the other conditions, are included. I have observed that the Government newspapers have been careful to avoid the discussion of this subject. The Montreal *Gazette* is the only one that I can find that has alluded to the subject, and that declared that the Indians within the Provinces, as distinguished from the Indians in the North-West Territories, are competent to exercise the franchise. What difference is there between the bands of Crow Quill or White Cap, who reside in the Province of Manitoba, and those of Big Bear, Pie-a-Pot, and Poundmaker, who reside in the Territories? The moral and mental condition of those tribes is the same. The Indians on those reservations are there under contract or compact with the Government, which gives to the Indian sufficient title of occupation to enable him to vote if the property which is in his posession is of the necessary value. Now, that being the case, it is perfectly clear that those Indians who reside upon reservations in British Columbia, Manitoba, and other Provinces, by this Act, will be voters for the election of members to the House of Commons, if they have in their possession property to the value of $150, or any of the other qualifications required. By the amendment I offer I do not propose to enfranchise the emancipated and enfranchised Indian; the Indian who has a separate holding, who is free from Government control, who has the legal capacity to make a contract and to assume the obligations of the white man, will be entitled to vote. I make no distinction between a white man and an Indian, except that distinction which the law has already drawn. What is the condition in which the hon. gentleman has put the Indian by the Indian Act? He has declared that he is not competent to take charge of his own affairs, that he is not competent to hold real estate or to make a contract; he is not required to pay taxes; he stands in a wholly different position from any other member of the community; he is wholly without any of those qualities which will enable him to discharge his duty as a citizen and entitle him to exercise the electoral franchise. I am not going now to discuss all those qualities which it is necessary for a person to possess in order to be entrusted with so high and important an element of freemen as the electoral franchise; but I am calling the attention of the committee, so that there may be no doubt about the matter, to the fact that the enfranchised Indian, the ward of the Government, the man who resides upon a reservation, whether he has a location ticket or not, if the piece of land he occupies and cultivates is of the value required here, will be entitled to have his name put upon the voters' list and to exercise the franchise. Now, I say that the great majority of Indians are not in a fit condition to exercise the electoral franchise. I have already read an extract from the report of the First Minister, four years ago, pointing to the fact that the Indian is not able to carry out municipal institutions, that he has not the intellectual capacity; that however simple you may make those institutions, they would be to him unworkable; and the man who is so low in the scale of intelligence as to be unable to do that, is to be put upon the voters' list and to exercise the franchise. The hon. member for Kent, New Brunswick (Mr. Landry) and the hon. member for King's, New Brunswick (Mr. Foster), have undertaken to leave upon the committee the impression that that was not the intention of the law. I say the intention is perfectly plain. I say it is plain that the Indian, if this Bill is carried in its present form, is entitled to exercise the electoral franchise. To that I am opposed; to that I believe the great majority of this House, if they voted freely, are opposed. I think that when we give an Indian, who assumes the duties that devolve upon white men, the right to the franchise; when we put him upon a footing of equality, we do all that even morality or prudence requires at our hands. Indeed, we admit by the manner in which we deal with him, by the special provision made in his behalf in our constitution, by the large expense we incur in order to support him—because we find that in the majority of cases he is unable to support himself—in all these things we admit he is intellectually, industrially, socially, in every way, the inferior of the rest of the population. If we take the best of them and emancipate them, you give them the same rights that you do the white men; and when you do that, if he is possessed of the electoral franchise upon the same condition as any other member of the community, I think we do all that we ought to do in the matter. By the amendment I have put in your hands it is provided that an Indian who is enfranchised, who has the same civil capacities as any other person, who has the same qualifications, as far as property is concerned, shall have the electoral franchise; and I think it would be a gross outrage to confer it upon any other.

Mr. DAWSON. I would like the House thoroughly to understand what the effect of the motion before us will be. The case has not been fairly stated by the Opposition side, nor has this motion now before the House been properly considered. What would be its effect if it were carried? The Indian Act says:

"The term 'enfranchised Indian' means any Indian, his wife, or minor, unmarried child, who has received letters patent granting him in fee-simple any portion of the reserve which may have been allotted to him."

That applies solely to the reserve: it applies solely to Indians living on reserves. The system they have to adopt to become enfranchised, the forms they have to go through, apply solely to Indians living on reserves. Now there is a large class of Indians, of people known as Indians, who live outside the reserves. We have a great many of them in every part of Ontario. There are professional men among those Indians who have abandoned their Indian life entirely, and live as white people do. There are among them boat builders, blacksmiths, tinsmiths, carpenters, and Indian farmers—all living among white people, and who now exercise the franchise. Now if this motion before the House were adopted, what would be the affect? The effect would be that all this class of Indians whom I have mentioned, would be obliged to go upon reserves, take up a little location and occupy it for three years, and go through a probationary term before they could exercise the franchise. It would disfranchise them. It is a most illiberal motion, as far as I can see. Now, I do not consider that this present Bill extends the franchise to Indians in the manner that has been set forth by the Opposition. I think for my own part, that it is not an exceedingly liberal measure as it is, and I propose to offer an amendment to the Bill, in its proper place, and define clearly what Indians, in my opinion, should have a right to vote. Clause 4 of the Bill defines the qualification thus:

"Of the age of twenty-one years and is not by this Act, or by any law of the Dominion of Canada, disqualified or prevented from voting."

Now, this Act prevents some of them from voting, because it is, I believe, an established point that minors cannot vote. The

Indian Act makes Indians living on reserves minors. These Indians cannot vote; so it will be fighting a shadow to say they shall not vote. The hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott) said that in his opinion minors could not exercise the franchise—and that hon. gentleman is supposed to know something of law, as much, in fact, as it is safe for any one man to carry—and I think his opinion should go for something in this matter. We heard a great deal of eloquence from the Opposition on Saturday as to what the effect would be of enfranchising Indians. We were told this Bill would enfranchise the heathen Indians of the North-West, and Indians everywhere in the country. But suppose the Bill should pass as it stands, it would only apply to Indians who have become civilised and industrious members of the community, and who have become possessed of a house and farm of at least a certain value. It will not extend to the wandering Indians of the plains, but only to those having fixed habitations and living as other people do. I think hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have taken an illiberal view of the matter. I call the attention of the committee particularly to this point, that by this motion the Indians now enfranchised, who live among white people, who have abandoned their Indian life, would be disenfranchised until they resumed their savage mode of life, again settled on the reserve and became possessed of a lot of land on the reserve. I think some hon. members the other night went a little too far in speaking of the Indians, in describing them as paupers, living on the bounty of the Government. They should have mentioned at the same time that the annuities paid the Indians were paid in accordance with solemn treaties and in payment for lands ceded to the Government. It is a right of which no government could deprive them, and which no government could make use of to gain their votes. There is one characteristic of Indians, which probably hon. gentlemen will find out, and that is that they are very often, like Irishmen, against the Government. So I do not think a Government could exercise any particular influence over them more than it could over any other people. The hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville) went into the question very fully the other night. I am sorry the hon. member, who displayed much ability in debate, should not have taken a more liberal view. He said that there were 130,000 Indians in the Dominion, that this Bill would enfranchise all of them, and that the House would be filled with Indians. I do not feel any apprehension on that score. The hon. gentleman also went on to point out how the Indians were living on the bounty of the Government, and he mentioned that last year $10,600 appeared in the estimates to be paid to Indians under the Robinson treaty. Does the hon. gentleman know how that matter stands; has he looked into the matter sufficiently to know that those Indians have been very badly treated by all Governments since the treaty was made with them? The treaty was made with them in 1850, and by that treaty it was agreed that they should receive a certain sum annually, when the sales of their lands enabled the Government to make the payment, which would amount to $1 per head. There is now, as I am informed, and have reason to believe upwards of $300,000 due to the Indians of lakes Superior and Huron under the Robinson treaty. They have no means of making their case known except by petition. Is it fair to shut our eyes against these grievances? If such grievances had been endured by white people they would have been heard of long ago. It was expressly stated when the treaty was entered into that the payments to the Indians were to be made out of the proceeds of the revenues of their lands. I believe both the late Government and the present Government entered into communication with the Ontario Government and insisted that that Government should pay this money, because it was a charge on the lands. The Ontario Government said the duty of dealing with the Indians belonged to the Dominion Government, that they had nothing to do with them and would not pay that money—I do not know that they positively refused, but they objected to the payment, putting it off from year to year, and this sum of over $300,000 has remained due to the Indians, and they have been unable to obtain it. If that money were distributed in establishing schools and in educating the Indians, they would soon reach a sufficiently high standard to enable them to take their places, probably in this House, or at all events to exercise the franchise. And yet when $10,600 have been voted in one year to those Indians, the hon. member for North Brant denounces it as an outrageous act, and as an evidence of the way in which the Indians are dependent on the bounty of the Government. But this payment was not a bounty or a gift. It was an amount justly due, and in fact only a fraction of the sum due. Again, the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Fleming) spoke of the troubles in the North-West in such a manner as to excite passion and prejudice against the Indians. He spoke of the rebellion having broken out, and insinuated that the Government were now about to give votes to such Indians as Pie-a-Pot. Admit that those people have been as bad as reported. Admit that they are disloyal, admit that they have gone into rebellion—admit all that, still let me ask one question. Hon. gentlemen stated the other day that the total number of Indians in this wide Dominion was 130,000, and out of this large number how many are in rebellion? A few hundreds, perhaps, and would it be just or fair to disfranchise the whole of this community, and to say that they should be punished for the faults of the few misguided men who have now taken up arms? Surely not; and however much we may condemn those men we should not allow our feelings to carry us so far as to say that this very much larger number, who are loyal and who have kept the treaties made with them, should be treated or even spoken of with injustice. As I stated before, I intend at the proper time and place to move an amendment. The clause now under consideration simply says that an Indian is a person, and I certainly think it is rather unusual to cavil so long about a single word, when, as the different clauses of the Bill come before us, there will be ample opportunity of discussing as to who shall or shall not vote. My intention is to propose that this Act shall be assimilated to the present Act of Ontario, except in a few minor particulars as to residence amongst Indians and other matters; and as hon. gentlemen opposite allude to the Ontario Act as being perfection, they will surely attach some importance to a provision similar to that which is set out in that Act. A great deal has been said by eloquent gentlemen about the tyranny of the Government. The hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) was very pathetic about it the other night. He said: Here we are going without sleep, deprived of our natural rest, until our faculties both mental and bodily are affected. It was really very touching, the eloquent way in which the hon. gentleman expressed himself. But I would ask him and others if there is not such a thing as tyranny on the part of an opposition, as well as on the part of a Government. Here they have compelled us, night after night, without the slightest compunction, to go without sleep. We have allowed them to argue this matter out to the fullest extent. But after all we could not please them; they became indignant because they were not replied to, and they went on speaking, and when they got tired speaking they went on reading stories, which would have been most interesting at the proper time and place. No doubt they were very interesting, but still people half asleep I hardly think could properly appreciate them. I hope the time will soon come when we will get a little further on with this Bill,

instead of haggling over one word—the simple expression that an Indian is a person—who can deny that an Indian is a person, and if not a person what is he?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A vegetable.

Mr. DAWSON. I think we should at least get through the interpretation clauses, and at the proper time and place we can discuss the question as to who shall, and who shall not vote, and discuss also whether an Indian should have a vote or not.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It is with no object of keeping the committee any longer on the interpretation clause that I rise to make a few remarks. It has been correctly stated that there has been a very full—I was going to say discussion of the subject, but that would not be the proper word, as it has not been participated in by both sides; but a great deal has been said upon this word "Indian" in the interpretation clause, and I shall endeavor to make but a few remarks, and avail myself of the opportunity of discussing it when the other clauses of the Bill come up. I think, however, the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) is precluded from taking the ground that he did that time had been wasted in discussing the interpretation clause. If there has been any confusion at all, it has been, I suppose, because the First Minister took care to declare in this clause that a person included an Indian, which certainly shows that the Minister himself thought there might be some difficulty if he failed to embrace them among those to whom he proposes to give the voting power, at the next general election. Of course he told the committee on Saturday night that the reason he put in these words was to prevent uninformed men, like the hon. member for South Brant, from not understanding the matter. I appreciate the compliment, and it was very considerate on his part to take that trouble for my benefit. I call attention, however, to the fact that much as this subject has been discussed, the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) is precluded from saying that the discussion was not needed, from the fact that he has argued publicly, as he has with me privately, that under the present Bill it is impossible for any Indian living on a reserve to vote. He says it cannot be done, the Indian law emphatically forbids it, that such Indians are minors, that they are disqualified, that they cannot vote, and I would of course hesitate to express my opinion on the law, after being told that my mind is uninformed in the matter, but let the First Minister rise in his place and say if, under the provisions of the Bill, no Indian living on a reserve and maintaining his tribal relation, would have a vote. I would ask the First Minister to state if that is the case.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would say that an Indian, although preserving his tribal relation, is qualified under this Act to vote.

Mr. PATERSON. Now, the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) has studied the Indian question year after year, and day after day; he has listened to all this discussion, and he yet has maintained the opinion which the First Minister says is incorrect. The other day he said the proposition to give a vote to an Indian on a reserve and maintaining his tribal relations, a minor, subject to the control of the Government, not allowed to manage his own affairs, was too monstrous to suppose. Out of the First Minister's own mouth he has heard that the intention of that Bill is to give the Indian in that position, what the Opposition has contended was designed to be done by the Bill. Do the members of the committee understand the question now? I know from private conversation, not with one, but with many of them, that they had no idea that the Bill contemplated that; they did not believe it; they shrank from it, and they do shrink from it in their private conversation. We shall see whether they have the courage of their convictions or not. I want to tell the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) that under the provisions of this Bill it is not only possible, but it is the will and the design of the hon. First Minister, to give votes, not alone to the Indians of the more advanced tribes living on the reserves of Ontario and Quebec, but to the Indians living in their tribal relations and under Government control in British Columbia and Manitoba.

An hon. MEMBER. And in the North-West.

Mr. PATERSON. I leave out the North-West because the Indians of the North-West are not yet admitted. But the hon. First Minister, I suppose, after he has the census taken in the North-West, intends to provide for its representation in this Parliament, and when that comes about the Indians of the North-West, perhaps next year, will also have votes. The enfranchising clauses of the Indian Act, which tell us how an Indian may be enfranchised, expressly declare that they shall not apply to the Indians of Manitoba and British Columbia; and yet these enfranchising clauses provide that an Indian, to become a citizen, must make application to the Superintendent General stating that he wants to be enfranchised; the Superintendent General then sends to the local Indian agent the application of that Indian; the local agent tells the Indian that he must get a certificate from some clergyman, stipendiary magistrate or two other magistrates, declaring that he has been a person of good moral character for the previous five years, and that he is of sufficient intelligence to be enfranchised; after he provides himself with that certificate, the Indian agent summons the council of the band to which the Indian making the application belongs, and tells the band that he has applied for enfranchisement, and that they have thirty days in which to file any opposition they may have to the Indian's claim. At the end of thirty days the affidavits made are sent to the Superintendent General; if he determines, after seeing the affidavits, that the Indian is entitled to enfranchisement, he then has power to give a location to the Indian of a certain portion of the reserve, which shall be his own; after all that is done, the Indian has to live for three years on that land, and if during those three years he has proved himself able to manage his own affairs, then, and not till then, the Government give him his land in fee-simple, and he does not even then obtain the power to sell it or alienate it. The most advanced Indian in the land has to go through all that process before he can be enfranchised; and yet, when I said that the Government were restricting their franchising clause too much, and were not giving the Indians a fair opportunity to rise to the level of other citizens, I was met with the statement from the hon. First Minister: Oh, gentlemen living in localities adjoining Indian reserves are anxious that the Indians should get the lands, because they know that they would soon go out of their hands. That was the answer of the hon. First Minister when he passed his enfranchising Act—that the Indians were not fitted for enfranchisement. That is the view he took with reference to the most advanced Indians in the country; for the Indians of my county—and in saying it, I do not want to make any invidious comparisons with other Indians—are, I believe, the most advanced tribe in the country. And yet, the hon. First Minister tells us with his own lips that the wild Indians living in British Columbia and Manitoba, I do not care whether he has a location ticket or not, if the revising barrister says he has property worth $150, is to have a vote; and for anything I can say, he can run as a member of this Parliament and come and sit in this House. These are the very Indians with reference to whom the hon. First Minister inserted this clause in his enfranchising Act:

"The section next following (the enfranchising clause) shall not apply to any band of Indians in the Province of British Columbia, the

Province of Manitoba, the North-West Territories, or the District of Keewatin, except in so far as the said clauses are by proclamation of the Governor in Council from time to time extended to any band of Indians in any of the said Provinces or territories."

I have detailed to the House, what they can read for themselves, all the machinery which is applied to the enfranchising of the more advanced bands of Indians outside of the Provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia; yet the First Minister preceded the enfranchising clauses of the Indian Act with the declaration that the Indians in British Columbia and Manitoba shall not even be allowed to apply for enfranchisement, so inferior were they; yet the same hon. gentleman now brings down a Bill to this House, to give those same Indians votes; and endeavors—would it be too strong to say—to smuggle it through the House; because the hon. member for Algoma does not understand its terms; because the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry), an eminent legal gentleman, does not understand it; because the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) does not understand it; because other hon. gentlemen with whom I have conversed privately do not understand it. But there we have the declaration of the First Minister that these Indians will have votes under this Bill. As I said before, this term, enfranchising the Indians, is a misleading term; it is not the proper term to apply to the Bill before the House. The Bill before the House does not enfranchise the Indian. The Indian can be enfranchised only through the machinery provided in the enfranchising clauses of the Indian Act. The Bill of the hon. gentleman is simply to give a vote to the Indian; but, while giving him a vote, it leaves him in the same position of tutelage, a minor or ward of the Government, that he was in before the Bill was introduced. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) is a gentleman of a great deal of intelligence, and I do not know whether he inspired the article or not, but the only paper that notices this question, the Montreal *Gazette*, falls into the same error as hon. gentlemen opposite. It says, referring to my argument:

"Upon the ground so clearly and forcibly defined by Mr. Paterson the Government has moved in to enfranchise the Indians and to confer upon them all the liberties and rights enjoyed by the white man."

This Bill does not do anything of the kind; it gives them the right to vote and nothing more. It does not give the Indian the right to hold his land and to dispose of it; it does not give them the right to leave the reserve for five years without forfeiting his claim to his portion of the land; it does not give him the right to sell his own produce; and he remains in precisely the same position, after you have given him the power to vote under this Bill, that he was in before. What sheer nonsense it is, and it shows how utterly hon. gentlemen opposite have failed to grasp the idea contained in this Bill when we find them making statements like that. What was it I said in reference to the enfranchising act when I spoke of the more liberal clauses that the hon. gentleman might avail himself of—not forcing the Indian, for I do not believe in forcing him, but giving him inducements to become enfranchised. I said:

"The whole Indian law discourages the assimilation of the whites and the Indians, and the solution of the Indian problem can only be found in wiping out the distinction which exists between the races. In giving the red man all the liberties and rights enjoyed by the white man, and entailing on him all the responsibilities which attach to those rights and privileges."

Is not that right? The ground I took then I take to-day. Give to him all the rights, lead him on to acquire all the rights and the privileges enjoyed by the white man, and entail on him all the responsibilities which attach to those rights and privileges. In other words, make the Indian a citizen as we are citizens; lead him on to acquire for himself the rights of citizenship. This Bill will not accomplish this. The only way in which it can be brought about is by the enfranchising clauses I have read in the Indian Act. Will the right hon. gentleman, the First Minister, answer me another question, as I hesitate to give my opinion, owing to my uninformed mind on these questions. Can the Indian serve upon a jury as other citizens can, even if this Bill passes?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not prepared to say; but I do not know that there is any law in the Province of Ontario against it.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman hesitates to say; he says he does not know there is any law against it. I venture to give my opinion that the Indian cannot. I would ask the First Minister another question. Have the Government of this country the power to order out the Indians, say the Indians of the Six Nations, under arms? I know the Indians of the Six Nations volunteer very often to serve, but have the Government the power to order them out to do battle for their country, as they have the power to order out citizens?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think they have.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman thinks so. He is not positive.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot be as positive as the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PATERSON. No, but you ought to be able able to give a positive answer, as Superintendent-General of the Indians, and as the introducer of a Bill giving the Indians the right to vote. I say the Government have not the power, as I understand our treaty relations with the Indians, of ordering them out to do battle in defence of the country. The First Minister does not say the Government have the power. Do not you see at once that though hon. gentlemen opposite seek to give them the vote, the Indians have not the rights, responsibilities and privileges of other citizens? Yet the Montreal *Gazette* and hon. gentlemen opposite talk as if we were denying to the Indians their right and liberties. No; I say the solution of the Indian question is give the Indians a chance, the more advanced Indians, but it would be wrong to attempt to enfranchise them all at once. There is a vast difference in the estate and condition of many of the Indians intellectually, morally, financially, and in every way, as compared with the whites; but give to the advanced Indian a chance to rise; give him opportunities greater than are given to him in the enfranchising clauses of the Indian Act of raising himself to the same status as that occupied by ourselves. I repeat that giving him the right to vote does not give him one iota of liberty and privilege greater than he enjoys under the Indian Act. He will be still a ward of the Government, in a state of tutelage, his affairs will be managed and controlled by the Government just the same as before. That is the ground the Opposition take. The utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite show that they did not seize this question in its true import. What has been said here from the Opposition side is true. The First Minister has confirmed it when he said it was his intention openly, under this Act, that the tribal Indians of Manitoba and British Columbia as well as of the North-West Territories, when representation will be given to those Territories under the Bill the hon. gentleman proposes to introduce, should not be enfranchised, but be given the right to vote—for the two things are vastly different—and to send representatives here, and yet not be able to sell their own produce, make their own bargains, lease their own lands, much less sell them, unless authorised to do so by the Ottawa Government. Is it a safe, is it a proper thing, is it right for the committee to pass the Bill, now that they understand clearly from the mouth of the First Minister what the intention is, and now that they can reason out, from the statements he has made, what its effect will be? I have found to my satisfaction an

entire justification of all that has been said by the Opposition in reference to this question from the mouth of the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) to-day. His views were directly contradicted by the hon. First Minister, and the committee now are made aware from the mouth of the First Minister how the case stands. They cannot any further allege it is not the intention of the Government to give a vote to the unenfranchised tribal Indians. They cannot say that this Bill will not give to the unenfranchised tribal Indians a vote, who, after they have been given this right, will still remain the wards of the Government, absolutely and entirely under the control of the Government. In the *Gazette* article we read that the Indians, who very often are dissatisfied with the Government, can show their dissatisfaction because the ballot is in force, and the Indian can cast his vote by ballot. How many of the wild Indians of Manitoba would be capable of marking their ballot? How many of the Indians of British Columbia who, the Superintendent-General has told us by the mouth of his own agents, are living in a state that is almost worse than savagery, who, we are given to understand by inference in one of the reports, actually traffic in the virtue of their wives and daughters, will be able to exercise this right intelligently? They are given a vote under this Bill, but remain in the same condition as before. There is in this proposition nothing to distinguish between the intelligent and unintelligent Indian, the moral and the immoral. They are all brought in. I would venture even now to suggest to the First Minister whether he himself, having given mature consideration to the question not having heard the debate out it is true and not having fully considered the question whether the Indians could serve as jurors, and whether the Government have the power to order them to do military service. I would ask the First Minister to consider whether it would not be the proper thing for him, when the next clauses are up, to consider the question, and see whether the amendment which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) has introduced—an amendment giving the enfranchised Indian who has acquired the same civil capacities as other subjects, in other words the Indian standing in the same position as any other citizen, the right to vote, but keeping that right from those who are in a totally different position, who are held and proposed to be held by the Government in the position of minors—should not be adopted. Of course those Indians are not on the assessment roll and cannot serve on a jury, for none but tax payers can serve on a jury, and I do not suppose that the First Minister seriously considers that they can.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire in the first place to point out to the committee, speaking for myself, and I believe in that I speak also for my friends on this side, there is not one man among us who desires that the Indian who is really a free agent, who is living under the same conditions as the white man, who is subject to the same laws in the same way as is the white man, and who is qualified as the white man is, should not have a vote. We are perfectly ready and perfectly prepared that all our red allies and brethren who come up to those conditions should have votes. It has been one of the most honorable traditions in Canadian history that we have endeavored, I believe, up to the present time, to deal justly and fairly with the red men who live within our borders. It is a thing I hope we will always continue to do. I hope that, under no circumstances, will we be found depriving our Indian allies who have come into communion with us in any way of the reserves or other privileges which we have formally accorded to them, but what we do object to is that Indians who are not free agents, who are not living under the same conditions or subject to the same laws as white people are, while they still continue to be more under the power and influence of a particular department of Government than any other class of the community, should be presented with votes. We say that that is mockery, that it does no good to the Indians, that it is only designed for the purpose of injuring certain white constituencies in which these men reside. That is our position clearly and distinctly, and we will not permit any hon. gentleman of that side, without contradiction, to allege that we are in the least degree opposed to giving the franchise to any Indian who fulfils the conditions to which I have referred. There is one aspect of this question to which I want to direct the attention of my hon. friends from the Province of Quebec. They may rest assured that, if they introduce a uniform franchise here, and in particular if they choose to give the votes to the tribal Indians, subject as they are to a particular Department of Government, subject as they are, as my hon. friend behind me pointed out, to be dealt with in a way in which no white men are dealt with, they put into the hands of all those gentlemen who desire to establish universal suffrage a most potent argument, as they will very soon find. There is very little doubt that the drift of public opinion throughout very large sections of this Dominion is now towards universal or manhood suffrage, and I say to hon. gentlemen from Quebec in particular that they may rely upon it that, if the Indian franchise, as intended by this Bill to be established, is established, it will add a very great impetus to the drift which is already setting in in that direction. That is for them to consider. I invite them to consider it seriously, because there is no doubt whatever in my mind that, whether they like it or not, they will find that they have supplied a very powerful lever to those of us who desire to see that alteration brought about. I have another thing to say to the First Minister. If his object is to give a vote to the Indians, if he desires to see Indians, as Indians, represented in this Parliament, he had better do it, if he sees fit to do it at all, by segregating the various Indian bands and allowing them, by modes which I will not pause to dwell upon, throughout the various Provinces where their numbers are sufficient, to send an Indian representative here. I could understand, under certain circumstances and in certain conditions, that it might be in consonance with the spirit of British institutions that the 130,000 Indians in Canada, who undoubtedly have interest not precisely similar to those of white men, should be allowed to send delegates, or even representatives, here. I am willing, if the First Minister chooses, to debate that question, on which a good deal may be said pro and con, and on which I now offer no opinion; but I say, if his view is to provide special representation for Indians, that, and not the way which he proposes in this Bill, is the way to do it. The First Minister now proposes to import into certain constituencies, for reasons best known to himself, a class of voters who shall be absolutely and entirely at the disposal of the Government of the day. That, as far as I can understand it, is the motive which has led to the introduction of these words and to the proposition to enfranchise tribal Indians to which my hon. friend is justly so much opposed. One word more. What grounds have we for segregating the Indians, and compelling them under severe penalties to live upon their reserves? Does not everyone know that the infirmities of the Indian character are such that it is dangerous to allow white men to mingle with them, that the free mixture of white men with them is to apt to tempt them into intemperance and other vices from which our Government have justly attempted to protect them heretofore? If the First Minister gives votes to a considerable number of the Indians living on their reserves, he is going to subject them, whenever an election comes on, to just that particular kind of temptation which they are least able to resist. I do not believe it will be for the moral benefit of the Indians, while living in bands on their reserves, to be subject to those solicitations, those

temptations and those inducements which have proved, as the hon. gentleman well knows, so often fatal to the virtue of their white brethren. I think, for the sake of the morals of the Indians, the First Minister, in his capacity of Superintendent General of Indian affairs, is bound to keep them free from that particular kind of temptation. I think the whole problem of the Indians is one that should not be com plicated in this way. I have always felt that, both here and in the United States, a scant measure of justice has been dealt to the Indians. All of us who have paid any attention to the teachings of history know that the change from a condition of a hunter's life to that of an agriculturist has never occurred in any other case without the lapse of a great portion of time. It took thirty generations in the case of our own forefathers, and I would probably be nearer the point if I said thirty centuries, to change them from the condition of hunters to that of agriculturists; and yet we ask that these unfortunate Indians shall be converted from one condition to the other in two or three generations. We ask a great deal more than, I think, can be done in the time permitted; and I do not think, at any rate, that we are doing them any injustice, or committing any unfairness, when we say that men in their condition cannot by possibility be brought up to the level of white men in three generations, or in two generations, or in one generation, when we know it was the work of many hundred years in the case of the races from which we ourselves are sprung. There does not appear to me to be any possibility of denying, as my hon. friends on this side have contended, that, if the hon. gentleman's measure is not qualified, either by the words my hon. friend from Bothwell proposes or by some other words, a considerable number of persons in certain constituencies will be given votes who are in no respects free agents, and who are not living in any way or degree under the laws and under the conditions under which their white neighbors are expected to live and vote.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would illustrate to the committee by one point how completely the Indian is under the control of the Government. I believe the Indians in my county are the most advanced Indians in the country. They sometimes come to me with complaints, and state that they are not satisfied with the local agent and ask me to write to the Department at Ottawa for them. I have told them: I am willing to do anything, but if I write to the Department at Ottawa asking what is the matter, the very letter that I sent will immediately be sent back to the local superintendent here, with the corner turned over, and the words "please report" put upon it; he will see every word I wrote. Therefore, under these circumstances, it seems to me you had better work through the local agent himself, as he will be more likely to deny you if he finds you are trying to work behind his back. They say, we cannot agree with him. Then, I said, the Department will not move until he reports, and as he reports the Department will decide. Now these are the most advanced Indians; and if they are in that position, don't you see when an election comes where they may be? Do they say, it is because I am afraid of the Indian vote? Let the Indian be a free man to vote for whom he pleases, and I will let you see whether I am afraid of him or anybody else. There is no one who has their esteem more than I have. But the Government want him to be tied hand and foot to the Government of the day, in the hope that they may use him, and make him cast his vote contrary to his inclinations. And do you not see the power they have? Is it right or fair for the Government to have such a power; is it proper, is it decent for them to do it? The very motion before the Chair is to add to the word "Indian" the words "including Indians who have been enfranchised," that is, who have been made freemen, who have been established and have the same civil capacities conferred upon them as other citizens, these are entitled to vote under this Act. Is not that right and proper? Then I say, give to the Indians all the facilities you can for being enfranchised, the only way you can do that, I repeat, is not by this Bill, but by adopting the enfranchising clauses of the Indian Act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman said a little while ago he was going to address more remarks to the committee when he came to the right part of the Bill. Well, he has addressed a great many remarks, for some hours, to the wrong portion of the Bill. As was stated last week, the question now is whether the word "Indian" will be included in the word "person." If the word "Indian" is not included in the word "person," it may be that it is excluded altogether. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) is of the opinion that this Act was controlled by the provisions of the Indian Act, which is now on the statute book.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) was of the same opinion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, he may be. The hon. gentleman stated in his remarks to-day that he would not say there was an attempt to smuggle this Bill through. Mr. Chairman, if there had been any attempt to smuggle this Bill through, the word "Indian" would have been left out of the Bill altogether, and if the word "Indian" had been left out altogether, no other question would have been raised and all the Indians would have a vote—all the Indians qualified, of course, under this Act. No man, white, or red, or black, can vote under this Act unless he is qualified under the Act. Now, Sir, when the word "Indian" was placed——

Mr. MITCHELL. Would the right hon. gentleman——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, let me get through. When the word Indian was put into the Act by myself, I must say that I had reference in my own mind to the Indians of the old Provinces, where they are educated and have been under a civilising process for years and years, where they have schools, where they can read and write—the greater portion of them. I take it that the Indians in the Province of Ontario, as a rule, can read as well as the white men. The majority of them were so far advanced in civilisation that the hon. member for Brant himself, in his speech in 1880, wanted to have them enfranchised immediately.

Mr. PATERSON Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He thought they ought to have votes in 1880, but he qualifies it now and says they ought not to have votes because they are under the influence of the Government. Why, Mr. Chairman, what an absurdity it is really to think of it. As I stated the other day, the Government is the trustee for these Indians, the Government looks after the interest of these Indians, looks after the whole of them as tribes, when the tribal relation continues, looks after them as a legacy, as a lingering continuation of the system that commenced when the Indians were savages, and in fact has been continued to this day. It is unfortunate that they were not relieved of those tribal relations long before this; but the Indians now have the advantage of continuing their tribal relations. There are very few of them who desire to be severed from their brethren. They are educated men; many of them are doing business and have large property. They are traders, or merchants, who have engaged in all kinds of business. But they prefer to stick to the clan system, just as, until lately, in my own country, the Highlanders stuck to their clan system in the highlands of Scotland. They desired not to be severed from their brethren; yet

they are in every way, in the older Provinces, just as fit, as far as intellect goes, as far as education goes, as far as having an interest in the prosperity of the country goes, as their white brethren. Mr. Chairman, I can remember the emancipation, the forced emancipation, of the negroes in the United States. I can remember how the benevolent abolitionists brought the uneducated slaves from the Southern States by the underground railway into Western Canada, where they got homes. And those men, although unaccustomed to freedom, although just emerging from serfdom, when they came to Canada and had lived here three years, in the portions of Canada where they are chiefly found, such as the counties of Essex and Kent, they had their votes; no one objected to their having a vote, and yet they came from a foreign country, they came from a servile condition. They were uneducated, having no traditions of freedom, having none of the independence of free men; but at the end of three years they took the oath of allegiance and became voters, and they are voters, and they have a powerful influence in Western Canada in electing some of the members that sit in this House at this moment. And here are Indians, aboriginal Indians, formerly the lords of the soil, formerly owning the whole of this country. Here they are, in their own land, prevented from either sitting in this House, or voting for men to come here and represent their interests. There are one hundred and twenty thousand of these people, who are virtually and actually disfranchised, who complain, and justly complain, that they have no representation. And they are to be put down because it is supposed that the head of a public Department, or the Government of the day, may, under the regulations of the Indian Act, perhaps influence some of these men towards voting one way or the other. I said, however, that when putting in the word "Indian," I had reference altogether to the Indians which I believed had shown themselves qualified to act as electors and be elected; and when we come to the proper portion of the Bill, as the hon. gentleman called it, I had intended, and do intend, to move an amendment by which it shall be applied only to the older Provinces. Now, the hon. gentleman says that the Indians on the Brant reserve, who have been continuing their tribal relations, are fit for freedom. I quite agree that they are fit for freedom, I quite agree that they are fit to exercise the noblest evidence of freedom, that is, the right of voting for representatives; and I think it is an injustice that these men should be prevented from exercising the franchise when, as I said before, they do all that citizens do. As regards serving on juries, the practice varies in the different Provinces. I understand in some of the Provinces Indians sit on juries, and that in others of the Provinces, unless they are assessed, they do not sit on juries. I therefore could not answer that question. As regards Indians serving in the militia: I do not suppose that question has ever been raised. Why? Because the inherent loyalty of the Indians has been such in all cases that they have come forward and volunteered. There was no necessity for conscription among the Indians for passing a law. They have some little pride in calling themselves allies. The hon. member for one of the Hurons said that whether as subjects or allies he would very gladly see a system of representation given to the Indians in this Parliament. He would be glad to see them get a system of representation. If it be their right, it may be that this is not the proper system by which to give them that right. I contend, however, it is the right system. It is the only way we can give them the electoral system on an equal footing with the white man. This is the only way of doing it. The Indian prides himself very much on his tribe being an ally of the Sovereign of Great Britain and Ireland; and that pride ought to be encouraged. I should be very sorry to see strict rules of any Militia Act—even if they were liable to it—enforced, because by admitting that they are, and have been from an early time in the history of this country, allies of the Sovereign, they felt proud to come out and fight by the side of their great ally, their Great Mother. But with all that, I am quite sure that if we choose, if it was a matter of expediency that they should be included in the Militia Act, why, of course, they would be included, and service would be obligatory on them as British subjects. They are proud to call themselves British subjects as well as allies. It was in the capacity of allies they became British subjects. They are British subjects now; they desire to remain so, and as British subjects they have the same rights as the white man. With the right of the ballot the Indian is as fully protected and is as independent as the working man of the factory. He is as independent in every way; and the Indian cannot only make his mark, but he can write his name in the older Provinces. He is quite as independent, and if the hon. gentleman, who speaks of the Indian's want of independence, knew as much as I do of one tribe of Indians, the Indians of Tyendinaga in East Hastings and the western portion of Lennox, he would know that they are as much divided in political opinion as are white men. I know the largest and most influential family of the Mohawk Indians in Tyendinaga call themselves Grits, and one of the chiefs, who was here the other day, told me he was a Grit. I said: "Your father was not a Grit." He replied, "But we are all Grits, all the Culbertsons are Grits." The Indians belong to different churches, to different religions; they have different politicial opinions; and as regards intelligent opinions, they are equal with the white men who surround them. It may be that it is the character of the Indians, or some of them, not to be prudent in taking care of their wordly goods. But there are some civilised races who are more prudent than others in this respect. There are not only races, but there are individuals who are intelligent in the exercise of the political franchise and who yet are foolishly reckless in husbanding their worldly resources. We might quote some of the greatest men in English history who were utterly incapable of attending to their own worldly affairs; yet were the greatest statesmen in Great Britain. I would ask the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) if he has read the private and personal life of Charles James Fox, a man who could not keep any money.

Mr. MILLS. He lost it in gambling.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; and perhaps the Indians are liable to loose their money in gambling. Then there was Sheridan and William Pitt, and other great men, who not only exercised the electoral franchise but governed nations victoriously. They were incapable, however, of attending as individuals to matters of their own concern. And so it is with particular races. In my own country there are two great nations, the Lowland Scotchmen and the Highlanders. The Lowland Scotchmen are known to be saving and industrious. The Highlanders are impulsive, not so industrious and certainly not so saving; but equally intelligent, equally possessing a right to vote as freemen, and equally exercising that right. So I say that the Indians living in the older Provinces who have gone to school—and they all go to school—who are educated, who associate with white men, who are acquainted with all the principles of civilisation, who carry out all the practices of civilisation, who have accumulated round themselves property, who have good houses, and well furnished houses, who educate their children, who contribute to the public treasury in the same way as the whites do, should possess the franchise. They do not, certainly in the Province of Ontario, and I believe in the Province of Quebec as well, I cannot speak confidently as to the other Provinces, contribute to the general assessment of the county in which they live; but they have their own assessment and their own system of taxation in their own reserves in those portions

of the country where they reside. They pay their own taxes, they make their own bridges and roads, they build their own school houses; they carry on the whole system in their own way, but it is in the Indian way, and it is in an efficient way. They carry out all the obligations of civilised men. If you go to any of the reserves in the older Provinces you will find that the Indians have good houses, that they and their families are well clad, the education of their children is well attended, their morals are good, their strong religious feeling is evident. You will find as good churches and as regular church-goers among the red men as among the white men. You will find that in every respect they have a right to be considered as equal with the whites. In the newer Provinces, in the North-West and in Manitoba, perhaps in British Columbia, they are not yet ready for the franchise; and it is my intention, when we come to the right place, to move an amendment in that direction. But as regards the Indian, the educated Indian of the old Provinces, our brethren living in the some Province with us, under the same laws, and carrying out the same laws as efficiently as we do—they do not fill our prisons in as large a proportion to their numbers as the whites do; in fact we seldom hear, comparatively speaking, of Indian crime. You find them steady, respectable, law abiding and God fearing people, and I do not see why they should not have the vote.

Mr. DAVIES. If the hon. gentleman had taken the pains when he introduced the Bill making this important change in the political condition of Canada, to explain its provisions at more length than he did, he might have saved this House a great deal of time which has been spent in discussing what the meaning of this Bill is. The right hon. gentleman chose to introduce the Bill with an explanation extending over eight minutes and a half, and it is now perfectly evident that in the fundamental changes which the hon. gentleman proposed to make, the members of the committee—those sitting behind the hon. gentleman, and those on this side as well—did not understand what his purpose and object was. I will undertake to say that until the right hon. gentleman rose a moment or two ago, at the end of four days' debate, not half the members of the committee really knew what his object was, or to what extent he intended to introduce the Indian franchise. We find the hon. gentleman stating now that the introduction of the word "Indian" was altogether unnecessary, that he did it merely to accentuate and emphasise his intention of giving the tribal Indian a right to vote—and when hon. gentlemen on this side stated it to be his intention, they were vociferously and lustily denounced by hon. gentlemen opposite, in the severest language they could use. The hon. member for Kent and the hon. member for King's said it was monstrous, it was inconceivable; they said that the leader of the Government never would propose such a Bill. These hon. gentlemen have had their answer to-day, and they have heard that the proposition which they denounced so much, which they spoke of in such terms, is the proposition of the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government. But shall we find those hon. gentlemen rising up to vote in opposition to the proposition of the First Minister, which they denounced so vigorously on Saturday, as a monstrous, an iniquitous proposition? No, Sir, you will see them rise up and follow the right hon. gentleman when he votes in favor of that proposition. Having now got so far with the reason why the word Indian was introduced, the reason being that the Prime Minister desired to accentuate and emphasise his wish to give votes to those people, he goes further and says that the Indian living in the tribal relation, under the provisions of the Indian Act, under the supervision of Indian agents, controlled by the Superintendent General, is a free man, a free agent. I shall not weary the House by re-reading the clauses of the Act which have already been read three or four times, to show that not one of those acts which are common in daily life by every free man, can be performed by an Indian, except under the sanction of the Superintendent General. He cannot purchase or sell property; any contract he makes is void, he owns nothing except by the will of the Superintendent General himself, and in every way he is a manacled slave, subject to the dictation of the Superintendent General; and he cannot even make a will except with the consent of that gentleman. The hon. gentleman appeals to that great act of British history which emancipated the black man from slavery, and he told us that when the black man reached Canadian territory he became a free man, and he was on the same level as his white brethern. So he does, and we are proud of the fact. We believe that every free man should have the franchise, and that if you make the Indian free, as the black man is, you should give him the vote. The contention which we oppose on this side is, not that the Indian *qua* Indian should not have the right to the franchise, but that the Indian, manacled in his hands, under the control and supervision and dictation of the Superintendent General, a perfect creature of the Government and its officers, should have a vote merely to register the whim and will of the Superintendent General for the time being. We say educate the Indian, elevate and civilise the Indian, and we say God speed those who are engaged in the work of elevating him to a higher plane of intelligence, and when they are elevated, when they are freed from the shackles which the Indian Act imposes on them, when they are declared by law to be free men, when they can march to the poll and record their own individual will as free men we would give them the right to do it. We say you have not the right to treat him otherwise than as the equal of the white man, when he has emancipated himself from the thraldom and control under which he lives, when he is in the tribal relation. But there is no comparison between the black man enfranchised and free, standing as to civil rights on the same level with the white man, and the poor unfortunate minor, as the hon. member for Algoma calls him, who has no mind of his own, who is not allowed to exercise any mind of his own. The right hon. gentleman goes on to argue with all the authority which he has as Superintendent General of Indian affairs, that the Indian has reached such a degree of intelligence as to entitle him to a vote, but when I turn to the opinions of the right hon. gentleman, as I find them on record over his own signature, not more than three years ago, as recorded in the Sessional Papers of 1881, I find that he considered that the Indian so far from being advanced sufficiently in intelligence to justify his having the right to vote for members of this Parliament, on the contrary he was not sufficiently advanced in intelligence to justify the right hon. gentlemen in conferring on him the simplest form of municipal government. Let me read what he says:

"The Department despatched a circular to the various superintendents and agents, calling upon them to report whether the bands under their supervision were sufficiently enlightened to justify the conclusion that the inauguration of a simple form of municipal government among them would be attended with success."

And here is the answer:

"From the majority of its officers who have replied to the circular the reports received lead to the conclusion that the Indian bands within their respective districts are not sufficiently advanced in intelligence for the change. An attempt will, however, be made at an early date to obtain the consent of the more advanced bands for the establishment of some such system. It is thought that a council, proportionate in number to the population of the band, elected by the male members thereof, of 21 years and over, and presided over by a functionary similar to the reeve of a township, might answer the purpose; or in its initiatory stage the council might be presided over with better results by the local Indian superintendent or agent."

And yet the hon. gentleman now comes before us, at the end of these three years, and tells us that they have not only

advanced beyond that stage in which he depicted them, but that they are sufficiently advanced to take their places alongside the white man and decide at the polls who shall govern the country. The hon. gentleman speaks of the education of the Indians, but I tell him that so far as the Indians in the Maritime Provinces are concerned—those of them that I know—this picture is very much overdrawn. I have been amongst those Indians, I have fished, and hunted and talked with them, and spent a good deal of time in their company, and to tell me that these Indians are at all educated, that they are a reading people or that they have the slightest idea of what government is, is an insult to the intelligence of any man who knows anything about them. They do not read the newspapers, they cannot read, and they have the crudest ideas of what Parliament is; they know or care little about it so long as they get the money and stores from the Indian agent. Beyond that they know nothing; and as for telling me that these people, while they are wards of the Government, should have a right to overcome the votes of white men—of farmers and mechanics—I say it is monstrous. The hon. gentleman went on to speak of the Indians of Ontario. Well, all I can say is, unless all those who have spoken of them bear false testimony, the condition of the Indians is very much overdrawn. I am told that not more than one in fifty can read, and that newspapers hardly circulate among them. The hon. gentleman has gone very much further than the motion put into your hands by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), in the direction of manhood suffrage, when he says that the uneducated Indian, with $150 worth of land, though unable to exercise it intelligently, should have the franchise. If he has it, surely the white man, if educated and intelligent, even though he does not possess $150 worth of land, should have it. I say the hon. gentleman has laid down a wrong basis for his franchise. I say that the possession of $150 worth of land is not the proper principle on which to confer upon a man the right to vote. To confer it upon an unenfranchised Indian because he has $150 worth of land, which he cannot sell, is going further than any civilised country has ever gone before, and I say it is an outrage and a shame. I say it is taking from those who ought to have the right the right they now have; it is putting up an Indian to override the white man. And with what argument does the hon. gentleman recommend this proposition? Why does he ask the House to swallow it. If, he says, the Indian is a spendthrift and spends his money, did not Charles James Fox do the same? The brilliant statesman and orator, the first man of his day, is compared to the untutored savage, in a state of tutelage to the Superintendent General. I regret very much that the hon. gentleman thought proper to recommend this Bill to the committee, by bringing into comparison with the untutored savage a man like Charles James Fox. It is nonsense, perfect nonsense, and nothing else. I had hoped, after we had heard from the hon. gentleman's own friends behind him, that the proposition as understood by us was an outrage, that the hon. gentleman would have modified it. No one denies the right of the Indian who is free, and who lives as a citizen of the Dominion, to a vote. Give it to him, but draw the line there, and let this proposition to give the vote to the unenfranchised Indian, who lives in his tribal relations and is under control of the Government, be struck out, because it is one of the many blots which cover the Bill of the right hon. gentleman.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have not troubled the House with any remarks in the lengthy discussion which has taken place on this matter, but I have regretted a good deal the time occupied in it, and the delay which has been caused in the public business of the country. While I say that I am going to speak my mind plainly about this matter, and say what I believe and what I intend to do, I think my hon. friends opposite have been throwing away their powder in drill practise, in place of reserving the many valid objections they have towards the details of the Bill until the right stage arrived, when they could present them, and they have been arguing, in my opinion, in support of a wrong conclusion. Now, in reference to this word Indian, what does this clause amount to? It simply declares that an Indian is a person. My hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) and a number of other hon. gentlemen have referred to the education of the Indians and the home creations which they have gathered about them in districts from which they come. Surely my hon. friends will not deny that Indians of that class are persons; and if an Indian is a person, why should we not so declare it in the Bill? I am satisfied, from what hon. gentlemen opposite have said, that there are a class of Indians in this country, from their intelligence, and from their accumulation of wealth and from the taxes they pay, to whom every man would willingly extend the right to exercise the elective franchise; and therefore I think this House should not have occupied five minutes in the discussion of this section, before passing it. So much for that. I may tell the right hon. Premier that I disagree entirely with the views he has expressed in relation to the Indians, so far as the section of country from which I come is concerned, at least. My Province is amongst the oldest Provinces of this Dominion. The early settlement of what was the Province of Nova Scotia, which covered the country from which I come, dates back several centuries, and it may be classed amongst the older Provinces of the Dominion; and I can tell the right hon. gentleman that the descriptions he has given of the Indians of the other Provinces are as far from the actual fact as day is from night; and I can fully endorse the statement made by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) that any man who knows the tribal condition of these Indians—the miserable, wretched state in which they exist, their beggary, humiliating and debased condition—I speak of it with regret—and knowing it, could for one moment think of giving that class of people the elective franchise, simply could not have fairly considered what he was attempting to do. Sir, I am speaking my honest convictions, and I intend to do it to the end in this matter. The elective franchise is too sacred to be dealt with by prejudices, by party purposes or by whims, and I do not want to see my right hon. friend have to change places and go to the other side of the House, for I am anxious that he should continue where he is and keep my hon. friends on the other side, where they are, to watch him and endeavor to keep him right. An hon. member says it is a patent that I have. It may be a patent to exercise my free and independent convictions in a case of so much importance as a Franchise Bill. I say it is the duty of every man to speak freely what his convictions are with regard to this subject. I wish to do it honestly and fairly. I have looked over this Bill with some little attention, and as hon. gentlemen know, I have supported the principle of the Bill to this extent, that I believe it to be the duty of the Parliament of Canada, by legislation of its own, to declare who shall be eligible to sit in this House, and on what conditions gentlemen shall sit here. I have supported the Government in that, and I want to support them to the end, if I can consistently and conscientiously, in order that we may put as perfect a Bill as possible on the Statute Book of this country. Now, Sir, I may say in relation to this Bill that there are two elements in it which are very objectionable, to my mind. One is all these fancy franchises that are contained in the second paragraph of the third section right down to the end of it. I would not have one of them; I believe they have not a tendency to extend the liberty of the people; they do not tend to make a more independent Parlia-

ment; they do not equalise the right to vote, as they ought to do, to every taxpayer in the country, and they will not, in my opinion, by their adoption, tend to promote that feeling of good will throughout the different classes of the community which it is desirable all legislation emanating from this House should have the effect of promoting. The debate emanating from the discussion on this Bill has excited an amount of acrimonious feeling between the two sides of the House which ought never to have been created. A course has been pursued by hon. gentlemen on the other side which is utterly indefensible, except upon the one principle, that they consider the Bill to be of so serious a character that the effect of it will be to give them no fair play at all, and wipe them out altogether. That is the only justification for their conduct which I can present. I do not mean to say that the Bill will have this effect, but I mean to say this, that if hon. gentlemen opposite happen to come into power—and unlikelier things may happen—I would not like them to have the power in my constituency of nominating the man who shall say who ought to vote for me, and I think it unfair to press a measure of this kind, so objectionable as it is to so many hon. gentlemen, when a very much more simple remedy can be provided, one the tenor of which will be in harmony with the Bill itself, and which will give to all equal justice, from the highest to the lowest. If my right hon. friend will accept the amendment, of which I gave notice three days ago, and which I will read to this House now, an amendment which will wipe out almost the whole of this Bill and give a better and safer franchise to the people, he will put an end to the difficulty which now exists, and settle the question in a manner satisfactory to the people. My amendment is as follows:—

That all that part of section 3, after the word "and," in sub-section 2, of section 3, be struck out, and the following substituted: Has been a resident of the electoral district for twelve months, and has been assessed for and paid his taxes for the current year.

The sub-section referred to declared what the qualification should be, beginning by stating that the voter should be a British subject by birth or naturalisation, and the words I propose to insert will follow. That is the amendment I propose to make at the right time. The right hon. gentleman, the First Minister, has accepted the principle of manhood suffrage by giving to farmers' sons who have no property the right to vote; why should he refuse it to others? Why not extend it to all? Let the hon. gentleman's Bill pass as it is, and go into the hands of the people, and I venture to say that 9 out of 10 men who will take it up will find a difficulty in making out what it means, with all its fancy franchises. Let the hon. gentleman simplify his Bill, keep out the fancy franchises, and adopt a franchise simple in its character, and it will be one that will be satisfactory to the country. I do not know that the amendment I propose will be satisfactory to hon. gentlemen opposite or on this side; but I know it is honest and just in its principle, it will be simple in working out, and I believe would give satisfaction to the people.

Mr. CASEY. The right hon. Premier has given rather a new turn to this discussion and has made it necessary by his remarks to revive a debate which was nearly closed. He said, in the first place, that the whole question on this clause was whether the word person included Indian. It is absolutely necessary to decide that point. The reason for making the definition is evident from the fact that there is no attempt to define the word "person" as including the negro. Why is it not thought necessary to state that the word "person" includes the word negro? Just because nobody has ever doubted that it does. But there appears to be great doubt in the hon. gentleman's own mind and in the minds of those who have looked into the Bill as to whether the word "person," for the purposes of this Bill, does or should include the Indian; whether indeed the Indian is a person in the political sense of the word at all. I have very great doubts on the question. I am inclined to think an Indian is not a political person, for a political person must be a citizen. The Indian, while under the care of the right hon. gentleman, is not a citizen, not a political person, unless we make him so by special enactment. I think, therefore, the necessity for defining the word "person," in order to carry out the hon. gentleman's intention, is evident, and his intention is equally evident. It is to introduce into the electorate of this country men who are not political persons, who are not citizens, for the purpose of outweighing the votes of men who are full citizens. It is to make a new class of political persons, to make people citizens for one purpose who are not citizens for all purposes. The hon. gentleman went on to say that my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) had claimed, in 1880, that the Indians ought to have the right to vote. But it was to the intelligent Indian that the hon. member for South Brant referred. The Indian who is as fit to vote as is a white man should not be excluded, simply because he is not a white man. But how should the admission of a qualified Indian be accomplished? By a change in the definition of the interpreting clause of this Act? No; it should be accomplished by a change in the Indian Act itself, which would make it possible for the intelligent Indian, the Indian who, as the right hon. gentleman says, goes to church and is as prosperous and intelligent as the white man, to become a full citizen. This Bill only gives votes to the Indians, without making them citizens, and I demand now, as I did in 1880, justice for these Indians. In the reserves near my own constituency there are many who answer to the description given by the Premier; who are quite as fit to exercise intelligently their franchise as the white man. For the Indians we claim the justice which this Bill does not give them, that of making them citizens of Canada. This Bill does not make them citizens of Canada. This Bill makes them merely voters. It gives them none of the other rights, makes them subject to none of the other responsibilities of citizenship. I claim that justice for these Indians which the right hon. gentleman has time and again refused to give them.

Committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Deputy Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into committee.

Mr. CASEY. The right hon. gentleman compared the case of the Indian to that of the negro. He remarked that escaped slaves from the Southern States had come into Canada in the state of ignorance and degradation which resulted from years of slavery, and yet, almost immediately, were allowed to take the oath of allegiance and become full citizens of this country, and since that time had been allowed to exercise the franchise, without any protest on the part of anybody. I do not think anybody is inclined to protest against the exercise of the franchise by those negroes, many of whom have proved, in a high degree, their ability to exercise it with benefit to themselves and to the country. But what is it which has made this negro, fresh from servitude, a useful, and in some cases, a valuable citizen of Canada? Is it not the fact that he has been allowed to hold property in his own right, and to deal as a rational and a free being with other citizens? What was claimed by the member for South Brant, five years ago, and what is claimed by myself, is that the Indian should be treated as well as the negro. I agree with the Premier that the average Indian on our reserves is as promising material for citizenship as the negro was when he arrived here from the Southern States—nay, more promising material. We know that the Indians have a talent for politics, at all events

within the limits of their tribe. They are people whose minds are inclined to take a political direction. They are excellent material to make citizens out of, and what we ask is, that they should be made citizens; that the right hon. gentleman's Indian Act should be so modified that it will be possible for every Indian, who possesses the capability, to become a citizen, and to take upon himself the duties and responsibilities which every man in Canada has to undertake when he reaches the age of maturity. I claim that it is a disgrace to our legislation that our Indians, with their intellectual capacity, with the education some of them have acquired, and the property some of them possess, should be treated with more suspicion and discredit than the negroes. I think great injustice has been done to our Indians in this respect. The right hon. gentleman has alluded to them as formerly the owners of this great country. Perhaps, it is not strictly correct to say they were the owners, but at all events they were the undisturbed occupiers of this country. They possessed perfect freedom and liberty of action; their chiefs were kings in a small way, their braves were free men, and now what is their condition? They have been kept by successive Governments in a condition very similar to that of the serfs in Russia, unable to leave their reserves without the consent of the agent, just as the serf in Russia was not allowed to leave without his master's consent; incapable of administering their own property, and even unable to make wills and dispose of their personal property without the consent of that paternal Government which has kept them in servitude for successive generations. I have no doubt that this servitude was originally established in the interest of the Indian himself, and might have been necessary for a time; but I agree with many who have spoken, that that time has passed with respect to many of our Indians—I do not say with respect to any whole tribe, but with respect to many individuals in the more advanced tribes—that the time has come when they should be allowed and even compelled to take the responsibility of citizenship. My hon. friend to my left says, not compelled. I do not know whether that would be consistent with the treaties, but they should be encouraged to take upon themselves the duties of full citizenship. To argue from all this, however, that the provisions of the present Bill, giving them power to vote when they are not yet citizens, should be adopted, would be perfectly absurd. I can go as far as anybody in urging the claim of the Indian to be a citizen, but I can go quite as far in contending that no one who is not a citizen should have the franchise; that, while he is kept in wardship, while he is in a state analogous to that of a Russian serf, while he is under the control of a paternal Government, he should not have the rights of a full fledged citizen of the country. The right hon. gentleman fought with a great many phantoms, in his speech this afternoon. He expatiated at great length on the wealth and intelligence of the Indian, and argued from that that he ought to have a vote. I go so far as to say that he should be placed in a position where he would have a vote; but the remedy for that is not in this Bill, but lies in making it possible for him to become a citizen. Then you will not need any qualifying clause, any definition in this Act. Give the Indian a vote. Let the Indian by all means become a citizen; then he will have a vote as a matter of course. You never think of inserting a clause in this Bill to say that a negro shall have a vote, simply because a negro is admittedly a citizen, and he gets his vote as a matter of course. You never think of putting in a clause to say that people of any other race among us shall have a vote, simply because, as soon as they become citizens, they get votes as a matter of course. Why should it be different with the Indian? Make it easy for him to become a citizen, then he will have a vote without any special provisions being necessary to give it to him. Our objection to admitting the Indians to vote is not based merely upon the present condition of the Indians. We believe some of them are not fit, as the right hon. gentleman did not think they were fit a few years ago, to exercise even municipal powers; but with regard to others who are individually fit, our objections rest solely upon their civil status. Therefore, it is beside the question for the right hon. gentleman to lay so much stress upon the personal capacity of these Indians. He went on to say that the Indian should "exercise the electoral franchise on an equal footing with the white man." Those were his own words. I am quite prepared to go with him to that extent. In fact, I do not think the position of this side of the House could be better expressed than in those words. We think the Indian should exercise the franchise on equal terms with the white man. Make the Indian just such a citizen as the white man, and then let him exercise the franchise on equal terms. That is exactly what we have been contending for. I do not think it could have been better or more fairly put than the right hon. gentleman has put it; but it is as far as the poles away from what this Bill provides. This Bill does not provide that an Indian shall exercise the franchise on an equal footing with white men; but it provides that he shall exercise the franchise on unequal terms; that his right to have the franchise shall be at the mercy of the Superintendent, who is the right hon. gentleman himself, at present, and at the mercy of the Indian agent, at the mercy of a host of underlings, as well as of the great grand master himself. Now, Sir, the real issue is in connection with that point. Are they citizens or are they not? Are they on an equal footing with white men? If so, they will have the franchise as a matter of course; if not, it is an outrage to give them the franchise. The right hon. gentleman says they are independent—as independent as the workingmen. Now, Sir, I do not think that the workingmen will relish that statement, or that his friends, who have made a special bid for the support of the workingmen, will relish the statement, that they and the tribal Indians on the reserves are on the same level with respect to independence. I do not think the thousands of workingmen who voted for the supporters of the right hon. gentlemen will like to be told that they are no more independent than the tribal Indian on his reserve. Just remember the absence of civil rights in the Indian, his inability to manage his own property, his inability to act in any capacity in which white men act, and then say if it is not an insult to the workingmen of Canada to tell them that the Indian is as independent as they are. The right hon. gentlemen said that in some of the Provinces the Indian does exercise the rights of citizenship. He did not tell us what those Provinces were. Those of us who come from Ontario do not know what Province he means. In fact, I am informed by gentlemen nearly as well posted in regard to the Indians as the Superintendent General himself, that there is no Province were they exercise the rights of citizens. I should be obliged if any member of any Province could tell us of any instance where the Indian, who has not been legally enfranchised under the present Indian Act, or some previous Act enfranchising Indians, can exercise the functions of a citizen. I do not believe there is any such case. And yet, Sir, it is not only those who are so enfranchised, who have been made citizens by an Act of this Parliament, or by some Act of Old Canada, or some of the provincial Acts, but also those who are holding tribal relations, that the hon. gentleman proposes to endow with the voting power. I rose on this occasion, not to prolong the debate, but to call attention to one or two of those new points that had been brought up by the right hon. gentleman himself, and which challenged discussion. I think I have satisfactorily referred to them, and I shall take my seat, merely protesting against the attempt that has been made to make it appear that we wish to exclude the Indian from the fran-

chise, on the ground that he is an Indian, or on the ground of any inherent or innate incapacity to become a citizen. We, on the other hand, believe that he has the capacity to become a citizen, and we claim for him the same right that is accorded to the negro, or to men of any other race in the country—the right to become a citizen in the ordinary way, and to obtain the franchise in the same way as every other citizen does.

Mr. CAMERON (West Huron). I think if there is any necessity for reason being assigned for the long discussion that has taken place on the interpretation clause, that reason will be amply supplied by the statement made by the First Minister this afternoon, especially in connection with the statement he made on the afternoon of Thursday, and the statements made on Saturday by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), and the hon. member for Kings, N. B. (Mr. Foster). It is perfectly manifest that the First Minister and his followers are not at one on the subject. It is perfectly clear that those hon. gentlemen I have mentioned do not read this passage as the First Minister reads it. It is perfectly manifest that the interpretation put upon the word "Indian," in the clause of the statute, is not the same as it is in the clause now suggested by the First Minister. Now, Sir, we were told, on Thursday afternoon, by the First Minister, in reply to my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills), that this Bill was not limited in its operations to enfranchised Indians, to the intelligent Indians, nor to the educated Indians, nor to the old Provinces. The First Minister knew perfectly well that Poundmaker does not live in the Province of Ontario, nor in any other of the old Provinces; he knew that Big Bear does not live in any of the old Provinces; and yet he stated, in reply to the member for Bothwell, that these two noted individuals would be entitled to vote under his Franchise Bill. Now, the statement made by the First Minister is perfectly clear. It is contained in the *Hansard*, and I suppose the *Hansard*, on this subject, can be trusted in its report of the language of the First Minister. What does *Hansard* say upon that subject? On Thursday afternoon Mr. Mills put the following questions to the First Minister:—

"Mr. MILLS. What we are anxious to know is, whether the hon. gentleman proposes to give other than enfranchised Indians votes.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

"Mr. MILLS. Indians residing on a reservation?

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, if they have the necessary property qualification.

"Mr. MILLS. An Indian who cannot make a contract for himself, who can neither buy nor sell anything without the consent of the Superintendent General—an Indian who is not enfranchised?

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Whether he is enfranchised or not.

"Mr. MILLS. This will include Indians in Manitoba and British Columbia?

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

"Mr. MILLS. Poundmaker and Big Bear?

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

"Mr. MILLS. So that they can go from a scalping party to the polls."

Now, Sir, it is perfectly manifest that whatever the First Minister proposes to do now, he intended all along to give the vote to the Indians in Manitoba, the North-West, British Columbia, and the older Provinces, civilised and uncivilised, Christians and pagans, no matter what their condition was. The proposition of the First Minister was that every one of these Indians should be enfranchised. What did the hon. gentlemen who addressed the House on the other side say? What did the hon. members for Algoma, for King's, and for Kent, N.B., say, and especially the hon. member for King's? Did they take the same ground as the First Minister—the same ground as the First Minister occupied this afternoon, when he was again interrogated by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson)? No; the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) did not take any such ground. That hon. gentleman goes upon the supposition that only the Indians who are enfranchised under the Indian Act of 1880 and 1884 are entitled to vote under this Bill. We are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that we have been taking up three or four days in discussing a question; but hon. gentlemen on the other side and their own leader do not agree in the interpretation to be put upon the statute. Can it be wondered at that we should discuss the question at length, in order to extract from hon. gentlemen opposite the real intention of this Bill. No hon. gentleman opposite condescended to answer. We challenged hon. gentlemen opposite with intending to overwhelm the free and independent vote in many of the constituencies by the electoral vote of Indians, by giving to Indians in the North-West, Manitoba and British Columbia, the power of voting, to pagan and civilised Indians alike. We were not answered. No one undertook to deny it. They could not do so, because the First Minister, in declaring his intention to Parliament on Thursday afternoon, stated in the plainest possible English that his intention was to give the vote to all Indians in the Provinces, and in the Territories, when they were entitled to send representatives to Parliament. I should like to know what the hon. member for Kent said upon this subject, and I shall be very careful to see how he votes. Let us see what that hon. gentleman said. He said:

"Sir, I say it matters not what nationality a man belongs to, whether he be an Indian or negro, if he possesses the same qualifications for the franchise that a white man does, he ought to receive it."

That is as we all say on this side of the House. If he possesses the same qualification he is entitled to exercise the electoral franchise, whether negro or Indian, or whatever his nationality may be. So says the hon. member for Kent. What is the First Minister's answer? Let the hon. member for Kent and the hon. member for King's take their answers from the First Minister. He says: No; I intend to enfranchise, not simply the Indians in the older Provinces and in Manitoba, but Poundmaker, Strike-him-on the-back, Yellow Quill and the Man-who-took-the-coat. Yet his own followers who, no doubt, were with him at the caucus when the matter was discussed, tell us a different story; and the member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), whose election would be materially affected by enfranchising the Indians, tells us that such is not the intention of the Bill—that it was not intended to enfranchise the Indians, except those who have acquired by industry, economy and moral and good lives the necessary property qualifications to entitle them to vote. The hon. member for Kent went on to say:

"Why should not the Indians have the franchise as well as anybody else, provided they stand upon the same footing as others?"

So we say. If the Indians stand upon the same footing, has the property qualifications, if he pays taxes, if he is amenable to the laws of the land, if contracts can be made by him legally and enforced, if he can deal with his own property, then give him the power to vote, and if necessary allow him to be sent to Parliament himself. The hon. member for Kent went on further to say:

"All this Bill proposes to do is simply to place the Indians on an equal footing with other men, and to give them equal privileges, whenever their conditions are equal. That is the interpretation I put upon the Bill, and I believe the country will so understand it. While we refuse to give them the same privileges as we give white men, does such a policy not tend to keep them down? In view of these facts, I think there is no harm in adopting this clause of the Bill and enfranchising those Indians who are equally qualified with white men to exercise the franchise."

I ask the hon. member for Kent, is that all this Bill proposes to do? I ask the hon. member for King's, is this all the Bill proposes to do? No. It proposes to do a great deal more, and the First Minister slaps his followers in the face, and tells them that is not so, and that he proposes to enfran-

chise the Indians, civilised and uncivilised, christian and pagan alike. That is what we protest against and what we have been protesting against during the last three days, and what we intend to protest against so long as his Bill is before Parliament. Then we have the utterances of the eloquent and elegant member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster). We always like to hear that hon. gentleman speak, although he often does not say very much; but his mode of address is always pleasant and elegant and adds to the amusement, if not to the instruction, of the House. What did that hon. gentleman say in discussing this question? I wish to draw particular attention to this, and I want the hon. members to notice how the hon. member for King's will record his vote, after hearing what the First Minister said this afternoon, that he proposes to enfranchise or give the power of voting to all Indians alike. The hon. member for King's said:

"Hon. gentlemen opposite get up and they thunder away for hours and hours, in a futile attempt to mislead the country into the thought that every savage Indian in the Great North-West is, forsooth, to be enfranchised, and made a voter under this Bill; that Pi-a-Pot and Pat-him-on-the-back, and those other Indians, with whose names hon. gentlemen are suspiciously familiar, shall have votes."

What does the First Minister tell the hon. member. He says: No; I intend to give the vote to Poundmaker, Strike-him-on-the back, and all the rest of them. The hon. member for King's said that we had been thundering away all night and all day on a subject that was not before Parliament, and that we were answering statements which the First Minister never made. It is as plain as the noon-day sun that the First Minister, when he introduced the Bill, intended to confer the right to vote on the Indians in all the Provinces and in all the Territories, civilised and uncivilised. The hon. member for King's went on further to say:

"One hon. gentleman even let his fancy—no, not his fancy, but some peculiar and hitherto abstruse faculty, which has lain dormant in his mind since 1872—he suddenly let it loose this afternoon, and in most chaste, eloquent and courteous words, he devoted about an hour of his talk to the leader of the Government, as to how fitting he would be to be the representative of those wild hordes of Indians in the North-West. Now, that may have been very clever, from the hon. gentleman's standpoint; very *a propos* from the peculiar cast of ability which he possesses; very much in the line of the hon. gentleman's antecedents, and of his constitutional qualities of mind; but, at the same time, it was not just in the best of taste, in a parliamentary debate, to indulge in any such remarks or make any such comparison. These hon. gentlemen know, and, if they do not, I pity the lack of intelligence which could not know —they know as well as they know they are sitting there, that it is not the intention nor is it in the power of this Bill to enfranchise the wild hordes of savage Indians all over the Dominion, whom they have been talking about."

That is a great compliment to the First Minister. The hon. member for King's, in his wisdom, says we ought to know that it is not in the power of the Government or this Parliament to enfranchise the Indians in the North-West, the vast hordes roaming over the prairies of the Territories. The First Minister tells him he knows nothing about it; that that is just what he intends to do, to enfranchise Poundmaker, Strike-him-on-the-back, and all the celebrities of the North-West. That is what the hon. gentleman said he proposed to do, in reply to a question asked by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). Yet the hon. member for King's said we should know better. I tell him that Parliament has power to do anything, except make a negro a white man. It can disenfranchise you and me. The First Minister, if he saw fit, and no doubt he would be supported, might pass a Bill disfranchising all the Grits in Canada? Parliament has the power to do anything; it is only a question as to how far it can go without outraging public opinion. The member for King's tells us:

"There is no other intention, and if hon. gentlemen had not a political purpose to serve you, would never hear them coming to such extravagant conclusions as that all the wild Indians in the country are to be enfranchised by the Bill. We are here simply defining the persons who come under the term Indian, and when the appropriate qualification clause comes up, it will be time enough to amend it, if, by any possibility, the wild Indians, to whom hon. gentlemen opposite refer, are included in it. Having read this Bill through, I fail to see where it allows those savage hordes of Indians to become enfranchised; but if, when the qualification clauses are reached, it is shown to my satisfaction that such is the case, I will join hon. gentlemen opposite in preventing any such possibility occurring."

Well, Sir, we have it now beyond peradventure, we have it out of the First Minister's own mouth, we have it recorded in the volume of the *Hansard*, we have it stated in the hon. gentleman's press, and the press throughout the country, that the intention of the hon. gentleman was to enfranchise all these wild hordes of Indians, no matter where they live, so that the hon. gentleman has now an opportunity of joining us, as he says, in preventing any such possibility occurring. It is true that the right hon. gentleman hinted now that he proposed to limit the operation of that provision to the older Provinces, but does that make it any better or more justifiable? We say that, to a certain extent, the educated Indian, the Indian who has had the benefit of some education, who has managed, by industry and perseverance, to acquire the necessary property qualification, ought to have a vote, but he does not propose to limit it to that class. What he proposes, and what the Bill enables him to do, is to allow every single Indian of the age of twenty-one years, who lives on a reserve, to have a vote, under the occupancy clause of the Bill, and the hon. gentleman knows as well as I do that there are not 10 per cent. of these tribal Indians, even in the older Provinces, who can read or write their names. The hon. gentleman says that these Indians will not be influenced by the Government or by the Superintendent General, because they have the ballot. Well, Sir, who will serve as scrutineer, when these gentlemen of whom, as I have said, only a very small number can read or write, will record their votes? Who will see how they vote? It will be the agent of the hon. gentleman, and it is folly, the rankest kind of folly, that these Indians, who know no more about politics than a jackass knows about navigation—it is folly to tell us that they will act independently, when they are surrounded by the political influence which will surround them. The hon. gentleman says they can read and write, but I would ask him to visit some of the tribes in the district from which the hon. member for Algoma comes; let him travel through that region, and he will find that the number capable by their intelligence and education of exercising the franchise will be very limited. He need not leave his own Province, for he will find there a large band of Indians living, not as civilised people live, but living in the lowest possible degradation; and yet these are the people whom the hon. gentleman even now proposes to enfanchise by this Bill. I say that many of the Indians of Ontario, especially those in the Georgian Bay region and in the disputed territory lately awarded to Ontario, are wholly unfit to exercise the franchise—just as much so as the wild hordes who roam over the prairies of the North-West—and still he proposes to enfranchise those tribes. I am told that in the other Provinces the same state of things prevails; that few of them are educated; few of them read the newspapers. There may, of course, be some, such as the chiefs, or others, who have been at school or college; but these are entitled to the franchise; and if the hon. gentleman wants to be reasonable and fair, if he does not wish to grasp constituencies out of the hands of the men who now retain them, he will limit the franchise to those of the intelligence necessary for the proper exercise of that power. But that is not his object. He knows, as well as I do, that in the constituency of the hon. member for Brant, the hon. member for Bothwell, and the hon. member for Middlesex, the hon. member for North Ontario, and the hon. member for North York, there are bands of Indians who still maintain their tribal relations, who are still under the influence of the Superin-

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

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

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

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

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

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What do you mean?

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

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

Mr. MITCHELL. The idea I have is that every person who comes and lives in the country, and labors and spends his money in the country, even if he is a foreigner—a Chinaman if you like, the most disliked class of foreigners—if he comes to make Canada his home, we ought to make Canada free enough to include even the Chinaman. I would like to see the Bill harmonious in its character. While it is desired to make it comprehensive, I can see no reason why we should exclude the Chinamen. Of course, I know there are gentlemen here who are prejudiced against the Chinamen.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. No.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. WELDON. Do the Chinese become naturalised?

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

Mr. CASEY. How many are naturalised?

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. About half a dozen.

Mr. DAVIES. I cannot reconcile it to my views to vote in favor of the exclusion of any condition, class or race from the rights of citizenship, when it is a precedent to their obtaining those rights that they should become British subjects. If a Chinaman becomes a British subject it is not right that a brand should be placed on his forehead, so that other men may avoid him. As a member of this House, and as a Radical, I enter my protest against this reactionary proposal. It is especially unfair, if the ignorant Indian is to have the right of the franchise conferred on him, that the Chinaman, who has become a British subject, who is an honest and a hard-working man, and has made up his mind to live in the country, should be excluded from taking part in the politics of the country. This is a new country; we should invite all classes of settlers to it, and make them feel, when they come here and make it their home, that they stand on the same footing as the people born here. The old exclusive idea has vanished. I enter my protest against this amendment. I am in favor of any one who has become a British subject and has the necessary qualifications having the right to exercise the franchise; and I would suggest to the hon. member from British Columbia that inasmuch as he has voted in favor of the Indians having the right to exercise the franchise, should his astute opponent capture the Chinese vote he might offset that by capturing the Indian vote. It is not right or fair that a broad question of principle should be decided by the passion or prejudice of those who come from one section of the Dominion alone. I have every regard and respect for the 10,000 or 15,000 whites who live in British Columbia, but decline to admit that their prejudices——

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has made a misstatement. He refers to us as 10,000 or 15,000 white people in British Columbia. That is a misstatement.

Mr. DAVIES. How many are there?

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I have told you and other hon. gentlemen, on more than one occasion, what numbers there are, but you take delight in misrepresenting things as they are in British Columbia.

Mr. DAVIES. Since the hon. gentleman has interrupted me, I hope he will have the courtesy to explain in what my mistake consists. How many thousands are there? The hon. gentleman's colleague said there were 15,000.

Mr. HOMER. I said 30,000 whites and 10,000 Chinamen.

Mr. DAVIES. That does not affect my argument in the slightest. By the census of 1881 there are 18,000 whites there. I decline to acknowledge the right of 18,000 or 30,000 whites, which would represent about 6,000 heads of families, to dictate to the whole Dominion a principle which in itself is vicious, which I am sorry to see incorporated in our law, namely, the exclusion of any one race or color from participating in the political franchises and privileges of the people of this Dominion. My contention is, that a Chinaman who has become a British subject by naturalisation, who resides in the country and has acquired the necessary qualification, has as good a right to be allowed to vote as any other British subject of foreign extraction.

Mr. WELDON. I endorse the views of my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies). It seems to me that to single out this particular nationality as not being capable of being voters, of exercising the franchise in this Dominion, is unjust and unfair. Very few Chinamen are naturalised; I presume those who become British subjects, whether in British Columbia or elsewhere, intend to make Canada their home. If so, they are as much entitled to vote as the Indians, who, the First Minister declares, are entitled to vote, or as any other foreigner who may settle down and become a Canadian citizen. Both the Chinese and Japanese have attained a high state of civilisation, and so far as we can gather from the report of the Commission, we find, in the great diversity of opinion, that there is a strong opinion that they are a thrifty and honest race, and I do not see why, when they become naturalised and make Canada their home, they should not be given the right to vote.

Mr. MILLS. I do not exactly agree in the views of my hon. friends from Queen's and St. John. I think the fair test for the exercise of the franchise is the possession of intelligence and public spirit, and if any race or class of people take very little interest in the exercise of the electoral franchise, I do not see any injustice in witholding it from them. I do not think it desirable to encourage the immigration of a large body of Asiatics. Their standard of civil morality, their views of government and of society, are all wholly different from ours; their training is different, and I think if we give them security for life and property for the short time they remain here—and very few become British subjects or acquire property in the country—we do for them all that is done for them in the country of their birth. If it were our desire to encourage the immigration of Chinese we could undertake to confer the electoral franchise upon those of them who give intentions of their desire to exercise the franchise, but I think the majority of them, even of those who are intelligent, and there are some intelligent and educated Chinese, care little or nothing about exercising the franchise. The great importance that is attached to the exercise of the right belongs to the races to which we, in this country, belong, and not to the Mongolians. We are seeking to promote immigration from Europe and not from Asia, and it seems to me that we are perfectly justified in extending the elective franchise, as far as we safely can do so, to every person who comes from Europe to this country and is naturalised, and in withholding it from a class of people that we may be disposed to tolerate, to give security to when they come here, but that we do not regard as desirable citizens to have amongst us. Anyone who has read of the social and domestic habits and the morals of the Chinese in California can come to only one conclusion, that there would be moral deterioration to no inconsiderable extent among all classes of the population where they became a numerous body. In view of that fact, I do not think it is desirable to extend to them the elective franchise. I would call attention, however, to the circumstance that the hon. gentlemen who represent British Columbia, while they are anxious that we should not confer the franchise upon a class of citizens who would be very undesirable in British Columbia, are quite ready to confer votes upon parties in other Provinces whom they are not willing to give votes to in their own. They have already voted to confer the franchise upon the Indians, according to the statement made by the First Minister, in Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, upon the condition that it shall not be conferred upon the same class of people in British Columbia, who, the First Minister knows, are the most enterprising, intelligent and industrious Indians on this continent. We shall have something more to say on those propositions when we come to the question of qualification; but I rose simply to express my dissent from the views of my hon. friends beside me, and to say that I see no objection to insert this provision, and that I believe we do no wrong in refusing to confer the franchise on the Chinese, who would not themselves desire to have it conferred upon them, and who, if it were conferred upon them, would probably use it as a mere matter of merchandise, instead of regarding it as a great privilege of freedom.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). The hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies), was kind enough, this afternoon, to devote some attention to me, to which I did not reply at once, because I thought the discussion on that matter had been prolonged quite enough. He made it his business to interpret in his own way what I said, but I think, if he reads the *Hansard*, he will find that I did not say exactly what he put in my mouth. It astonishes me beyond measure, however, to hear what the hon. gentleman has to say in reference to the Chinese. If I heard him correctly, he said: I decline to acknowledge the right of 18,000 or even 30,000 people to dictate to the whole Dominion as to what the franchise shall be in any Province of this Dominion.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman clearly misunderstood me. I said I declined to allow 6,000 heads of families, in British Columbia, to dictate as to what people in other Provinces of the Dominion should exercise the rights of franchise.

Mr. LANDRY. I did not hear him use the words 6,000. If I understood him correctly—and it is the same number which is taken out from the census, 18,000—his words, and I took them down, were that he declined to acknowledge the right of these 18,000, who would represent 6,000 families, to say who should be entitled to the franchise. If I understood the hon. gentleman in his arguments some time before, he contended that each Province should have the right to say what should be the franchise for that Province.

Mr. DAVIES. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANDRY. And yet he is not willing that the hon. gentlemen from British Columbia should be heard as to what franchise should prevail in their own Province.

Mr. DAVIES. Yes.

Mr. LANDRY. And the hon. gentleman from the city and county of St. John (Mr. Weldon) endorses those sentiments directly. They are not willing, if the hon. gentlemen from British Columbia unanimously agree, that the Chinese in that Province should not have the right of franchise, to accede to that view.

Mr. DAVIES. I freely acknowledge the right of British Columbia to decide as to who shall exercise the franchise in British Columbia. I decline to acknowledge the right of British Columbia to dictate to the Maritime Provinces of this Dominion who shall exercise the franchise in those Provinces.

Mr. LANDRY. I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman's explanation.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). That is what he said.

Mr. LANDRY. Perhaps his friends understood him in that way. It may be what he meant to have said.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is what he did say.

Mr. LANDRY. For myself, feeling that these gentlemen from British Columbia know, better than I should judge any of us do, what suits them, that they, not the local representatives in the Local Legislature, but the members in the Dominion Parliament, can, by fair and honest argument, here, convince this House that a certain class of people within their borders should not exercise the franchise, I think it is right for this Parliament to hear their arguments and act in accordance with their sentiments.

Mr. DAVIES. We have not heard the arguments yet.

Mr. LANDRY. Yes; we have heard from one of them that there were some 15,000 Chinamen in that Province and 30,000 whites, and that those whites do not think the Chinamen should have the right to vote, and he gave the reasons. From those reasons, and from what I have heard outside and have read about the Chinamen there, and from the fact that it is necessary to submit to this Parliament special legislation in respect to the Chinese there, which shows that they occupy a special position—and it is the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite that those who occupy a special position, different from the other people of this Dominion, should be treated in view of that special position—I am willing to agree that, as far as that Province is concerned, the Chinamen shall not be allowed to vote, although theoretically it would be more in keeping with my own views that a Chinaman should have a vote, if he can place himself on the same footing as a white man. I do not hesitate to say that that is my view in regard to a Chinaman or any other man, I do not care of what country or nationality. I am not, however, willing to carry that feeling to the extent of going against hon. gentlemen who know the condition of their Province better than I do. That is the position I wish to define clearly before the House and the country, that if I give a vote on this subject it is in deference to the people of British Columbia, because I think they understand the position and situation of their Province better than we do.

Mr. WELDON. That is the best argument I have heard yet in favor of the provincial franchise. It is perfectly right that British Columbia should have the power to exclude the Chinese from the franchise, but why should that Province have the right to compel New Brunswick and Nova Scotia to exclude Chinamen from the franchise, who have become naturalised British subjects, and have become possessed of property? What right has British Columbia to dictate to the other Provinces as to who shall have a right to vote?

Mr. EDGAR. In this matter we ought to pay a good deal of respect to the experience of British Columbia; and when we find members from that Province unanimously pronouncing against giving the franchise to Chinamen, and when we are aware that that is the only Province in the Dominion where the people have had an opportunity of becoming acquainted with that race, I think we should take their experience for a good deal. I think that when Chinamen appreciate the advantages of our civilisation, when they ask for the rights of citizenship and become naturalised, it will be time enough for us to give them the franchise.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I do not think the hon. member for Kent, N.B. (Mr. Landry) was so illogical when he stated that he was going to vote in deference to the opinions of the members from British Columbia. The members from British Columbia are united on this question; but are not the members for any other Province in the majority in favor of giving the Indian a vote, and in favor of giving a vote to women? If he was illogical, then the different Provinces here would have to be in a minority on this question, instead of being in a majority, as they are; and he will bow to the will of that majority, therefore he is not illogical. I am very glad that this has been eliminated from the Bill. If it had not been eliminated we would have had stacks of books brought in here upon the Chinese pigtail; we would have had copious tears from the hon. gentleman from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), and other members, over the injustice of the Chinese being denied the right to vote; and they would have argued in favor of giving votes to a dirty, greasy man, a man with a long pigtail hanging down his back, unfit for human society, with a forbidding countenance, with a flat head, with pinched toes. We would have been told—that not only did they not send their money that they earn across the water, that they lived not on a penny a day, that they sent not their bones away to China, that they would even be buried in the soil of Canada—that they were British subjects. We would have been told that the Indian was once master of the forest and the stream; that he was the white man's

master; that the white man came and took away his property; that the Chinaman should not vote, but that the Indian should vote; and instead of a short discussion, as we shall have now, we would have been here seven or eight days on that subject. The hon. members opposite cannot be consistent for a single moment. They have taken up the case of the Chinaman. They know he is not a British subject; that he has no affection for any other country than China. They know that Chinamen have no geography but that of China, that they teach their children no heaven but a Chinese heaven, and yet hon. gentlemen would give a Chinaman a right to vote and withhold it from the Indian.

Mr. GILLMOR. I am surprised to hear the hon. gentleman make this tirade against the Chinese. I believe they have just as good a right to wear a pig tail as my hon. friend has to wear a bald head.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I rise to a question of order. If this discussion is allowed, where these kind of personalities are indulged in, we shall be led on to talk of blear, sunken eyes, of a cadaverous countenance, and all that sort of thing, and the House will become a bear garden; all because some hon. gentlemen, as you do, Sir, and many other hon. gentlemen in this House, happen to have a little bald place on the top of their head, showing there is some brains there.

Mr. GILLMOR. If it is no disqualification for citizenship for a man to have a bald head, I do not see why it should be a disqualification for a man to wear a pig tail. I have read a great deal about the Chinese of British Columbia, and I think the Government have done a good thing to this country, whether they get the Chinese vote or not, by sending that Commission and getting information with regard to the habits of those people. I think any man who has looked over that report will come to a different conclusion with regard to the Chinese than my hon. friend from King's, N. S. (Mr. Woodworth), has come to. I do not think myself they are the most desirable class of citizens, but we have them here and they have been a great service to this country. They have been the means of enriching this country. They were welcomed into the United States with open arms, and they have been of great service on the Pacific coast when there was a scarcity of white labor. They used to walk in the Fourth of July procession, but ten years after that, when they came into competition with the workingmen, they were no longer allowed to walk in that procession. No doubt, prejudices exist against the Chinese in British Columbia. We have heard hon. members from that Province talk about the degradation of the Chinese. There was one hon. gentleman, Mr. Bunster, who talked in this way, and he was a judge of morals; he was a judge of qualifications that men ought to have to become citizens. I repeat, I do not think they are a desirable class of persons, but I think that, as British subjects, in British colonies, we ought to show them fair play. They have been of great service in the building of the Pacific Railway; they are doing good work now on the Pacific slope, in redeeming waste lands, and doing work white men would not do. They have been the means of enriching the United States on the Pacific coast, and British Columbia, to a very great extent. And now we talk about comparing the Chinese with the Indians. You had better compare their civilisation with your own. They were a civilised race when your ancestors were barbarians. They have one kind of civilisation, one sort of habits, and you have another; but they were a highly civilised people, and they could read and write when your ancestors could neither read nor write, and were barbarians. I am not anxious that they should be encouraged to come here, because it will take a long time to assimilate them. They have had no chance to assimilate. What chance have they had to assimilate with other people when they have been murdered, shot down like dogs, and that in a civilised and christian country? What an example of our educated civilization have we shown to these Chinese. Look at this report of the Chinese Commission. We have heard much said about their morals. Read the report, and you will see how they stand in proportion to the number of white men sent to gaol and to the penitentiaries. I have lost my notes, but you will see that two white men have been sent to the penitentiary in British Columbia, as against one Chinaman, and Indians have been sent in greater numbers. We have been talking about the Chinese for eleven or twelve years, and yet I am afraid few hon. members have read the report of this Commission—I have not read it thoroughly myself. This is the first time the Chinese have had a chance of having their case made known. I have heard the leader of the Government express his sentiments, not very fully, it is true, but I have heard him say enough to show that he was disposed to give those people fair play. Let hon. members look at the financial aspect of this question. The amount of business done in British Columbia by the Chinese amounts to over $1,320,000 a year. They pay revenue into the Treasury to the amount of $162,300. Compare them with the Indians, with whom I also sympathise. Chinese merchants in California and British Columbia, according to this report, stand A 1. Their merchants are capable, honorable men, who are ready to meet their obligations. I think that we, as Britons and lovers of fair play, should look at this question fully. I do not say we should encourage them to come among us, because it would take a long time for them to become assimilated with us, and I do not know that it is desirable. But we find them erecting large buildings in Victoria, investing in real estate, and proving of great advantage to the business of that country. Much is said as to their cheap way of living. If they live on 1 cent a day it is no crime. But the truth is, they live like other people. In order to try to starve them we have heavily taxed their food, which is principally rice; we have put 60 per cent. on that article, 2½ cents on a quantity of rice worth 4 cents. Flour can now be bought at $2 or $3 per 100 pounds, and they are now using flour, and are having as good food, perhaps, as some of those who are talking so much about them. And they are able to procure it, because they are industrious and prudent. It is said that they take their money away with them. The report goes to show that the Chinese laborer earns about $300 a year, and that it costs him from $250 to $275 to live; so he could not take more than $30 or $40 away. They do not, therefore, take their money out of the country. Then some hon. gentlemen complain because they take their ashes and bones away. Who cares? We do not know the reasons for it. Perhaps, if we understood their religion and their family ideas, we would have a different idea with respect to it. This report says they revere their ancestors, and do not forget them. That is one part of their religion. If we had a little more love of home and relatives we would be all the better, and our civilisation is not quite up to theirs in that respect. It is merely the difference between Eastern and western civilization. Since the Chinese have been in British Columbia they have been more moral and industrious than the white population, which we hear so much about. If the Chinese had had votes we would not have heard the members from British Columbia railing about them during twelve years. If the Commission's report had backed up and confirmed the statements made by those hon. gentlemen, they would have been very ready to have risen in their places and read it. If it would not occupy too much time, I would read the report to the House myself. It shows that the Chinese compare favorably with whites, even in a moral aspect. The Chinese are successful merchants and good laborers. They have benefited the country by giving cheap labor. They have left the product of their labor in the country, and they have taken their money and done what they liked with it. But in reality they have spent

that money in the country, and they are carrying on a large business. The report of the Commission is here to confirm what I say. The Chinese merchants alone in Victoria import annually $500,000 worth of goods from China, Japan and the United States, and they do a home trade of $400,000 or $500,000, making more than $1,000,000 of direct trade for the Chinese houses. Is not all this business of great advantage, in providings freight and increasing the general flow of commerce? Is not $1,000,000 worth of business done by Chinese equally as advantageous to this Dominion as if that amount were done by any other men? They are successful merchants, I repeat, and they are doing a great deal of good to the country, financially. Another word as to the moral question, because I have been astonished, after all I have heard, to see how favorable they stand in that regard; that, in fact, they are superior to the whites, if we are to judge by the police returns in Victoria. And these poor people have been oppressed in every possible way. They have been taxed for everything; and the Government proposes by the Bill now before the House to compel them to pay a tax of $10 per head. I do not object to that tax, because in British Columbia they have propably enough white labor and could get on without them. After building the Pacific Railway and doing all kinds of house work that other men would not do, the people want to drive them away. I think, however, it is better to keep them out than let them come in, and not give them the same liberties which other men enjoy. According to the Commission's report they pay $2,700 rental for the small rooms in which they sleep. They pay $6,150 for ground on which they burn charcoal for the use of the whites. They pay, as interest to money lenders, $8,400 annually. This shows that the money lenders have confidence in them. They pay for road tolls $13,000, that is for liberty to walk out into the country; and they own $100,000 worth of real estate there; and yet when they earn that money and invest it, and cannot take it away, they are not to be allowed to vote—although they have become citizens and have become naturalized. From what I know of the right hon. gentleman, from what I have seen of the benevolence of his heart, I do not think he likes to do this thing; I do not believe he does it with a good grace. I agree that they are not a desirable race of people in every way, but I have seen a disposition on the part of this Chinese Commission to show them fair play, and if the Chinese never vote, that report is worth all it cost the country. I say that when you read that report, though I have not read it thoroughly, you will come to the conclusion that in California and British Columbia these people are treated in a spirit of injustice that no Briton should tolerate. Now, it is a difficult question to decide, but I think this House ought to give them a vote, when they come to this country and prove themselves such good citizens, in many respects, educated as they are, and well behaved as most of them are. No doubt many of their customs are peculiar, but I believe our customs would look as odd to them as theirs do to us, and that is quite natural. But I believe they have been proved to be a docile people, and as appears by this report, though they are penurious, though they are careful in making contracts, and close to a degree, after making them, they are faithful to the performance. They claim what is due, and they pay what they owe, which is no fault, certainly. With regard to their education, I believe the majority of them can read and write in their own language. It appears that their promotions in their own country are altogether based on intellectual qualifications; they are promoted for intelligence alone. They are not an uncivilised, an ignorant, a cruel or a vicious race. Of course, like others, there are some bad and others good, but the good have been lost sight of and the bad have been exaggerated. Is it fair to treat these people as you propose? For my part, I believe in a unity of the human race; I believe that of one blood God made all the nations of the earth, and I should be sorry to see any man, of whatever race, receiving anything but fair play in a British colony. I find that, by the redemption of swamp lands alone, on the Pacific coast, they have increased the wealth of California $400,000,000 or $500,000,000, and those are the people who have been so much despised and maltreated and abused. I repeat, that I do not want to see such a thing happen in a British colony, in this Dominion; and at any rate, let us talk about the matter in a reasonable and rational way. Let us expose their vices, but when you contrast them in that report, which I believe to be true, I tell you they compare favorably with those christian people, the whites of British Columbia. I find, from this report, that those high-toned gentlemen in British Columbia think it a terrible crime to use opium, and yet they license eleven Chinese in Victoria to sell it, and they charge them $500 apiece for the license. They take the $500, and they license them, and they stand up and condemn them as a race that eat and smoke opium. They allow them to sell rum, too, and for that they pay a license of $50. If these people wanted to set a good example, they should tell them to keep their money, that they did not want it. But in this high state of civilisation, in this christian land, they take $500 and give them a license, so that as many as choose may indulge in that degrading custom. Away with such hypocrisy! They talk about their mode of living, but as a rule they are a people of cleanly habits. I have talked with those who employ them as laundry men and house servants, and they say they are clean, confiding and gentle, and I think they are nearly as honest as the white people, according to the records—more so, in proportion to the population, for there have not been more than one in the gaols and penitentiaries of British Columbia to three white people or Indians. As to the Indians, I would give them a vote if they became free men. But supposing the Indians had paid $150,000 into the revenue this year, that they stood high as merchants, and in other respects that they were good citizens, would we think of refusing them the franchise? Certainly not; and I do not think we should refuse it to the Chinese, who are, many of them established there as merchants, who will soon own their buildings, who pay taxes and are subject to the laws. The trouble is that the white people could not compete with them in a fair field and no favor, as merchants or laborers, and they must come to Parliament to legislate against them, though they prove the best laborers they could get on the railway. I see by one report that they had some hard work on the rocks, which it was supposed the Chinese could not do like white men, and they got some Cornish miners to do the work, but it turned out that the Chinese, man for man, did more work than they did. I would like to be understood with regard to this question on Chinamen. Notwithstanding all I have said, I do not think we should encourage them as citizens, because I do not think that would be desirable. But as they have come here and invested their money, and while you consider how many of them have become residents, who have become merchants, who are rich, who are subject to taxation, who are a benefit, so far as commerce is concerned, I think they ought to be allowed to vote. I do not think they ought to come in competition with white labor, but I think the country would be benefited if we had some such men to do certain kinds of labor, which they can do better than white men, and which white men will not do. Nobody who reads that report will feel that that Commission were determined, notwithstanding the prejudices which exist against that race, to give the truth on this whole matter, and I regret, for that reason, that the leader of the Government will not consent to give those a vote who are really established there, who own property and do business there, and who have become British subjects.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). It is very interesting to hear the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) enlighten us upon "what is" and "what ought to be" in the Province of British Columbia. I think ordinary courtesy might have prompted him to allow the members from that Province to know best what is going on there, and what is best for the people of that Province. He said, at the close of his remarks, that he would like to be understood on that subject. If the hon. gentleman would like to be thoroughly understood, especially by the members from British Columbia, he had better start afresh and make his speech over again; because I, for one, have not been impressed with his remarks. The members from British Columbia are perfectly satisfied with the right hon. leader of the Government for having introduced into the interpretation clause that the word "person" shall include an Indian and exclude a Chinaman; and in seeing that introduced—I think I can speak for all of our members on this point—having secured, in fact, all that we really wanted, and knowing that silence under these circumstances is golden, we do not say much on the subject. As for the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), a gentleman whose acquaintance I made many years ago, and for whom I have the very highest regard, I cannot help making this remark. He endeavored to show that because the Province of British Columbia was rather small in population, that, therefore we were not in a position to dictate or suggest to this Dominion what should be in the Franchise Bill. I do not think any member from British Columbia would for one moment seek to dictate to this House what should or what should not be, and certainly the innate modesty of the members from that Province would preclude the possibility of their doing anything of the sort. But the members from British Columbia, although they do not essay the House with long speeches, generally know what they want for their Province, and as a rule know what they are talking about.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). You help to put our Indians in.

Mr. BAKER. I think not. The hon. member for Queen's said that we had a very small population and therefore we were not capable of giving an intelligent vote on this question. Now, I would like the hon. member for Queen's thoroughly to understand that the island of Vancouver alone would hoist the island of Prince Edward "in board" like a jolly boat between the fore and main masts of a line o' battle ship, and perhaps the day will come when we will do it, population and all. Certainly, our white population is not very large, but the hon. gentleman must take into consideration the fact that the area of British Columbia is somewhat extensive, and that territory as well as population must be considered in dealing with a prospective franchise. It is equal to that of the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec put together, and that area will some day be filled with a population from every part of the Dominion, as well as from Europe; and I have no doubt a very large number of the inhabitants of the island to which the hon. gentleman belongs will come there, and will be constituents of mine should I happen to be in Parliament at that particular time. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) said that we were a little inconsistent in including the Indians and excluding the Chinese. It so happens that the admission of the Indians to the franchise, at present, at least, does not materially affect the Province of British Columbia; but the exclusion of the Chinese is just what we want, and I feel perfectly convinced, without detaining the House by any further remarks, that is what we are going to get, in part, by this Bill.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Baker) informs us, and very truly, that British Columbia is supposed to know what her own wants are, and that we should not interfere with British Columbia in attaining her wants.

Mr. BAKER. I did not say that. I did not say that they should not interfere, for I fully recognise the right of every member of this House to speak on every subject which comes up here; but I implied that the hon. member for Charlotte had better look after Charlotte and let me look after Victoria, in preference to affording us gratuitous advice upon a subject with which we must necessarily be more conversant than other hon. members.

Mr. CHARLTON. Exactly. He took the hon. member for Charlotte to task for having interfered with what was a British Columbia question. He said British Columbia understood her own wants. Sir, we believe that is the case with British Columbia, and we believe it is the case with Manitoba, with Ontario, with Quebec, with New Brunswick, with Nova Scotia and with Prince Edward Island; we believe each one of these Provinces understands its own wants and should be allowed to arrange its own franchise. We believe that British Columbia should be allowed this privilege, and should be left to say whether the Chinamen should have a vote or not; we believe that this Bill is an infringement on the rights of British Columbia, and of every other Province in this regard; and the remarks of my hon. friend from Kent, N.B. (Mr. Landry), and of every other hon. gentleman who spoke on this subject, serve to point and to enforce the argument, that every Province in the Dominion should be left to exercise its own rights in this matter, and that the Dominion should not interfere with its exercise of those rights.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). If the hon. gentleman will be kind enough to say what I said leading to that conclusion, I would like to hear it.

Mr. CHARLTON. I understood the hon. member for Kent to say that British Columbia was the best judge as to her wants, with reference to the enfranchisement of the Chinese, and that we should respect the wishes of British Columbia.

Mr. LANDRY. That is not the way I said it.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is what I understood the hon. gentleman to say. If he says that British Columbia should not be the judge of its own wants, I have nothing to say. But I rise to-night, not for the purpose of defending the Chinese franchise. I am sorry to have to disagree with my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Daves) and my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon). I agree to-night, a thing I seldom do, with the hon. Premier, in reference to this matter. I think it is not wise or desirable that the Mongolian race in America should be enfranchised. I am willing to concede that the Chinese civilisation is a wonderful civilisation. Looking back over history, I realise the fact that 3,000 years ago, when our race was in barbarism, the Chinese civilisation was as far advanced and as thoroughly developed as it is to-day. But for 3,000 years that civilisation has been a stereotyped civilisation, neither advancing nor receding. I realise that the Chinese race is a wonderful race. No other people have the pride of race that they possess. No other people look down on all other races with the supreme contempt with which the Chinese race look down on other races. Considering that their numbers are so great, and taking the fact that they will not assimilate with other populations, it is only a precautionary measure, at this stage of our national existence, to deny to them the privileges of the franchise. It is said that they were first cordially welcomed into California. That is true; they were considered a valuable addition to the population, and the United States, above all nations, have welcomed immigration from foreign nations. But by

the time 40,000 or 50,000 Chinese had been placed in California the alarm of the American people was awakened. They realised that these people might pour in upon the western slopes of the Rocky Mountains by hundreds of thousands and millions, and that they might subvert the institutions of that country; and it is a significant fact that you can scarcely find a white person on that Pacific slope in California, in Oregon, in Washington Territory, or in British Columbia, who is not opposed to Chinese immigration, who does not look upon the invasion of Mongolians with alarm—as a great evil. It is true that cruelty has been practised in the treatment of the Chinese by the dominant races. That is a matter greatly to be regretted, and which all humane persons do regret. Their rights, under the law, should be carefully observed, should be considered sacred, but it does not follow that the Chinese should be enfranchised. It is a prudential principle among Anglo Saxon communities that foreign races should be taken in only so fast as they can be assimilated; if they are to be allowed to enter the commonwealth faster than the process of assimilation can be carried on, that immigration becomes, not a benefit, but a detriment to the country. We have purchased our own liberties as a race—everything we possess in the shape of liberty and privilege; we have shaped our own institutions as a race; it is our business to maintain these privileges and these institutions, and we can maintain them best by excluding races that we know cannot be assimilated, that will not become citizens, and will not aid us in building up and perpetuating our institutions. For this reason, it is only a salutary precaution to refuse to grant to the Chinese and the Mongolian races the privilege of citizenship and the right to vote; and I agree with the First Minister in the provision he proposes to insert in this measure.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). Either I must be very unfortunate in my mode of expression or the hon. gentleman must have a very reprehensible disposition to misunderstand what I say. What I said about British Columbia was, that this Parliament was the proper tribunal before which to bring representations, either for or against the franchise, in any one Province, if there were any peculiar circumstances which would justify one portion of the inhabitants of a certain Province being treated different from the other inhabitants or the inhabitants in another Province. This Parliament is the tribunal before which those circumstances and representations should be brought; and if Parliament were convinced that the representations from the people of any Province were just, Parliament should yield. I said I was convinced that in British Columbia, from what my hon. friend from British Columbia has said, and what I had read of the facts, the Chinese should not be allowed to vote; but I said clearly this was the tribunal before which the case should be brought, and by the decision of this tribunal British Columbia should abide, since that Province had thrown in its lot with the others in this Dominion. If the representatives from British Columbia can convince this Parliament that a portion of the inhabitants of that Province should be treated differently, owing to their being differently situated, from the rest of the inhabitants, then their representations should be admitted and their claim granted. I do not mean to say that they should make out their case in the Local Legislature, but that the members for British Columbia should make their case known here and that we should decide in the matter.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I have been trying to find exactly what are the conclusions that the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Landry) is trying to arrive at. If I understand him, he says that the members from British Columbia know better than we do their own interests, as to the franchise they require, and that, moreover, although his private opinion is in favor of giving a vote to the Chinese, he is prepared to yield to the representations of the members for British Columbia.

Mr. LANDRY. If I am convinced they are right.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That argument must be followed to its logical conclusion. If my hon. friend is willing to grant that privilege to British Columbia, why should he not extend it to all the other Provinces, where there are circumstances as peculiar as in British Columbia. For instance, there is the Province of Prince Edward Island. When the time comes, my hon. friend no doubt will be ready to give to the island the franchise it requires and enjoys at present, and no doubt, when the Province of Quebec comes to be considered, he will be willing to allow the peculiar circumstances of that Province to have full weight; and he will do so all the more readily because the same blood flows through his veins as through ours. The position the hon. gentleman takes shows the entire principle of the Bill is wrong. Its principle is uniformity of franchise. What has become of that uniformity? The First Minister says the Indians must have a vote; and he passed to-day such an encomium on the Indians that we felt we never knew before what the Indians were, until we heard what the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) said, and he depicted the Indian as he truly is. The First Minister was willing to give a vote to the negroes, but not to the Chinese. I think the Chinese are superior to the negroes; not that I would like to give a vote to the Chinese, under present circumstances, but I say, if you want a uniform franchise, it is impossible to have it by this Bill, because this Bill will give a checkered vote, a saltered vote, all over the Dominion. We shall claim, as we have a right to claim, for the Province of Quebec, as Prince Edward Island has a right to claim, the disposition of our own franchise. That is a right all the Provinces should have; and if we establish a precedent in British Columbia, that precedent must be followed in all the other Provinces.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot quite understand the argument of the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), or the conclusion he has come to. He commenced by stating that each Province should have the making of its own franchise, and I presume that each Province should exercise its own franchise as well at Dominion as at provincial elections. At the same time, he says it is a wise precaution in this Bill to exclude the Chinese. He said that was a wholesome policy; that there were strong reasons for excluding them from the right to vote. Suppose that, for economic reasons, British Columbia desired to introduce the Chinese population, desired to have them as workingmen, laborers and settlers, and in order to encourage this introduction, was prepared to give them a vote. I quite agree with hon. gentlemen opposite, it would be well to give them a vote *quoad* British Columbia, but they have given the strongest reason why we should retain the settlement of the franchise as regards Dominion interest. They state the Chinese should not have the franchise, that there are moral, political and social reasons against their having a vote, and it is a wise and just precaution that we should exclude them. Of course we ought to exclude them, because if they came in great numbers and settled on the Pacific coast they might control the vote of that whole Province, and they would send Chinese representatives to sit here, who would represent Chinese eccentricities, Chinese immorality, Asiatic principles altogether opposite to our wishes; and, in the even balance of parties, they might enforce those Asiatic principles, those immoralities which he speaks of, the eccentricities which are abhorrent to the Aryan race and Aryan principles, upon this House. That is a convincing reason, and they approve of it. The hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) spoke very ably, as he does, very instructively as well as amusingly, on this point, but

he concluded that he did not think they were desirable citizens. To be citizens they must exercise the franchise. He did not consider they ought to do so. At the same time he argued very strongly that they were a very superior race to the whites in British Columbia, and if they are superior in intellect, in morality, and in education, I do not see how he came to that conclusion. The truth is, that all natural history, all ethnology, shows that, while the crosses of the Aryan races are successful—while a mixture of all those races which are known or believed to spring from a common origin is more or less successful—they will amalgamate If you look around the world you will see that the Aryan races will not wholesomely amalgamate with the Africans or the Asiatics. It is not to be desired that they should come; that we should have a mongrel race; that the Aryan character of the future of British America should be destroyed by a cross or crosses of that kind. The world is filling up fast enough. We can be in no very great hurry to have our hundred millions in British America. That will come fast enough. Let us encourage all the races which are cognate races, which cross and amalgamate naturally, and we shall see that such an amalgamation will produce, as the result, a race, equal, if not superior, to the two races which mingle. But the cross of those races, like the cross of the dog and the fox, is not successful; it cannot be, and never will be. We know that the Chinese have broken through their ancient exclusive system. They are now spreading themselves wherever they can. They have burst the boundaries of China; they are seeking foreign opportunities of labor and employment, principally because of the over-population of their own country; but, wherever they go, there is something antagonistic to the races that they go to intermingle with. Go where you will, where the Anglo-Saxon race predominates, you will find that they unite in the east and in the west in opposition to having a fixed population of Chinamen amongst them. All the Australian colonists agree upon that. Although the Chinese were invited at first, for very obvious reasons, in the paucity of labor and the sparseness of population in California, when they were valuable as working machines for a time, they soon began to crowd in there, to be formidable there, and they would swarm over into California, and if they were allowed in British Columbia, they would swarm over there in large numbers, and we would have an Asiatic population, alien in spirit, alien in feeling, alien in everything, and after they attained formidable proportions in their numbers, you could not keep them out. Look at what has happened in the Malaccas; look at what has happened in Singapore. There England had a colony of Malays. The aborigines are Malays, as generous, active, pleasant people, as there are in Asia. England threw open the Malaccas, threw open Malaya generally to the Chinese. They have swarmed in there, and the Malays are now virtually aliens in their own country, slaves and serfs to the Chinese, who have swarmed in there, and are absorbing the aboriginal race. The feeling is not confined to British Columbia. You see all through the Province of Ontario especially, and in Quebec to some degree, wherever there is a meeting of workingmen, they make a solemn protest against the introduction of Chinese labor. They are afraid of it, even in the few that have already come. They see in the distant future this foreign race coming in, disturbing the labor market and shouldering out our own people, when there is no necessity for it. We are in the course of progress; this country is going on and developing, and we will have plenty of labor of our own kindred races, without introducing this element of a mongrel race to disturb the labor market, and certainly we ought not to allow them to share the Government of the country.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman does not seem satisfied with the numerous and important questions that are involved in this Bill, but he proposes to introduce the very large and complicated question of miscegenation. The hon gentleman has given us a lecture upon the subject. He tells us what races may properly mingle and what races may not. The hon. gentleman has expressed views that are not exactly in accord with the views of Pritchard and Latham, though they may be in accord with the views of Morton, Gliddon and Agassiz. I think we have quite enough in this measure to occupy the serious attention of this House, without entering into the question which the hon. gentleman has now raised, but I may make this observation. The hon. gentleman says that the African race never can mingle with the Caucasian or Aryan race.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not say that; I know they do mingle.

Mr. MILLS. He said, not successfully. He has deprecated such miscegenation. He says their immigration into the country is to be discouraged, and, if I were to follow the hon. gentleman's argument to its logical conclusion, we must infer that it is his intention to disfranchise the colored men of this country as well as the Chinese.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. MILLS. That is what his argument pointed to, if to nothing else. He has foreshadowed the view he intends to take, and he proposes to take a line hostile to the African as well as to the Chinese. I do not propose to enter into that discussion. I rose simply to notice the observation which the hon. gentleman had made in reference to what I had said and what had been said by my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He says we have formed an opinion on this subject, that we have discussed the condition of the Chinese and have expressed the opinion that they were not a desirable population to invite or encourage to come to this country, and that, at the same time, we have heretofore supported the provincial franchise. That is perfectly true. I am ready to leave the Chinese question to the Provinces. I am ready to leave it to the people of British Columbia to decide whether the Chinese should vote in British Columbia or not, but he has forced this question upon us, and, while he has forced this question upon us, I have my own view as to the means I shall adopt to form a proper judgment. I would rather not be called upon to form a judgment upon that question for any other Province than Ontario, but the hon. gentleman has left us no choice, and he has forced it upon our consideration, by saying that he will not leave it to the Provinces. I will tell the committee why I think these people ought not to have votes, and I find that opinion is adopted by the people of British Columbia, who are best acquainted with the Chinese. I would have much preferred that the hon. gentleman had left the people of British Columbia, through their Legislature, to decide this question for themselves. He says, because they have expressed an opinion upon it, is evidence they were not willing to leave it to others. I say that is not a logical conclusion. The hon. gentleman brought the question here, and declared it was to be dealt with by this House, and he has forced every hon. gentleman in this House to form an opinion upon the subject. When the hon. gentleman introduced this Bill he told us it was most desirable to have a uniform franchise for the whole Dominion. What did he announce in this very resolution? Why, that he proposes not to adopt that uniform franchise. He gives this as a reason for bringing the question here, and after it is brought here, he says a uniform franchise cannot be adopted; that he proposes to confer the franchise upon the wards of the Government in Ontario, but that he will not confer it upon the wards of the Government in British Columbia. He proposes to deal with one class of population, in one Province, in one way, and with the same class of population, in another Province, in an entirely different way. It is the

hon. gentleman who should correct his logic, and not the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and myself.

Mr. CASEY. I have listened with great interest to some of the arguments of the right hon. Premier, especially with reference to the evil effects of the introduction of Chinese labor into British Columbia. Perhaps, Sir, it would have been better if he had reached this conclusion some time ago, and had taken measures to prevent the employment of vast hosts of Chinamen on the Onderdonk contract in that country. I am sure it would not have been impossible to obtain white men enough in British Columbia to have built that railroad, or, if so, it would have been possible to get them from elsewhere. But the hon. gentleman has allowed the question of Chinese labor and the question of the Chinese franchise to rest until now, and now he says, in connection with the question of excluding Chinamen from the franchise, that the importation of Chinese labor is injurious to British Columbia. Grant that it is; grant that the men are slaves; grant that it is not merely a question of cheap labor but a question of slave labor in competition with free labor. I say his protest comes too late, and it would have been better to have prevented the employment of those coolies in British Columbia Perhaps even now, when Onderdonk has nearly ceased to want Chinese, he will gratify the sentiment of that Province, by preventing the continuance of the employment of Chinese labor by one of the Government contractors.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I may be allowed to add one reason to those already given in favor of the amendment. I agree to a large extent in the remarks of the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor); unfortunately, I cannot agree with him in his conclusion with regard to this Bill. If the hon. gentleman is speaking in sympathy with that race, a large portion of whom have found their way to British Columbia, I may tell him that, unless he wishes to make voting compulsory, he does not consult the wishes of the Chinese, in proposing to give them the right to vote. The Chinese in British Columbia, no more than in California, do not ask the right to vote. I had occasion to converse with his Excellency, the Consul General of China, in San Francisco, an exceedingly clever man, highly cultured, and who belongs to a family of diplomats in his own country. I asked him whether his countrymen desired to have the rights of citizenship in those countries where they had emigrated, and he answered me: We do not, and the reason is this: We know very well that foreign powers are aware of the immense population we have in the Chinese empire, some 435,000,000. Our intention in going abroad is to give an opening to the commercial genius of the nation, to the adventurous spirit of the nation. We go abroad to trade and to engage in mercantile pursuits, and in mining and other industries. But we know that if we ask the right to vote we should simply excite the jealousy of foreign Governments, who would fear that on account of our immense population at home, we could furnish so great a number of voters as would constitute in their eyes a danger. We desire to avoid exciting those prejudices, and for that reason we do not desire the right to vote. All we want is the privilege of citizenship, and to be let alone when we obey the laws, not to be treated as pariah, when we conduct ourselves as well as the citizens of other nationalities. So I do not think we need trouble ourselves in this House, in endeavoring to confer the franchise upon people who do not want it, and who would prefer not to have it. As to the desirability of having large numbers of that race in this country, of course I endorse entirely the remarks of several hon. gentlemen, and especially of the leader of the Government—not because they are the dirty, unintelligent and criminal class that they are so often represented to be; I do not believe that; I believe that Chinese immigration is a danger to any new country like our own, not because they are a degraded race, but because their immigration might become dangerously large. I think the Chinese have proved themselves to be, not only the equals, but the superiors, of all other races, in the competition for labor; they exercise extreme frugality, and their way of living is one not adapted to our view of civilisation. They, in general, have no families. They do not want to assimilate or remain permanently, and in view of those conditions they are dangerous and should not be encouraged more than to a certain extent. Now, what is that extent? I heard the last speaker say that it would have been better for the Government to have prevented that population from ever invading the shores of this country. I think that the coming of Chinese to British Columbia, as was the advent of Chinese to California at the opening up of that great country, has been a great benefit to that Province. California would have been kept back fifty years in its progress, in the development of its industrial wealth, in the working successfully of its mines, except for the Chinese. I think that up to this point British Columbia has found it to be of great advantage to have that cheap labor. When white immigration could not reach those distant territories, when none except rich men could afford to cross the seas, in order to reach those shores, the Chinese were necessary to develop the resources of those countries. Has Chinese immigration gone far enough? I think so. I take the opinions of those who know British Columbia well, of those who live in the country and have examined its resources and whatever differences of opinion, and there are large differences of opinion, may exist as to the estimation in which the Chinese are held, there is one point upon which there is no difference, and it is this: That at the present moment it would be a threat to the particular civilisation of America and to our institutions if we allowed that immigration to assume greater proportions than at present. They were of great use in carrying out the great work of building the Canadian Pacific Railway. That railway, no more than the Central and the Southern Pacific and the Atlantic and Pacific in California, could have been carried out rapidly without Chinese labor. No one could deny that a great impetus was given to that new Province, with its immense resources, by that immigration. But now that the first step has been taken towards bringing in white labor, that communication has been established and people can reach that Province by railway—and I hope they will, at moderate rates, as in the United States—I think the people of British Columbia are right in asking, and the conclusions of the commissioners who enquired into the question are right, in saying that this immigration shall be restricted in a large measure, and that above all we shall not give them the right to vote and obtain full citizenship in this country, which, while it would be a threat to our institutions, would be a privilege they do not want to possess and one which they would not exercise, because they do not get naturalised as British subjects.

Mr. COOK. The Secretary of State has stated that the Chinese do not want to be enfranchised. Probably he will tell the House whether the Indians have asked to have the vote or not. He has also stated that no more Chinese are desired in this country. He also mentioned that he thought it was necessary to have had the Chinese for the purpose of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway. But he did not explain to the House the reason why the Government disallowed the Chinese Bill, recently passed by the Local Legislature of British Columbia. Probably he will explain these two points to the committee.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am not going to give the reasons why the Chinese Bill passed by the Local Legislature of British Columbia was disallowed. The reasons have been given, and the hon. gentleman can read them. It was not a subject pertaining to the Local Legislature, but came within the purview of the Federal Parliament. As regards

the desire of the red skins: I have not visited very much in the North-West, or even in Ontario. I have known, however, some Indians in the Province of Quebec, who had the right to vote, and who exercised it very intelligently. I know that the Indians of Lorette are voters. I know that some years ago Indians of a county near Montreal, Laprairie, possessed the right to vote, and I am perfectly satisfied they exercised it wisely and, perhaps, in the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite, they exercised it too wisely.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I desire to refer briefly to some remarks made by one or two hon. members, because I know that sufficient has been said on previous occasions as to the merits of this question. The hon. member for Prince Edward Island stated that no arguments had been used in favor of this proposition of the leader of the Government. I should like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has not heard this question discussed for a number of years in this Parliament, and reasons given why such privileges should not be granted to the Chinese population of British Columbia. He also declared he was opposed to that Province dictating to the Dominion as to who should vote and who should not vote. I wish to inform that hon. gentleman, if he is not aware of it, that this is not a question for British Columbia alone, but for almost the entire Dominion—especially the Province of Ontario. There is scarcely a constituency that has not spoken upon this question. If we refer to the number of petitions sent to this Parliament last year and this year, I think they will conclusively prove the feeling of the people of the Dominion on this question The hon. member for Charlotte, N.B. (Mr. Gillmor), referred to statements which had been made as having been exaggerated statements, and I suppose he referred to some members from British Columbia. I wish to remind that hon. gentleman that so far as I am concerned he will fail to find in the *Hansard* any exaggerated statement made by me on this question. Any statement I have made I am prepared to stand by, and to prove it, if necessary. The hon. member also referred to the number of Chinese sent to the penitentiary as being less numerous than the white people. That is no criterion whatever as to the crimes committed. It is well known, and it has been stated in this House frequently, that it is impossible, on account of the secret societies that exist among Chinese, for the purpose of frustrating the ends of justice, to convict them, in many cases, of crime. So the statistics with respect to the penitentiary are no evidence whatever as to the number of crimes committed by that class of the population. They are a very dangerous element to be allowed to possess the franchise. I remember very well when the Chinese, in the city of Victoria, had the privilege of voting at the municipal election, and I remember, on one occasion especially, when a certain individual was running for the position of mayor—a person of not very good character. All this person had to do was to go to the Chinese merchants, who had control of those Chinese laborers, and contribute a little to them, and secure the whole vote; and the result was that those people were brought to the polls like flocks of sheep. From that time the people became alarmed, and I am happy to say that the Legislature of the Province passed a law prohibiting the Chinese from voting, and from that day to the present they have not been allowed the franchise. I shall refer to some remarks of the Secretary of State when the Bill comes before the House.

Amendment (Sir John A. Macdonald) agreed to.

On paragraph 6, "farm,"

Mr. MILLS. I ask the attention of the First Minister to this clause for a moment. Twenty acres is the limit of a farm in this definition, but we know that in the Province of Quebec they do not measure by acres at all, an *arpent* being something less than an acre. I also ask his attention to the fact that this definition has obviously been framed when the farmer's son was the only son of an owner to whom a vote was given. If the hon. gentleman looks at the 8th sub-section of section 4, he will see that the vote is also given to the son of the owner of any other property, so that the son of anyone holding nineteen acres would be entitled to vote, not as the son of a farmer, but as the son of an owner. This definition had its origin in a different state of the law, when a farmer's son was the only son to whom a vote was given. But under this Bill this portion of the definition might be struck out altogether, and a general provision made as to the sons of owners.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am obliged to the hon. gentleman for his suggestion as to the word *arpent*, in order to bring in farmers' sons in the Province of Quebec. As to the other suggestion, I might say that, on referring to the Ontario Act, I find that twenty acres is the limit fixed there.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I have no doubt in the Ontario Act it is limited to twenty acres, but I think that limit is not correct. You will find, in the neighborhood of towns and cities, many farms of less than twenty acres, the owners of which live in comfortable houses and are in fairly good circumstances, doing farm work or conducting market gardens. I suppose, that the sons of these men could not vote under this limit, and if the hon. gentleman would reduce that limit he would meet a great many such cases.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not see why there should be this definition. So long as the franchise was a famer's son franchise, as distinct from the son of any other land owner, there was a necessity of defining what a farm is, in order to give the farmer's son a vote. But when you give the franchise to the sons of land owners generally, why have you a separate definition for the sons of those particular land owners—the farmers. You give the franchise to the sons of owners, provided the value is up to the qualification, whether the property is a farm, a house, or a market garden, and why then complicate the Bill by a definition of farm or farmer's son.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It must be a limit of twenty acres, in the case of a farm, but there is to be no such limit in town property.

Mr. BLAKE. It must be twenty acres for a farmer's son, but if the farm is really a market garden, near a town or village, which may be worth far more than a farm of 100 acres, and produce more, his son is to be excluded. The son of a mechanic, who has a $600 house in a village, is to have a vote, or two sons are to have votes, while the son of an owner of a market garden of fifteen or nineteen acres, which is worth probably ten times as much, is to be excluded from the vote.

Mr. CASGRAIN. In the neighborhood of Quebec there are a number of small farmers, especially in the villages along the Beauport road, who live on small plots of ground from which they derive large profits. But under this clause many of them would be deprived of the right to vote.

Mr. BLAKE. In the 8th section the qualification is given:

"Is a son of any owner of real property in such electoral district, other than a farm."

Now if the real property consists of nineteen acres, and has the value, the son will have a vote, and surely you will not deprive him of a vote because the nineteen acres happen to be farm, instead of waste or uncultivated land, upon which you give him a vote.

Mr. MILLS. It is clear that that would be the effect of the clause, though I have no doubt that it was not the intention. In the first instance we find that farmers' sons were

the only sons of proprietors to whom votes were given. The law was so understood for a number of years. The recent Act in Ontario gives votes to the sons of land owners, where the amount of land is sufficient to give it to them, irrespective of the use to which the property is put. Now, the hon. gentleman is proposing to do the same thing, and he uses the expression farmers' sons as to plots of land of twenty acres or upwards. As this expression reads, it is perfectly clear that it would be open to the construction which is put upon it by my hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake). If the land was not used as a farm, it would give the owner and the son of the owner a vote; but if it was used as a farm, they would not be entitled to vote. I think this portion of the Bill will have to be recast before it will accomplish the purpose the hon. gentleman has in view.

Mr. DAVIES. I think the definition itself, and also sub-section 7 of section 3, are unnecessary, because the greater includes the less, and sub-section 8 of section 4 includes the farmer's son. If you take out of sub-section 8 of section 4 the words "other than a farm," it will apply to any property. But if the hon. gentleman is determined to keep it in, I would call his attention to the fact that he is limiting the owner to a person holding in fee simple and in possession, thereby excluding a large class of owners throughout the country, who do not hold their property in fee simple or in free and common soccage. If he would make the clause read, "owner or occupant thereof," he would embrace those classes who hold their land by other tenures.

Mr. MILLS. The clause at present will exclude the sons of persons in Manitoba who have taken up lands as homesteads, and who have not yet been three years upon them, and taken out their patents.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was a considerable stretch of principle when the Province of Ontario extended the franchise to farmers' sons. It did so upon the ground, however, that the farmer, whose son was to vote, was the owner, not the occupant; and as it was known that the common practice was, at any rate, for one of the sons, who expected to be his father's heir, to work with him, while the other sons struck out for themselves or were provided for by their father elsewhere, it was thought that such a one should have a vote. But it would be going very far to say that the son of a mere occupant, having no present interest in his father's estate, should have a vote. The hon. gentleman says a farmer's son in Manitoba would be cut off before the patent was issued. Well, I should not think the farmer's son should have a vote under those circumstances. It does not at all follow that the homesteader will ever get his title; he may forfeit it · he is earning his title, and he is only an occupant until he gets it. His son has no present interest. The difficulty the hon. gentleman mentions could amount to nothing in Manitoba, because if the son is old enough to have a vote he can go on to the next lot and homestead it for himself; there is no necessity for his voting on his father's occupancy. The definition of a land owner in the Ontario Act is:

"The expression 'land holder' shall mean and include any person who is the owner of real property of at least twenty acres in extent, or at least of an actual value in cities and towns of $400, and in townships and incorporated villages of $200."

Mr. CASEY. That includes every land holder who would have enough property to vote in his own right; and the sons of any person who is qualified to vote in his own right are also qualified to vote along with him; but in the hon. gentleman's Bill the property must be sufficient in value to qualify the owner in himself and the sons in themselves. When the interest of the homesteader is sufficient to qualify himself, I do not see the reason why the same sort of interest should not qualify his sons.

Mr. MILLS.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There is very little chance of difficulty arising in Manitoba from the farmers sons of an occupant not getting a vote, because that would be a very rare case in which the son would not have a holding of his own, the land being practically obtained there for nothing; but in the Province of Ontario there are a great many farmers who do not hold their farms as free holders in free and common soccage. In Huron and Bruce, in some of the newer townships, the patents, in 10 or 20 per cent. of the holdings, have not been issued, and the farms are simply held under a license of occupation. In two or three townships in the riding I represent, and also in the east riding of Huron, a large number of the farmers hold simply under license of occupation from the Crown. Some of them have been so held for twenty-five years, the patents never having been taken out; in some of the cases the land has been paid in full; in others it has not. Yet, by the definition the First Minister gives of farmer and farmers' sons, it is quite manifest that, applying the strict letter of the law, the sons of these men, who hold under license of occupation from the Crown, would not be entitled to vote. Under the 5th sub-section of section 4, the farmers would be entitled to vote themselves, because they are *bonâ fide* occupants of real property in the electoral district, under license of occupation from the Crown, but their sons would not have the right to vote. As I understand the First Minister, he does not think it right the sons of the mere occupants of land should have the right to vote. I do not agree in that view. Take, for instance, the county of Huron. The hon. gentleman knows the fine class of farmers that are there, and yet I venture to say 80 per cent. of them have not taken out their patents, but hold their land merely under license of occupation from the Crown. The suggestion of the hon. member for Queen's, with respect to this sub-section will cover the case. The word "farm" should be held to mean the land actually occupied by the owner or occupant; and then, by the amendment made to the sub-section interpreting farmers' sons, adding to the word "owner" the word "occupant," that would cover the whole case; and unless the hon. gentleman puts that in I fear a large number of the sons of farmers who have no other qualification will not be allowed to vote.

Mr. WELDON. This clause, I think, is unnecessary. In New Brunswick persons make application for land under certain conditions. They get an interest in that land, which they can dispose of, although the Crown grant has never been issued to them at all. They may sell their right in it, although it may be years before any grant issues; they never become freeholders in free and common socage, although they have a license in the land and a vested right in it which they can dispose of. This is a new franchise. It would seem that in Ontario a vote was given to what they call farmers' sons, and it was confined to farmers' sons; but this Bill goes beyond that; it gives the right to vote to the son of the owner of real property, where the real property is sufficient to qualify the father and the son, or the two sons, as the case may be. In the 4th section there is a distinction between the farmers' sons and the owner of real property. The definition of a farm is that it must not be less than twenty acres, but a man might possess nineteen acres and his sons would have the right to vote under the 8th sub-section of section 4, if the property were worth the amount required, whether as a farm or not. The definition of a farm was therefore totally unnecessary, and it will raise the question as to whether a property shall be dealt with as a farm or not. In the one case, the farmer's son would not have a vote, while in the other he would.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With the permission of the committee, I will allow this to stand over.

Mr. WELDON. I draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the question of the word "occupant." Difficulty will arise with regard to parties holding by adverse possession, as to whether they can be considered as owners. A party gets a title by a possession of many years, but it does not vest the freehold in him in free and common soccage. It gives him a title—to use the expression of the late Lord Chief Justice Campbell, of England, a parliamentary fee. Although twenty years' adverse possession gives a man a title, it requires forty years—I only speak of the law of New Brunswick—before the legal title can be totally extinguished. I know a case which actually happened, where the property was held against the tenant by courtesy after twenty years' possession. We could not turn the party out, but the tenant, by courtesy, lived for thirty years as tenant by the courtesy, the title against him was barred, and after he died, the heirs of his wife came in and got possession. In that case the occupant would have a vote.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think there would be any doubt about it. A title by prescription is just the same as a title by fee; and the law presumes an original title when there is a prescription. The form used to be: "Whereof the memory of man runs not to the contrary." That is supposed to be based on an actual conveyance, whether by the old system of delivery, the delivery of a clock, or delivery of a charter, a conveyance in writing. That prescription is diminished by slow degrees, but the principle is the same—a statutory title by prescription, in the first place, in fee simple, and in the next place in free and common soccage. There are so many kinds of tenure—free and common soccage, and, in the English law, copyhold.

Mr. MILLS. Adverse possession.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is a statutory declaration that the party holds in free and common soccage, as far as the law of this country goes.

Mr. EDGAR. I think, as the hon. gentleman says, free and common soccage is not an estate, but a tenure. That tenure was introduced in 1791, and, as I understand, it only applies to lands granted from the Crown which shall be held in that tenure. It expressly says so in the statute, and it would give the estate, which I am sure the hon. gentleman desires to give in this case, as an estate of freehold, if that language were used.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We are getting off the track.

Mr. EDGAR. No; because it is on the word "owner."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Let that stand over.

Mr. EDGAR. In order to ascertain whether this clause is necessary or not, I would ask the hon. gentleman to look at it in this way; I had an amendment prepared, to add after the word "acres" the following words:—

Or not less than ten acres when the same are cultivated as a market garden.

On looking over it, however, I concluded not to put that in, because, under the Act, it does not matter whether we put ten or twenty or 200 acres in that clause, because the 7th and 8th sub-sections of the 4th section render it unnecessary.

On paragraph 7, "city,"

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman defines a city and a town under this and the next paragraph, and they are both dependent on the action of the Provincial Legislature. Supposing a city in Ontario should be held to require a population of 10,000, and one in Manitoba 5,000, the hon gentleman will see that he might have a different property qualification in those places.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is quite true, but you must have a definition.

Mr. MILLS. So we are not actually controlling the franchise.

On paragraph 10, "parish,"

Mr. WELDON. What is the meaning of "generally reputed to form a parish?" In Nova Scotia the parishes are purely ecclesiastical, and the townships are the civil divisions. In New Brunswick the counties are divided into parishes, which are the civil divisions, but ecclesiastical parishes are carved out of them. For instance, a portion of the parish of Sussex, in the county of King's, is divided for ecclesiastical purposes, but has no recognition as a civil division. There might be some difficulty in regard to that. The city of Portland also is divided into parishes for ecclesiastical purposes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This, of course, is merely a definition. There are ecclesiastical parishes, and parishes which are known to the temporal law. In the seigniorial part of the Province of Quebec the word "parish" is held to be equivalent to "township," in the Eastern Townships, where the seigniorial tenure did not exist. This is to define a parish, when it used in the Act as meaning what is generally reputed to be a parish. In the Province of Ontario, for instance, there are ecclesiastical parishes, but the word does not come into force, because they are merely ecclesiastical divisions. In Quebec, they are not only ecclesiastical divisions but temporal divisions, quasi-municipal divisions. I do not think the hon. gentleman will find any difficulty in that.

Mr. WELDON. Would not those parishes, in Quebec, be formed by statute?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Some of them have existed from the early settlement of the country, and they are esteemed to be the statutory or ecclesiastical divisions of the country.

Mr. LAURIER. I would suggest, that as far as the Province of Quebec is concerned, we should make a special application. The hon. gentleman is quite right in saying there are some parishes which have existed from the earliest time. Of some of them it is impossible to find any record; still they exist now by statute. I think he might very well recognise that ecclesiastical authority. Under the present system, in Lower Canada, all the ecclesiastical parishes are recognised by the civil authority. The bishop first issues a decree, by which the territory to be formed into a parish is designated, and his decree is afterwards confirmed by the civil commissioners, and therefore every ecclesiastical parish is invariably acknowledged by the civil authorities. There is a reason for that, because no taxes could be levied for ecclesiastical purposes, for building of churches or anything else, unless the decree of the bishop, which constitutes the parish, is afterwards confirmed by the civil authority.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will be no harm to leave it as it is now, because it simply says that whatever is reputed to be a parish, no matter what the original designation by the ecclesiastical or civil authorities, is called a parish in the definition. This has always been the definition running through all the statutes.

Mr. MILLS. We have never had to deal with an election law applicable to all the Provinces before. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman, in proposing this definition, intends it as descriptive of the parish spoken of in subsequent sections. Now my hon. friend beside me mentions the fact that in Nova Scotia the parishes are altogether ecclesiastical. Then in New Brunswick there are ecclesiastical and civil parishes. What we call a township in

Ontario is called a parish in New Brunswick, and there is no township at all in New Brunswick, I am told. This definition will be very confusing in the Province of New Brunswick; in fact, it would not be applicable.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Parishes in New Brunswick must either have been created by civil or ecclesiastical authority, no matter which. This must apply to either, of course.

Mr. MILLS. Certainly not. The hon. gentleman will see that neither of these definitions, nor the enacting clause, would give the slightest intimation to any party which parish was meant. Suppose this question were to arise: Is this Act in New Brunswick applicable to a civil or an ecclesiastical parish? The answer to the hon. gentleman would be: It is applicable to both. So it is, but it is not with both these that the hon. gentleman intends to deal. The hon. gentleman wants it applicable to the civil parish and not to the other. He wants a definition that will include one and exclude the other, in New Brunswick. While this definition may satisfy Quebec, it will not satisfy New Brunswick.

Mr. WELDON. In New Brunswick a parish is exactly what you call a township in Ontario. They are created by statute, and out of them is carved, by the civil authority, what are called ecclesiastical parishes. It is created, not by ecclesiastical authority, but by the Legislature of New Brunswick, and out of that civil division might be carved one or two parishes for ecclesiastical purposes only. In Ontario you have cities, towns and incorporated villages, which, I presume, cover all the divisions there, while the parish, with us, would simply mean a parish which had been erected for civil purposes by the civil authority.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not see how the question can well arise, whether it did or did not arise long ago, between Upper and Lower Canada. When this clause was in the Act it was quite well understood. In Ontario the division is by township, while in Lower Canada it is by parishes, although for ecclesiastical purposes there are parishes in Ontario. But will this meet the hon. gentleman's view:

Parish means any tract of land which is generally reputed to form a parish, whether it has been wholly or in part originally erected into a parish by the civil or ecclesiastical authority, and which now exists as a territorial division.

On paragraph 12, "farmers' sons,"

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I have an amendment to this clause, which I will read:

Farmer's son means any male person not otherwise qualified to vote' being a son, grandson, stepson or son-in-law, and an owner or occupant.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The son of an occupant ought not to vote, because he has got no title whatever.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). In some of the western towns men who have been living upon farms with, perhaps, 60 or 70 acres cleared, for 25 years, have never taken out a patent; yet they are under licensed occupation from the Crown, with their sons living with them. Now why, in cases of that kind, should not the occupant's son have a right to vote just as well as if his father had taken out a patent? In some townships parties have not taken out patents although they have been in occupation 25 years. Some have paid in full and some have not. The question has not arisen yet, but it well arise under this clause; and the effect will be that in some townships the sons of the occupants will be entitled to vote, while in other townships they will not have that right.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will see that we are greatly enlarging the franchise that now exists in Ontario.

Mr. MILLS.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I think not.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The word "owner" will signify a proprietor in his own right, or in the right of his wife, of freehold estate, legal or equitable, in lands and tenements held in free and common soccage, of which such person is in actual possession. As to a landholder, we must look back at the interpretation given. The hon. gentleman will see that an occupant has a right, because he is in peaceable possession. The title of the father is only the title of occupancy, and as the son has no title to occupancy, he should not have a right to vote. The hon. member has mentioned that, in western Ontario, a number of persons have not taken out their patents. We have a right to believe that they would have taken out their patents if something did not remain to be performed towards the Crown; and if anything is required to be so performed, they should perform that condition before their sons should vote upon an estate, which he may perhaps forfeit for non performance of the conditions of occupancy. We must keep the principle as clearly limited as it is in the Ontario Act, that sons should only vote as owners, or if their fathers are proprietors of estates for life or for a larger interest.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The word "owner" in this Bill means a person who holds freehold estate in free and common soccage. The interpretation of the word "owner" in the Ontario Act is a proprietor, either in his own right or the right of his wife, of an estate for life or a larger interest. I contend, in regard to such estates, as I mentioned, they would be in each case an equitable estate, because the parties would have a right against the Crown to get their deeds the moment certain conditions were performed. Under the Ontario Act the sons of such owner will have votes; but under the interpretation of the present Bill it is quite clear that the sons of licensees will not be entitled to vote.

Mr. VAIL. There are quite a number of persons in Nova Scotia who, I think, although fairly entitled to vote under the operation of this Bill, will not possess that right. We have a large number of persons, more particularly in Cape Breton, who are merely squatters on the land, but who have paid to the Government nearly all the amount due. A small sum only requires to be paid to enable them to receive their patents. Under this interpretation the father only will be entitled to vote, and not the son. The father is, to all intents and purpose, owner of the property, and his son will be deprived of a vote, although his father holds his property on a title equal to free and common soccage.

Mr. DAVIES. A large number of persons in Prince Edward Island agreed to purchase land from the Government, and if they have not taken out their deeds the sons will not have votes. I do not think the hon. gentleman intended that. Probably the state of the law in the Lower Provinces was not brought before his attention. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) has called attention to cases where men, who have been in possession of land for wenty, thirty or forty years, do not take out patents, because their present title is almost equally good, yet the sons of those men will not have votes.

Mr. TROW. There are many scores of cases in North Perth, where farmers holding property of the value of, perhaps, $6,000, have not taken out patents, because, perhaps, $100 was due, and payment has been deferred from year to year. This clause would deprive the sons of such men of the right to vote.

Mr. MILLS. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to a class of cases in this city which would not come under this provision, namely, those of parties who have perpetual leases of military property. The hon. gentleman knows that you cannot dispossess them; that they have a right to

the renewal of the lease forever. Yet, they have not a title in free and common soccage. No matter what might be the value of the property, the sons of the lessees would not, under the definition given, be entitled to vote. How does the hon. gentleman intend to exclude them; is that his deliberate intention, or is it from the fact that he has overlooked the peculiar tenure by which they hold.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; my intention is to make it as wide as it now is in Ontario, and no wider.

Mr. WELDON. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to what the result will be in the city of St. John. A large portion of that city is held under perpetual leases. When the Loyalists came there, in 1784, a town plot was laid out in lots, and an apportionment was granted to them. When the city was incorporated the ungranted lots were given to the city, or almost all of them, and the corporation has never parted with them. Some have perpetual leases, some have ninety-nine years leases, and some twenty-one years. I should say that one-third of the real estate of St. John is held under those leases. Take the wharves of the city, the most valuable property there. The property of the late Senator Robertson, worth $100,000, would be entirely excluded, because it is held by lease and not by freehold.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow) is quite correct, and I think there will be many farmers' sons who will be left out, if the Bill were left as it is, because many of the farmers in my county, who bought their lands from the Canada Company, and who have farms worth $3,000 or $4,000, have balances still due to the company, and their sons would not have a vote, which, I think, would be unfair. In some cases the sons of these men work together on farms of 250 or 300 acres, though they have not their title from the Canada Company. The Bill, in that respect, would not be as liberal as the Ontario Act is to-day, which permits farmers' sons, in those cases, to vote.

Mr. WELDON. I might also mention that the city of Portland is largely held by leases, from two or three estates, and I should judge that in St. John and Portland together 50 per cent. of the real estate is held by tenants. Practically, these parties consider them as valuable as freehold, but still they are not freehold.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. And therefore their sons should not have votes.

Mr. WELDON. It may happen that the sons of a man who has one of these properties, worth $10,000 or $20,000, held by these perpetual leases, would not have a vote, while the sons of a man alongside, with a property of $1,000, would have votes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is only a twenty-one year lease after all, so they are not owners' sons.

Mr. WELDON. It may be 999 years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You would enfranchise those in New Brunswick, who never had a land owners' property at all.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman laid down the rule this evening that a man's having property was no evidence of his fitness to vote.

Mr. TROW. I am quite sure that the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) will, if this clause passes in its present shape, be deprived of scores of votes which were recorded for him last election. Many of these men have large and valuable farms from the Canada Company, or from the Crown, though many of them are indebted for balances on these lands.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I take it that those who voted for my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Hesson) last election will vote upon the same property next election. They voted last election under the Ontario Act, and these words are exactly as in the Ontario Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; exactly.

Mr. CHARLTON. I would point out to my hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. Trow) that he need not be alarmed for my hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. Hesson), as no doubt the revising barrister will make it all right.

On paragraph 13, "electoral district,"

Mr. WELDON. I would suggest that the word "parish" be inserted after the word "township."

Amendment agreed to.

On paragraph 17, "actual value," or "value,"

Mr. FISHER. I have put in your hands an amendment which I wish to lay before the committee. The actual value is here defined to be the present market value of any real property, if sold upon the ordinary terms of sale, and it is something which is to be determined by the revising officer. I wish to make an amendment, that the actual value means the value as shown by the assessment roll of the municipality in which the property lies. I think there is a very important difference between my amendment and the provision of the Bill as it stands, and I think it is a difference which is essentially in favor of the amendment I propose. The Bill, as it stands now, practically leaves in the hands of the revising officer the assessment of property upon which the various classes of voters will qualify as voters. It leaves practically in the complete control of the revising barrister the power to put anybody on the list or not. The amendment proposed does not affect in any way the business of the revising barrister, with regard to the various franchises which are not based upon property; but those franchises which are based upon property, I contend, should be based on the proper valuation of that property, as ascertained for purposes not connected with the electoral lists. The assessment roll, which I wish to take as the basis of the value of the property, upon which various classes of voters shall qualify, is made out for the purposes of municipal taxation, which affords a guarantee that the value fixed is the real and correct value of that property. The taxation of every owner in a municipality is based upon it, and he himself is interested in having the property correctly assessed; whereas, by this Bill, the assessment is left in the hands of an officer appointed by the Government, who has no direct interest in the correctness of the assessment, and whose hands are in no sense tied by the counterbalancing interest on the part of the elector. Under the municipal system, if an elector desires to be put on the voters' list, he asks the assessor, as I believe is sometimes the case, to assess his property sufficiently highly to qualify him to vote, and he has to pay a corresponding increase in his taxation; whereas, under this Bill, the elector may try to show to the revising barrister that his property ought to be assessed more highly than it is in the municipal assessment, and if he does so, he is not required on that account to pay any increased taxation to the municipality in which he lives. Under the municipal system, not only is the person interested in keeping his assessment at the correct value of the property, but every person in the municipality who elects the councillors who revise the assessment rolls is also interested; so that the assessment roll is pretty sure to indicate the correct value of the property in the municipality. I think, therefore, that if the revising barristers are obliged to base the voter's lists, over which they have so much power, on a valuation roll,

which is out of their power, it will remove a good deal though not by any means all, of the objection I entertain to the revising barristers having control over the voters' lists. It is for these reasons that I propose:

That the actual value of any real property shall be the value as assessed by the assessment roll of the municipality in which the property lies.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I object to that altogether. It would have the effect of disfranchising a great many people. We all know that the assessed value is not the true value; it cuts down the value amazingly. The gentleman says that because there will be no increase of taxation a person might be anxious to get his property valued too highly before the revising officer. He is not such a fool as to do that, because his neighbors would know it, and the next time the assessor went around, he would fix the value according to the man's statement.

Mr. WELDON. This is a very indefinite clause. It says that the value shall be "the present market value." That altogether depends on the time and upon the terms under which it might be sold, whether for cash or on time, and the length of that time. I adopt the same view as the right hon. Prime Minister, that the assessment roll is not always the best place to ascertain the value; because it is well known that property is not, as a rule, assessed at its full value. I would suggest an amendment as follows:—

Actual value or value means the present value of the property, a the same manner as if it were appraised as belonging to the estate of deceased person, provided that in no case shall the value be less than the assessed value in the municipality or parish.

That would take the assessment roll as the basis, but the value might be beyond that. The value will be ascertained in the same way as when a man puts his property in the hands of an appraiser to value, because he estimates its fair value to the party, not what it would sell for in the market, which would depend on the terms and conditions under which it could be sold and the demand for real estate at the time. While I agree with the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) that the assessment roll should form the basis, I do not think it should be the actual basis, but it should be the minimum of value; so that the parties would be allowed to come in and show that upon a fair valuation the property was worth more than it was assessed for.

Mr. TROW. The First Minister is perfectly correct when he says that the assessment roll does not at all times give the actual value; at the same time, it seems to me to be the preferable basis, because it affords certain safeguards. In the first place, the assessor is under oath to make a proper and just assessment; then it is revised by the court of revision, and afterwards again by the members of the county councils; so that there are several checks and safeguards in operation before it is finally revised. I do not think lawyers are the best valuators of real estate. In very few instances, in my county, have I known a lawyer who could value a farm as well as an assessor, and I think it would be better to adopt the same system in this Bill.

Mr. FISHER. I am not familiar with the state of affairs in New Brunswick or the other Provinces; but in my own Province, the actual value of the property is taken as the basis of the municipal assessment. Some years ago that was not the case; but the assessors and the municipal authorities have found, as a matter of convenience, that the actual value is the best to put on the assessment roll, and they have almost universally, I believe, adopted the practice of assessing the property at its actual value, as nearly as they can ascertain it. This is very much better, and it practically amounts to the same thing, as it would be, so far as the people in the municipality are concerned, whether the property was valued higher or below its actual worth. If the property were all valued below its actual value, the rate of assessment of taxation would have to be so much more on the dollar, to get the necessary money to do the work of the municipality; if the property were valued higher than its actual value, the assessment per dollar would be so much lower. Even supposing it were valued lower than its actual value, it would be the same for the whole municipality. Everybody has the same chance in each municipality, though the chance may not be quite equal all over the whole Dominion. The right hon. gentleman, the Premier, said nobody was going to ask to have his valuation raised in order to get on the voters' list. Well, even under present circumstances, I have known men who have asked the assessors to raise the value of their property for this purpose; but even supposing nobody was such a fool as to ask this, how about the man whose valuation will be lowered a little, so that he will not be put on the roll? Will he be brought down to the same level? No; he will still have the same tax to pay, under the municipal assessment, though he will not get the right to vote, because the right hon. gentleman does not chose to give it him. That is the reason I do not believe that the valuation should be left in the hands of the revising barristers. The way proposed by the amendment is the only way in which safety will be given to the people who qualify on their property for a vote under this Bill; and if, as it is at present, the assessment is left in the hands of the revising barrister, it simply puts in his hands the power to decide whether anybody shall have or shall not have a vote.

Mr. LAURIER. I understood the First Minister to say he was willing to take the franchise as it was in the Province of Ontario, and extend it no further, but I find by the Ontario Act that the basis of the franchise is the municipal valuation; so that if the Prime Minister adopts the rule he laid down a moment ago, he cannot object to this amendment, which proposes the same basis as is adopted in Ontario.

Mr. BOWELL. The assessment roll is not final.

Mr. LAURIER. It is the basis.

Mr. BOWELL. So it is in the other case. The basis of the voters' list is the assessment roll in Ontario, but you can appeal to the court of revision and have it raised or lowered, and if you do not succeed there you can go before the judge, who, in this case, is the revising barrister.

Mr. LAURIER. Let the list be made out according to that basis.

Mr. CASEY. The Minister of Customs is mistaken in saying the assessment roll is the basis in both cases. It will not be the basis of the voters' list in this Bill. It is to be taken as part of the evidence; there is nothing to say that even in a first rough draft the assessment roll will be the basis. This clause particularly specifies the value, for the purpose of qualification, shall be subjected ——

Mr. BOWELL. Neither is it the present law in Ontario. If a man is left out he can insist on being put on.

Mr. CASEY. This makes the basis the opinion of the revising officer on the information in his possession at the time of such revision. In the one case, the rough draft made by the township clerk must be made from the assessment roll, without his exercising any judgment as to the value of the land. Then there may be an appeal to the court of revision to have the assessment roll revised; if that fails, there may be an appeal to the judge; but there is this great difference, that the judge revises, not only the voters' list but the assessment roll, and the effect of his decision is to change the sum for which the appellant is taxed on the assessment roll. Under the present Bill, the person who is assessed too high by the assessment officer for the purpose of giving him a vote pays no penalty. He may be assessed at $100 in the municipal assessment roll and the

revising officer may value his property at $250, to give him a vote, and he will still pay taxes only on the $100. There is a material difference between a change being made on both the assessment and voters' list and on the voters' list alone. It has been said that next year the assessor will put the property up to the figure fixed by the revising officer, but the assessor is sworn to do his duty in valuing the land, according to the system laid down by the law, and he cannot swear this land is worth the increased value put upon it by the revising officer simply because that officer chose to fix the value at such figure. Again, if the assessor should follow that valuation, it is quite open for the person whose assessment has been so increased to appeal, and say: I did not value my land at the value put upon it by the revising officer; that was his doing. Remember, the revising officer can raise the value of his land without any request of the man himself, of his own motion, for the purpose of including him in the voters' list, or lower it, for the purpose of taking him off, without any appeal on the part of either of the parties concerned. This man will be in a position to say: I did not value it at this high figure; the revising officer put it at that; that is his opinion; my opinion is that is so much; and so the two things might go on concurrently and compatibly for years, a man being rated at $300 for voting purposes and at $150 for assessment purposes, without the slightest dereliction of duty on the part of the assessor or any appeal on the part of the party interested, and without his having to pay any increased taxation for the fictitious value given to his property for political purposes. I object to this clause on the ground of vagueness, and chiefly because it introduces just the principle which is sought to be remedied by both the amendments before you—the principle of a valuation of land made by a political officer for a political purpose, pure and simple, and with political objects in view. I am not inferring that the revising officer will be always partisan, but the question he will have in view in gauging the value of property which is near the amount required for qualification will be: Is this man entitled to a vote or not? He will look upon the valuation, not from the point of view of local assessment, but from the point of view of whether the man should have a vote or not. Therefore, I call him a political officer, making a valuation for political purposes. Of the two amendments, I prefer that proposed by my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. Fisher). I quite agree with him that it is absolutely essential to a fair valuation of land that it should be valued for taxation purposes and not for political purposes; that the average assessor, bound by oath, responsible to the municipal council, which is directly responsible to the people of the township, subject to the checks of the court of revision and the appeal to the judge, is not only likely but certain to be an infinitely more impartial valuator of land than the irresponsible officer appointed by this Government to value the land for political purposes only, and who is himself the sole judge of value, of law, of evidence and of everything connected with the valuation of that land. The Premier says that, because the land is generally assessed at a lower value, this plan would restrict the franchise. That sounds very plausible, but it appears very absurd, when you recollect that we have been working under that system for years; that, ever since we have had voters' lists at all, the basis has been municipal valuation; and that, in every other country, as far as I am aware, in which English precedent is followed, the municipal or parish assessment is the basis of the valuation for voting purposes. In the Province of Ontario, during all the years that the right hon. gentleman has conducted campaigns in that Province, the municipal assessment has been the basis of the franchise. It is absurd for him to say now that it restricts the franchise unduly. We know that property is sometimes valued below its actual cash price, but it is chiefly in regard to the large properties that that rule prevails, and not in regard to the small properties, as to which it may be doubtful whether the value will be sufficient to qualify the owner for a place on the roll or not. Even if there is an appeal to the county judge, he has to apply the rule laid down in the assessment law of Ontario, which the assessor should have followed if he did his duty. This paragraph in the present Bill leaves a tremendous loophole, to say the least of it, for a difference of judgment, or a weakness or fallibility of judgment on the part of the revising officers. It is extremely vague; the Ontario Act is precise, and the amendment of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Weldon) is precise. This Bill is as vague as possible, and it bears upon its face the suspicion of having been left purposely vague. When you take the words "ordinary terms of sale" in connection with the proviso that the revising officer will determine "upon the best information in his possession," you have no definition whatever of the ordinary terms or sale. You make no provision as to what the revising officer must be guided by. I think it would puzzle the right hon. gentleman himself to say what are the ordinary terms of sale. Even in any particular locality they are subject to constant variation, and they can hardly be applied to the sale of lands throughout the Dominion. The land may be sold for cash or for credit, for a certain number of years, at 6 per cent., or 5 per cent., or 8 per cent., or 10 per cent., and the market value would be different in all these cases. If a man said his property was valued at $175 when it should have been rated at $200, the applicant might urge that the terms to be adopted were long credit and a low rate of interest on the unpaid balance, while the party who desired to strike off his vote would say the terms were cash or a short term of credit, at the ordinary rates of interest paid for land. It is easy to make a difference of $25 by taking the one or the other rule. The revising officer can take which he thinks proper as representing the ordinary terms of sale, and that gives a tremendous opportunity for, to say the least, a variety of judgment. I might even go farther. We know there will be partisan revising officers who will wish to put one man off and another man on the list. There is room for him here, while remaining within the limits of the law, to exercise his partiality and to choose arbitrarily that particular basis which will produce the value for the property which he wishes to see produced. Then again, as to the best information in his possession at the time of such revision. That is a very vague clause. It is not provided that he shall know much of the value of lands in the neighborhood. This reference to the best information in his possession would allow him to take, keeping strictly within the terms of the law, such information as he chooses to get. He is not compelled to proceed on the best information he can get; he has power to proceed with the best information he has in his hands at the time. I conclude, therefore, that the clause is extremely vague, and leaves glaring occasions for favoritism, partiality or mistake, on the part of the revising officer, and that it fails to show any basis at all upon which the property is to be valued. I prefer the amendment of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher), because it asserts the principle that the valuation should be made by the municipal officer for this as well as other purposes. I also like that amendment because, in Ontario, at all events, it will secure just what the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) is seeking to insert in the Bill, namely, the valuation, in the way he stated, of all property. I think there should be some definition in the provision. It is absurd to throw ourselves upon the mercy of the revising officers, who will necessarily be more or less partisan, without at least laying down some definite rule for their guidance in the valuation of land.

Mr. AUGER. I think the First Minister has not looked on all sides of this question. He must consider that the

farmers or voters generally have something else to do than to watch these officers make up the list. Now, in the municipalities we have our valuators, who go around the county and make a roll. A notice is given, and on a certain day the roll is revised by the municipal authorities. A man has to watch that to see whether he is properly valued, and if he finds that his property is valued to its full value, then he wants others to be valued fully also, because otherwise he will have more than his share of the taxes to pay. If he is not satisfied, he has the right of appeal to the county council. Under the present system, when the voters' list is made from that roll, all the voter has to do is to see that his name is on the list. If it is not on the list, he can apply to the council to have it put on, and then appeal to the court if not satisfied with the decision; but according to this system he will have to do this work, and then he will have to watch the revising officer, because, although his name may be on the roll, he is not certain that it will be put on the revising officer's list. Then there is the question of cost. How is it possible for a professional man, a barrister, to be able to value the whole county in much less than a year? At present the municipal council generally appoints the same valuators from year to year, because they are better acquainted with the property in the municipality. Very often it takes a month to make a valuation in some municipalities. How is it possible that a perfect stranger, who knows nothing of the value of property in those municipalities, is to make a valuation in less than a year? He may be the best man in the world; if he is an honest man, it will take him longer than if he is a scoundrel, because if he is the latter he will care nothing about doing his duty. But if he is an honest man he will want to value the land correctly. Take my own county, for instance. There are fourteen municipalities, and how much time would it take for an officer to go around and visit and value these properties? He cannot do it alone; he must have somebody with him; and all this will cost money. If the amendment of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) was accepted, all he would have to do would be to take the valuation roll made by parties who are acquainted with the land in the municipality, and revised by officers who knew the value of land. I think the First Minister ought to accept this amendment. I do not see what injustice there would be; everybody would be treated alike, all over the Dominion, while otherwise the matter would be left in the hands of an inexperienced man, who does not know the value of property and who would put the elector to the trouble of going to the county at the first meeting, and again at the second meeting, in their municipality, for the final revision. Of course, if he does not get justice there, he will have to take an appeal, if the revising officer will let him have it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I think the proposition of the amendment of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher) is the only correct way in which the desired information can be obtained. Not only is it the correct, but it is the cheapest and the only practical method by which it can be accomplished. It is the only way in which proper safeguards can be thrown around it. The assessment roll is made out by gentlemen who are placed under oath to value property at its actual cash value. But that is not the only safeguard. If a man feels aggrieved, if he considers that the value of his property is sufficient to enable him to have a vote, he has an appeal to the court of revision. That, in Ontario, and I presume it is the same in the other Provinces, is composed of the members of the municipal council. They also, before they enter on their duties, take a solemn oath to do justice. If the township is divided into wards, one man must necessarily be well acquainted with the ward, and I believe in most cases it will be found that every member of the council knows of his actual knowledge whether the property should be raised in valuation or not. So we say that safeguards are thrown around it, and it is the most correct valuation that can be made in that way. Not only so, but under the Ontario election law there is still another appeal provided, namely, to the county judge. If a man feels aggrieved and thinks his property should be raised, so as to give him a vote, he can appeal to the county judge, and—I desire hon. members to notice this point—if the appeal be sustained, the costs are saddled on the council. So all the safeguards imaginable, in order to obtain a correct valuation, are provided by this method. I asserted that it was the cheapest way in which the matter could be decided. By adopting this plan it saves this Government from paying anything, except a mere trifle, to obtain an assessment roll. Again, I said it was the most practical way. If you do not adopt the revised assessment roll as a basis, what other basis are you going to get? Is the revising officer to become an assessor, and go through the riding, from one end to the other, placing a value on all property in dispute? If that be so, it is going to take a pretty smart revising officer to make out a voters' list within a year. We know that some of the ridings vary from twenty miles to 100 miles between their extreme points; and it took the assessor, who was a very smart man, two months to prepare an assessment of one of the townships in my riding. We can easily understand the immense amount of labor in which it is going to involve the revising officer if he becomes assessor, and is called upon to go through each riding and see if property entitles the parties to vote or not. It may be objected that under this Bill the revising officer may take such information as he requires. That is going to make the matter worse. If he is going to do so by taking evidence it is going to make the expense much larger, for the only difference is, that instead of the cost being borne by the Province, it will have to be borne by individuals. I cannot see any other way of getting a cheap and correct assessment, except by the method proposed by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher). Any other is going to be not only costly, but incorrect, and I fear utterly impracticable.

Mr. TROW. I highly approve of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher), as the only practicable solution of the difficulty and the only equitable mode of assessment. The actual value of property is sometimes imaginary. It depends very much on the circumstances of the case. A man may want to enlarge the limits of his farm, by taking an adjoining farm, so as to provide for some member of his family, and for that additional land he may pay 30 or 40 per cent. more than any other person would be willing to offer. Again, the person who sold a portion of his farm might subsequently desire to repurchase it, and be willing to pay a much higher price. So the value of land is largely imaginary. I desire to ask the First Minister now, in the event of the revising officer obtaining information requisite to enable him to arrive at a correct valuation of a section of land, and in the event of there being a trial in respect to the valuation, by whom is the expense to be borne? Is it to be by the individual whose property has either been lowered or raised, or by the municipality, or by the Dominion?

Mr. SPROULE. I desire to say a word in regard to the valuation of the assessment roll. Valuators are appointed to go round and make valuations. In the same county very different values are given to land separated by very short distances; 100 acres may be valued at $1,000, and yet right across the road, in another township, the same quantity of land may be valued at $2,000. Village lots are valued at $80 or $100 above the amount at which they have been bought. This I have seen several times. While I admit that, for the purpose of making the first roll, it would be

convenient to use the assessment roll as a foundation, I deny that it shows anything like the correct values.

Mr. TROW. In the event of one township having a lower valuation, is that not recorded by the county council at the next revision.

Mr. SPROULE. It is recorded for county purposes, but not by the assessor.

Mr. MILLS. I hope the hon. First Minister will take this clause into further consideration. It is very vague. In the Ontario Assessment Act it is provided that the valuation is to be made on the actual cash value, as if sold to meet a just debt of an insolvent estate. You then know the principle on which the value is made. In this section, it says that the amount shall be the market value of any property on the ordinary terms of sale. Now "the ordinary terms of sale" is very indefinite. It may mean one thing in one municipality and a wholly different thing in another. One may sell for cash, and another for a long term of credit, and the interest may be different, so that the valuation of a property may not depend on the intrinsic value, but on a different practice of the terms of sale. Then it provides "whether as owner, tenant, occupier or farmer, or other owners' son." Now, the hon. gentleman proposes to allow this to stand over in another portion of this section, for the purpose of determining this particular provision of the Act relating to farmers and other owners' sons, so the definition in this clause may be required to be changed hereafter. It seems to me that we ought to have something more definite than is set out in this clause. I am satisfied, if this plan were called into practical operation at this moment, there is not a representative on that side of the House or on this who would not be put to more expense for these lists than would be required to conduct an ordinary election, for the first year and for every year. I am satisfied that the members of this House have not yet begun to realise what will be the cost and trouble and difficulty and length of time required in the preparation of the voters' list, where there is not an original list prepared by some stated authority, outside the rivising officer, whether it is a board, as in the State of New York, elected by the people and representing both parties, or by a municipal council, elected for another purpose, and who can perform this duty at the same time. There ought to be some plan of making up the lists originally and some definition given as to what is to be the actual value of the property. The language of the clause is certainly very loose and vague. Now, the First Minister said that the assessed value is altogether below the actual value. I know that was the case years ago, but there has been a great change in western Ontario of late years, and I believe in most western constituencies the hon. gentleman will find that, if you were to take the assessed value, it is very near the value which is to be determined in this way—as near as it can be fixed. Then, again, if that were the case, supposing the hon. gentleman's statement was well founded, that the assessors do fix the value of property altogether below the real value, what follows from that? Why, that the hon. gentleman should fix a lower valuation here as the standard of qualification for voters. He would meet the whole case in that way. If he thinks that the sum he fixes as the qualification of a voter is all that is required of him, and that the assessors generally fix a lower valuation, he will meet the difficulty by saying that the valuation shall be something less, and still we will adhere to the revised roll. Then there are only to be required to be put on the voters' list those persons who are not included within the assessment valuation—at all events, those conditions of qualification which are not included on the assessment roll, and that can be better done, most assuredly, by persons in the locality, elected by the people of the locality, who know the parties and circumstances, better than by any revising officer, who is a stranger. Then take this part of the definition "as determined by the revising officer, upon the best information in his possession at the time of his revision." Now, a partisan revising officer might have in his possession information obtained from parties, and no other. The hon. gentleman says he will not do that, but we should proceed here so as to guard the rights of the people against abuse. If it is otherwise, it would not be necessary to make provision for revising officers at all, for in most of those cases the difficulty arises, not from errors of judgment, but from the extent to which a man's judgment is warped by political feeling. Now, in New York, to guard against that, there are three revising officers elected, called inspectors. By that means both parties are represented on the board, and those revising officers are liable to prosecution. It seems to me—I will not discuss the matter at length, at present—that the revising officer is treated as a judicial person instead of a ministerial person. There is no provision that he shall be liable for misconduct or prosecuted for fraud, or for disregard of his oath, and he cannot be punished, as an assessor is punished, for wrong doing. Now, in most American States there is provision for the punishment of a revising board for wrong doing, but there is none here.

Mr. HESSON. The clause says that the value means the then present market value of any real property, if sold upon the ordinary terms of sale. Now, as I understand, the evidence which is now brought before a court of revision is that of the comparative value of adjoining properties—at all events, that is the case in the county of Perth. Well, it comes before the judge upon appeal, and the judge takes his information from actual sales made on certain terms which are well known as the actual value of property. It may be part cash, or all cash, but it is on sales absolutely made, and on facts obtained from the registry office, as to sales in the county. Besides, he has the power and the right to take evidence. I cannot conceive, therefore, that any great injustice could be done. As I said before, the assessed value will be the basis on which any voters' list will be made up. If that is the case, I do not think there will be any variation from that at all. I agree with the hon. gentleman that in western Ontario the values are pretty well up to the absolute value in sales—in Stratford, I think it is—and in some cases property will not sell for its assessment. It is not so much the case for farms, though for county purposes they are put up to high values. I do not apprehend any danger, because the assessment in the first instance will fix the basis on which their values are established; and if it is a question of appeal to the judge, I think he will pursue the course which has always been pursued, and take it from the actual values.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. member for Perth (Mr. Hesson) does not agree with the First Minister. The First Minister told me the danger was that the property would be assessed too low, and that consequently a great many would be disfranchised if we took the actual assessment of the municipalities. But the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat says they are, in many cases, assessed higher than they are worth.

Mr. HESSON. I think so.

Mr. FISHER. Then there would be no danger of disfranchisement. I think that, as a matter of fact, the municipal assessment will be as near the actual value as the assessors can discover, and I do not think there is any great danger in either case; but the argument of the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) contradicts absolutely the hon. First Minister's argument, and I think between the two I have suggested the happy medium which ought to be taken. The hon. First Minister seems to be afraid that there shall not be equality in the assessment, but that the

assessment in various localities shall be different. I think, however, that the assessment of people who know the values in the municipalities, assessors appointed by the municipal councils, supervised by the municipal councils, and watched by the people, whose interest is that the assessment should be as just and equal as possible, is not so likely to be incorrect and unequal as the assessment of a gentleman who is only one individual, not in a municipality, but in a whole county, and who cannot possibly know all the values in a large county as well as the people in a municipality, which is a much smaller area, can know the actual values of the municipality in which they are assessed; and the revising officer has to act simply on the information in his possession. A revising officer in Ontario may have a different idea of value than a revising officer in New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, and these officers are as likely to vary as the municipal councils or the assessors. If there is anything in that argument, it is in favor of retaining the provincial franchise. It simply shows how impossible it is for this Legislature to legislate on a matter that really comes within the rights of localities, and does not properly come within the scope of a Legislature dealing with matters pertaining to the whole country. I think, so far at all events, hon. gentlemen opposite have really given us no reasons sufficient to show that the amendment I propose is untenable, and I trust that the right hon. First Minister, if he is not prepared to accept it now, will hold this section over, and frame a section which will carry out his views and still accomplish the object I have in view.

Mr. HICKEY. I think the language in the Bill is the only language that can place this matter properly before the country. There are many counties in which the assessment does not represent the actual value of the property, and there are probably other places where the actual value is stated in the assessment roll. In the latter case, there would be no difficulty, because the revising barrister is directed to take the last revised assessment roll, and that will be *primâ facie* evidence that the names there should be on the voters' list. But, in case there is an appeal in any municipality against the list, his duty will be to take evidence as to what the actual value is, and as to what the ordinary mode of selling is. It makes no difference whether the property in that locality sells at a higher or a lower price, or whether it sells for cash or on time, because it is the actual value that will entitle the voter to be placed on the list. So that, I think, there is no vagueness in the clause, because the value must be fixed by evidence before the revising barrister, whether the actual value is given in the assessment roll or not. Although the assessors are sworn to give the actual value, it is well known that, in taking the oath, they are accustomed to follow up the work of previous assessors, and they think they are complying with their oath in doing so. But lately, since farmers' sons have been put on the voters' list, the smaller properties have been assessed at their actual value. I think, under the circumstances, the language of the Bill is the best that could be used.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I asked the commitee to allow two paragraphs to stand over, because the arguments of hon. gentlemen on the other side, and this side as well, had raised a doubt in my own mind, and I felt bound to solve that doubt on a full consideration of the arguments used. About this clause, however, I have no doubt; it has been very carefully considered, and I am quite satisfied that it is not vague. I am quite satisfied that every man of sense will understand what it means—that it means that the value shall not be based on a cash sale, but on the ordinary mode in which property in the particular locality is disposed of. Every county judge, or revising officer where there is no county judge available, will of course come to that conclusion. If you look forward, you will find that before he can commence any operation in the way of revision he is obliged to get the assessment list. At present in Ontario, as it has been said, the appeal is *ad nauseam;* the list is made by the assessors; this list goes to the municipal court of revision, which disposes of it finally, unless in cases in which there are appeals from that revised list. That is the present law. The Bill merely provides that instead of the revised assessment list only going before the county judge in individual cases of appeals, it is considered that the revised assessment list is appealed against as whole. That is the only difference between the present law of Ontario, and the law as proposed here.

Mr. WELDON. The hon. gentleman is always referring to the law of Ontario. I am opposed to the law of Ontario governing the whole Dominion. We have our rights below as well.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to say that I was merely answering the arguments of gentlemen from Ontario.

Mr. WELDON. If you look for a precedent, you always refer to the law of Ontario. Now, if the assessment was made the basis to start with, there might be something in the arguments brought forward. The right hon. leader of the Government says the terms of sale can be ascertained in each locality. I defy him to go through New Brunswick and ascertain what the terms of sale are.

Mr. KIRK. Hear, hear; the same in Nova Scotia.

Mr. WELDON. Just now, you go through different parts of the country and you will find that the farms are sold for nothing, because the people are leaving and going to the States. Farms in New Brunswick are unsaleable. We want the assessment roll to be taken, in order to get at some basis to start from.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. How does the assessor get it?

Mr. WELDON. From his personal knowledge. But the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) says there is the roll of the valuators to commence with, appointed by the county council. The revising officer is not bound to receive that at all. He may throw it to one side, and call in some person. I understood the First Minister to say the assessment roll was to be the basis; we would not object to that. Let the hon. gentleman take the proposition of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher), or if that be not satisfactory, let him take mine, but let the assessment roll in the first instance be the basis. As the 12th section stands, the revising officer can use the assessment roll or not, as he likes, because it says: "With the aid thereof and such other information as he may obtain." How is the revising officer going to value the property? Is he to go through the county and examine the property and value it? There are many barristers here of more than five years' standing, and I for one, would be very sorry to have that duty imposed on me, of going round the country and valuing land.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). On page 15, section 30 provides that "The revising barrister shall obtain, as soon as possible, a certified copy or certified copies, as the case may be, of the last revised assessment roll or rolls, if any there be, for the electoral district for which he is appointed * * * * and with such copies and such other information as he can obtain." Does the hon. gentleman object to his getting better information? Is it not possible the roll may do some injustice to some voter? Now, this Act provides that he shall not only take advantage of every means by which the assessors now make up their roll in the Province of

Ontario, every means by which the clerk of the municipality makes up the list upon that assessment roll—and I presume that in every other Province there must be some proceeding analogous to what we have in Ontario—but in addition to that, he may make use of any other information he can obtain.

Mr. VAIL. Read the 39th and 40th lines.

Mr. WOOD. After that, every provision for appeal and correction of the list comes in, so that there is no necessity why any man who has a right to be placed upon the list should be left off.

Mr. WELDON. That does not carry it any further than what I read from the 12th section.

Mr. WOOD. Then I cannot understand the Queen's English.

Mr. WELDON. Does it say he must take the assessment roll as the basis.

Mr. WOOD. Certainly.

Mr. WELDON. Certainly not. The 30th section applies to the subsequent revisions. The first revision is made under the 12th section. That says he shall get a copy of the assessment roll, and with the aid thereof make his list. He is not bound to take a single name or a single valuation from the roll.

Mr. BOWELL. He is then bound to print it.

Mr. WELDON. He is to print the list he has made.

Mr. BOWELL. And post that throughout the county, and then the exceptions are taken.

Mr. WELDON. Yes; but who is to pay the expense of it?

Mr. BOWELL. Who pay it now?

Mr. WELDON. What I propounded is, that you are not to put obstacles in the way of a man exercising his franchise. He is entitled to get it as easily as possible, without any expense to the country or to himself. The assessment roll is not for the purpose of making votes, but to get the assessment for parochial, township or county purposes. When that is made, a man is called upon to pay his assessment. He naturally wants to see what he is assessed at, and, if he is assessed too high, he wants to appeal, and can take his measures accordingly. He sees his assessment by the personal application of a demand for rates and taxes. In this way it is brought home to him. But here a reviser comes in. He is not like the assessors, who live in the district and know all about the property. He is a barrister, who need not reside in the electoral district. He may be an entire stranger, and he makes up this list and posts it up, and a man has to attend and watch it. Everyone has to go and see whether his name is there or not. Either make the assessment roll the basis or make it the minimum; because, if a man sees that he is assessed for a $150 or $300, as the case may be, he will know that he is bound to go on the voters' list. Under this Bill, he has to go and find out, because a neighbor of his may tell the revising officer that his property is not worth what it was assessed for. The revising officer may accept any information, any hearsay evidence; it is not sworn evidence, and a man's rights are at the mercy of this sort of evidence. Then the value is to be the value on the ordinary terms of sale, not the actual value.

Mr. HICKEY. It says actual value.

Mr. WELDON. But I want to know what the definition of actual value is. This says, "the then present market value, if sold upon the ordinary terms of sale." A revising officer in Nova Scotia or New Brunswick may say the ordinary terms of sale are so-and-so, in my opinion. Sales are made there in every possible way—sales for cash, sales on time, sales under execution, sales under order of the Court of Equity. What are the ordinary terms? Either put it as it is in Ontario, or as it is in the amendment which I propose, which is the legal way all through the Maritime Provinces. When a man dies the value of his real estate is appraised by persons appointed by the Court of Probate. I say, take it in that way, and take the assessment roll as the basis of it. Then you have something to start upon, but now it is at the whim and caprice of the revising barrister. It would be better to have the assessment roll made *primâ facie*, which the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Hickey) said it was, but which I fail to see. It is very different to say the revising officer shall be aided by the roll, and to say that the roll shall be *primâ facie* evidence. That would be far better, but let it be cut down by sworn evidence, by a court where a man can be heard. Here the list is made up in the first instance by the revising barrister, on the best information he can get, and the first thing a man knows is that his name is not on the list. He goes to the revising officer and asks how it has been done. He says, it is on the best information I could get; your neighbors said it was not worth that, and I cut it down. The 30th section refers to the lists made after the first list. This has to be done every year. It is not that when a man is on the list he remains there, but he has to go through the trouble and expense every year.

Mr. HESSON. That is the case now.

Mr. WELDON. Suppose it is, it is brought home to a man every year by his taxes. He knows what is going on. When he is assessed he is notified of the assessment and called upon to pay his tax.

Mr. HESSON. He is liable to be appealed against, as assessed too high or too low.

Mr. WELDON. He gets a notice of that. If he thinks he is assessed too high he can go to the assessment roll and ascertain, but here he knows nothing of it at all. He gets no individual notice. Bear in mind that the great principle of the assessment is that he shall have individual notice of it. Here he gets no notice whether he is on the list or not. All he has to do is to hunt up some list and ascertain it. He has got to go to all this expense to ascertain whether he is on the list or not. Then when we come to the 30th section. He makes up the first list and he goes on and revises the list, and procures a copy of the assessment roll and a copy of the list, which may be totally different, and such other information as he can obtain. Not information on oath, not evidence, but such information as he can obtain in any way. He shall proceed to revise the voters' list, and "erasing from said lists the names of any persons who are dead or who are not, according to the provisions of this Act, entitled to be registered as voters, and making any other verbal or clerical corrections which may be necessary." It gives him power to set to work behind a man's back and erase his name from the list, and the man, unless he happens to see the list, has lost his vote. It seems to me that we should take the basis of the assessment. What objection can there be in principle? The only objection that has been urged at all is that put forward, that sometimes the actual man does not appear upon the roll. Then one man comes up and says the assessment is too high, and another comes and says his assessment is too low. But make a minimum, beyond which the revising officer shall not go. Then the man has some protection. But as it stands now, it leaves every voter at the whim and caprice of the revising barrister, a man who may be utterly incompetent to fulfill the duties which are now placed in the hands of the valuators and assessors.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). The hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Cameron) and the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Auger) seemed to me very much to magnify the difficulties in reference to the revising officer.

They labored to show that it was necessary he should be cognisant of the value of all the lands in the country. That is absurd. Every man knows that the only value at all about which there can be any question is the small value. In 99 out of 100 cases the value will be so far above the ordinary vote value that there can be no difficulty. It is only when the value is close to the value of the vote that the question of valuation comes in at all. I have made a calculation of a number of appeals in my riding for ten years, and I find the questions of appeal on valuation do not amount to 1 per cent., that in nineteen out of twenty cases last year, the appeal was on the highest valuations. And this applies to the question of the security, set forth by the hon. member for Brome in his resolutions, in reference to the protection of the valuator in the matter of taxes. That is nonsense also, because it is only where the amount of taxes is important that the man looks after them at all; it is against the high valuation that he appeals.

Mr. WELDON. But he has to pay the statute tax.

Mr. FERGUSON. He is not asked for the statute tax for five or six months after the list is made out. If he is not assessed he does not do it. The only evidence he has of his name being left off the voters' list is that published by the municipal clerk. That is the same course which is adopted when the voter is left off the list prepared by the revising barrister. In many instances the values are given by the assessors to-day, who never visit the locality. They put down Tom Jones for $150 on a log house, and never visit the locality. They do that in every county in this Province. And I know more than that. In Ontario to-day our municipal elections largely take place over contests to secure partisan assessors to make partisan voters' lists; and the value of these revising barristers will be chiefly taking the matter out of the hands of the partisan assessors.

Mr. WALLACE. Hon. gentlemen opposite seemed to be troubled for fear some poor fellow may be put on the assessment roll. The whole burden of their song is that too many may be put on the assessment roll. The proposal made by the hon. member for Brome I consider an extraordinary one. If the assessor assesses a piece of land for $100, then that has to be taken as final, according to his amendment. If ten men should come up and swear that they knew that property, and knew it to be worth $200, the assessment of that assessor would go against those ten men, though the assessor may never have seen the property, as he never does, in most cases. Then again, by the present law of Ontario, if the assessor does wrong there is an appeal to the county judge, as there will be to the revising barrister in this case. If the evidence brought before him proves that the property is worth more, the change is made; but by the amendment of the hon. member for Brome the evidence of any number of men will go for nothing against the dictum of the assessor. What is the use of having a revising officer or a judge, if the assessor's decision is to go without appeal? These hon. gentlemen are very anxious to have an appeal from the judge, but not so anxious to have an appeal from the assessor, who has no evidence before him on which to make this assessment.

Mr. FISHER. I am surprised to hear such an extraordinary account of the municipal arrangement in the Province of Ontario. I had always heard that Province extolled, as presenting a model of municipal government. I can only speak with authority of the Province of Quebec, but I can tell the hon. gentleman that if their account of municipal government be true, an infinitely better state of affairs prevails in the Province of Quebec. We have assessors who are sworn officers, who are not partisans, and who, moreover, are thoroughly acquainted with the business they have to perform. They do go from place to place, and in every place they make an estimate of the property, according to the best of their knowledge and ability. But hon. gentlemen talk about the assessment roll, and those assessors having their authority put against the authority or evidence of ten or a dozen sworn witnessess. Does the hon. gentleman not know that in Ontario those assessments are liable to be appealed against?

Mr. WALLACE. I pointed out that, by your amendment, there would be no appeal.

Mr. FISHER. The assessment roll is not such until it has been revised and corrected, and then it becomes the legal roll of the municipality. The assessment roll of the municipality is published, and is open to the inspection of any ratepayer. It is not necessary for a man's name to be left out in order that he shall know it, because his neighbors will know it, and they will take care that his name is not left out.

Mr. WALLACE. The hon. gentleman says the assessment roll is published.

Mr. FISHER. It lies in the office of the municipality, and is open to the inspection of any ratepayer. That is what I said. There is no danger of anyone being left off that roll. But in case of an assessment roll being provided by the revising barrister, no one can know whether his name is on the list or not until the voters' list is published, and then a man cannot tell the reason why his name is omitted, whether it is considered that his property is not sufficiently highly assessed or not. The assessment roll of a municipality is subject to appeal, and when it has been revised and corrected it becomes the legal assessment roll of the municipality, and then, and then only, I wish to see it taken as the basis of the list to be made up. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Ferguson) said that only small properties would come into question. I quite agree with the hon. member; but it is the owners of those small properties who are most careful to look at the amount of taxes they have to pay. Rich men do not care so much, but poor men look at every cent, and take care that they are not over assessed. It is therefore absolutely necessary that the assessment roll of the municipality should be taken as a basis, and a final basis, because if you depart from the assessment roll, then you are leaving the revising officer to do what he pleases. I do not suppose that any man assessed at $5,000 will be left off the roll; but the converse is likely to be true, that parties assessed a little lower than the amount necessary to obtain votes may have their assessment increased; and though they would not have the hardihood to strike off a vote in the first case, yet it would be easily possible to slightly increase the assessment in the latter case, so as to confer a vote. Under this Bill the officer will have to go over the whole county, enquire into the value of the property and assess it. It is beyond the power of any one individual to do this. He is not likely to do it or to attempt it.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). There will not be more than about twenty cases in each municipality which will require investigation, and they will be cases where the amount is very near that necessary to obtain a vote. The idea that the revising officer will have to go round a whole county and value the property is bosh.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I have been a little surprised at the charges made against the assessors by the hon. members for West York and North Leeds and Grenville. The assessors generally do not conduct the business in the manner described by those hon. gentlemen. They have stated that the assessors go to a certain house, and from that house information is obtained for the assessment round that locality. I do not believe that that system prevails. I believe they examine every piece of real

estate and place a value on it. In order to show the safeguards of the present system, I may say that the assessors, when they make an assessment, leave a schedule showing the value placed on the property; if the party assessed is not satisfied he can appeal to the court of revision, held by the municipal council of the township. By this clause you open the door for fraud, which may be committed under this Bill. I do not say that fraud will be the result, but I say it opens the door to fraud; it takes away the right of appeal from the people, and it leaves them without being able to determine whether they are on the roll or not. There is also the danger of people being placed on the roll whose names should not be there. The present system pursued in my riding and in Ontario is as follows: The assessor is selected on account of his qualifications for the office; he has to be a man of good judgment and possessing special qualifications with respect to the value of property. He proceeds on his rounds, and goes to every owner of real estate, makes an assessment and leaves a schedule, showing the amount they are assessed for. After the assessment is completed a court of revision is held by the municipal council, and any person can give notice of appeal to the clerk, and may come before the council, who are directly responsible, and if he is assessed too high the council may reduce his assessment, and if too low they may raise him. The people have a direct monetary interest in it, especially if they are poor, for they feel the payment of taxes more than others. But under the proposed system you leave the determination in the hands of an officer who is unable to visit the places and ascertain the values. The cost will be something terrible, and you will not have the guarantee that people now have that justice will be done in each case. Now, about the value of the property. In our section property has begun to be assessed at its cash value. That has been the case in Brant township, and in Bentinck it has been raised every year for the last number of years, and in order to have the county assessed on the same basis, they appoint a board of commissioners to equalise the assessment. These commissioners visit the whole county, they are supposed to examine it closely and to determine whether the assessment by the assessor in each township has been carried out fairly and justly, and whether each township is paying a proper amount of county rates. Under the present system you have all through the greatest safeguards to the people. It is a system which is cheap, and you place it within the reach of every man who has a right to be put on the list. He sees the list published, and if his name is not on the list, he can appeal to the county judge, who can put him on. But after the revising officer has determined the fact that he is not entitled to vote, he has no appeal on the matter of fact. I think the present basis of preparing the voters' lists should be left as it is, because it is the most correct and common sense basis—it is the fairest, and one which prevents fraud. Now, the member for Leeds says that this is for the purpose of keeping a partisan majority out of the councils. And my hon. friend wishes to transfer this power from the people to the Government. I like to see good men elected for municipal councils, irrespective of their politics, and if good men are elected, the lists will be right and proper. We want to know on what basis it is done; we want to see that no man is put on the list who should not be on, but we do not want it to be left to the judgment of one man. Under the present system, we have the judgment of the assessor, in the first place, and I am proud to defend the character of the assessors. I know there are some assessors in my riding who are not favorable to me, politically, but I never yet had occasion to take exception to a single name being placed on the list. The assessor is generally a man qualified for the work, and then it afterwards comes before the council, who are directly responsible to the people, and they determine whether the assessor has performed his duties correctly or not. They know all about the township, and that is one of the reasons why they are elected. They find out whether the roll is on a fair and honest basis, and whether the assessor has displayed reasonable judgment and fairness in estimating the value of property. If the people are not satisfied, they go before the council, and their evidence is heard and the council determine whether the assessment is fair or not. Look at the number of safeguards, without expense, that are thrown around the voter. If the people are not satisfied with the decision of the court of revision, they can appeal to the county judge. The matter is conducted all along openly and aboveboard; everything is transparent, and there can be no fraud, if there is vigilance on the part of the people. The lists are scattered over the riding, and the people can examine them without expense. Now, if the whole matter is left to the determination of the revising officer, no matter how good that man may be, how is it possible for him to travel over the township and testify as to the value of property. Will his testimony be as good as that of the assessor and the owner of the land, who has brought his neighbors before the court of revision to substantiate his evidence? Will the people have as much respect for his decision as they have for the decision arrived at under the present system? The hon. member for Leeds and the hon. member for West York would lead us to the belief that the assessors, in their counties, are men of scandalous character; the assessors have to swear to the value of property, and they say they are false to their oath, and that they value property they have not seen. That is a terrible imputation on the assessors. I am sure nothing of the kind has ever occurred in my county.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you acquainted with the assessment in Artemesia. I know a case there, of my own knowledge, of an assessment for $2,500, where $5,000 was refused for the property.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That may have been before 1882, but the assessment of that township has been greatly reformed since that time, I hope.

Mr. HESSON. I think that in the older parts of the country that applies more than in the new.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If the member for East Grey is aware the assessor of Artemisia has not been discharging his duty fairly, I hope he will let the people there know it. Now, the revising barrister is only to use the best information in his possession. If he is a partisan man, very little, or no information, perhaps, would be the best information he could have. The trouble will be that those who are assessed low will be struck off. I think the thing is not right. It opens the door to great danger. It does away with the right of the people to examine into this matter, which they have been accustomed to do for years. They have all these safeguards which I have mentioned under the present law, which gives every man the opportunity to prove his right to be placed on the voters' list. This Bill does away with all these safeguards, and places the voters' lists under the control of a revising officer, who will determine them according to the best information in his possession. I do not think it is right. However good a man may be, it is not right to place the rights and the liberties of the people in his hands, in such a way that he may deprive them of those rights and liberties. I do hope that this amendment will carry. I think the Bill would be very objectionable if allowed to pass in its present shape, because I think it gives an opportunity for fraud and injustice to be committed on the people of the country.

Mr. BOWELL. It seems to me that we have been discussing for the last hour a question which is not now before the Chair. The simple question is as to the mode and manner

in which you shall arrive at the value of property upon which a person shall be entitled to vote. The amendment proposed by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher), instead of saying that it shall be the value of the property on the ordinary terms of sale upon which the voters' list shall be made up, takes the assessment roll as fixing the final value of the property. That being the case, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) did know what he was talking about. In the Province of Ontario the value of the property upon which the voters' list is to be made, which entitles a man to vote, is the value put upon the property by the assessor.

Mr. LAURIER. Is not the assessment roll provided by the municipal council in Ontario? Then, is it not subject to an appeal by any person who is aggrieved? And is it not only after all these appeals are made that taxes can be levied? This is the roll on which all these proceedings are taken.

Mr. BOWELL. Not at all. Taxation has nothing whatever to do with the voters' list. When there is a positive declaration of what certain words mean, and an appeal is made from that, would not the revising officer go back and say: The law has made a provision which fixes the value of your property by the assessor. Could he go behind that? In my own Province I know the assessor makes the assessment; I know there is a court of revision, before which the assessment can be changed, and there is an appeal to the county judge; but there is nothing in the Ontario law which says that the assessed value shall be finally the value of the property upon which a man shall vote; there is no provision which declares that the assessed value of property shall be final in the provincial Act, but if the amendment passes the value is finally and irrevocably fixed without appeal.

Mr. FISHER. The amendment reads, "the assessment roll in force." In the Province of Quebec, and from the hon. gentleman's statement I should say it is the same in Ontario, an assessment roll does not come into force until it is revised and comes under appeal, and therefore it is the absolutely correct assessment of the municipality.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman is not correct. The assessment roll may be finally revised by the court of revision. From it the voters' list is made, and the voters' list does not become final until a certain time has elapsed; and if no appeal is made, it then becomes final. But for a certain period after it has been made from the assessment roll, you can go before the judge and have it amended, wherever you can prove it to be wrong; but the assessment roll previous to that is final. My hon. friend has not drawn the distinction between the revision of the assessment roll and the final revision of the voters' list. I admit that the assessment roll is final, so far as it affects the taxable property in the municipality; but from that roll is made the voters' list; that voters' list is then posted, and you have to go to the trouble to find out if a man's name is upon it.

Mr. FISHER. In the Province of Quebec no man can have his name placed on the voters' list if it is not also on the assessment roll.

Mr. BOWELL. Do I understand you to say that if, by error or by design, a man's name is left off the assessment roll, he cannot go to the judge and get his name put on the voters' list?

Mr. FISHER. Certainly not, if the assessment roll is in force. No man can go on the voters' list who is not on the assessment roll. If he is not on the assessment roll he has an appeal from the roll, as provided by the municipality, so as to be put on the assessment roll.

Mr. BOWELL.

Mr. CASEY. I want to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the law. The law is that the judge does not amend the voters' list as a separate affair. When an appeal is made to the judge against the rough draft of the voters' list he amends the assessment roll and the voters' list, on account of the amendment to the roll.

Mr. WALLACE. The judge makes two revisions. He revises the assessment roll, and then, after the voters' list is made out from that assessment roll, and is printed and posted in all the municipality, you can appeal from that again; so that you have the appeal on the assessment roll and an appeal on the voters' list, which does not affect the tax at all, but it affects the right to vote.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not know how it is in Quebec. If an elector who has been, by design or accident, left out by the assessor or the clerk of the municipality from the voters' list, has not a right to appeal to a judge in the Province of Quebec, to have his name put on the list, you are not as liberal as we are in Ontario. In Ontario, if an elector's name be left off the voters' list and be on the assessment roll, he can appeal to the judge to have it put on the voters' list. If it be left out of the assessment roll and consequently out of the voters' list, he can appeal to the judge, within a certain time before the election, to show that he had not been assessed, by accident or for any other reason, and he will be placed on the voters' list, which has nothing whatever to do with the assessment roll, and his name does not go on the assessment roll. One of the best features of this Bill is the fact that we do not take the assessment roll as a finality, though we take it as a basis. The object of this Bill, which I think is clearly expressed in it, is that the revising officer, in making out the first list, shall send for all the assessment rolls in the electoral district, and a penalty will be imposed upon the clerks of municipalities who do not furnish him with assessment rolls. He has then to take all the information he can obtain, and I presume he will. I do not suppose a gentleman sworn to do his duty will be dishonest any more than the assessor; nor so much so judging from the experience I have had with some assessors. I have been assessed sufficiently to give me a vote, and have had the notice paper to which my hon. friend refers, served upon the party who represented the property, and was then deliberately cut down afterwards, to keep me out of my vote, and I had to go to the expense of appealing to the judge to have my name put on the list. I am giving you one instance of the manner in which the assessment rolls are made up; and I think that, when you look at this Bill fairly, and judge it upon its merits, you will find that in giving credit to the revising officers, who are sworn to do their duty, and are subject to dismissal by Parliament if they do not——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh!

Mr. BOWELL. It is all very well to laugh, but they are just as honest as the men——

Mr. MULOCK. As the men whom they elect.

Mr. BOWELL—as the men chosen by the municipalities. I repudiate the insinuation made by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). We had enough of such insinuations the other day, and I think it is as well, when we are discussing this question, as I frankly admit we are upon its merits, to do so without throwing out insinuations which imply perjury and rascality of every conceivable description. I decline to enter into that kind of discussion, nor do I think it will add to the dignity of this House or to the amenities of debate if we are to have these slurs thrown into the teeth of those who are desirous to have a fair electoral list, though they may differ from hon. gentlemen opposite, who think another system better. If there is one thing in this Bill which will commend itself to the

people it is the fact that we will not be subject hereafter to the whims of every political partisan assessor.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh !

Mr. BOWELL. I am speaking from my own personal knowledge of what has taken place in a municipality, and if this Parliament is to have a voters' list of its own it should have the appointment of the officers who are to carry it out. I am not prepared to say that I would object to the proposition of my hon. friend from St. John, though I do not think it necessary to provide specially that the revising officer should take the assessment roll as the basis on which to make up that voters' list. I take it for granted, if I read the Bill aright, that that is the provision of the law. But I think, when the House looks at the amendment and sees the interpretation to be put on the value of property, and who is to fix it, they will object to that amendment. I cannot see any great difference between the provisions of the law, as read by one of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and the provisions of this law, as to fixing the actual value. The Ontario statute provides that it shall be the cash value, and the present proposition is to make the "ordinary terms of sale" the actual value. What are the arguments used by hon. gentlemen opposite in reference to that? Is there any better mode of ascertaining what the ordinary value of property is? The Customs law says the market value at the time at which the article is purchased shall be the basis of value. So in this case it would be the market value at the time when the assessment rolls were made up. What is the difference between saying the cash value or the ordinary market value? The latter would probably be greater than the former, because, when you buy for cash you get the article cheaper, so that the adoption of the ordinary market value would widen the franchise. I do not see the slightest difficulty on this particular point, and I do not propose to go into the other questions discussed to-night.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I do not think we shall find a better argument than that of the hon. member for Leeds in favor of the assessment roll being taken as a basis. He says not 1 per cent. of the assessment roll will be appealed against. Can we hope for a system which will be right more than 99 times out of 100? I desire to file a mild protest against the character given by representatives from Ontario to the Ontario municipal machinery. One would suppose that hon. gentlemen opposite were actuated by the true instincts of old Toryism, which considered municipal institutions as sucking Republics and, if this goes abroad to other Provinces, they will imagine that our officials are so corrupt that it is necessary to appoint officers of the character of revising barristers to take charge of our municipal institutions. Much stress has been laid upon the oath of revising barristers, but no stress has been laid upon the oath of assessors or the obligation of councillors. The assessor is subject to a penalty if he values property wrongly to a greater extent than 30 per cent. What remedy have you in the case of the revising barrister? It is said that the assessor may value the property without seeing it. Is it probable that the revising barrister will see it? Besides, I think the class selected for this office would be the last that business men would send to appraise property. They may be judges of law, but it does not follow that they are judges of value. Gentlemen have argued as if the assessment roll was the basis, but the Bill says it is an "aid," not a basis. They argue that the revising barristers are to revise, but the Bill says they shall make the list. If the assessment roll is to be the basis, let the law say so. The Minister of Customs partially yielded to that point. As I understand the amendment, it is that the average assessment shall be taken as a scale to ascertaining values. If mistakes are made by municipal officers, there is a remedy. They are among their own people, and if they do wrong it is quickly corrected. How with regard to the revising barrister? Suppose he turns out bad. How are you going to remedy him? He runs on until he is removed by this House. The assessor, if he does anything wrong, is subject to quick correction by those who elect him. Furthermore, the court of revision is composed of persons of different political caste. The assessors are usually two in a township, one taken from each side, and thus partisanship is guarded against. We do not expect perfection, but the chances are of getting nearer right and the remedy will be much quicker.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to ask the attention of the Minister for a moment to this clause as to the definition. We have to deal with the whole subject as to the party by whom this valuation is to be fixed in the defining clause. Why undertake to discuss an accidental definition when we could deal with the whole subject upon the question as to the revising officer? I will say that the proposition of the Government is wholly unlike any thing to be found in any country where representative institutions prevail. Neither in England, nor the Australian colonies, or in New Zealand, or in any State of the American Union, is it in the power of the Executive to appoint a revising officer, or the parties who prepare the list. In England the list is prepared by the overseers of the parish, and by the clerk, upon which list are put the names of all the parties, and it is subject to revision by the revising barristers; but they are appointed by the judges, and the Government has nothing to do with them. The same thing is true with the Australian colonies, and with every State of the American Union. What would you think of a person who should seriously propose to appoint the judge who is to try the case between himself and another litigant? The Government propose to commit us, in this defining clause, to the mode in which the preparation of the voters' lists shall be done. It provides that the party who prepares the list shall be called the revising officer. He is the same party who revises the list, and from his decision there is no appeal in the first instance. Now, that seems to me a preposterous provision. The party who prepares the list ought not to be the party who hears appeals. The party who hears appeals should be distinct from the party who prepares the list. This list, in its original preparation, requires special legal knowledge. In the United States, in most instances, there is a board elected specially for this purpose, and both parties are represented on that board. We could do the same thing here. If hon. gentlemen opposite are opposed to taking the assessors and the council, let them provide in the Bill that the people in each municipality can elect persons to prepare the voters' list. Let them not take the matter out of the hands of the people, if they believe the council are not to be trusted, which, I believe, is a calumny on the council. The representations with regard to the assessors, which I have heard here to-day, would be a calumny upon the assessors of my own section of the country. We must provide for the election of men to prepare the voters' lists and give from their acts appeal to some independent party.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman says that persons should be elected for the purpose of preparing voters' lists. Now, we elect a council for the very purpose of appointing the assessors, and the hon. gentleman knows, and every member of this House knows, that not only are the council elected on political principles, but the assessors are appointed on political principles. My hon. friend knows it perfectly well. He knows that the great struggle has been between the parties on that point for years. I give him my own county as an instance; I do not think there is a single township in which the assessors have not been elected on that principle for years. In the city in which I have lived for the last forty years that battle has been fought out from year to year between the two great parties. My hon.

friend will not be in any better position if the council are taken, in the first place, upon the principle, and they choose their assessors. What better would it be if this suggestion is carried out? I think it would be very much better, and we will get rid of some portions of these partisan struggles, and it will be in the interests of the country if we could have gentlemen appointed by the Government for this purpose, gentlemen who have reputations, and who are responsible to this House. I do not think any gentleman would value his position so low that he would be willing to place it in the hands of his party, and say: I will sacrifice my reputation for the paltry pittance you give me as a salary to discharge that work. I think it is asking too much of the members of this House to believe that we should get rid of the political principle by still leaving the appointment in the hands of the electors. My hon. friend must know that has been the trouble in the past.

Mr. MILLS. No.

Mr. HESSON. You may dissent from me, but I think there are very few gentlemen who are conscientious in this matter, who will not admit that I am correct. The court of revision is chosen in that way by a majority of the council, and in each township, and each city, town and county, the councillors have been for years elected upon their political principles rather than upon their qualifications as citizens. The hon. gentleman has taken an interest in these matters as well as myself. I believe in meeting it squarely and honestly. I think we can get rid of much of this discord, and that we should have better men, men of high character, placed in the position. In my own county this change will not prove of any advantage to me. In the town, not only is there a Conservative majority in the council, but there are also Conservative assessors. In other municipalities it is the same. A change will therefore be of no benefit to myself; but I feel that each will have to make some sacrifice, and that we should select officers of character and capacity for the position.

Mr. VAIL. The point is to obtain the best means of finding the value of property, in order to give people their right to vote. Three men, appointed by the municipal council, all sworn to make a correct assessment, are much more likely to arrive at a correct value than revising officers or county court judges, or anyone else who resides in only one portion of the county. Such is our experience in Nova Scotia. I was surprised to hear that in Ontario matters are not conducted as they should be—first, in the appointment of the officials, and second, in making the assessment—because I always thought that Ontario was a model Province. In my constituency the assessment has been prepared by the same officers for very many years; and I never look at the lists, until a few days before the election, because everyone is perfectly satisfied that they will be perfectly correct. I do not believe the proposed change will prove satisfactory; and in my opinion the Government will realise that they have made a mistake in appointing revising barristers to place a value on property of which they know nothing.

Mr. MILLS. The committee must regret the condition of things prevailing in North Perth—that there is a regular struggle over the municipal elections to decide which party shall control the voters' lists, that the assessments are made with a special reference to that point, and not with respect to the valuation of the property. The hon. member would lead us to believe that his friends have been eminently successful as to these points, and that his success at the polls was due to that cause. The hon. gentleman has in effect told us that those men whom the people themselves elect are utterly unfit for the duties they are appointed to discharge. How comes it, then, that the same people who elected those incompetent men elected so competent a representative as the hon. gentleman? Is it not a very extraordinary circumstance? The hon. gentleman has told us that the people are not to be trusted, that they are utterly incapable of doing this work, and that it must be taken out of their hands and placed in the hands of Government officers.

Mr. HESSON. It is certainly a most remarkable fact that although, as the hon. gentleman says, I am sent here under the present system of voters' lists and elections, I am willing to support a measure that is going to change it. The hon. member is not straightforward or he would admit that he has fought this matter in his own county in order to secure not only the council, but the revisers and the assessors, so that he might control the voters' lists. If that system has sent me here, why should I be willing to change it? Because I believe we should get rid of it, and if the hon. gentleman possessed half the independence that he professes, he would take the same grounds, and unite with me in endeavoring to secure better men for the positions.

Mr. WATSON. I think the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) is quite consistent. The hon. gentleman explained that he thought it was perfectly regular and proper to appoint assessors, and so on. The hon. gentleman now goes on to state that he is in favor of the present proposition to have revising barristers appointed. Under such an arrangement he would no longer have to fight. I think that is one of the strongest arguments, showing that they cannot always depend on having those who are strong party men. I think there are no assessors but who try to do their duties, as they are sworn officials, and besides, they have to look to their billet. They do not know whether the council next year will be Reform or Tory, and it is to their interest to do what is fair between man and man. I am surprised at hon. gentlemen imputing such actions to the assessors of Ontario. In Manitoba we find that they do their duty, and the system of making up the list there is very satisfactory—in fact, nothing could be fairer. If hon. gentlemen do not see fit to adopt the amendment of my hon. friend from Brome, and I think the suggestion of the hon. member for Bothwell would be a fair one, as if three men were elected there would always be a certainty of both parties being represented, I do not think it would be fair to leave it to a revising barrister, though I have a good deal of confidence in county judges. I think, perhaps, that is the reason that the hon. member for Perth supports the provisions of this Bill. He is afraid there might be a fight in Stratford, and that under the assessor he might not be certain to be elected.

Mr. AUGER. I rise to protest against the insult thrown against the farmers of the country by the hon. member for North Perth. He says they must appoint revising officers, and that the reason is that they have a reputation to maintain. Have not the farmers of the country a reputation to maintain, one which is worth that of the lawyers of the country? The insult is thrown at the farmers of every county of the Dominion, as in each county there must be at least thirty men appointed as assessors, who, by the way the hon. member for North Perth spoke, have no reputation or character to maintain. I just rose to protest against the insult thrown against the farmers of Canada, who will remember it.

Mr. PLATT. It is evident, from all that has been said by the hon. member for North Perth, the hon. Minister of Customs and others, in defense of the provisions of the measure, that they have simply been true to their traditions and instincts, in maintaining that the people of the country are not competent, or capable, of managing their own affairs. The Minister of Customs told us that if there was one thing

more than another which should commend this Bill to the consideration and admiration of the House, it was the fact that it would relieve us from the whims and fancies of partisan valuators. I would like to know how the farmers of North Hastings take those remarks—those who have the power of electing from among themselves the officers who know the value of the farms surrounding them, who know the value of each and every parcel of property in their townships, and whose appointments come direct from the people—whether or not they will consider that an insult has been thrown at them, when they are told that they are unfit, that they are too partisan, too low in their political instincts, to consider their own welfare, or the welfare of the nation. I think, Sir, with the hon. member for Shefford, that an insult has been cast upon the rural constituencies of the country. When they are told that they are unfit to valuate, that they are too partisan in their character, and that, therefore, they must have officers appointed by the Central Government, perhaps some petty lawyer, who will come to the rural districts and dictate to the people what is the value of the property for which they are assessed. I think the rural constituencies of the country have most to complain of in this particular, and I think the insult will be resented. I hope these hon. gentlemen who have cast such slurs on the honesty and integrity and ability of those gentlemen who are annually selected by the farmers of this country, will retract them, and will remove the obnoxious clauses from the Bill. It may be true to the instinct of hon. gentlemen opposite to protest against the people of this country deciding for themselves as to the value of their property; but I contend that the simple and just machinery which has been in existence in the various Provinces is a machinery that is more satisfactory to the people, and will give a sounder basis on which to found the voters' lists than that proposed in this Bill. We have the judgment of gentlemen selected by the people, revised by the entire councils of the various municipalities, and again subjected to the revision of the judges of the land. All that is to be set aside as unworthy of consideration, in the view of hon. gentleman opposite; and they are to be so careful in the selection of their officials that they will be able to send lawyers throughout the country, who will be less partisan in the valuation of property than the honest farmers of the country. I think, when hon. gentlemen come to consider this matter seriously, they will see that they have not only cast a slur on the rural communities, but on the ability and competency of the farmers of this country, and the citizens of our various towns and cities, who now select the officers to perform this duty.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not going to enter into a discussion with my hon. friend as to whether I have insulted the honest and in elligent farmers of North Hastings or not. I shall be quite prepared, when the time comes, to discuss that question with him.

Mr. PLATT. I referred especially to the hon. gentleman's assertion that at present we are under the influence of the whims of the partisan assessors who are elected by the honest people of the country.

Mr. BOWELL. The assessors are not elected by the people; they are appointed by the council who are elected by the people; and the revising barristers will be appointed by the Government which owes its existence to the people. But we leave that matter to the farmers of the country. Perhaps, I could meet the views of hon. gentlemen opposite, if they would accept what I propose, by adding these words at the end of the clause:

Provided that the assessment roll, as finally revised for municipal purposes, shall be *primâ facie* evidence of the value of such property.

Mr. MULOCK. I am glad the hon. gentleman has made this remark, more particulary because he has accompanied it with the hope that the suggestion would, to some extent, meet the views of the Opposition. It is the first expression I have heard falling from any gentleman on that side, to indicate that they are prepared to consult the judgment and feelings of hon. gentleman on this side. It is the first intimation given that the slightest consideration would be paid to our arguments and views. I am glad to know that we are approaching a more cordial understanding on the subject, and I trust, as we go on, that whereever it appears the Bill can be improved, so that the machinery finally provided will be such as will afford the cheapest and most convenient means whereby every person entitled to the franchise shall be on the roll, amendment will be made. If we proceed in that spirit, perhaps the Bill will not be so vexatious as it appears on its face.

On paragraph 18, "real property,"

Mr. WELDON. I would suggest that that be amended by making it read, "belonging to or fixed to the land." Otherwise, a saloon upon wheels or a photographer's van would be real property under this paragraph.

Mr. BOWELL. I move that the words, "forming part thereof," be added.

Amendment agreed to, and Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3.10 a.m. (Tuesday.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 5th May, 1885.

The DEPUTY-SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MOUNTED POLICE RECRUITS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. leader of the Opposition asked me yesterday about the number of recruits engaged for the Mounted Police. Since the 1st of March 230 recruits have been engaged and 113 horses purchased and reported to the Department. Other purchases have been made by the officers of the force, but not yet reported.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I beg leave, in consequence of a remark made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) yesterday, to read a paragraph of a letter from Mr. Street, who is at the head of the Half-Breed Commission, to my hon. friend the Postmaster-General, as follows:

"There are stories abroad that the half-breeds to whom we gave script at Fort Qu'Appelle went and bought rifles and ammunition with the money. You may give this a most unqualified denial. We have taken trouble to enquire, and we find that no half-breed has bought either a rifle or powder since we were there. Their wives have spent a good deal of money in finery, and the men have bought horses and cattle, and paid some of their debts."

ENQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders are called, I once more desire to call the attention of the hon. leader of the Government to the fact that the papers on which the proposals relating to the Canadian Pacific Railway are based, have not yet been laid before the House. At the same time I

would call the attention of the Acting Minister of Railways to the fact that a number of returns moved for at an early period of the Session bearing on this question, have not yet been brought down. On the 5th of February there was a return ordered of the number of persons entering and leaving Manitoba and the North-West by rail. On the 6th February there was an Order issued for the details of the estimates of the Deputy Minister of the Interior of the receipts from the various quantities of land in the North-West amounting to $58,000,000. On the 9th February there was an Order for the earnings and expenses of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and running expenses in certain divisions; on the same day there was an Order for the joint transactions of the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway in connection with sale of town sites under the first arrangement; on the 12th February, there was an Order for certain expenses and receipts and some estimates of cost in connection with the construction of the road and its equipment; on same date, there was an Order with reference to land grant bonds, to which only a partial return has been made, a return dealing with the information which is in the possession of the Finance Department and the Order required some information which was to be obtained from the Railway Company; on the 17th, there was an Order for a statement of certain expenditures by the Canadian Pacific Railway; on the 17th February there was an Order for various matters, statement of the $1,600,000 paid to the North American Contracting Company, a statement of the grades and curves, certain estimates of cost, Ontario and Quebec bond sales, and some other things; on the 24th there was an Order for a return relating to the 615 miles west of Winnipeg, divided into sub-headings; on the 6th February, there was an Order for correspondence with reference to the disallowance of Provincial Acts, and also for the reports of the High Commissioner.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I brought that down.

Mr. BLAKE. I thought that was an answer to Order of the previous year but not to this year.

Mr. POPE. I think all the reports were brought down.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, there is no answer to the return. On the 12th February there was an Order with reference to the Manitoba and North-Western Railway, and I call the First Minister's attention to the deficiency in the return laid on the Table. On the same date there was an Order for the papers in connection with the Short Line in Nova Scotia. There was a little passage of arms as to that Short Line between us, but the hon. gentleman's good nature has caused him to forget altogether that circumstance, which I hoped would have stirred him up to bring down the papers.

Mr. POPE. I will attend to that.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has been attending to it ever since 17th February last. On the 23rd February. there was an Order for a statement with reference to the expenses of ocean mail services.

Mr. CARLING. I will bring it to-morrow.

Mr. Blake. I hope it will come, because we have a contract to deal with now. On the 12th March, there was an Order for correspondence and information with reference to the License Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is also an order of some considerable standing with respect to savings bank depositors, a portion of which, at any rate, I was led to understand as long as three weeks ago was in preparation and would be brought down immediately. It seems to me that the return with respect to savings banks, so far, at any rate, as concerns the Government savings banks contradistinguished from the Post office, could easily be obtained and ought to be brought down.

Mr. BLAKE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I hope the Minister of Finance will be in his place to-morrow, and he will attend to this.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am glad to hear that, but the First Minister, in his absence, could take a note of it. There is another matter to which I would call the attention of the First Minister or the Minister of Militia. I would like to know if it be a fact that the *Globe* correspondent has been either dismissed or forbidden to send any communication from General Middleton's camp.

Mr. CARON. I have seen the statement in the papers, but know absolutely nothing about it. The General, of course, in command of his force, has absolute control over his camp. He has not indicated anything to me about the *Globe* correspondent.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Am I correctly informed that the reporter from another newspaper, I believe the *Mail*, was given permission to attach himself to the Queen's Own, but that the same facility or permission was refused to the reporter from the *Globe*.

Mr. CARON. I can tell the hon. gentleman that every application made to me was refused, among others the application made by the correspondent from the *Mail*.

Mr. CHARLTON. I beg to call the attention of the First Minister to the fact that certain returns were ordered with regard to timber licenses. One set of returns with regard to applications not granted another with regard to applications that have been granted. We have received information as to the applications not granted, but with regard to the licenses granted no information has been received. When may we expect it?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I thought I had brought down every possible return the hon. gentleman had moved for.

Mr. CHARLTON. You brought down nothing this year except a couple of returns with regard to applications not acted upon.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 3, "qualification of voters in cities and towns,"

Mr. CHARLTON. Before you put the motion, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the qualification of voters in cities and towns, I wish to put an amendment in your hands dealing with the franchise question. We have reached now the fundamental principle of the Bill, the principle of taking the control of the franchise from the Provinces and giving it to the Dominion. All the other provisions of the Bill, of course, rest upon this section and are cognate to it. The fundamental principle of the Bill is the recognition of power and the exercise of power on the part of the Dominion Government, to control the franchises, with reference to the elections of members to the House of Commons, that hitherto have been in the control of the different Provinces of the Dominion; and I shall proceed to the discussion of that great and broad principle that underlies all the provisions of this Bill. I shall, of course, hold myself at liberty to make incidental reference to any provisions of the Bill which are cognate to this provision and rest upon it. It is noticeable, I think it must be apparent to all who have listened to the debates upon this Bill, that the advocacy of this measure has been a feeble advocacy. From the speech of the right hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill, lasting but a few minutes and dealing with very few of its provisions, deal-

ing with them in the briefest manner possible, down through all the speeches that have been made by members on the Government side in the advocacy of this Bill, that—and I think we may say it safely and fairly, and without prejudice to the ability of hon. gentlemen on the other side—the advocacy has been characterised by a want of force, by feebleness. Among the very first steps taken in this measure was one by the hon. gentleman who introduced it, to drop one of the most essential and important features, one to which he informed the House he was very much attached and wedded, and one which he was very desirous to see incorporated in the Bill. Yet, without any effort to secure the passage of that provision in regard to woman suffrage, he abandoned that feature of the Bill without struggle and without any attempt to induce his followers to accept his views in reference to that matter. We had also in the presentation of this Bill, the speech of the hon. the Secretary of State, in which that hon. gentleman, while attempting to instruct the House with reference to the provisions of the measure, demonstrated to the House that he was himself in ignorance of one of the most important provisions which he was attempting to deal with. Whatever may have been accomplished by the gentlemen who have advocated this Bill, whatever purpose they have urged, they have, at all events, failed in one thing - they have failed to show that any cause exists for this innovation, for this change that it is proposed to make in regard to the franchise in this Dominion. They have failed to show that there is any dissatisfaction in any Province with the condition of things existing, they have failed to show that any part of the population of any Province is dissatisfied with the power which rests in the Legislature of their own Province to control the franchise in that Province, they have failed to show that any public interest has been endangered by the exercise of the power which has hitherto been exercised by the Provinces, they have failed to show that popular liberty has been imperilled in the slightest degree or that the public weal would be advanced by any change. They have not only failed to show this, but they have not attempted to show it, they have made no attempt to show that there is any potent or cogent reason for the change they propose. But, although no cause has been shown, a palpable purpose has been manifested. In conversation a few days ago with a prominent member of the Conservative party—and I will not say whether he is a member of this House or not—I advanced the opinion that this was a fundamental constitutional change of very great importance, a change in regard to which the people of Canada ought to be consulted, and that in my belief the proper course to take was to give the Bill full and ample discussion here and then to lay it it aside till next Session, enabling us in the meantime to ascertain what were the opinions of the people of Canada in reference to it. I held then, and I hold now, that this would be the proper course, that we ought to feel the presure of public sentiment, and ought to know, before we take a step of such a fundamental character as this, what the opinion of the people of Canada is in regard to it, whether any great majority of the people are in favor of it or whether a great majority are opposed to it. What was his answer? Not that this will not be the proper course; his answer was: Oh, that would make it too late for the next election. And in that he betrayed inadvertently the whole animus of the Government and of the Government party in the passage of this measure at this time. It is a measure which is not demanded by the public, which it is not designed to use for the public weal, but which is introduced and is to be passed for the purpose of enabling the party in power to exercise influence on the next elections; and, if this measure were to be laid over till the next Session, until we might be possessed of the opinions of the people of Canada with reference to it, then the purpose for which it was introduced would fail, and it would be unnecessary to introduce it because it could not be used to influence the elections in the interest of hon. gentlemen opposite. This then is the palpable purpose of this Bill.

We live here in this Dominion under federal institutions. The several Provinces are joined together by a federal compact, and it is proper, in discussing this clause, in discussing the advisability of this change with reference to a fundamental principle, in arriving or attempting to arrive at a conclusion whether we shall make the control of the franchise pertain to the Dominion and not to the Provinces, to examine the fundamental principles which underlie the structure of a federal union. The English race has made many important contributions to civilisation. In 1215, when King John granted the Great Charter, when the principle was conceded that taxation should only be levied by consent of the people's representatives, when the principle was conceded that there should be trial by jury and a speedy rendering of justice, there was a great contribution to civilisation. When, in 1265, the Parliament of England first received its distinctive representative character, and borough franchise was established, there was another great contribution to civilisation. When from 1629 to 1649, that great struggle went forward between Charles the First and the Parliament of England, when an arbitrary king attempted to override the liberty of the people of England, to raise the revenues required for the maintenance of a standing army by arbitrary taxation and ship money, when he attempted to override those liberties by the operation of the Star Chamber, and when, as the result of the struggle, Parliament triumphed, liberty was vindicated and the king was conquered, there was another great contribution to civilisation by the English speaking race. When the Bill of Rights was passed in 1689 when the Military Bill was passed, and Parliament assumed control of the sword, there was another great contribution by the English speaking race to civilisation. Another great contribution to civilisation was made when the Reform Bill of 1832 was passed, and the elective franchise was extended, and residency was made a condition of voting. Another contribution was made in 1867, when that franchise was still further extended, and again another in 1872, when voting by ballot was adopted in England. And a still greater contribution was made in 1884, when two millions of the citizens of England were enfranchised by the Bill recently passed. But, more prominently than all these great events, a contribution of infinitely greater importance to civilisation than any of these was made when the federal principle was established, the principle by which races, communities, commonwealths not homogeneous, that could not be assimilated together in one legislative union, can be united together, retaining and maintaining their independence of action separately, and at the same time acting in harmony as a whole body. I repeat that that contribution was the greatest which has been made by the English speaking race to civilisation, the ability to secure permanent concert of action without the sacrifice of local independence and self control. Now this principle, introduced about 100 years ago, has already produced results of enormous consequence to the human race; already, under this principle of federal union, a power has been built up on this continent numbering, at the present moment, 55,000,000 people, a power which has had a marvellous career of progress and prosperity, a power upon which the federal system has conferred untold blessings. Here, in the Dominion of Canada, we have another experiment; we have another power growing up under the beneficent operation of the federal principle. We see the federal principle in operation, or about to be placed in operation, in Australia, and we have the prospect that before many years a large portion of the African continent will be welded together under the operations of the federal principle.

We have the possibility of 200,000,000 or 300,000,000 of people in Hindoostan and Burmah living together and enjoying the blessings of this great system. And, Sir, if we look into the future, we have the probability before us, in twenty-five years, of 100,000,000 of English speaking people on this continent, living under the blessings of federal union. If we look ahead a century, and if the ratio of increase that has prevailed in the past is maintained in the future, we will have on the continent of America more than 1,200,000,000 of English speaking people, living under the beneficent operations of this system of a federal union of commonwealths, each retaining its own distinctive autonomy, all banded together and acting through and by a common purpose. And not only will this be the system under which this vast development of the Anglo Saxon race will take place, but this is a system broad enough and comprehensive enough to embrace more than one race and more than one language; it is a system under which diverse races and diverse languages may exist, banded together for one common purpose and enjoying one common blessing.

Now, Sir, our Dominion as I said a moment ago, is a federal union. This federal union has existed for eighteen years, and perhaps we have not yet had time to work out all that we may need to know with regard to the proper working of federal institutions, and, Sir, we should understand what are the bed-rock principles of a federal union, and in taking steps to ascertain the fundamental organic law that underlies a federal union, we should proceed with the greatest caution and deliberation; we should shrink from the possibility of doing anything that might prejudice or threaten the stability of federal union and bear fruits of disaster in the future. We all know that this Dominion is not a legislative union. We all know that from this hall does not emanate all the legislation, and all the laws, that are binding in the various parts of this Dominion. On the contrary, we know that this Dominion is a Government which exists by virtue of the action of independent component parts; that the authority exercised by this Government is not inherent in itself, but is delegated to this Parliament by the Provinces that constitute this Dominion, by the Provinces that, through their delegates, through their independent action, formed this Dominion. Sir, these Provinces were entities, were individuals, each with an existence of its own. The two Canadas, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, entered into the Confederation as sovereign and independent Provinces. They did not merge their nationality and their separate existence into one great whole, but they retained their nationality, their separate existence, their autonomy, and the power they possessed, I repeat, are powers that were delegated to this Dominion by the independent Provinces that still retain their separate existence. Sir, what is the language of the constitution of the country? The preamble of the British North America Act recites:

"Whereas, the Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick have expressed their desire to be federally united into one Dominion under the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with a constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom: and whereas such a union would conduce to the welfare of the Provinces and promote the interest of the British Empire: and whereas, on the establishment of the union by authority of Parliament, it is expedient, not only that the constitution of the legislative authority in the Dominion be provided for, but also that the nature of the executive Government therein be declared: and whereas it is expedient that provision be made for the eventual admission into the union of other parts of British North America: Be it therefore enacted, &c."

You see these Provinces, acting individually, did not surrender their right to a separate existence, and they possess that right to-day. Now, Sir, when this constitution was adopted, the powers delegated to this Dominion by the various Provinces were set forth in section 91 of the British North America Act. What are those powers? Sir, they are clearly and explicitly and specifically stated in the instrument:

"1. The public debt and property. 2. The regulation of trade and commerce. 3. The raising of money by any mode or system of taxation. 4. The borrowing of money on the public credit. 5 Postal service. 6. The census and statistics. 7. Militia, military and naval service, and defence. 8 The fixing of, and providing for, the salaries and allowances of civil and other officers of the Government of Canada. 9. Beacons, buoys, lighthouse, and Sable Island, 10. Navigation and shipping. 11. Quarantine and the establishment and maintenance of marine hospitals. 12. Sea coast and inland fisheries. 13. Ferries between a Province and any British and foreign country, or between two Provinces. 14. Currency and coinage. 15. Banking, incorporation of banks and the issue of paper money. 16. Savings banks. 17. Weights and measures. 18. Bills of exchange and promissory notes. 19. Interest. 20. Legal tender. 21. Bankruptcy and insolvency. 22. Patents of invention and discovery. 23. Copyrights. 24. Indians, and lands reserved for the Indians. 25. Naturalisation of aliens. 26. Marriage and divorce. 27. The criminal law except the constitution of courts of criminal jurisdiction, but including the procedure in criminal matters. 28. The establishment, maintenance, and management of penitentiaries. 29. Such classes of subjects as are expressly excepted in the enumeration of the classes of subjects by this Act assigned exclusively to the Legislatures of the Provinces."

These, Sir, were not inherent powers, but they were powers delegated to the Dominion of Canada by the separate Provinces that formed this Dominion. By virtue of the delegated powers derived from these Provinces, the Dominion of Canada exercises these powers—not by inherent right, not by any inherent power that the Dominion possesses, but by the consent of the several Provinces, acting as their agent and in their behalf. And what were the powers reserved by the sovereign Provinces that formed this Dominion? There were certain powers that they did not delegate to the Dominion, but reserved them to be exercised by themselves alone; and what were they?

"1. The amendment from time to time, notwithstanding anything in this Act, of the constitution of the Province, except as regards the office of Lieutenant-Governor.

"2. Direct taxation within the Province in order to the raising of a revenue for provincial purposes.

"3. The borrowing of money on the sole credit of the Province.

"4. The establishment and tenure of provincial offices and the appointment and payment of provincial officers.

"5. The management and sale of the public lands belonging to the Province and of the timber and wood thereon.

"6. The establishment, maintenance and management of public and reformatory prisons in and for the Province.

"7. The establishment, maintenance and management of hospitals, asylums, charities, and eleemosynary institutions in and for the Province, other than marine hospitals.

"8. Municipal institutions in the Province.

"9. Shops, saloon, tavern, auctioneer, and other licenses in order to the raising of a revenue for provincial, local or municipal purposes.

"10. Local works and undertakings other than such as are of the following classes (classes stated).

"11. The incorporation of companies with provincial objects.

"12. The solemnisation of marriage in the Province.

"13. Property and civil rights in the Province.

"14. The administration of justice in the Province, including the constitution, maintenance and organisation of provincial courts, both of civil and criminal jurisdiction, and including procedure in civil matters in those courts.

"15. The imposition of punishment by fine, penalty or imprisonment for enforcing any law of the Province made in relation to any matter coming within any of the classes of subjects enumerated in this section.

"16. Generally all matters of a merely local or private nature in the Province."

So here we have on the one hand, certains powers retained in the Provinces that form this Dominion, and certain powers transferred by those Provinces to this Dominion, on the other hand. It is this one clause in the constitution, section 41, which gives to this Dominion the power to fix and regulate the franchise for the election of members to the House of Commons. It is true that such power exists and is contained in section 41; but that power is not a mandatory one, it does not say the Dominion "shall"; it is merely a permissive power, it says the Dominion "may." And the Dominion will be justified and is justified to-day in not exercising that permissive power until it has been shown that in order to preserve tranquility and peace, in order to protect the interests of the people of Canada, the Dominion should of right exercise that power. The Dominion may exercise that power; but it is not to be supposed that the Dominion Government should exercise that power

without sufficient reasons being shown; and if sufficient reasons have been shown, then only I hold that this power, this reserve power and permissive power, should be exercised by the Dominion Government. We are not to suppose that the delegates from the various Provinces who settled upon the terms and sanctioned the terms of the constitution were perfect. We are not to suppose that the things they authorised are certain to be perfect and above challenge. On the contrary, we know that their work was performed fairly well, much of it remarkably well, nevertheless mistakes were made. The experience of eighteen years has demonstrated that mistakes were made in the fundamental, organic law of this country. The experience of eighteen years has demonstrated that it would be desirable to have changes and modifications in the constitution. With respect to the principle of granting subsidies by the Dominion to the Provinces, many people are convinced that a fatal mistake was made there; that a mistake was made by which the Provinces are at liberty to make insatiable demands on the Dominion Government, not realising that whatever the Dominion Government pays to them directly, they must repay indirectly; and it is held and believed that it would be better not to have introduced this principle of granting subsidies, but to have allowed the Provinces to pay their own expenses. With respect to the constitution of the Senate, there are very few who will say that a mistake was not made with respect to that matter. The mode of constituting the Senate is such that that body is the reverse of representative, and it cannot possess the confidence of the people because it does not represent any of the different parties in this county. With respect to clearly defining the rights and jurisdictions of the Provinces, it was not done. We have had confusion, and we have confusion to-day, with respect to the jurisdictions. This being the case, knowing very well from the experience of eighteen years that mistakes were made by those men, we are not bound to assume that clause 41, permitting the Dominion to assume the power it is proposed to assume to-day, was a wise act; and we have a right to examine for ourselves into the grounds that exist for the granting of this power, and see whether it would not be better to leave matters in the position in which they now are. We are bound, in short, before we take this step, before we make this change, before we take from the Provinces the power they have exercised for eighteen years and place it in our own hands, to show that an imperative necessity exists for making this change; and if we cannot show there is an imperative necessity for this change, it is better to leave the matter in the position where it rests at the present time. We are told by the First Minister that the position of allowing the franchise in regard to Dominion elections to be determined by each Province, and those franchises being different one from the other, is an anomaly. Well, I think it would be a greater anomaly if we adopt an uniform franchise for the Dominion, for in every Province in this Dominion there will be a difference existing between the provincial and the Dominion franchise, and there will be a class of voters who will have the privilege to vote in elections for the Provincial Legislature who will be debarred from voting at elections for members of this Dominion Parliament. But the hon. gentleman is not right in saying, if he does say, that he proposes to put an end to the anomaly by a uniform system of franchise. He does not even propose that. His Bill does not propose an absolutely uniform system of franchise throughout the Dominion; and in the end I have no doubt this Bill will introduce as great diversity with respect to the franchise in the various sections of the Dominion as exists by the present mode and under the various Provincial laws regulating the franchise.

As I said a short time since, this federal system revised and put into operation about 100 years ago was a system devised for the express purpose of enabling various commonwealths, communities and component parts by entering into a federal union to maintain their distinctive features and distinctive institutions. For instance, in the United States it would have been impossible to have had a legislative union between Massachusetts and South Carolina. You could not have secured the necessary assimilation and have made the population of those colonies homogeneous. Of the thirteen colonies that form the federal union, five or six of them were entirely diverse from the rest, the southern colonies from the northern colonies, and for lack of community of interest a legislative union would have been simply impossible. A federal union was devised for the purpose of enabling them to retain their distinctive institutions, to retain control over their own affairs and to reserve their local independence, and at the same time to bind those colonies together as one indivisible whole for common defence and to secure perfect concert of action between those colonies. And this purpose succeeded. If there was diversity of interests between Massachusetts and Carolina, between Maryland and Connecticut, between Georgia and New York, is there not to-day diversity of interests and institutions between Quebec and Ontario, or other Provinces of this Dominion? And this federal union, if you act upon its fundamental principle, is a system designed to give a Province situated as Quebec is, perfect control over its own local institutions, to rear a wall of adamant around that Province that cannot be transgressed by other Provinces, to shield its institutions, to enable it to maintain perfect independence and control of its own local institutions without the possibility of interference by other Provinces. That is the fundamental design of any federal union, and the principle of this Bill, the purpose of this Bill, breaks down that very barrier which that fundamental principle intended to rear around a Province, situated as the Provinbe of Quebec is. 125 years ago, Sir, we commenced our colonial existence; 125 years ago French institutions as distinctive institutions on this continent ceased. 125 years ago the power of the French King on the continent of America passed away forever; 125 years ago the French Canadians of Canada after a heroic and desperate struggle were subdued, and became a conquered race. Now, suppose the conqueror had had the bad taste, the fatuity, to endeavour to assimilate this population completely with the Anglo Saxon population of the other colonies and make it homogeneous with the colonies to the south, would he have succeeded in such an attempt? No, Sir, his effort would have been a blank, a total failure. But the English conquerors, who were wise and far-seeing men, treated the French colonists with the utmost forbearance and consideration. They respected their prejudices, they respected the retention of their language, their religion, their semi feudal institutions —everything which was distinctively French Canadian, everything which the French Canadian held dear, everything which separated him from the Anglo Saxon colonists, everything which marked him in any degree or sense, as a man of different nationality, different race, different prejudices, different religion—everything of this kind the English conqueror respected. He allowed him to retain his institutions, he never meddled with them; he allowed him to retain his language, and to-day that language is an official language here in the House of Commons, just as much as the English language is, and on account of the moderate conduct on the part of the English, when they succeeded to the Dominion of this continent, in consequence of this forbearance, this knowledge and prudence in the management of the French Canadian people, instead of the French Canadian being to-day an alien or an enemy to the institutions of the country, he is a component part of the population, and is as loyal as any man in the Dominion of Canada.

Now, Sir, under this federal union, it was designed and it is necessary, that the French Canadian should have perfect and complete control of his own local affairs; he should be placed in the position where he can maintain his independence of action against every attempt to subvert it and everything he holds dear in religion, in social usage, in language, in anything which pertains to him as an offshoot of the French race, is something which this federal union has no business to meddle with. What are we doing to-day? Why, Sir, we are breaking down the last barrier which protects the French Canadians from the inroads upon his independence——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. Hon. gentlemen say "hear, hear," but I say we are fixing a franchise which though it may be satisfactory to the gentlemen on that side of the House from the Province of Quebec to-day, may be made unsatisfactory to them in the future. Having now arranged a franchise satisfactory to Quebec, suppose next year or next Parliament we choose to make a change. Suppose that the other Provinces, which have numerical superiority, the Provinces of Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick united in forcing upon the Province of Quebec universal suffrage, or woman suffrage, or socialism, or communism, is not Quebec bound hand and foot, is she not powerless to resist any innovation of that kind—powerless to retain the rights which she now possesses? I say, Sir, she is. I say that this fatal principle of substituting a power on the part of the Dominion to control the franchise, for a power which is now in the hands of the Provinces, is a fatal step, a step which will enable the majority of those Provinces at any time to adopt a policy with regard to the franchise that may be most intensely distasteful to some other Provinces in this Dominion. I say that the hon. gentlemen from Quebec who are supporting this innovation, who are giving away the power which that Province now possesses, of protecting itself against attempts by the other Provinces, are recreant to the interests of their Province and the interests of their race. I am glad that one or two of the French Canadian members, who usually act with the Government majority, have been far-sighted and independent enough to take an independent stand upon this matter, and any man who stands up for the rights of his Province and resists this attempted innovation and insists that Quebec shall continue to possess the rights that she has enjoyed for years, is worthy the thanks of his constituents and his country. And not only has Quebec an interest in this matter, but every other Province has an interest. There is no Province in this Dominion that has not in some respect conditions in which it differs from all other Provinces. There is no Province in this Dominion where you can adopt a franchise which would be suitable to another Province, with the certainty that it will be satisfactory to that Province. There is no Province but is the best judge of its own wants in this matter, and there is no member of this Confederation that is not entitled to say in what manner it shall elect its delegates, to represent it as a sovereign Province in the confederated nation, and although the reasons may not be as cogent with regard to the other Provinces as to Quebec, there is no Province in this Dominion which is not interested in the maintenance of the present condition of things in the Dominion. I have a work here, and I shall deal very sparingly in quotations from it—a work on the principle of the federal union and State rights by Mr. Centz, of Boston. With reference to the feature of admitting new States, and to the action of individual States in their sovereign capacity, forming a union, and making provision for the admission of other sovereign States at future times, he says, of the provisions of the United States constitution:

"Article four, section three, declares that 'new States may be admitted into this union;' and article four, section four, includes the phrase, 'every State in the union.' Moreover, the said constitution declares that it was to be 'established,' and take effect, 'between the States so ratifying the same.' Nay, more; its powers were only delegated, and hence must be wielded by trustees and agents, chosen by, and subordinate to the delegating States, while the 'powers not delegated are reserved to the States respectively, or to the peoples of the same. There is no evidence or even hint, of any change of character of the States; but, on the contrary, they are named in the constitution as absolute and complete political bodies, which are necessarily the parties to, and the actors under, the federal system. And, finally, all elective power and right was inherent and absolute in the people composing these States, as their constitutions show; and moreover, they declared in their federal constitution that they were as States, to keep and exercise the said elective power. It is provided in article one, that 'the people of the several States' are to choose the 'representatives;' and that 'each State,' 'by the Legislature thereof,' is to elect' Senators. Article two provides that 'each State shall appoint presidential electors. These Congressmen and presidential electors are citizens and subjects of their respective States, and in their vicarious and representative character, they appoint all other federal officers. So that here, in the constitution itself, we have the most positive and absolute proofs that the States are sovereign over the Federal Government, this being their mere agency, or, in other words, a part of their machinery of self-government."

Sir, what is this Dominion more than that? Is it not a mere agency of the Provinces—a part of the machinery of their self-government— not all of it, because they have in addition to this their provincial institutions and their municipal institutions. But as this author lays down with regard to the United States, this Dominion is merely a part of the machinery of self-government which the people of the respective Provinces, through their delegates, have instituted and ordained, and it has no inherent powers except the power derived from them. With regard to the suffrage, holding that it was a right which pertains to the constituent members of a confederacy, he says:

"Suffrage is—humanly speaking—the pearl of great price of republican freedom. It is vital to freedom, and must be absolutely controlled by the people who own it, and not by any Government."

Is it the proposal of this Bill that the suffrage shall be controlled by the people who own it, and not by the Government? Is it not, on the contrary, the purpose of this Bill, that the suffrage shall not be controlled by the people who own it, but by the Government to enable it to thwart the wishes of the people?

"The voting power belongs, of original and absolute right, to the community called the state, who are the real Government—what we call government being the agency thereof; and a republic being a government of the people by the people. Says Montesquieu: 'In a Democracy there can be no exercise of sovereignty but by the suffrage of the people, which are their will. Now, the sovereign's will is the sovereign himself; the laws, therefore, which establish the right of suffrage, are fundamental to this Government. In fact, it is as important to regulate, in a republic, in what manner, by whom, and concerning what, suffrages are to be given, as it is in a monarchy to know who is the prince, and after what manner he is to govern.' The original voting power is the people composing the society or state, in whom, as every State constitution declares or implies, 'all political power is inherent' The derivative or delegative voting power is an endowment, by society or the State, of individual members designated or described as voters, in the constitution of the State. As Montesquieu says: 'The laws which establish the right of suffrage are fundamental to the Government; and hence they are found only in the fundamental laws of the States, established, of original right, by sovereign power. It is plain, then, that if the Government, whether state or federal, controls or disposes of suffrage without warrant in the constitution, it strikes at the very vitals of the republic, from which it derives its entire existence and powers, and commits perjured usurpation, as well as flagrant treason. It is equally plain that an insidious and fraudulent revolution is now going on, tending to subjugate the people of this country—just as all other free people have been—to the 'absolute supremacy of the Government.'"

Sir, is there any such purpose in this Bill to subjugate the people of this country to the absolute supremacy of the Government? Do the Government propose, by this Bill, to go back to the constituency that sent them here? Do they propose to submit themselves to a free, unbiassed expression of the popular will of this Dominion? No, Sir; they seek to secure, so far as they can by the provisions of this Bill, the absolute supremacy of this Government, and in doing

this, to subvert the principles that underlie human liberty. Edmund Burke says:

"This change, from an immediate state of procuration and delegation, to a course of acting as from original power, is the way in which all the popular magistracies of the world have been perverted from their purposes."

Sir, that is what this Government are doing to-day—perverting from its purpose the original intention of the founders of this Dominion—perverting from its purpose the desire of the majority of the people of this country. The purpose of this Bill, I repeat, is to secure a verdict, not from the majority, but to secure a verdict by fraudulent and improper means. Again, let me draw the attention of the committee to the difference between delegated and inherent power; let me again affirm that we do not possess in this House inherent power; that the power we exercise is a power delegated by the Provinces of this Dominion, not a power inherent in the Government of this Dominion.

As I said awhile ago, the federal principle has been in operation about 100 years. This contribution to civilisation was made in the year 1787, and we are taking advantage in this country of the experience of another nation that invented this system of government, and has been enjoying its blessings. My right hon. friend told the House some time ago that he had copied his fiscal policy from the United States. The founders of this Confederation copied our political institutions in a great measure from those of the United States. The federal system under which we live to-day is a system we have copied from that country; a system that the Australian colonies are about to copy; a system that will be put into operation in South Africa shortly; a system that will ultimately probably embrace the great mass of civilised men in various confederations. Under these circumstances, it is not aside from our duty or purpose to-day to enquire into the experience of the United States; it is not aside from our purpose to show the differences between our federal system and theirs, and to examine whether in adopting these differences we have acted with wisdom. The United States, as we are all aware, had 150 years' experience in self-government, in the formation of liberal institutions, before we had any colonial existence at all. Before Canada passed into the hands of England, Massachusetts was a colony 150 years old; and when we commenced our career as a colony, the various English colonies of North America were well instructed in the principles of self-government. Various circumstances had combined to give them a breadth of view in regard to those principles, the frugal and thrifty Hollanders had formed a colony in the New Netherlands. That colony had passed into the hands of England, and the views of those colonists served to mould and modify the views of other colonists. The colonists of New England were of that stamp of Englishmen who had formed the English commonwealth, who had given to England her heroic history; and those Puritans, whatever may have been their faults of character, were men of purity and virtue, and of indomitable purpose, who laid the foundations of their colonies, broadly and firmly upon the principle of immutable liberty and fear of God. The Puritan colonists, when the revolution broke out, had, to a greater or less extent, leveaned all the colonies that formed the United States. Those people had developed and thoroughly understood the principles of self government; and the knowledge they possessed and the institutions they had formed, were welded and purified in the furnace of war when the colonies revolted in 1776. The fall of Quebec was an epoch in the history of the world, the importance of which was dimly foreseen then and is scarcely comprehended to-day. When the eyes of Wolfe and Montcalm were glazed with death on the Plains of Abraham, a great empire was passing from the grasp of one power into the hands of another, and, as a consequence of that battle, the whole basin of the St. Lawrence and of the great lakes, the illimitable prairies of the West, and the Valley of the Mississippi passed into the hands of England. That event led directly to the American revolution. Had these colonies remained in the possession of France, the American colonies would not have been able to assume the duties, the responsibilities of a separate national existence, because their enemy at the north with whom they had been at war for generations would have rendered it impossible, in their estimation, for them to maintain a separate existence. But when Canada passed into the hands of England, and the British colonies no longer needed the guardian care of England, this instinct for freedom and separate government, which was in them, became so strong that on the first attempt of the Mother Country to impose upon them any restriction which they deemed at variance with the principles of liberty, they revolted and established their own independence. These colonies, with a colonial history of 150 years, with the experience of a great war, tried in 1777 an experiment. They formed themselves into a confederacy; they tried the experiment of self-government; they attempted to live under the articles of Confederation; they did live under those articles for ten years. Then, with the colonial experience of 150 years, with the experience acquired in the war of Independence, with the experience under a form of Government lasting for ten years, the articles of Confederation, these Provinces or States had reached that degree of education and knowledge and development that fitted them for the work of founding the permanent and admirable institutions under which they live to day; and with all this knowledge, with all this experience, extending through, all these generations, these colonies, through their delegates, proceeded to form a constitution, this constitution which was adopted in 1787 and under which they have lived and thriven to the present day. Now, I hold that in deliberating as to what measures we should take with regard to our own fundemental law, in deliberating as to what we shall do in fixing the federal institutions under which we shall live, we will be prudent and act with wisdom if we carefully scan the record of that country and learn from its experience such lessons as it may teach us. That constitution adopted in 1787 has since then received fifteen amendments; 10 of them were made almost immediately after the adoption of the constitution, and for over 90 years only 5 amendments were made to that instrument, so perfect has been its working and operation. Three of the changes were changes due to that great struggle which resulted in the emancipation of the servile classes of that country. Who were the men? What was the character of the men who devised this constitution, who fixed its principles? Were they men unknown to fame, men without reputation, men whom we cannot respect or trust? No; they were men whose names shall live in history while history exists; they where men who have been properly termed giants in intellect and giants in experience. We may avail ourselves of the experience and the labors of such men as George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, Thos. Jefferson, James Madison, John Adams, Benjamin Franklin, Josiah Quincey, John Randolph, John Jay. Are the deliberations of such men as these, guided by experience, to be treated lightly, to be treated without respect? I think not. What was the character of the Government under which the United States existed for ten years, the articles of Confederation? I will take the liberty of reading one or two of the articles in order to show what was the character of the institutions which it was found necessary to supplant. Article 2 of the articles of Confederation provides:

"Each State retains its sovereign, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not by this Confederation expressly delegated to the United States in congress assembled."

Article 3 says:

"The said States hereby enter into a firm league of friendship with each other for their common defence, security of their liberties, and their

mutual and general welfare; binding themselves to assist each other against all force offered to, or attack made upon them, or any of them, on account of religion, sovereignty, trade, or any other pretence whatever."

Article 5 provides:

"For the more convenient management of the general interests of the United States, delegates shall be annually appointed in such manner as the Legislatures of each State shall direct, to meet in Congress on the first Monday in November in every year, with a power reserved to each State to recall its delegates or any of them, at any time within the year, and to send others in their stead for the remainder of the year.

"No State shall be represented in Congress by less than two, nor more than seven members; and no person shall be capable of being a delegate for more than three years, in any term of six years; nor shall any person, being a delegate, be capable of holding any office under the United States, for which he, or another for his benefit, receives any salary, fees, or emolument of any kind. Each State shall maintain its own delegates in a meeting of the States, and while they act as members of the Committee of the States, in determing questions in a United States Congress assembled, each State shall have one vote.

This then was a league of sovereign States. In it each State acted as a unit, giving but one vote. Each State under this confederation maintained its own liberties, and the expenses of the confederacy were a common charge on all the States, but were a voluntary charge. The leading defects of the Confederation, were: First, the confederacy had no power to levy taxes or raise a revenue—its revenue was to be derived from the contributions of the respective States; secondly, the confederacy had no power to enforce its laws except by the consent of the States; thirdly, it had no power to enforce its treaties; fourthly, it had no coercive power it any case, but only the power of recommendation. After 10 years' trial, it was found this system of government was not one calculated to promote the interests of the United States. It was not workable. Now you would naturally suppose, when it was determined to make a change, that having recognised the principle of State sovereignty in the articles of Confederation to such an extent that the powers of the States exceeded the powers of the confederacy, and hampered the confederacy so that it could not go on with its purposes—you would suppose that, when the change was made, the tendency would have been to fall into the opposite extreme, and to invest the federal union with powers which would submerge and obliterate the powers of the different States. But such was not the case. The convention met in May, 1787, and the very first step taken was to recognise the existence of the States, to recognise the States as the individual component parts of the Federal Union, and to recognise the fact that whatever powers the Federal Union would be invested with would be powers delegated to it by the States; and as a recognition of this principle, the convention provided that the votes upon all questions should be by States, each State having one vote, it being necessary for the State delegations to provide how its vote should be cast, whether by unanimous agreement of the delegations or by an agreement of the majority of the delegates. But in each case, upon all questions debated by this constitutional convention, the votes were by States. I propose to call the attention of the committee to some of the resolutions introduced into this constitutional convention, composed in part of the great men I have mentioned, with reference to this question of suffrage, the one we are now debating. I propose to trace up how it was that the United States adopted in their constitution the principle they did adopt in 1787, that the qualification for voters for President of the United States and for members of Congress should be the qualification required in each State for a vote for a member of the most numerous branch of its State legislature. In the quotations that I propose to give, I shall not read the debates in full upon any of these questions, but I shall merely refer to one or two of the statements which I think pertinent to the question of suffrage as we have it under consideration to day. The first resolution and address I shall refer to will be that of John Randolph, of Virginia:

Mr. CHARLTON.

"Mr. RANDOLPH then opened the main business. He expressed his regret that it should fall to him, rather than those who were of longer standing in life and political experience, to open the great subject of their mission. But, as the convention had originated from Virginia, and his colleagues supposed that some proposition was expected from them, they had imposed this task on him. He then commented on the difficulty of the crisis and the necessity of preventing the fulfilment of the prophecies of the American down fall."

After proceeding to enumerate the defects of the Confederation, with which I shall not trouble the committee, as I have already briefly alluded to that, he goes on:

"He proposed, as conformable to his ideas, the following resolutions, which he explained one by one."

I shall only give three of those resolutions, which are pertinent to the discussion:

"Resolved, That the Articles of Confederation ought to be so corrected and enlarged as to accomplish the objects proposed by their institution; namely, 'common defence, security of liberty, and general welfare.' Resolved, therefore, that the rights of suffrage in the National Legislature ought to be proportioned to the quotas of contribution, or to the number of free inhabitants, as the one or the other rule may seem best in different cases. Resolved, That the National Legislature ought to consist of two branches. Resolved, that the members of the first branch of the National Legislature ought to be elected by the people of the several States."

A few days afterwards, Mr. Pinckney, of South Carolina, introduced a "Plan of a Federal Constitution." I will give two of the articles of that plan:

"The style of this Government shall be 'The United States of America,' and the Government shall consist of supreme legislative, executive and judicial powers. The legislative power shall be vested in a Congress, to consist of two separate houses. The members of the house of delegates shall be chosen every year by the people of the several States; and the qualification of the electors shall be the same as those of the electors in the several States for their legislatures."

Then Mr. Randolph introduced a plan or a resolution:

"The fourth resolution, first clause, that the members of the first branch of the National Legislature ought to be elected by the people of the several States, being taken up.

Mr. SHERMAN opposed the elections by the people, insisting that it ought to be by the State Legislatures. The people, he said, immediately, should have as little to do as may be about the Government. They want information, and are constantly liable to be misled."

Then further on:

"Mr. MASON (of Victoria) argued strongly for an election of the larger branch by the people. It was to be the grand depository of the democratic principle of our Government. It was, so to speak, to be our House of Commons. It ought to know and sympathise with every part of the community, and ought therefore to be taken, not only from different parts of the whole republic, but also from different districts of the larger members of it; which had in several instances, particularly in Virginia, different interests and views arising from difference of produce, of habits, etc., etc.

The very argument which is urged now in justification of the fixing of the franchise by States, based upon their different interests, their different views, the difference of their produce, their habits, and so forth.

Mr. WILSON contended strenuously for drawing the most numerous branch of the Legislature immediately from the people. He was for raising the Federal pyramid to a considerable altitude, and for that reason wished to give it as broad a basis as possible. No Government could long subsist without the confidence of the people. In a Republican Government, this confidence was peculiarly essential. He also thought it wrong to increase the weight of the State Legislatures by making them the electors of the National Legislature."

"Mr. GERRY did not like the election by the people. The maxims taken from the British constitution were often fallacious when applied to our situation, which was extremely different. Experience, he said, had shown that the State Legislatures, drawn immediately from the people, did not always possess their confidence. He had no objection, however, to an election by the people, if it were so qualified that men of honor and character might not be unwilling to be joined in the appointments. He seemed to think the people might nominate a certain number, out of which the State Legislatures should be bound to choose."

On the question for an election of the first branch of the National Legislature by the people, Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina, and Georgia voted ay; and New Jersey and South Carolina, no; Connecticut and Delaware, divided. Then, passing on, we have resolutions again introduced by Mr. Pinckney, asking for the

election of the members of the popular branch directly by the State Legislatures. I shall not trouble the House with the debate upon them, but this motion was put to the vote and lost. The States voting for it being Connecticut, New Jersey, South Carolina, three in number; and those voting against it being Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina and Georgia. This was a proposition to elect the members of Congress by the State Legislatures. Mr. Pinckney made another motion, that, if the members of Congress were not elected by the State Legislatures, they "should be elected in such manner as the Legislature of each State should direct." That was lost. Then a report was made by the committee in reference to the suffrage question, five lines of which I will read:

"Article 4, Section 1.—The members of the House of Representatives, shall be chosen, every second year, by the people of the several States comprehended within the Union; the qualifications of the electors shall be the same, from time to time, as those of the electors, in the several States, of the most numerous branch of their own Legislatures."

Then a motion was introduced fixing a uniform suffrage for the election of members of Congress, to consist of a freehold franchise. This was an interesting debate, and I will read a few brief extracts in regard to this matter.

"GOUVERNEUR MORRIS moved to strike out the last member of the section, in order that some other provision might be substituted which would restrain the right of suffrage to freeholders.

"Mr. WILSON. This part of the reportw as well considered by the committee, and he did not think it could be changed for the better. It was difficult to form any uniform rule of qualifications for all the States. Unnecessary innovations, he thought, too, should be avoided. It would be very hard and disagreeable for the same persons, at the same time, to vote for representatives in the State Legislature, and to be excluded from a vote for those in the National Legislature."

Sir, we can see the same objection likely to exist here. It would be hard in our own Provinces for some person to have a vote for a member of his own Provincial Legislature, and to be debarred from a vote for a member of this House of Commons. That is a cogent reason, and in my opinion an unanswerable reason for allowing each Province to fix its own franchise, and to have a uniform franchise for the Province itself, and for the National Legislature. Then Colonel Mason said:

"The force of habit is certainly not attended to by those gentlemen who wish for innovations on this point. Eight or nine States have extended the right of suffrage beyond the freeholders. What will the people there say if they should be disfranchised? A power to alter the qualifications would be a dangerous power in the hands of the Legislature.

"Mr. BUTLER. There is no right of which the people are more jealous than that of suffrage. Abridgments of it tend to the same revolution as in Holland, where they have at length thrown all power into the hands of the senates, who fill up vacancies themselves and form a rank aristocracy.

"Mr. DICKINSON had a very different idea of the tendency of vesting the right of suffrage in the freeholders of the country, he considered them as the best guardians of liberty; and the restriction of the right to them as a necessary defence against the dangerous influence of those multitudes, without property and without principle, with which our country, like all others, will in time abound. As to the unpopularity of the innovation, it was, in his opinion, chimerical. The great mass of our citizens is composed at this time of freeholders, and will be pleased with it.

"Mr. ELLSWORTH. How shall the freehold be defined? Ought not every man, who pays a tax, to vote for the representative who is levy and dispose of his money? Shall the wealthy merchants and manufacturers, who will bear a full share of the public burdens, be not allowed a voice in the imposition of them? Taxation and representation ought to go together.

"DR. BENJAMIN FRANKLIN. It is of great consequence that we should not depress the virtue and public spirit of our common people, of which they displayed a great deal during the war, and which contributed principally to the favorable issue of it. He related the honorable refusal of the American seamen, who were carried in great numbers into the British prisons during the war, to redeem themselves from misery or to seek their fortunes by entering on board the ships of the enemies of their country; contrasting their patriotism with a contemporary instance in which the British seamen, made prisoners by the Americans, readily entered on the ships of the latter on being promised a share of the prizes that might be made out of their own country. This proceeded, he said, from the different manner in which the common people were treated in America and Great Britain. He did not think that the electors had any right, in any case, to narrow the privileges of the electors. He quoted, as arbitrary, the British statute setting forth the dangers of tumultuous meetings, and, under that pretext, narrowing the right of suffrage to persons having freeholds of a certain value; observing that this statute was soon followed by another, under the succeeding Parliament, subjecting the people who had not votes to peculiar labors and hardships. He was persuaded, also, that such a restriction as was proposed would give great uneasiness to the populous States. The sons of a substantial farmer, not being themselves freeholders, would not be pleased at being disfranchised, and there are a great many persons of that description. On the question for striking out, as moved by Mr. Gouverneur Morris, from the word 'qualification' to the end of the third article—Delaware, aye, 1; New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, no, 7; Maryland, divided; Georgia, not present."

This was the vote upon the proposal in the convention that formed the Constitution of the United States, to have a uniform franchise in the States, a proposition for which one State only, the insignificant State of Delaware, voted, a proposition against which all the other States voted that voted at all. Then, Sir, we have the provision of the Constitution as finally adopted contained in three lines:

"Section 2. The House of Representatives shall be composed of members elected by the people of the several States, and the qualification in each State, shall be the qualification recognised for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature."

That was the qualification, after all this discussion, running through four months, a discussion embracing almost every possible scheme, a discussion embracing the principle of a uniform franchise, the principle of having the representatives elected by the State Legislatures, the principle of having the representatives elected as the Legislatures of the States should direct the principle of a uniform suffrage; and the principle of the suffrage finally adopted was that prevailing for the most numerous branch of the State Legislature. That is the principle adopted in 1787, and it has been in operation in that country to the present time. That Constitution, as I stated before, has received fifteen amendments; ten of these were adopted almost immediately after the adoption of the Constitution; five only have been adopted after over ninety years; three of these amendments were rendered necessary in consequence of the rebellion. Since that Constitution was adopted, the number of States has increased from 13 to 38, with seven territories; and the country that then extended over a narrow strip of land along the Atlantic coast, now embraces the whole continent to the Pacific slope. Since that principle was adopted, a vast development of the resources and population of that country has taken place. The country has passed through different phases and stages of existence, and yet, Sir, the wisdom of that provision, fixing the franchise by the Legislatures of the different States, has never been questioned; there never has been one voice raised in the United States, during the 97 years that Constitution has been in operation, during the time when the population has increased from 3 million to 5 million—there never has been one voice raised against this provision, or questioning the wisdom of this provision adopted in that country, a provision which we have also acted upon for eighteen years, and which we to day, without reason, and without cause, are about to change. Sir, the only qualifications, the only limitation as to the suffrage adopted in the United States, a suffrage pertaining to the most numerous branch of the State Legislature, is contained in that provision which provides that the constitution shall guarantee to every state a republican form of Government. If any State attempt to adopt a suffrage that is subversive of the principle of Republican Government, then only would the United States be justified in interfering; but so long as the institutions of the State are consonant with the principles of a Republican Government the Federal Government cannot interfere. Although the franchise in the various colonies were very different in their character—in some a freehold, in others universal suffrage, in others the payment

of taxes, although there was great diversity as to suffrage qualification, yet, Sir, the wisdom of the arrangement arrived at then has never been called in question by one public man in the United States in the last one hundred years.

With regard to the diversity of qualification that existed, I have shown that the attempt to secure a uniform franchise was defeated, that it received but one vote, and that one the vote of the most insignificant State in the Confederation. I have show that almost every conceivable plan with regard to the mode of constituting the House of Representatives in the United States was proposed in that Convention and voted down. I have shown that after full consideration of all the schemes, of all these methods that were proposed, the constitutional convention settled down upon that principle, the principle upon which the Dominion of Canada has acted for the last eighteen years, and with the very best results. Now, Sir, as to the diversities of these franchises. I have here Elliot's Constitutional Debates, and in the appendix Mr. Elliot gives the qualification of voters in the various States comprising the original States, and in some of the States admitted very shortly afterwards.

"In Maine, citizenship and three months' State residence; New Hampshire, residence and payment of taxes; Massachusetts, citizenship, one year's State, and six months' district residence, and payment of taxes; Rhode Island, the qualification was the same as under the charter granted by King Charles, freehold; Connecticut, a qualification of citizenship, six month's residence, one year's performance of militia duty, and paying a tax, blacks excluded; Vermont, one year's residence: New York, citizenship, a certain State and district residence, having paid tax, or performed military duty, or been assessed, or having labored on highway, freehold for people of color; New Jersey, one year's county residence and an estate worth £50, proclamation money; Pennsylvania, citizenship, two years' residence and payment of taxes; Delaware, two years' residence and payment of taxes, blacks excluded; Maryland, citizenship, state residence of one year, county or city, six months, blacks excluded; Virginia, white male citizen, twenty-one years of age, district residence, freehold $25, leasehold estate $20, housekeeper and head of family assessed; North Carolina, for Senators, freehold and one year's residence, for House of Congress one year's residence and payment of taxes; South Carolida, citizenship two years state residence, a freehold or six months district residence, and payment of taxes, blacks excluded; Georgia, citizenship, six months county residence and payment of taxes if assessed; Ohio, one year's residence, and being assessed with taxes, or laboring on highways, blacks excluded; Kentucky, citizenship, two years' state or one year's district residence, blacks excluded; Tennessee, a freehold or six months' county residence; Mississipi, citizenship, one year state and six months' district residence, payment of taxes or enrollment in the militia, blacks excluded; Alabama, citizenship, one year's state and three months' district residence, blacks excluded; Louisiana, citizenship, one year's county residence, payment of taxes, blacks excluded; Indiana, citizenship, one year's residence. Blacks excluded; Illinois, six months residence, blacks excluded; Missouri, citizenship, one year's state, three months' district residence, blacks excluded.

Those were the qualifications for voters in those different States. Hon. members will see there are very wide differences. In some States it is freehold, in others merely citizenship, in others payment of taxes, in others enrollment in the Militia. The divergencies could scarcely have been wider than were those existing in the qualifications in the various States when the constitution of the United States was formed. If there ever was a case where it was proper to insist on an uniform franchise, where there were wider differences as to the conditions of the franchise, that case existed there; and yet after the fullest consideration of all the phases of the question by such men as Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, John Adams and George Washington, men of towering intellect and ability, the framers of that constitution deliberately settled down upon the principle that the safety of the institutions of the United States required, with respect to the franchise for the election of the President and members of the House of Representatives, that the United States should not interfere in any degree with the features of that franchise, but leave the arrangement of that matter totally and entirely to the various States composing the Confederation. This decision arived at after careful study, after ten years experience under the articles of the Confederation, and continued for 100 years without creating the slightest necessity or demand for any change in that feature of the Constitution, should be a potent argument with us at this time, without experience of our own to guide us, and should exercise great weight in leading us to the conclusion that the franchise at present existing, the franchise which has worked admirably, smoothly and without jar or friction for eighteen years, is a franchise which under, all the circumstances, we are not warranted in meddling with or changing.

I have the authority of Colonel Alexander Hamilton with respect to this subject; and of the celebrated George Bancroft, historian of the United States, and I will read brief extracts from these authorities. Colonel Hamilton in his history of the proceedings of the Federal Convention in the United States says:

"The first view to be taken of this part of the government relates to the qualifications of the electors, and the elected. Those of the former are to be the same with those of the electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature. The definition of the right of suffrage is very justly regarded as a fundamental article of republican government. It was incumbent on the convention, therefore, to define and establish this right in the constitution. To have left it open for the occasional regulation of the Congress would have been improper, for the reason just mentioned. To have submitted it to the legislative discretion of the States would have been improper for the same reason, and for the additional reason, that it would have rendered too dependent on the State Governments that branch of the Federal Government which ought to be dependent on the people alone. To have reduced the different qualifications in the different States to one uniform rule would probably have been as dissatisfactory to some of the States as it would have been difficult to the convention. The provision made by the convention appears, therefore, to be the best that lay within their option. It must be satisfactory to every State, because it is conformable to the standard already established, or which may be established by the State itself."

Mr. George Bancroft, in his history of the Federal Convention, says, at page 91:

"Mason and the Pinckneys required a qualification of landed property for the Executive, judiciary and members of the National Legislature. Gerry approved securing property by property provisions. 'If qualifications are proper,' said Gouverneur Morris, 'I should prefer them in the electors rather than the elected;' and Madison agreed with him. 'I,' said Dickinson, 'doubt the policy of interweaving into a republican constitution a veneration for wealth. A veneration for poverty and virtue is the object of a republican encouragement. No man of merit should be subjected to disabilities in a Republic where merit is understood to form the great title to public trust, honors and rewards.' The subject came repeatedly before the convention; but it never consented to require a property qualification for any office in the General Government. In this way no obstruction to universal suffrage was allowed to conquer a foothold in the constitution, but its builders left the enlargement of suffrage to time and future law givers. They disturbed no more than was needed for the success of their work. They were not restless in zeal for one abstract rule of theoretical equality to be introduced instantly and everywhere."

"They were like the mariner in mid-ocean on the rolling and tossing deck of a ship, who learns how to keep his true course, by watching the horizon as well as the sun. In leading a people across the river that divided their old condition from the new, the makers of the new form of government anchored the supporting boats of their bridge up stream. The qualifications of the electors it left to be decided by the States, each for itself."

Again, at page 126, he says:

"What should distinguish the electors of the United States from their citizens? The constituency of the House of Representatives of the United States from the people? The report of the committee ran thus: 'The qualifications of the electors shall be the same, from time to time, as those of the electors in the several States of the most numerous branch of their own Legislatures.' Gouverneur Morris desired to restrain the right of suffrage to freeholders; and he thought it not proper that the qualifications of the National Legislature should be dependent on the will of the States. 'The States,' said Ellsworth, 'are the best judges of the circumstances and temper of their own people.' 'Eight of nine States,' remarked Mason, 'have extended the right to suffrage beyond the freeholders. What will the people there say if any should be disfranchised?'"

What will be the result of this Bill, when passed? A large portion of the population of Prince Edward Island and of British Columbia are disfranchised. Thousand of electors also in Ontario will be disfranchised. "What will the people say," when electors under the provincial laws are

found to be disfranchised by this Bill. Mr. Bancroft continues:

"'Abridgements of the right of suffrage,' declared Butler, 'tend to revolution.'"

It is a dangerous thing to disfranchise any portion of the electoral body which now possesses the franchise. At page 128 Bancroft says:

"Each State was therefore left to fix for itself, within its own limits, its condition of suffrage; but where, as in New York and Maryland, a discrimination was made in different elections, the convention applied the most liberal rule adopted in the State to the elections of members of Congress, accepting in advance any extensions of the suffrage that in any of the States might grow out of the development of republican institutions. Had the convention established the freehold or other qualification of its own, it must have taken upon itself the introduction of this restriction into every one of the States of the Union."

In the United States the voters' qualification by the State Legislatures is that by which a voter is allowed to vote for President. He is qualified to vote for members of the House of Representatives, and, Mr. Chairman, the State Legislature of each State is qualified to elect the members of the Senate of the United States. They are not appointed by the Government of the day, but each State elects two Senators. Then, Sir, we have the direct election of the President by the people, the direct election of the members of the House of Representatives by the people, the basis of the electorate being that established by the State, and we have the election to the Senate of the United States by the States, the senators being the representatives of the States, while the members of the House are the representatives of the people. Now, how does that system correspond with ours? Here, Sir, we do not elect a Governor, of course; he is appointed for us. The Provinces do not elect the members of the Senate; they are appointed by the Government of the day, and if one party remains in power long enough, we will have the members of the Senate all of one party, and that body will not in any sense or way represent the sentiment of the people. Then, Sir, if we pass the Bill the Dominion will fix the franchise for the Provinces. The Provinces are ignored in the selection of the head of the Government—the Governor General; they are ignored in the election of the members of the Senate, and they will be ignored in the election of the members of this House. They are not, then, recognised by this Government as sovereign; in short, Sir, they are not recognised as existing at all. They have lost their individuality; they have lost their sovereign capacity; they have lost the last hold they possessed in regard to the management of the affairs of this Dominion, as sovereign Provinces.

Now, I may notice here some of the objections raised in the early part of this discussion by hon. gentlemen opposite to the views we take, and some of the arguments adduced in favor of this Bill. The Secretary of State informed us that he was fighting for the autonomy of his Province. He says: Am I not a representative of the Province? Yes, he is. But he is the representative of the Province, he is an agent of the Province, who is usurping the authority of his master. The mode in which he fights for the autonomy of his Province is to destroy the autonomy of that Province, so far as an enactment of this House can destroy it. He says it is not consistent with our dignity to allow this and smaller Provinces to dictate the basis of the electors for this Dominion. Well, Sir, we saw last night one of the smaller Provinces dictating the basis of the Dominion electorate, with reference to the Chinese of British Columbia. And we will see other smaller Provinces dictating the basis of the franchise for this Dominion. The Secretary of State, in making that statement, spoke without his host. All the Provinces which exercise any influence in this House will, to a greater or less extent, dictate the basis of the representation of this Dominion. Then he said that the Bill recognised the progress of the age. Sir, the Bill does not recognise the progress of the age; the Bill is a retrocession. The progress of the age is in the direction of investing humanity with greater powers and privileges and rights—of demonstrating, developing and strengthening the federal principle which exists in this country and in the United States, and this Bill, Sir, is a blow aimed at the fundamental principles of Confederation. It is not consonant with the progress of the age; it is a retrograde measure, which the House should never adopt. The hon. member for King's, N.S. (Mr. Woodworth), thought he made a point in this matter, because the States fix the suffrage by constitution and not by statute. Does that alter the fact they fix it? It is no matter by what mode they act, so long as they fix it, whether the mode be by an Act on the Statute Book or by a provision in their organic law. Whichever way they adopt, they do fix the suffrage and control the suffrage, and whenever they please they can change the suffrage, as every State in the Union has changed it from time to time. The fixing of this feature in the constitution simply makes it a little more troublesome to effect a change; it must be done in a very careful and deliberate manner. The Legislature must propose an amendment; the people must vote upon it and sanction it by a large majority; then a constitutional convention must be called; the convention enacts the amendment and the amendment has again to be submitted to and approved by the people. It is a salutary mode of providing against hasty or reckless change in the constitution.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the event of adopting this Bill, in the event of putting an end to the control of the franchise by the Provinces, and taking over that control by the Dominion, I hold we cannot consistently do less than give to every taxpayer in this Dominion, who is a citizen, a vote, unless he is an idiot or insane. I hold that the principle which should govern us should be that no Province should be allowed to have a franchise more liberal than the franchise of the Dominion. If, Sir, any Province has a franchise more liberal than ours, then that grievance which has been pointed out by the framers of the constitution of the United States, that grievance which has been repeatedly pointed out in the course of this debate, of disfranchising a voter who has a vote for a member of a Local Legislature, and is denied a vote for members of this House—that grievance will continue to exist. Sir, if we are to have a Dominion franchise it should not be less liberal in its provisions than the franchise of the most liberal Province in the Dominion. If there is any Province in the Dominion which has a franchise based on manhood suffrage that should be the provision which should govern us in this Bill. Then, Sir, we should insist that no Government or party in this country should interfere in any way with the free expression of public sentiment. Sir, this Bill is designed to interfere with the free expression of public sentiment. It was not introduced to the House because there was any necessity for changing the franchise or assuming the direction of the franchise by the Dominion Government. The Bill was not introduced because any abuse existed, because there was no demand in this country, small or great, for the change which is being made to-day. But the Bill is introduced in order to enable the Government to interfere with the free expression of public sentiment.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order. I think the hon. gentleman is decidedly out of order. I think such an expression is not pertinent to any amendment which he intends to bring before us, and I have read the hon. gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CHARLTON. Your ruling is that I am out of order for saying that the Government have introduced this Bill to interfere with the free expression of public sentiment. Well, Sir, if you rule that it is improper, inadmissible, unparlia-

mentary, to characterise this Bill as an interference with the free and proper expression of public sentiment, I shall, of course, bow to your ruling. I do not retract that expression: I could not retract it very well, because it would be saying that the Bill is a good one, and that it is not a good one is that on which I base my opposition to the Bill. In whatever form the Bill is passed it should provide simple and inexpensive machinery for the registration of votes, and that machinery should be placed under local control. This Bill should provide for the registration of votes without the appointment of a registration pasha.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is out of order again. We are on the qualification clause, not on the question of the revising barrister.

Mr. CHARLTON. But this qualification clause is the fundamental principle of this Bill. From this clause, giving this Government control of the franchises that now inhere in the Provinces, every principle of this Bill proceeds to; that clause every principle of this Bill is cognate; it is the fountain from which every provision emanates. I hold that in this clause, which provides for a change in the fundamental law of the land, the whole question is opened, although I do not propose to discuss the whole question; but for the purpose of my argument it is necessary to make some incidental allusions to the principles of this Bill. Now, when I say that the qualifications should not be less liberal than those of the most liberal franchise in the Dominion, am I out of order? Surely, when I say that this Bill, if it does change the franchise, should institute machinery, not expensive or under the control of this Government, but machinery under local control, I am not exceeding the bounds of order; because I cannot discuss the provisions of this clause unless I am allowed to say what I think the franchise ought to be and how I think the voters' list ought to be made. Now, Sir, I think the poor man ought not to be insulted by giving to the rich man more than one vote. I believe the man who has property scattered in various ridings is not entitled, by virtue of having a little more money than the poor man, to cast half a dozen votes when the poor man can cast but one. I believe every citizen of this Dominion should stand before the law on the same level as the meanest and poorest citizen of Canada; and I believe the rich man ought not to be allowed to exert one iota more political power and privilege than the poor man. Therefore, I think if this Bill becomes law it ought to provide for universal suffrage, because it already exists in some of the Provinces; it ought to provide for cheap and inexpensive machinery within local control; it should not give the rich any power or advantage over the poor voter. I know that the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) does not believe that. I wonder if he ever heard the story of Benjamin Franklin at the convention.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The ass and the man?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes. The question was, if a man had a vote because he owned an ass that was worth $50, and the next year the ass died, and the man had no vote, which had the vote, the ass or the man? I do not believe in giving the ass a vote in this country; I do not believe in giving a man with property any advantage over others. I believe that residence ought to be a qualification, and that no man ought to have more than one vote.

Now, in addition to the superior privileges and the greater extent of control exercised by the American States in the Federal Union than is exercised by the Provinces here, I have pointed out that the electors have votes for their Presidents as well as for their members, and that the State Legislatures elect senators, while they are appointed here by the Governor in Council. But besides, all the States of the American Union enact their own criminal code, and all the judges in the United States, except the United States Circuit Court and Supreme Court judges, are appointed by the different State Governments. So that you see, under our system, we have given the Provinces vastly less power and vastly fewer privileges than are possessed by the States in the American Union; and surely, in view of the existence of all these powers pertaining to the electors and to the States under the federal system in the American Union, we have not gone as far as we ought to have gone in recognition of the sovereignty of the Provinces in this Dominion; and I hold that it is not consistent with our duty or with the principles of public policy that we should take from the Provinces the last distinctive privilege they possess, to fix the franchise for the members who represents them in this House. Another objection which I have to this measure is that the change it introduces will tend to confusion and to vex the public. In the first place, there will be confusion in the qualifications. The voter will be at a loss to know whether he is a voter under the Dominion Act or not. In many cases, if a man finds that he is on the voters' list for the Province he will suppose that he is a voter for the Dominion, and at the last hour he may find that he has not the franchise which he might have had if he had applied for it. Then, there will be confusion with regard to the mode of getting the names of electors on the list. Under the provincial system his property is assessed by the assessor and his name goes on the list; if the assessor fails to do his duty, the elector goes to the township court of revision and there presents his claim, and it is not attended to; and he fails to secure justice there, he has an appeal to the county judge. This is the mode of proceeding the elector is familiar with now; but this Bill provides an entirely different mode—one that will create confusion in his mind, and it will take a long time for the great body of the electors of this country to become accustomed to the changes made. Then there is a change made in the mode of obtaining the list. Under the present law each member of Parliament receives ten copies of the list, and each postmaster receives a certain number; they are easily obtained; but under this Bill the list cannot be obtained, except at the cost of 6 cents for each ten names. Consequently, it may be a matter of great difficulty and expense for the elector to obtain a list, in order to see whether his name is upon it or not. Then, confusion will be introduced in regard to legal procedure in connection with appeals. Confusion will also be introduced with regard to polling places. The returning officer may establish a polling place in a division with entirely different bounds from those to which the voter is accustomed, and he may go to a polling place and find that he has no vote.

Mr. BOWELL. They do that now. Every returning officer has a right to change the polling division.

Mr. CHARLTON. There has been no public demand or public pressure for this Bill—a Bill calculated to vex, to trouble, and to inflict expense on the great mass of the electors of this country. What will be the expense of working this pet scheme? We have now a franchise that will suit our purposes in every respect better than the one we are about to propose. We have now a franchise that is working smoothly; under its operation all these vexations, all these conflicting views with regard to qualification, the mode of putting on the list, the mode of obtaining lists, the legal procedure, the applications for appeal——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman will not find anything about these in this clause. I must ask him to discuss it on his amendment.

Mr. CHARLTON. The amendment provides for a provincial franchise. I am talking about the advantages we will derive as a people in the various Provinces by striking out this section of the Bill and adopting a provincial fran-

chise, and what I am saying is thoroughly pertinent to the amendment. As an argument for the adoption of a provincial franchise, I was about to point out that this section of the Bill under consideration which I propose to amend will inflict a heavy and useless expense on the people of this country, an expense that will not give us any corresponding advantage. We have 211 electoral districts in Canada. Under this Bill we may have 211 revising barristers, 211 bailiffs, 211 election clerks, 211 constables—in all, 844 officials appointed to work the machinery that it provides. What will be the cost of all this? In England they pay a revising barrister 200 guineas; suppose we pay half as much, there is $105,500 for the revising barristers. Then there are the election clerks, the bailiffs, and the constables, which will cost at least $200,000; then there is the expense of printing. What a vista is open there for printing jobs to needy country organs. Then there are travelling expenses and incidentals of all kinds. It is not to be supposed that the cost of working out this scheme will be less than $500,000 a year, in order to furnish that privilege so dear to the Tory heart, of filling new positions with officers, of filling 844 new positions, and cutting off votes and perpetuating the party in power. It is nothing that our expenses——

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order. I ask if the hon. gentleman is in order in talking about the expenses, of methods of carrying on elections, when we are simply upon the qualifications of voters in cities and towns.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has not surely looked at the drift of this amendment or he would not raise this point of order. My hon. friend proposes that the provincial qualification in each Province shall be the qualification for the election of members for this House, and he is pointing out the advantages which will accrue from our adopting that qualification and substituting provincial machinery for the machinery proposed by this Bill. It is one of his reasons, and a strictly pertinent one for proposing this amendment, that it will save us a large amount of expense. My hon. friend is showing what that expense, under this Bill, is likely to be, and in doing so his observations are entirely pertinent to the amendment.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to ask whether or not, Sir, there is an amendment in your hands? I would like you to read it.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I have seen the amendment, but have not got it. The hon. member has it in his own possession.

Mr. MULOCK. My hon. friend from King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), I understand, takes exception to that portion of the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in which he refers to what he considers will be the unnecessary expense in the scheme proposed. That part of the argument of my hon. friend is questioned by the hon. member for King's, N.B. That I think is the point of order the latter takes. It may be that, in his judgment, it is not material whether a large sum of money is saved to this country or not.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of order. I was objecting to no argument on the point of expense. I was simply objecting to the bringing up of irrelevant matter in the discussion.

Mr. CASEY. What is the particular irrelevant matter the hon. gentleman objects to? I understood his objection was directed towards the question of expense. The hon. gentleman says not; what does he object to?

Mr. FOSTER. It would take me some time before I could make it plain to the hon. member for West Elgin. It is not necessary for me to say whether or not I am opposed to the expense; I am simply taking the point, that when we are discussing a clause we should stick to that clause. The hon. member for North Norfolk is speaking to the clause on the qualification of voters.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FOSTER. The property qualification of voters in cities and towns; that is what he is speaking to. There is no amendment read to this House; there is no amendment, Sir, in your hands. Suppose, for the sake of argument, there were; we have not heard it read. The hon. gentleman has one opinion of it, which may be wrong, for he is not infallible. Supposing that the amendment provides that the provincial qualification shall be put in place of that in the Bill, there would still, if that qualification were put in, remain the question of expense, as to how that qualification would be carried out.

Mr. CASEY. The gist of the amendment has been stated to the House by my hon. friend from North Norfolk, and I understand it is to do away with all this machinery against which he is arguing. When the hon. member for King's has been a little longer in the House, he will be aware that it is in order to speak to an amendment which has not been moved, and state reasons for proposing that amendment, and then propose it at the end of the speech. The whole question is, whether the amendment the hon. gentleman is going to move will do away with this machinery and its costly, heavy expense.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to be clear, and it is an important and pertinent argument in favor of what my hon. friend desires and proposes to do, that a large sum of money will be saved to the people by adopting his proposition. I can conceive of no argument which, particularly at such a moment as this, should address itself more forcibly to the members of the committee. I never heard before that the proof that a large sum of money would be saved to the people of Canada is a reason against taking a particular view.

Mr. CHARLTON. I beg to hand you, Sir, my amendment, and I suppose I will be allowed to say a word with regard to the point of order.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend is not bound to show his amendment. He has been arguing all the time in favor of a provincial franchise and he is proving that it will save great expense, which is a most conclusive argument.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has been allowed as much latitude as the Chair could allow him. I think he can, under his amendment, discuss the question of expense. I believe the amendment is large enough to allow him to do so. I do not quite understand the hon. gentleman, who has not read the amendment and does not know what it contains, questioning the relevancy of the hon. gentleman's remarks. I have mentioned that the amendment was not put into my hands to read; it was handed to me as a notice of the amendment to which the hon. gentleman is now speaking.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I should like the Chair to rule whether the member was within his province and power when he made his remarks prior to putting his amendment in your hand.

Mr. BOWELL. I am not prepared to say that, if his amendment covers the ground which he himself has covered, the hon. member would himself be out of order; but I take the liberty of differing from the position taken by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier). How is this committee to know whether a gentleman, who addresses the House for an hour, or for two or three hours, on almost every conceivable subject, is within the scope of the amendment which he proposes to lay before the committee until he reads it? It may be that hon. gentlemen opposite, who in all probability may have concocted, or, as that may be an

offensive word, I will say, who understood the tactics of their party, know, from what occurred in caucus, what my hon. friend from North Norfolk intends to do, but there are members who cannot know, until the amendment is read, what it contains. I simply take exception to the view of the hon. member for Quebec East, that a member is not bound to read the amendment he proposes to any particular clause. As a matter of convenience, in order to let the House know what the point is to which he desires to lead the House or the committee, he should read it.

Mr. COOK. In that case the hon. gentleman should have asked to have the amendment read before he took the ground of order.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no doubt my hon. friend from Simcoe can settle the matter, but I am not aware that the hon. member for North Norfolk intimated the intention of moving any amendment.

Mr. LAURIER. The doctrine is a most extraordinary one. I have never understood that any member is bound to put the amendment in the hands of the Chairman before he sits down. Here is the proposition: that we are asked to adopt a certain franchise. The hon. member is not bound to propose an amendment. He can take the opposite view and argue upon that.

Mr. BOWELL. That is enough, if he adheres to the principles laid down in the motion before the House.

Mr. MILLS. He can do more. The Government propose a certain franchise. It is open to any member to say: I would prefer the provincial franchise, and to state his reasons. The reason may be that it would save expense, and the member goes on to state that as the reason, and he may state that and every other reason which occurs to him without proposing an amendment. He may seek to convince the Government that they should assume the responsibility of making a change in the Bill before the House, and all that without moving an amendment. If, however, he chooses to move an amendment, there is no doubt that it would be open to the Chairman to say: I do not see the bearing of the argument upon this particular question; I do not see its relevancy; and he might call upon the hon. member to confine himself to the point to which his amendment tends.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). There is no doubt the hon. gentleman is quite right in his general proposition that, if the hon. gentleman's remarks are relevant to the clause of the Bill in your hands, he would have a right to speak to it; but, when the question of order is raised, he says: I have an amendment, and my speech is relevant to that amendment. Though it is true that, in Committee of the Whole, members may speak as often as they please, still the debate is restricted to the matter in the hands of the Chair, to the clauses in the Bill which is being considered, and if an amendment is moved, that amendment must be in the hands of the Chair, so that every member of the committee may know what it is.

Mr. EDGAR. So it was.

Mr. WHITE. But that is not the point. According to the statement of the hon. member for Bothwell, the hon. gentleman was out of order if his remarks were not relevant to the clause in the Bill before an amendment was moved to which he might speak. Then, clearly, he was not in order when he had not put that amendment in. We cannot, in committee, do what is done in the House—make a speech and follow it up with a motion. In the House, an hon. gentleman can say he is going to follow his speech with a motion at any time; but in committee, where the debate is more restricted to the precise clause before the Chair—because the principle of the Bill has been affirmed before it goes into committee at all—the amendment must be in possession of the Chair before an hon. gentleman can speak to it.

Mr. CASEY. I do not know where the hon. member for Cardwell gets his authority for that statement. Certainly that has not been the ordinary practice of this House in committee during the thirteen years that I have been a member, and I do not think there is any authority for it in the books.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am very well satisfied with your ruling, Mr. Chairman, and am grateful for your impartiality. I ask you to call it six o'clock.

Committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

Mr. CHARLTON. When the committee rose at six o'clock I had been referring to the fact that the Bill was objectionable on account of the expense that it entailed upon the country. A point of order was taken, and you sustained me in my position. I took the ground, early in the remarks I made to-day, that the clause under discussion is a fundamental clause, as it provides for a change in the franchise. It is the franchise on which the entire Bill is founded. Everything provided in this Bill proceeds upon the basis that the control of the franchise shall be changed from the Province to the Dominion. I was pointing out that this Bill would entail an expense upon the country of, probably, half a million dollars annually; that it provided for the appointment of 211 barristers, of 211 clerks, of 211 bailiffs and of 211 constables—in round numbers, 850 officials, to be appointed throughout the various ridings of this Dominion. I was about to point out that another objectionable feature of the Bill was this: that the remuneration of these officials was left with the Governor in Council to determine, that the power placed in their hands by this clause was a great, and, I think, unconstitutional power. I believe if we are to provide for the creation of so many officials we should provide definitely what the remuneration shall be, and that we should not leave to the Governor in Council the important matter of determining what their compensation shall be. I was about to allude, also, to the fact that we have in this House members from various Provinces. We have members from the Province of Prince Edward Island, who are sent by the electorate of that island, that electorate consisting of all the male citizens of the island. These members are sent here by their electors to look after their interest, and in supporting this Bill they basely betray the trust that has been reposed in them; if they vote to support this Bill they vote to disfranchise a large portion of the electors who sent them here to look after the interest of Prince Edward Island. The same may be said of the members from British Columbia. They are sent here by the electors of British Columbia, where the qualification is manhood suffrage; and these delegates from British Columbia, who come here to represent that Province in this Dominion of Canada, come here and surrender the rights of their constituents, or the rights of a large portion of their constituents, in supporting a Bill that would disfranchise, possibly, one-half the electors who sent them here to look after their interests. Now, Sir, with regard to the $500,000 of additional expense placed upon this already heavily taxed and over-burdened country. Is it not enough that our annual expenses have risen from $13,500,000, in 1868, to $33,000,000 in 1886; that in addition to the $33,000,000, we are incurring war expenses at the rate of $350,000 to $400,000 per month, as long as the difficulties remain unsettled in the North-West; that in addition to this large sum we must meet a large sum for permanent military

increase, the first instalment of which we have just seen in the addition of 200 or 300 men to the Mounted Police force; and that in addition to these two extra items, the war expenses and the permanent increase of the military staff, we must also incur largely increased Indian expenses in the future? I say, Sir, is it not enough that in addition to the $33,000,000 of ordinary expenditure, added to that the military expenditure, added to that the permanent military increase, added to that the permanent Indian increase, amounting, possibly, to $5,000,000 or $6,000,000 more in the current year, we must, in addition to all this mountain of taxation that rests upon the people of Canada, and is sure to bring us face to face with a large deficit within the coming six months, we must needlessly add to that burden an additional expense of $500,000 per annum, for the purpose of placing in operation a totally useless Bill, a totally uncalled for measure, a measure that will not promote the interests of any portion of Canada, except the office holders, who wish to maintain the positions they now occupy? Is it not enough that in addition to this we owe to-day, if we take the assets this Dominion possesses and count them at their actual worth, a net debt of at least $225,000,000, or $50 per head for every man, woman and child in Canada, a debt going up rapidly from month to month, and a debt that must reach vastly greater proportions than it has already reached? Is it not enough that we are soon to have an interest charge upon this country of, in round numbers, $10,000,000 per annum? Is it not enough that our civil list is altogether out of proportion to the needs and resources of this small country? Is it not enough that every Department is swarming with useless officials? That we have in every Department of this Government useless officials, incompetent officials that we have 50 per cent. more officials than are actually necessary to do the work, if all these officials were worked as men are obliged to work in private business, their hours are from ten o'clock in the morning till four o'clock in the afternoon, and even then they cannot find enough work to keep them employed even when the House is in session? Is it not enough that we have political complications, that we have public misapprehensions as to the respective jurisdiction of the Province and the Dominion? It is not enough that we have all these things, that this measure must be introduced to add confusion to confusion, to increase the complications, to increase the expenses that curse this country?

But, Sir, what can be the object of this Bill? Not necessity. The present law works well. The present law has been in operation eighteen years, and under it five general elections have been held. The present law, it has been demonstrated by time, usage and experience, is all the law that we require with regard to the franchise. The principle of federation, the fundamental bed-rock or principle of federation, shows that the Provinces should have control of this matter that we are about to take from them; it shows that they are component parts of this Dominion, that the powers we have here are delegated to us by those Provinces, who give us the right to sit here as their representatives; and that it belongs to the Provinces to decide who shall represent them in the Dominion Parliament. Now, Sir, the object cannot be that the law does not work well. The object is not the simplification of the law. The simplification of the law is always proper where no principle is sacrificed, but no simplification of the law is secured here. On the contrary, the law creates confusion. The object is not that we may have additional guarantees for liberty in this country, because this Bill, Sir, imperils the liberty that is now possessed by the Provinces of this Dominion. This Bill casts down the barrier that was erected around the Provinces to enable them to maintain their separate economy, their national existence, and their peculiarities of constitution. As I have explained, the federal principle is designed to protect the Provinces in the enjoyment of everything peculiar to them and their institutions, of everything they cherish, of everything that might be imperilled by allowing other Provinces to interfere in their own local and domestic affairs. That is the fundamental principle of federation. It is that component parts of the federal system shall have in their own provincial autonomy independence of action, local control over their own affairs, and yet be banded together for general purposes and common defence. This Bill lays the axe at the very root of that federal principle, it throws down the barrier that now encompasses the Provinces, and it lays the different Provinces of this Dominion open to incursion and interference by all the other Provinces. That is the great objection to this measure. That, of course, is not the object of this measure. The right hon. gentleman has not introduced this measure in order to cause this interference in the affairs of the Provinces by other Provinces; that is not his actual object, I assume. I suppose one of the objects of this Bill is to create additional patronage; it is a matter of some importance to have 850 offices to fill. It will give him additional prestige and power; it will increase his chance of controlling the elections, to have the 850 offices created by this Bill to fill. Another object had in view by this Bill is to imperril provincial rights. The right hon. gentleman believes—I think I am warranted in saying it—in legislative union; he is not heartily in favor of a thorough federal principle. He has often made attacks on the rights of the Provinces. They have been resisted, and these attacks have been ineffectual; but the principle supported by the right hon. gentleman has been clearly established, and that is a principle of hostility to the rights of the Provinces. Another object of this Bill is to enable the hon. gentleman and his friends to control more effectually the election machinery. There can be no doubt on that score. It places in their hands a great and potent weapon. It places in their hands the control of the primary selection of the election and returning officers. It gives to them an undue and unfair advantage, and if they choose to exercise that advantage unfairly, there is scarcely any limit to the extent to which that advantage may be used through the manipulation of the voters' lists by his absolute and irresponsible revising barristers. When we were about to go to the country, in 1882, the hon. gentleman introduced a measure—I will not characterise it as it might be characterised—for the purpose of influencing the approaching elections. Now, when the time approaches for another election, another measure is introduced, and I am warranted in saying that it is designed to accomplish the same purpose. We had the Gerrymander Act that chastised us with whips; now we have the Franchise Bill, that will chastise the country with scorpions. The Gerrymander Act was as objectionable, we thought then, as any measure could possibly be; but this measure is much more objectionable; it is a greater infringement of the public rights and liberties, and will have a much more dangerous influence even than the measure of 1882. This Administration, of course, does not owe its existence to the Gerrymander Act; but it might have owed its existence to that Act. It was designed to give this Administration an advantage. It did give it an advantage, to the extent of eight or nine, ten or twelve seats. It might, however, have been the means of keeping the Government in power. If it had been the means by which hon. gentlemen opposite held their seats to-day, it would have been by virtue of a measure that was the very reverse of honesty and uprightness in political conduct. It may be that the measure under discussion to-night will be a measure to which the right hon. gentleman opposite, at some future day, will owe his position as leader of this House; and if he ever owes it to this measure, he will owe his position as leader to a measure designed to thwart the wishes and desires of the people of this country. This measure, of course, is constitutional, and we have been so

informed by the hon. gentleman. He has also expressed his opinion as to the necessity of this measure. It is a measure which, if adopted by this House, might properly be the prelude to another measure. The right hon. gentleman has but one more step to take in order to test to the utmost the long-suffering endurance of the people of this country. After having passed this Bill, let the right hon. gentleman declare himself the dictator of the Dominion. Let him submit such a proposition to Parliament, if it is necessary, because if the right hon. gentleman were to introduce a Bill declaring himself dictator, I have not the slightest doubt but that it would receive almost the united support of hon. gentlemen opposite. We may realise the scene depicted some time ago in a cartoon. The right hon. gentleman was depicted as seated on a throne of state with a sceptre and crown, and beside him stood the Minister of Public Works in canonicals and with crozier; and on the other side was the High Commissioner to England, clad in mediæval armor, and before the potentate who sat upon the throne—this great Cæsar—were arraigned a couple of haggard looking boys, one of them representing Mr. Mowat and the other the leader of the Opposition in this House. They were in chains; they were arraigned before this potentate on trial for being contumacious, and they received, as their sentence, to be cast into outer darkness where there is weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth. The right hon. gentleman might introduce such a measure with perfect safety, and it would be the legitimate and logical sequence of the measure under consideration to-night. It would only be an infraction, greater in degree but not greater in kind, of the principle of popular liberty, as compared with the present Bill. A word as to the constitutionality of this Bill. We know that the right hon. gentleman is a great constitutional lawyer; we have his own declaration to that effect. I have here an extract from a speech delivered by him on 3rd November, 1873. The right hon. gentleman said:

"On every question of constitutional law I have had the satisfaction of having the courts—well, not perhaps the courts, but of those men who make the courts—in my favor, and I have never made a constitutional or legal proposition in which I have not had the support of the legal advisers of the Crown in England, and in which I have not been right, and hon. gentlemen have been wrong."

Again, on 30th May, 1882, the right hon. gentleman, speaking at Toronto, said:

"But, gentlemen, I tell you as a lawyer, as a constitutional lawyer—and it is with some pride that I say it. I have never laid down yet, since 1867, a constitutional question which, on reference to the highest courts of the realm, has not been sustained, and that I have not, in one case, expressed a constitutional opinion, but that the highest courts in this country and England have sustained my opinion."

Mr. HESSON. What has that to do with the question?

Mr. CHARLTON. If the hon. member will wait a little until I develop this matter he will see. That is the right hon. gentleman's opinion of his own astuteness as a constitutional lawyer. This is one of his constitutional measures, and I suppose the right hon. gentleman may point to his triumphs in the past as proof that the opinion expressed by him of his own acuteness was not overdrawn. It used to be, in the time of old Rome, that the great generals returned home after having accomplished triumphs on the Lybian sands, in the valley of the Nile, in Mesopotamia, against the Gauls and other nations, and were accorded triumphs, and they entered Rome amid the plaudits of the people. What are the triumphs which the right hon. gentleman can claim? As a constitutional lawyer he can claim triumphs on the Insurance Bill, Mercer Escheat, on which he appealed to England and was floored; in Hodge *vs.* The Queen, where the right hon. gentleman was again floored; the Streams Bill, which Bill, after having been disallowed three times, was referred to England on appeal——

Mr. CHARLTON.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I ask the hon. gentleman to confine his remarks to the clause before the committee.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am speaking, Mr. Chairman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Chair, Chair.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am dealing with the great constitutional knowledge displayed by the hon. gentleman. This is a constitutional question, and in discussing such questions we naturally refer to the opinions of those gentlemen who have displayed that ability required for the management of matters of this kind. Perhaps it will not be necessary to allude to a couple more triumphs the hon. gentleman has made. I do not wish to transgress the rules of order, so I will tell a story which will illustrate the point, and I think when you have heard it you will admit that it is in order. It is the story of a young doctor who settled in a town, and he was called upon in one of those cases which sometimes occur in well regulated families; he was asked next day how he was getting along, and he said, not as well as he could wish—that the mother was dead, and the child was dead, but he had strong hopes of saving the old man. Now, the measure before the House to-night has been introduced for the purpose of saving the old man. The Mercer Escheats case, the Streams Bill, the Boundary Award, the License Act, are all dead now, the old man made no capital out of these defeats and they hope, by introducing this Bill, to save the old man, and save what little is left of the party. Last summer we had a couple of great ovations at Toronto; one given to the leader of the Ontario Government and the other to the leader of this Government. The leader of the Ontario Government had returned from England, where he had gone on behalf of the interests of his Province, and when he came back he was able to present, as a gift to his Province, a little tract of 64,000,000 acres of land he had won in the boundary award, and he was greeted with a hearty and spontaneous ovation, such as was never before witnessed in Ontario. The right hon. gentleman went to England—I do not know what for, but when he returned he received an ovation. I do not know that he presented 64,000,000 of acres of land to the country, or anything of that kind, but the only result of his visit, that I could ever ascertain, was the possession of an extra pair of pantaloons, of a very warm color—scarlet—and an advance in title. He came with this mark of his Sovereign's favor, but he did not come proving that he had bestowed any advantage to the country, and the ovation was not given to celebrate his victories, but for the purpose of saving, as the young doctor hoped to do, the head of the family. He is now playing the part of the constitutional lawyer in this last Act. We have him as sponsor and introducerof this Bill. He is infallible, I suppose; the past tends to prove that he is, to some extent, and the Bill is calculated to advance, not the interests of this country, or of the people of this country, but to give to the party now in power the political advantage which they would not possess without the passage of this Bill. The Bill is designed to place in their hands the control of the election machinery of this country, and it only depends on their honesty whether that machinery shall be worked properly or improperly. It is a Bill which the country should not permit to pass. It is a Bill which has already been condemned, universally and without exception, by the independent press of this country. It is a Bill which we hear of outside of these walls, as having aroused the indignation of, the people of Canada. Sir, what will the Bill consummate? What has led up to it? Has the hon. gentleman given us the privilege of recording to-night a career faultless and without blame. No, Sir; although a most astute public man, he has sacrificed the statesman to the politician. He has obtained and held power in this country by practising measures and schemes which he ought not to have

practised. Sir, soon after Confederation was formed the hon. gentleman gave to one Province, with 10,000 inhabitants, six representatives, and to another Province four representatives for 13,000 inhabitants. In the election of 1872 the hon. gentleman made use of means which he should not have made use of to carry that election, and in the election of 1882——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman will please accept my ruling. The clause is before the House, and not the whole Bill, and his remarks now are certainly not pertinent to the clause.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am sorry, Sir, that you will not allow me, on the fundamental clause, upon which everything in the Bill depends, to discuss points cognate to it. But I will bow to your ruling. I do not think, however, that your ruling should prevent me from saying that this clause, providing for the qualification of voters in cities and towns, is a clause which is an infringement on the rights of the Provinces to fix that franchise if the Provinces possess that right. I assert now, as I have asserted before, that this right which the Provinces have enjoyed for eighteen years, under which we have had five general elections, is a right which ought not to be interfered with. I assert now, as I asserted before, that there can be no possible reason for interference with the exercise of that power, because of reasons which I have assigned. I assert now, as I have asserted before, that it is a bad indication for the future of this country that measures of this kind should be resorted to by a Government to keep themselves in power. I say we should hesitate, we should pause, we should think what the consequences of this measure are to be. I hold, Mr. Chairman, that we ought to take care that it may not be said of this country as it has been said of other countries:

"Our own,
Like free States forgone, is but a bright leaf torn,
From time's dark forest, and on the wild gust thrown,
To float awhile by varying eddies borne,
And sink at last forever."

If this condition of things is to be continued, if the rights of the people are to be trampled upon, if the legislation of this country is to be shaped for the express purpose of continuing one party in power by means fair or foul, if the expenses of the country are to be increased half a million of dollars, and all this confusion and vexation and expense introduced in the preparation of the voters' list, in order that the right hon. gentleman and his friends may obtain some advantage they otherwise would not have obtained—I say if these are the principles and motives which are to actuate our public men, in the legislation they are responsible for, and which they introduce into this House, then, Sir, the liberties of the people of Canada cannot be preserved. If the people of Canada will submit to the style of legislation we have had in this House of Commons since I have been a member, if they are to submit to Gerrymander Bills, and Bills creating revising pachas, who are irresponsible dictators, to say who shall and who shall not vote—I say if the Government of this country will perpetrate these things and the majority behind them will support these things, then, Sir, have we fallen on evil days. I am much afraid of transgressing the rules of order, so that it is very difficult for me to express my opinions to-night. But this Bill is a proposed infraction of the true federal principles of component autonomy. It is an infraction of that right which should be an inherent right on the part of every Province; it is an infraction of that right which pertains to every Province which united to form this Dominion, and delegated certain power to this Dominion. It may be very true that the right is a permissive one in the constitution, but unless there is an imperative demand for the exercise of that right it should not be exercised. After being left in the hands of the Provinces for eighteen years, after having worked smoothly and satisfactorily in every Province in this Dominion, Sir, it is a deliberate attempt, not to benefit the people, but to pack the popular jury, that they may secure a verdict from that jury which they cannot secure from the free, unbiassed expression of the will of the people. It is a Bill, in its animus and its provisions, in every respect, to be condemned by the people of this Dominion, and a Bill which I shall oppose with all the power I possess. I hear that there is a threat made that this House is to be dissolved if the Opposition persist in their opposition to this Bill. Sir, let the Government dissolve this House. No more proper step could be taken at this juncture than to appeal to the country on this very Franchise Bill. We defy the Government to dissolve the House; for that means that we should obtain a verdict of the people of Canada upon a measure affecting the interests of every man, woman and child in this Dominion. Sir, I move:

That all the words in section 3 be struck out, and the following substituted in place thereof: Subject to the exceptions herein contained, all persons qualified to vote at the election of representatives in the House of Assembly or Legislative Assembly of the several Provinces comprising the Dominion of Canada, and no others, shall be entitled to vote at the election of members of the House of Commons of Canada for the several electoral districts comprised within such Provinces respectively.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I beg to move, in amendment to the amendment:

That clause 3 be amended by inserting after the words "every person shall," at the beginning of the same, the words "except in the Province of Prince Edward Island."

I may say that I agree with the general terms of the Bill. I believe that the preparation of the electoral lists, and everything appertaining to the election of members of this Parliament, should be in the hands of this Parliament, instead of in the hands of the Local Governments. It seems to me very absurd indeed that matters appertaining to this Parliament should be under the control of another body with which we have nothing to do. I may say that we have had manhood suffrage in Prince Edward Island for the last twenty-five or thirty years. We have found it to work very well in the election of members to the Local Legislature, and also in the election of members to this House; and when the proper time arrives, if this amendment is carried, I shall take the opportunity of submitting the amendments that shall be necessary in order to perpetuate manhood suffrage in Prince Edward Island, as we have it at present.

Mr. CURRAN. In rising to address a few words to this committee, I feel called upon to do so more particularly as one coming from the Province of Quebec, to the people of which so strong an appeal has been made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in one portion of his address, in which he sought to make it appear that this Parliament, by the present Act, was seeking to invade the sacred rights and privileges and immunities of that Province. I feel called upon, as one whose father and whose grandfather received hospitality and found a home in that Province, to say a few words in vindication of the course I am now pursuing in supporting this Bill, and in vindicating the motives which actuate me, and I have no doubt the large majority, in fact, the whole, of those who are supporting this measure. The hon. gentleman who proposed the amendment has laid down two or three principles which he said ought to guide us in this matter. He has travelled over ground already far more ably and eloquently covered by one of the hon. gentlemen who addressed this House during the debate on the second reading of this Bill; and if anything were required to convince this House and this country that the present discussion is merely for the purpose of consuming valuable time, I think nothing could be

more convincing than to refer to the fact that all the points included in this amendment have been fully covered by an amendment proposed by the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier)—a gentleman who, if he devotes perhaps too much time to the embellishment of his ideas and to the beauty of the language in which he conveys them, is above speaking against time in this House, and always affords us a pleasurable moment when he undertakes to address us. I cannot say so much for the hon. gentleman who has detained us from half past three until recess, and from recess until nine o'clock to-night. In one part of the hon. gentleman's speech—that part of it in which he referred to the franchise—it struck me very forcibly, when I was listening to his constitutional history, that I had read something very like that before. I thought, therefore, I would look into the pages of a well-known book, and I discovered that the few interesting passages in the opening of that speech were to be found in the "Encyclopedia Britannica"—all he has said about the progress made by the people of England under the Magna Charta, and how that charter was wrung from King John, down to the days of the exactions, the peculations, and speculations, which the hon. gentleman told us that Charles the First had practised upon his subjects. But when he left that branch of the subject and went still further, we could readily see that the hon. gentleman, in going over the constitution of the United States and the history of the United States, and of the different States of the Union, was dealing with matter which was entirely his own. His speech lost all its charm, his language ceased to be pleasing, and certainly it ceased to evoke any sentiment in the breast of any patriotic Canadian; because, after all, we have a constitution of our own, we have laws which guide us, we have our Confederation Act, to which we must refer, and I think that a very brief reference to that Act will show that the course we are now pursuing in endeavoring to enact this measure is one that is not only in the province of this Parliament but unmistakeably was contemplated by the founders of Confederation, one which was merely put off for a time; it will show that the Provincial franchises, which have been used so far, were never intended by the founders of Confederation to be used more than temporarily in this connection. But we were told that this measure should have been submitted to the people at large, whilst in the same breath it was announced, as it has been announced time and again since the opening of this debate, that this measure, or something similar to it, has been before the country for eighteen years, whilst everyone knows that this measure, in almost its entirety, has been before the country in the shape of a Bill since 1883. We are told that the people were being taken by surprise, that their liberties were sought to be destroyed, and that all those privileges which they value so highly were to be wrested from them in a most tyrannical manner. I hardly conceive that any hon. gentleman in this House will consider that this measure is more important than the measure of Confederation itself. It will hardly be supposed that any hon. gentleman will consider that the discussion of the franchise is more important than the inauguration of the great Confederation under which we live; and as special appeal has been made to the people of Lower Canada, through their representatives in this House, I may, perhaps, refer to what was said during the Confederation debates, which are the great index of the aspirations, the ideas, and the views of those who inaugurated our present system of government. More particularly I will refer to the language used by the late lamented Sir George Etienne Cartier—who was the incarnation of the ideas of the French Canadian people, the incarnation of all that is noble and patriotic, of all that ought to raise that people high in the scale amongst those who inhabit this section of British North America—and with regard to this very question of submitting the Confederation scheme to the people at large, he said, in reply to the very same argument that is now being used by the hon. gentlemen opposite, that this present measure should be submitted to the people:

"Here was this scheme of a union of the Provinces mentioned in the programme of the Cartier-Macdonald Government, in 1858. He merely quoted this passage to show that neither Parliament nor the country was now taken by surprise with regard to this scheme. We had general and special elections since 1858, and to pretend that this subject, which had been so often canvassed, was new to the country, was to assert an untruth."

Cannot we assert the very same thing of this Bill? Have we not had bye elections? Have we not had this scheme, to use the language of the hon. gentlemen opposite, before the people for 18 years, and this Bill since 1883 before the people, and have we not had election after election with this Bill standing there? Have not hon. gentlemen opposite contested those bye elections? If they thought the rights, liberties and privileges of the people were being invaded, why did they not raise this question at these bye elections? No doubt other hon. gentlemen in this House will remember that on the occasion of this Confederation debate, some hon. gentlemen who are now participating in the views of the mover of the first amendment were present, taking part in the deliberations on that great occasion. The hon. the ex-Finance Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright) spoke then, and in view of the charges that were then being hurled at the Administration of the day, that they had not submitted the question to the people of Canada, that they were taking the people by surprise, that they were urging a measure which threatened the existence of the autonomy of the Provinces, a measure which was wiping out all their rights and privileges, we had that hon. gentleman saying:

"Let us not be daunted by any accidental checks—we must lay our account to meet such in matters of not one-tenth its importance—this is the time and this is the hour; never again can we hope to enter on our task under circumstances better fitted to remove the natural, the inevitable prejudices, which must exist between so many different provinces—never again can we hope to receive a warmer, a more energetic support from the Imperial authorities—never again can we hope to see a Ministry in office which shall command more completely the confidence of the great mass of our people, and which shall possess the same or equal facilities for adjusting those sectional difficulties which have disturbed us so long; and I trust that in this most important crisis this House will show itself not altogether unworthy to be entrusted with the destinies of 3,000,000 of their countrymen."

Yet this was in view of the enactment of a great measure, without having been previously submitted to the people for their approval and ratification, a measure a hundred times more important, perhaps, than the one we now have before us, because in that measure the hon. gentleman advocated the very principle of this Bill, which was involved in it, and if we take up the British North America Act we will find that the pretensions laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite are totally irrelevant. They talk about invading the rights of the Provinces, about depriving the Provinces of something which has been secured to them. I defy hon. gentlemen to seek through the statutes of the British Empire or of any dependency of the British Empire where they have responsible government, and to find a section of law which more clearly and emphatically and distinctly shows, than this section 41 of the British North America Act, that the provision made was merely considered as a temporary matter:

"Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides."

Anticipating that the Parliament of Canada should provide otherwise, clearly and distinctly laying down that the day, whether far or near, must come when the Parliament of Canada would exercise that right which is inherent in everybody to determine what shall be the qualification of, what shall be the means adopted to establish its own membership. It goes on:

"All laws in force in the several Provinces of the Union relative to the following matters or any of them, namely, the qualifications and disqualifications of persons to be elected or to sit or vote as members of the House of Assembly or Legislative Assembly in the several Provinces, the voters at elections of such members, the oath to be taken by voters, the returning officers, their powers and duties, the proceedings at elections, the periods during which elections may be continued, the

trial of controverted elections and proceedings incident thereto, the vacating of seats of members, etc., shall respectively apply to the election of members to serve in the House of Commons for the same several Provinces."

I say there never was a section which more clearly shows by its language that it was merely intended that this state of affairs should be a temporary one. And what has been the course of our constitutional history with reference to this very matter? We find that, up to the present time, we have made a change in every one of the subjects mentioned in this section. We have, of our own motion, without consulting the Provinces, without taking the consensus of the people, without consulting the Provincial Legislatures, taken our own course with regard, first of all, to the qualification of persons to sit in this House. We have abolished the property qualification. We have not waited for the Provinces to take that step. We have not stood by and allowed ourselves to be guided exclusively by the action of the Provinces. We have interfered with the qualification, we have interfered with the oath to be taken by voters, because we have our own oaths, we have our own returning officers, and define their powers and duties by our own election law; we have the periods to which elections may be continued fixed by this Parliament, and we have the trial of controverted elections, and the voiding of the seats of members, all fixed by the legislation of this Parliament, and in most instances by the Acts brought in by hon. gentlemen opposite, each one of them trampling upon the rights of the Provinces, if their own views and language used in this debate are to be adopted as correct and sound. But we have more than that. Referring to these self-same Confederation debates, we find the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), who, too, was guilty at that particular time, if guilt there be, of having violated the trust of the people, of having pushed forward a measure of such vital importance without having first consulted the people of Canada, speaking of the veto power in these words:

"If each Province was able to enact such laws as it pleased everybody would be at the mercy of the Local Legislatures, and the General Legislature would become of little importance. It is contended that the power of the General Legislature should be held in check by a veto power with reference to its own territory, resident in the Local Legislatures respecting the application of the general laws to their jurisdiction. All power, they say, comes from the people and ascends through them to their representatives, and through the representatives to the Crown. But it would never do to set the local above the General Government."

This is the language of the hon. member for East York on that very remarkable occasion. It cannot be contended for one moment that we are violating the privileges of the Provinces. It has been admitted in this House, it has been admitted by the leader of the Opposition himself, that we have the power, if we wish to use it; and in fact in the debate which was held on the election law of 1874, the hon. gentleman said "the power of fixing the franchise was delegated to the various Provincial Governments because of the confidence reposed in the Local Legislatures, and if it turned out that they abused this power this House could take it out of their hands." Now, what has been done, what has been said, what has been urged on different occasions in this House? When the measure of 1874, just referred to, was under discussion on, which the leader of the Opposition spoke as I have just quoted, Sir Charles (then Mr.) Tupper, said that "he had no confidence in the uprightness or fairness of the Local Legislatures in fixing the franchise, and quoted the recent action of the Legislature of Nova Scotia, agreed to under a false impression that they could alter the Dominion franchise, which he characterised as monstrous and mischeivous, and declared was done with a view to exerting influence in the recent general election." As early as that date, then, according to the statement of one of the most eminent public men in the country, at least one of the Local Legislatures was acting in such a manner as to interfere with the rights of this Parliament, was enacting local laws which, according to his statement, were monstrous, mischievous, and showed that there was a disposition at that time to interfere with the rights and privileges of this House. But we have had far more than that. We have had it shown, in the course of the present debate, by the successor of that hon. gentleman, the member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend), that not only at that time, but since then, enactments have been made by the Local Legislature there which had the effect of depriving of the right to vote persons whom this Parliament believes to be entitled to vote, persons working in the coal mines, who are deprived by the recent action of the Local Legislature of exercising the franchise to which they are entitled; and my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Wallace), in the speech which he delivered a few days ago, relative to the new Franchise Bill that has passed the Ontario Legislature, showed that the bottom literally falls out and has fallen out of all the argument that has been put forward here with so much force, that we, by this Bill, are seeking to go back to a different constituency from that which elected us to sit in this House. I say that the hon. members of this House from the Province of Ontario cannot go back to the same electorate which sent them here, in consequence of the Bill which has recently been passed by the Legislature of that Province. That is a self-evident fact, and that meets these gentlemen at the very threshold of their argument, and shows how utterly careless they are of the assertions that they throw across the floor of this House and send to the country, since anyone who will take the trouble to turn over the statutes of the last Session of the Ontario Legislature can see that they are speaking here that which they imagined the people are so densely ignorant as not to know the first thing about, but in this they are grossly mistaken. Now, Sir, we have had a variety of arguments adduced, more or less pertinent to the subject before the House. I am pleased to find that the hon. gentleman who has just made the sub-amendment is likely to carry it in this House, and that in the island of Prince Edward the franchise that has existed there for so many years is likely to be maintained. That is an old established community, which is not likely to be disturbed by any great influx of immigrants, and I trust the Government will see their way to acceding to that amendment. We were told, amongst other things, that the only good measure this Bill could contain was one of universal suffrage, that manhood suffrage alone would meet the requirements of the country. Now, Sir, it is not my purpose to discuss that question, which, I think, is rather aside the issue at this moment. But I may be allowed to say that whilst the time may come in this country when universal suffrage will meet with the general approbation of the people, I think the urging of that suffrage is only one more argument to show how utterly illogical, how utterly untenable, is the position taken by the hon. gentleman who has moved the amendment. Whilst he has spoken at great length on the beauties of manhood suffrage, upon the fact that no man should have more than one vote, no matter what his property may be, or where it may be situated, he is arguing here for the maintenance of the rights of the Provinces, and at the same time he is urging that which neither Ontario nor Quebec have for one moment thought of adopting, but which Ontario, at the last session of its Legislature, voted down by a considerable majority. However, there is one thing that must be gratifying to the workingmen of this country. At a meeting which has been already referred to in this House, where, in the interests of the Reform party, it was sought to raise a cry against the leader of the present Government, I have heard it stated: What has become of the Franchise Bill? Why don't the Government go on with the Franchise Bill? And, Sir, I can say to those people, and to the people of Canada generally, that if

we have not in this Bill what is commonly known as manhood suffrage, we have, at all events, that which gives a vote to everyone who deserves to be called a man in this country. Manhood suffrage has its defects and it has its advantages. Manhood suffrage, as has been stated here, would be a very simple system, as far as registration is concerned; but if anyone will take up this Bill and look at the clause which we are now discussing, he will find that every man who, in any way, directly or indirectly, contributes to the progress and the stability of the country in which we live, is, under this Bill, enfranchised. Is it possible that you can go lower than the tenant who pays $2 per month, or $20 per annum? Is it possible that you can go lower than the person who earns $300 in the country and $400 in the city, per annum? Why, Mr. Chairman, under the provisions of this Bill every man who contributes in any way, by his wealth, or by his labor, to the good of the country, will be entitled to be registered under this system. I feel that we would be recreant to the duties which we owe to the country at large if we did not attempt to extend the franchise and to put capital and labor upon the same basis, on a par in the eyes of the law, and to give, as we are giving here, the vote to every deserving man in the country—not to a man because he is a human being of the age of twenty-one years, but to every man who has succeeded in showing, by his industry, his activity and his energy, that he is worthy of being recognised a man in the eyes of the law of the land. The hon. gentleman says that the present Bill will create confusion; that the people will not understand in what class they will come; that we have the tenant, the farmer, the laborer, persons under the income franchise, and other persons who have a right to vote under different circumstances, and that all this will cause great confusion in the public mind. Now, I do not go so far as the hon. gentleman; I do not go so far as manhood suffrage; but I do feel that there is enough intelligence in the minds of the people, in the mind of every man who earns his dollar a day, in the mind of every man who is laboring for the interests of the country as well as for the interests of himself and family, that there is enough intelligence among the people of Canada to know whether they fall into one or another of the classes mentioned in this Bill. I think the hon. gentleman's argument is an insult to the people of Canada, and that he rates their intelligence far too low. Now, Sir, I do not imagine the hon. gentleman supposes that I am going to follow him through his long dissertation with regard to the affairs of the United States; I do not suppose that any hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, at all events, will follow him in that field. The hon. gentleman can never stand up in this House, he can never speak upon any subject, he can never deal with any branch of the public affairs of this country, without dragging in the United States, without dragging in the practice of the United States, without dragging in all the great and glorious beauties of their constitution, without holding up to us as models the great men of the United States, as if we had not men in our empire, and espcially in our own country, whose example is worthy of being followed, as a bright shining light to guide us in the way we should go. I say we have had great statesmen in this land, we have had names to which we can appeal with a proud patriotism far beyond any sentiment that would be evoked by the names he has called upon us to admire here to-day. These are great men in his eyes, and they are great men in our eyes; but whilst we admire these men, we have love, respect, esteem and veneration for the names and memories of great Canadians that adorn the pages of our history. And, now, before sitting down, allow me to say one word through you, Sir, to the hon. members or this House generally, and to the members from the Province of Quebec in particular. I feel that those hon. gentlemen who have been sent here by the electorate of the Province of Quebec are, not more so, but equally as patriotic, equally as desirous of maintaining the rights and privileges of that Province, as are the members who compose the Local Legislature of that Province; and for my part, I am satisfied they will believe me when I say to the people of the Province of Quebec, who now know I am supporting this measure, that I would rather sacrifice anything in this world, no matter how dear it may be to me, rather than forfeit their confidence, rather than be an instrument in depriving them of one single right guaranteed them by our constitution. Our Local Legislatures are above the influence of this Parliament. We cannot interfere with those Legislatures; we cannot, by any Act we pass, interfere, in any material degree, with the right of the Provinces to manage their own affairs, with respect to the franchise or anything else. But every man in this House must feel, and every man in this country does feel, that when Confederation was established it was established for a purpose, not merely to keep alive provincial institutions, not merely to foster and to fortify those great bulwarks which are to guard the progress and prosperity of this country, but it was to bind all these great Provinces together into one greater whole. And what means, let me ask, can be better adapted than by the meeting upon the floor of this Parliament of men sinking the miserable petty jealousies that are sought and have been sought to be raised, since the beginning of this debate upon questions of provincial rights or rather provincial prejudices—I say what nobler spectacle can be presented than that of seeking to adopt one general line of policy in regard to the franchise, as far as the circumstances of our country will allow. In conclusion, allow me to say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to those of a different origin, among whom I was born, educated, and among whom I have grown up, the men with whom I have been living in the strongest bonds of brotherly affection up to the present time, that knowing, as they do, that so far as I am concerned, the words *avant tout je suis Canadien* arouses in my breast a feeling of patriotic exultation as fervent as anything that may be said with respect to the land of my forefathers, that I can never cease to love. I trust the day will never come when I shall be found supporting a measure which in any way or in the slightest degree invades the rights or trenches upon the privileges of the Province in which I was born. I say this in all sincerity; and in supporting this measure and opposing the amendment of the hon. gentleman, I do so because I conceive that amendment to be nothing more than an appeal to provincial prejudices, and we should seek in this general Parliament of Canada, whilst preserving the rights of the Provinces, to look forward to the great future of the Domioion in which we live.

Mr. LAURIER. I have followed with a good deal of attention the speech just delivered by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), with the hope that at each succeeding sentence he would give us his full, complete and candid opinion on the question before the committee. The question has taken within the last few hours very important development. It is whether we should adopt the principle involved in this Bill, that is to say, whether we should have a Dominion franchise, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, or whether we should adopt the proposition of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that each Province should have a right to its own franchise; or whether we should say, as is suggested by one of the members for Prince Edward Island, that we should have a Dominion franchise, provided, however, that it applies to all parts of the Dominion except Prince Edward Island. The hon. member for Montreal Centre has pronounced himself in favor of a Dominion franchise, provided, however, that it does not apply to Prince Edward Island. But surely when the hon. gentleman has spoken so eloquently in favor of a

Dominion franchise, when he has shown that it is only right to adopt such a franchise, it is proper that he should at least give the reasons which impel him to adopt the principle of the Dominion franchise, and explain why he is willing to except Prince Edward Island.

Mr. CURRAN. Because we will be restricting, there.

Mr. LAURIER. Does not that argument apply also to the Province of British Columbia?

Mr. CURRAN. I can give a reason for that, also.

Mr. LAURIER. Why apply it to the Province of Quebec, when a certain number of electors in that Province would be disfranchised? The hon. gentleman shakes his head; but I will convince him at once that such is the fact. Under this Bill, which the hon. gentleman supports, a large number of electors who at present vote will be disfranchised. Under the law, as it exists in Quebec, it is provided that all electors in cities can vote for members of the Local Legislature or House of Commons, with a qualification of $300, if such cities do not form part of any county. But it is provided that in all other cities and towns the franchise shall be only $200. Under this Bill, which the hon. gentleman approves, it is provided that the franchise, either in cities or towns, shall be $300. Therefore, in all cities and towns which form part of a county, all those electors who are assessed between $200 and $300 will be deprived of their votes. So the hon. gentleman is going to disfranchise a certain number of voters. The reason the hon. gentleman gives as to why he will not deprive Prince Edward Island of the provincial franchise is because he would thereby deprive a certain number of electors of the right to vote. I ask him to be as generous to Quebec, from which he comes, as he is to Prince Edward Island; and I hope, when the proper time comes, he will take the same action in regard to the Province of Quebec as he is now doing with respect to Prince Edward Island. The hon. gentleman, in the course of his argument, asked why the Liberal party had never brought this question before the country. It is a simple and obvious reason. It is because we think the provincial law a good one, and that it does not want to be reformed. I can quite apprehend that the Conservative party, not being satisfied with the present law, considered it their duty to bring the question before the people. However much I respect the opinion of the hon. member for Montreal Centre, I think it is a matter of deep regret that upon a question of such moment, when such important amendments are proposed to the Bill, the Government have not expressed their opinion as to those amendments. In fact, they have not yet told us why they have introduced the change which they now want to press on the country. Although we have been discussing this Bill for two weeks, the Government have not yet told us why they desire to substitute for a provincial franchise a Dominion franchise, with all the expense connected with it. They have not told us the benefits we are to expect from it. The only reason given during the debate is the reason that has been repeated by the hon member for Montreal Centre: that power is given to this Parliament to enact such a law as is now contemplated; that at the time of the Confederation debate it was contemplated that the Parliament of Canada should legislate on the question of the franchise. My hon. friend has quoted the speeches delivered in the Confederation debates to prove this Parliament has the power to enact such a law. The hon. gentleman might have dispensed with that. No one has contended that it was not within the power of this Government to enact such a law.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, yes.

Mr. LAURIER. No; no one has disputed it. It must be admitted by everyone that it is within the power of every Parliament, unless debarred by the constitution, to regulate the franchise to elect members to that Parliament. But while we, on this side of the House, admit that it is within the power of this Parliament to legislate on this question, to determine the question of the franchise, what we say is, that it is not within the spirit of the constitution to constitute a different body of electors for this House from the body which elect the members for the Local Legislature. We contend that it is not within the principles of the constitution to have two separate bodies of electors, one for the Provinces and one for the Dominion. We contend that it is not in the spirit of the constitution to have the people represented as an aggregate here, but that the true spirit of the constitution demands that the people of the several Provinces should be represented as separate individuals, each and everyone of them. Sir, the American constitution has been much more provident than ours in that respect. The American constitution, at the outset, determined that the electors who should elect the representatives to Congress should be the electors as determined by the State Legislatures. This is a standing feature in their constitution. They have not created a central body of electors, but they have declared in their constitution that the body of electors who are the electors in the different States should be the electors for the general Confederation, and that is a principle which we should adopt here. It has been several times stated that up to this moment the principle we contend for in this respect has never been admitted by this Parliament—that this Parliament has not legislated upon this matter. But that statement is not accurate. We do not here act upon a different franchise such as existed at the time of Confederation, but if we have, if members are to be elected upon the provincial franchises, it is on the deliberate wish of the Parliament of Canada. The Parliament of Canada legislated in this matter, as was contemplated in the Confederation debate which has been referred to. That legislation is found in the last Act, and the only Act of that kind, passed in the year 1874, which reads as follows:—

"No prescription or disposition contained in any Act of the Legislature of the heretofore Province of Canada, or any of the Provinces which now compose the Dominion of Canada, concerning the elections of members of the Legislative Assembly of any Province, shall apply to the elections of members to the House of Commons which shall take place after the passage of this Act, except, however, the prescriptions and dispositions which may be in force in these Provinces at the time of such elections last mentioned, relative to the qualification of electors and the preparation of electoral lists, which shall apply to the election of members of the House of Commons, as prescribed by the present Act."

So you see that the principle which we are now contending for has been adopted by the Parliament of Canada in the year 1874. I ask what is the reason we should depart from that law. One reason given by the Prime Minister, when he introduced the Bill, was the principle of uniformity; in fact, the Minister introduced this Bill as a matter of course, and with little more intimation than when he moved the Bill concerning the administration of oaths of office, at the beginning of the Session. But what has become of the principle of uniformity now? Where is the principle of uniformity at this moment? We have not passed two clauses of this Bill, and yet the principle of uniformity has been broken through. It was contemplated in the Bill which the hon. gentleman introduced that the Indian should have a vote. The terms were as general as general could be. They applied to the Indians in all parts of the Dominion—in British Columbia and Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec and the other Provinces. Yet, after a protracted discussion, the Prime Minister told us that the intention was to restrict the operation of this clause to the Indians in the older Provinces. Where is the uniformity of Indian suffrage? If it be right to have an Indian suffrage for the older Provinces why is it not right to have it in British Columbia and Manitoba, if uniformity is what is intended? In fact, the Prime Minister declared that it

was his first intention to restrict the Act to the older Provinces, so that at the first he seemed to be convinced against himself that uniformity was not possible. As a matter of fact, it is not possible, and it is not contemplated by this Act. Look at the principle of the Act. You have in one section of the Bill a provision for conferring a personal property franchise upon certain classes of the community. A fisherman, wherever he has a boat and fishing tackle, may qualify as a voter upon them. I do not grudge them that privilege, but while we are allowing fishermen to qualify on personal property, why should that prevent people in other pursuits from qualifying on a similar franchise? Take the case of a skilled artisan, with a box of tools, which may be worth more than the fisherman's boat and tackle, and yet you do not allow him to qualify on personal property. You may have in the city a young student, whose books may be of greater value by far than the boat and tackle of a fisherman, and still he will not be able to qualify on his personal property. Where, then, is the principle of uniformity? Again, according to the Bill, if a man has property worth $150 in the country he has a vote; but if the same property is situated in a city he shall not have a vote; and what is the reason for the difference? The reason is, that there is a difference in value between property in the city and property in rural districts. This is a truth which no one can deny. Will it be denied that there is also a great variety of property to be found as you go from one Province to another? Will it be contended, for instance, that land assessed for $150 on the flats of the Thames River, in Kent, is not of more value in its nature than land assessed for $150 on the rocky heights which separate New Brunswick from Quebec? There is a relation in value, and though you may fix a general standard and attempt to secure uniformity, still it is in the very essence of things that you cannot attain what you have in view. There is also a great variety in persons; men are not equally educated. Take, for instance, the Indians. The Prime Minister stated yesterday that the Indians in the older Provinces were qualified to exercise the franchise, while, in his judgment, the Indians in the newer Provinces did not reach that qualification. There again is a difference; there is no uniformity. And now, I ask again, who is to be the judge of the qualifications? What is to become of the principle of uniformity? We know very well what is the true inwardness of the amendment moved by the hon. member from Prince Edward Island. We have been told from the very first that the Prime Minister would not insist on "pedantic uniformity," and we have heard, in a speech from another member from Prince Edward Island, that probably there would be such an amendment as is now moved. But where is the uniformity? Without going any further, we know beforehand that the kind suggestion thrown out by my hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) to the Government, that the Government should, forsooth, adopt the suggestion of the hon. member from Prince Edward Island, will be adopted by the Government. The Government have not yet spoken, but we know that the amendment was adopted even before it was moved—probably in caucus, as an hon. member behind me suggests. But whether it was adopted in caucus or not, since it is the determined policy of the Government that Prince Edward Island shall be exempt from the operation of this Act, what becomes of the principle of uniformity? What is the reason that Prince Edward Island should be exempted? I understand the reason beforehand. We know that by and bye some member of the Government will rise up and repeat what has just been suggested by the hon. member from Montreal Centre, that, forsooth, they will not apply the Act to Prince Edward Island, because there universal suffrage exists; they ought not to restrict it, and they will not interfere with it. But if they will not interfere with universal suffrage in Prince Edward Island, I ask on what principle will they interfere with any other kind of suffrage in any other Province? It is not because Prince Edward Island has universal suffrage that it is not to be interfered with. The true principle is, that every Province has the right to its own franchise, whether it is universal or restricted, good or bad, since it believes its franchise to be best for its own people. That is the only principle on which we can consistently act—that we must let every Province judge for itself what suits it best; and I am sure that every liberal member of this House will deem it his duty not to interfere with the rights and privileges of any Province in this matter. In the course of his able speech, this afternoon, my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) gave a very potent reason in favor of having but one franchise, and not two franchises, as is contemplated by this Bill. If this Bill becomes law there will be, in one Province a body of electors for the House of Commons and a body of electors for the Local Legislature; but my hon. friend has shown that if this state of things is admitted to exist, it will create discontent, because naturally the body of electors who shall be deprived of their votes in one election, though they may vote at another, will be discontented. In the Province of Quebec, for instance, there will be a body of electors who shall be allowed to vote at local elections, but prevented from voting at Dominion elections. Will not these people be discontented? Will they not ask: Why should not we vote at the Dominion elections as well as at the provincial elections? Discontent there will be, and it will be the more dangerous because it will not be in the power of any Legislature, scarcely, to remedy it. It will not be in the power of the Local Legislature, because we do not give it the power to allow these men to vote in Dominion elections. They may apply to this Parliament, but they will be told: We want uniformity and we cannot relieve you, because if we relieve you we must relieve others in other Provinces. Therefore this discontent will be beyond the reach of any legislative action. There can be in this matter but one true and consistent principle, which is to leave each Province to determine its own franchise. Now, I put the question to the members from Prince Edward Island. They are quite willing that there should be a Dominion franchise; they think it is a very good thing; but they won't have it; they think it will be a very good thing for others, but not for themselves. Well, I ask my hon. friends from Prince Edward Island, is it generous in them to force upon us a franchise which they won't have for themselves? When my hon. friend from North Norfolk moves an amendment, intended to give, not only to Prince Edward Island, but to all the other Provinces, their franchises, is it generous to say: No, I won't have it for the other Provinces, but I claim it for myself? This is the kind of justice we are to have at the hands of the Government. Sir, there must be more than that. If we are to be just to all the members of the Confederation we must give the provincial franchise, not only to Prince Edward Island, but to Nova Scotia, to New Brunswick, to Quebec, to Ontario, and to all other members of the Confederation. If there is a reason for giving it to Prince Edward Island there is just the same reason for giving it to all the other Provinces. I appeal especially on this point to my hon. friends from the Province of Quebec. I ask them if it is not true that to give the provincial franchise to one Province and to refuse it to another is an infringement on provincial rights, an invasion of the principle of the constitution. I am sure, Sir, it must be a very unpleasant task sometimes to be a Conservative from the Province of Quebec, and a member of the great Conservative party. It must be a very unpleasant task sometimes for federalists to belong to the great Conservative party of Canada. It is a singular fact, yet it is a fact, that upon the very fundamental principle of this constitution, upon the principle upon which this constitu-

tion must be worked out, upon the principle, the application of which arises almost every day, not only in the policy of the Government, but in matters of general policy and even in private legislation, upon that principle which is to every one of us the polar star which is to guide our course in every obscure way, the great Conservative party are not united. The leader of the party and his followers from Ontario are openly and avowedly in favor of legislative union; the Conservatives from the Province of Quebec are in favor of federative union. In fact, I do not see the bond of union between them; I do not see any common principle. They hold the fort together, and they share the spoils of office. But while they share the spoils of office, the principle either of one section of the party or the other section of the party must go down and be trampled under foot. The principle of both parties cannot prevail, because the principles of both sections are not identical. Either the federative principle or the legislative union principle must triumph. I ask my hon. friends from the Province of Quebec, of the Conservative persuasion, which is the principle that prevails in this House? Is it the federative principle or the principle of legislative union? Which is the principle that is trampled under foot in this Bill? I put the question, but I do not press for an answer. But if the answer were given by the lips, as it is felt in the heart, I say this Bill would never become law. I understand the principles of my friends from the Province of Quebec, and I share them; I am in union with them; I am in favor of a federative union; but while I understand their principles, I do not understand their conduct; I do not understand why they should sacrifice any principle in which they believe in their hearts. But on the other hand, I quite understand the conduct of our Conservative friends from Ontario. They are in favor of a legislative union, and they will never miss an occasion of weakening the principle of federative union. But, while I understand their conduct, I do not understand their principles. We have had before in this country a legislative union. Lower Canada and Upper Canada were once united in legislative union. Will my hon. friends from Ontario, who avow openly that they are in favor of that system, say that the legislative union between Upper and Lower Canada, which existed from 1841 to 1867, was prolific of good, of liberty, of harmony, and contentment. Is it not a fact, on the contrary, that this union, though it was legislative in its character, never could be carried out in its integrity as a legislative union? Is it not a fact that we had to advance, by the very force of events and circumsiances, as close as possible to a federative union? Is it not a fact that we had an Administration for Lower Canada, and at the same time an Administration for Upper Canada?—a legislation for Upper Canada and a separate legislation for Lower Canada? Is it not a fact also that, notwithstanding all these concessions to the federative principle, the union was so bad that we had to give it up and seek relief in our present constitution? Government had become impossible; the legislative union had become unworkable; and in order to get out of the state of chaos which was created, we had to adopt a federative union. And now what do we see? We see the federative principle subjected, day after day, to a sever strain by those who, forgetting events, would bring back the state of things from which the country suffered so much. This Bill is another attempt made in the same direction, but I hope that the principle laid down by the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island shall be extended from Province to Province, until it reaches British Columbia and the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). It is not my intention to detain the House at very great length, but as I differ somewhat in opinion, as regards the question of law, with many of the legal profession in this House, I desire to place my views before Parliament and before the country. The hon. gentleman who has resumed his seat, and several gentlemen in opposition, maintain that the Local Legislatures of this Dominion since Confederation enjoyed the privilege of framing franchises for the Dominion Parliament. I hold that they are in error, and I think I am in a position to prove it. In the first place, I may state that the principle of uniformity is not the one to which this Parliament ought to attach the greatest importance. There is another principle involved, which is of very much greater importance to the Dominion than the principle of uniformity, and that is, that which was firmly laid down by the right hon. gentleman, the leader of the Government. The principle of the Bill is this, that the representatives of the people of Canada in the Dominion Parliament should have the right to control the electorate of the Dominion; and that, if there is any change or reform needed, the reform should be carried by the representatives of the people, as a whole, and not be affected by local legislation. The object of this Bill, then, is to prevent a change in the franchise of the Dominion at the mere whim or caprice of any Local Legislature. It is not necessary to sustain this principle that we should adopt a uniform franchise all over the Dominion. Now, the British North America Act provides by the 41st section, which has been repeatedly quoted, but which I believe has not been fairly interpreted by the legal profession in this House:

"Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, all laws in force in the several Provinces at the union—(and this is the point to which they fail to call sufficient attention)—relative to the following matters, or any of them, namely,—the qualifications and disqualifications of persons to be elected or to sit or vote as members of the House of Assembly or Legislative Assembly in the several Provinces, the voters at elections of such members, the oaths to be taken by voters, the returning officers, their powers and duties, the proceedings at elections, the periods during which elections may be continued, the trial of controverted elections and proceedings incident thereto, the vacating of seats of members, and the execution of new writs in case of seats vacated otherwise than by dissolution,—shall apply to elections of members to serve in the House of Commons for the same several Provinces."

What I desire to call special attention to is the fact that the Local Legislatures had not the right or the privilege to change the franchise of this Dominion until 1874. In 1871, owing to the fact that the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia changed the franchise, it was necessary, in order to enable the representatives from Nova Scotia to this Parliament to appeal to the legal electorate, to pass a law in this Parliament. It was rendered necessary, also, on account of a change in the franchise by Ontario. It mattered not if the Local Legislatures changed the franchise every year. That would not change the franchise for Dominion elections. In 1871, owing to the incidental disfranchising of several of the electors in Nova Scotia, who had a right to vote according to the election law of 1867, it was necessary to pass a law, which was assented to in this Parliament on the 14th April, 1871. A provision in this law was to this effect:

"The laws in force in the several Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick at the time of the Union, on the 1st day of July, 1867, relative to the following matters, that is to say, the qualifications and disqualifications of persons to be elected, or to sit, or vote, as members of the Legislative Assembly or House of Assembly in the said several Provinces respectively, the voters at elections of such members, the oaths to be taken by voters, the powers and duties of returning officers, and generally the proceedings at and incident to such elections, shall, as provided by the British North America Act, 1867, continue to apply respectively to elections of members to serve for the House of Commons for the Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, subject to the following exceptions and provisions, that is to say."

As it was owing to the disfranchisement of several electors in Nova Scotia that this clause was placed in the Statute Book, and as it was necessary to provide either a revising barrister or a reviser, in order to place on the legal electoral list for the Dominion of Canada the votes which were disfranchised by the Legislature of Nova Scotia, this clause was re-enacted; and because also the Ontario Legislature changed the franchise in 1869, which was an extension of the fran-

chise, it was deemed prudent to adopt the laws relative to the elective franchise in the several Provinces, excepting Ontario, as it was provided for by the British North America Act. Accordingly, sub-section 2, of this section, provided that:

"In the Province of Ontario the qualification of voters at elections for members of the House of Commons shall be that established by the laws in force in that Province on the 23rd January, 1869, as the qualification of voters at elections for members of the Legislative Assembly, and the voters' list to be used at elections of members of the House of Commons shall be the same as for such elections for members of the Legislative Assembly, on the basis of qualification aforesaid."

Thus you will see that, in 1871, the principle that the representatives of the people of Canada in the Dominion Parliament should have the right to control the electorate of the Dominion, and that, if there is any change or reform needed, it should be carried out by the representatives of the people as a whole, and not by the Local Legislature, was reaffirmed. This law continued in force for two years, and it seems strange to me, who happened to be present on that occasion, as I am now, to see the very great difference of feeling which exists in the House of Commons. At that time, although this House affirmed the principle that it had the right, and no other legislative authority had the right, to frame an elective franchise for us, there did not seem to be any strong feeling expressed relative to the subject; but, unfortunately, owing to the interference of the Local Legislatures with the franchise since that time, in the interests of party, not of a local party but of Dominion parties, there is great irritation created throughout the length and breadth of this great Dominion, but particularly in Ontario.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is not so.

Mr. CAMERON. Then I fail to judge correctly of the feelings which were expressed in this House, and the excitement which prevailed among hon. gentlemen opposite. It could only create one impression upon the mind of an unsophisticated Cape Bretoner, and that is that they feared that an honest elective franchise would be adopted by the Dominion Parliament. To the law passed in 1871, as the British North American Act provided, reaffirming the principle that we had a right to control the elective franchise of this Dominion, there were not less than nine amendments moved. I shall only call attention to two of them, because they are very important and are pertinent to amendments made on this occasion. One of the amendments was moved by the present leader of the Opposition, and was in the direction of uniformity, and it is a very singular fact that the leader of the Opposition to-day, who seems to favor a disjointed franchise for this Dominion, was then in favor of uniformity:

"The Hon. Mr. DORION moved in amendment that the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with power to amend the same by providing that any permanent public officer or employé receiving a salary from the Dominion Government shall be disqualified to vote at the election of a member for the House of Commons, and all such officers or employés who shall vote at an election shall be liable to a fine of $200, and their vote shall be null and void."

This clause was aimed at carrying out the elective franchise which was adopted by the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia.

"Mr. BLAKE moved, in amendment to the said proposed amendment, to leave out all the words after 'that,' and insert the following:—

"The said Bill, in effect, provides for the disqualification, as voters in Ontario and Quebec, of all officers of Customs and Excise, postmasters in cities and towns, and judges of the superior and county courts; that the said Bill does not provide for the disqualification, as voters in Nova Scotia, of Government servants; that the principle on which the disqualification is based is general, and should be applied to Nova Scotia, where, as in Ontario and in Quebec, the voting is open; that the said Bill be recommitted to the Committee of the Whole, in order to provide for the disqualification, as voters in Nova Scotia, of the same classes of Government servants as are disqualified in Quebec and Ontario."

This was negatived. At that time the hon. gentleman who now leads the Opposition moved these amendments in the direction of a uniform franchise, aiming at the disqualification of a large number of voters in Nova Scotia who were qualified to vote under the laws existing at the time, and guaranteed to them by the British North American Act, until this Parliament would otherwise provide. The law passed in 1871, and which was assented to on the 14th of April, only continued in force for two years. From April 14th, 1873, until the 23rd June, 1873, there was no electoral franchise or election law in force in the Dominion of Canada, for Dominion elections. I paid very dearly for my knowledge of this fact. Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provided, the laws in force on the 1st July, 1867, in the several Provinces, were to govern the elections for the Dominion Parliament; but the passage of the law of 1871 provided, not a universal franchise, for the Dominion, it is true, but a franchise over which the Local Legislatures could have no control. Therefore, as soon as that law expired there was no longer any election law in the Dominion of Canada. However, on the 23rd of May, 1873, a Bill somewhat similar to that which was passed in 1871, was passed by this Parliament. It provided that the election law in force in Nova Scotia on the 1st July, 1867, and in the other Provinces, except Ontario, should continue in force in the Dominion; and that the law which was passed by Ontario in 1869 should be the law from that date. This, then, was the law of the Dominion until 1874. Up to that time this Parliament not only had a right to exercise the power to frame its own franchise, but no Local Legislature had any right to do so. I go farther, and say, that the Local Legislatures to-day have no right to frame a franchise for the Dominion Parliament. But by a most ludicrous Act, which was passed in 1874, as soon as the Local Legislature of any Province changes the electoral franchise for that Province, so soon, forsooth, will the electoral franchise for the Dominion be changed also. It is only by coincidence; it is not because the Local Legislature has more power to do so, but because this Parliament has transferred, without any authority, the privilege to the Local Legislature to frame a franchise for this Parliament. On entering Confederation we were under the impression that no Local Legislature would have the authority to do so. The British North America Act says: "Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, the laws in force in the several Provinces of the Union, relative to the following matters, or any of them, shall continue to prevail." In 1874 there was only one clause relative to the franchise of this Dominion, and that is the clause that has created all the disturbance in this House, on this occasion. That was an unfortunate clause, and it was not only unfortunate in the past, but from present appearances, if I am any judge of the situation, if the representatives from Ontario express the feelings of their constituents, I apprehend that serious consequences will follow. Indeed, I was not a little alarmed, a few days ago, when I learned that not less than 5,000 men were going to march from the Province of Ontario down to this Parliament, to use all constitutional means to compel the Government to withdraw the Bill. Now, the question, in my mind, was, what were the constitutional means? If the case was a very desperate one, requiring a desperate remedy, it is just possible that they would use Winchester rifles and Gatling guns in order to compel the Government to withdraw the Bill. I hope, however, there was no serious intention to use such constitutional means to prevent this Parliament from exercising its right to frame a Franchise Bill for the Dominion of Canada. I would say, in reference to the clause to which I have already referred, passed in 1874, that the whole franchise is included in such case:

"Subject to the exception herein above contained, all persons qualified to vote at the election of representatives in the House of Assembly or Legislative Assembly of the several Provinces composing the Dominion of Canada, and no others, shall be entitled to vote at the election

of members of the House of Commons of Canada for the several electoral districts comprised within such Provinces respectively; and all lists of voters made and prepared, and which would, according to the laws in force in the said several Provinces, be used if the election were that of a representative or representatives to the House of Assembly or Legislative Assembly of the Province in which the election is held (where such lists are required to be made) shall be the lists of voters which shall be used at the election of members of the House of Commons to be held under the provisions of this Act."

Not until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, as the British North America Act provided, but until the Legislature of the several Provinces provides, the elective franchise which existed in 1874 shall continue to be the electoral franchise for the Dominion. What absurd legislation that must have been, transferring the right which the British North America Act conferred upon this Parliament alone to the Local Legislatures, inferior legislative bodies, in violation of the constitution! I observe the very extraordinary feeling which seems to exist, particularly in Ontario; and when I observe that very little attention is paid to the changes in the franchise by the representatives of any other Province in this House, I commence to reflect upon the cause which could have had such an extraordinary effect upon the representatives from Ontario. It occurred to me that more than eighteen years ago a strong feeling existed in the eastern part of the Dominion, in the older Provinces of Canada, which compelled them to resort to a system of government which was new to them. Upper and Lower Canada, in 1867, finding that it was impossible for them to go on any longer, owing to the dead locks, they resorted to the scheme of Confederation. I enquired into the history of that scheme; in fact, I had a good deal to do with the agitation, against it from its commencement, in 1864, until the present time. But my attention was called particularly to a speech delivered by a very extraordinary man. The representations made of him in a letter addressed to the Boston *Herald*, in March last, induced me to turn up that extraordinary speech. That speech appears to me to be almost prophetic. I ask the indulgence of the House while I read an extract from it. During the discussion on the Confederation question, Mr. Dunkin referred to the probable future of the Confederation in the following language:—

"I trust I have not been too prolix in my attempts to show that the constitution now offered for our acceptance presents machinery entirely unlike that of the United States, and entirely unlike that of the British Empire—that it is inconsistent with either—that so far from its profering to us all the advantages of both and the disadvantages of neither, it rather presents to us the disadvantages of both and the advantages of neither; that so far from its tending to improve our relations either with the mother country or with the United States, it holds out to us very little prospects indeed for the future in either of these respects. I shall not attempt to review my arguments on either of these heads, for I do not think that, to anyone at all willing to reflect what I have advanced, can require to be proved more fully. If I am not entirely wrong, the only way in which their proposed machinery can be got to work at all will be by an aggregation, so to speak, in the first Federal Cabinet of the leading men of the different existing Provincial Administrations. The attempt must be made to combine the six majorities, so as to carry on an Administration, in harmony with the understood wishes of the six several Provinces, irrespectively of every consideration of principle, or of sound, far-seeing policy. I do not see how, although this thing may be dull at starting, it can be carried on—I was going to say, for any length of time—I might say for any time, long or short, unless by a system of the most enormous jobbery and corruption. Whenever any sore spot shall show itself—and we may rely on it there will be more than one such show itself very soon—then feuds and divisions of the worst sort will follow, and the machinery will no longer work. Unfortunately, there are in it none of those facilities for harmonious workings, none of those nice adaptations by which the stronger power is so tempered as not to fall too harshly on the weaker. Just so long as the majority in all the different Provinces work cordially together, well and good. But they cannot possibly work harmoniously together long; and so soon as they come into collision, there comes trouble, and with that trouble, the fabric is at an end."

While listening to the discussion of the past two weeks I seriously pondered over the possibility of this language being prophetic. It is not uniformity that is desired by the promoters of this Franchise Bill, but that the representatives of the Dominion Parliament should exercise the right to control the electorate of the Dominion. The British North America Act gave the control of such electors to this Dominion, and that control should never have been transferred to any other body. But what seems extraordinary to me is the fact that the red man, the Indian, is at the bottom of the whole difficulty, on this occasion. The Ontario Legislature lately passed a Franchise Bill, giving votes to Indians, by which they were enabled to vote for Ontario members in this House. So soon as the leader of the Dominion Government proposed to allow Indians in other sections of the Dominion to vote for members of this House, there was a most extraordinary apparent ebullition of feeling throughout Ontario against the measure. I fail to see why, if the Indians of Ontario are allowed, by the existing law, to vote for members in this House, the members for Ontario should refuse to allow that right to be extended to Indians in the other Provinces. Nova Scotia has also passed a Franchise Bill, and it will affect very materially the representatives of that Province in this Parliament. I listened very seriously to the remarks of the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) on a late occasion, when he referred to the very strong feeling which exists in Nova Scotia against Confederation. And I might quote by the hour, if I rose to speak against time, as it has been represented as being done lately by some hon. members, speeches which have lately been delivered in the Local House by Liberals, if not by Grits, against Confederation. Let us see the absurdity of leaving this law on the Statute Book. In 1867-68 and 1869 public meetings were called in Nova Scotia to urge upon the representatives of that Province not to attend this Parliament. They did not all obey the recommendation of the people; they believed they could better subserve the public interest by discharging the duties for which they were elected. But assuming that the agitation for repeal, which exists now in the Province of Nova Scotia and particularly in the Legislature, and which was only postponed until the Nova Scotia Government ascertained whether they would obtain better terms or not, was resumed, and that the Local Government were determined that representatives of the people of Nova Scotia should no longer occupy seats in the House of Commons, it would be an easy matter for them to bring about a crisis in that Province which would startle the whole Dominion. In 1886 the local elections will take place there. After contesting their elections they could call the Legislature together, on the eve of the Dominion elections, and temporarily abolish the franchise, and then there would be no electoral lists for the Dominion elections. It is not very probable they would do so, but it is possible, and it is to remove that possibility that I would strongly urge on this Parliament not to give power to any Local Legislature to so change the franchise as to change the complexion of the representation in this House very materially. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I beg to assure this House that I have no serious objection to the franchise in any of the Provinces of the Dominion. I am strongly in favor of a uniform franchise for the Dominion, if we can possibly attain it; and failing to attain a uniform franchise, I am in favor of a franchise which seems to be most acceptable to the majority of the representatives from the several Provinces, and I firmly believe that the franchise which is now before Parliament, if it is so amended, as we have reason to believe it will be amended, will be as perfect a franchise as can be adopted for this Dominion. There is one objectionable feature in the Bill—one which seems to be very objectionable, particularly to my hon. friends opposite from Ontario—and that is the revising barristers. In 1871, when the law was passed, the same principle was involved; and what seems very extraordinary is the fact that the present leader of the Opposition moved an amendment with reference to the revising of the electoral lists in Nova Scotia, which gave absolute power to the revisors to make up such lists as they felt disposed, without any appeal to a higher judicial authority.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read.

Mr. CAMERON. It is as follows:—

"Mr. Blake moved, in amendment to the proposed amendment, to leave out all the words after 'that' and insert the following: 'The said Bill be recommitted, with instructions to provide that all persons who are appointed revisors under chapter 28 of the Revised Statutes of Nova Scotia, respecting elections, shall, within a certain time after they have prepared the annual list of electors to vote for members of the General Assembly of Nova Scotia, prepare a list of electors for the purpose of elections for the House of Commons, adding thereto the names of all officials and employees who are qualified to vote under the said Act, but who may have become disqualified by any subsequent Act of the Province of Nova Scotia;' which was agreed to."

Now, I call your attention to the fact that there is no appeal from the revisors in Nova Scotia, and as I have as much confidence in a revising barrister of five years' standing, or a county judge, as in the revisors of Nova Scotia, I would not be afraid to refer the electoral lists in Nova Scotia to any revising barrister, without any appeal. But I say I am in favor of an appeal from a revising barrister, and although having no appeal from the revisors in Nova Scotia never caused any great injury to the electoral franchise, so far as I know, and although I believe it would not cause any serious injury to the electoral franchise of the Dominion, yet, because hon. gentlemen opposite are very anxious to have an appeal from the revising barrister on questions of fact, I can see no reason why they should not have it. But having no appeal from the revisor has several advantages, and among them is this advantage, that it would save the people from a great deal of expense——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMERON. It unquestionably would. In Nova Scotia our course hitherto has been this: The electoral lists were prepared in the ordinary course, by the assessors and revisors, who had all to do with the lists. The candidates who seek for a position in the Legislature faces the electoral lists which would exist, and they never fear the result. I have had experience in that direction, and I always inform the intelligent electors of Inverness that every person who felt that I was the best representative in their interests, in the Dominion Parliament, should vote for me, but that any person who felt that any one of my opponents would be a better servant in their interests, should support him, and that, I believe, is the spirit which should animate any candidate appealing to the people for a seat in Parliament.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) The last time I spoke on this Bill, I said that we had not heard any reason given for its necessity. Not one reason has been given either by the press which supports the Government or by the hon. First Minister himself, when he introduced this Bill. From that time we have heard but very little discussion from hon. gentlemen opposite. We have heard a few reasons, it is true, but I believe that the more we hear of that kind the worse it will be for the Bill, if we are to judge by those which have been given. For instance, a few days ago, the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), said that the Bill was desirable, because it was going to introduce uniformity or general citizenship, which, in his opinion, was a thing which was extremely useful, if not necessary. To-night, we have just heard the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) saying that what he desires most is not uniformity, and that he is not supporting this Bill because it is going to introduce uniformity of franchise, but in order to consecrate the principle that this Parliament has a right to legislate on this matter. This is a peculiar reason. In the first place, there is not a person that I know of, in this House or out of it, who has ever denied that this Parliament has a right to establish, if it choses, a franchise, either uniform or distinct, for each of the Provinces within Confederation. Nobody can be unaware of that fact. And I do not understand why people should be so bent on upholding, on the other side of the House and before the public, such a proposition, which nobody thinks of denying. I have before me an article from *Le Monde*, a newspaper published at Montreal, and established through the agency of the hon. Minister of Public Works, which newspaper is considered, rightly or wrongly—and I think that this opinion is not altogether incorrect—but is considered as reflecting the opinions of the hon. Minister. Here is what I find in yesterday's edition of that newspaper. The article is headed "The Electoral Franchise." As will be seen, the article deals specially with the Bill now before the House, and its object is to give the reasons which may be invoked in favor of the Bill. It begins thus:

"We have shown, in a preceding number, as clearly as possible, that the Parliament of Canada had the power, under the constitution, to legislate on electoral franchise for the whole of Canada."

So the author of the article says that he has shown in a preceding number that which had no need of being demonstrated, that which nobody has ever denied. But what wanted to be proved is what he proposes to establish in the present article—and we will see how he succeeds—it is the expediency of such a measure. I will remark, by the way, that if the Dominion Parliament had not the right of legislating on this matter the evil would not be very great, because then this law would not be worth the paper on which it would be printed. We know very well what happened to other laws initiated by the First Minister, who is not, as we all know, in favor of the automony of the Provinces; we know, I say, that these laws died a natural death, or rather a violent death, either before the Privy Council or before the Supreme Court. Therefore, if that provision of the Bill to which I object was not within the jurisdiction of this Parliament, it would be unnecessary for us to discuss it; or, at all events, we could only discuss it from a theoretical point of view, as showing the tendency of the present Parliament towards legislative union. But we could not point out the immediate danger of it for the Province of Quebec or the other Provinces of the Dominion, because there would be an appeal before the courts. Every one of us who have addressed the House have admitted that Parliament has a perfect right to legislate on this subject. But it is a question whether this Bill suits the country or not, whether it is expedient to pass it or not. Well, what are the reasons given by the author of the article in question in favor of its expediency. Here is what he says:

"It remains for us to speak to-day of the expediency of such a measure It is one of the loudest cries of those who are opposed to it: 'That law is good, but it is not necessary. Where are the petitions asking for it?' We might very well reply, with just as much force: This measure has been before the public for seventeen years. Where are the petitions praying that it should not be adopted."

This does not exactly represent the opinion of those who are opposed to the Bill. I do not think that one journalist can be found, either in the Opposition or on the Ministerial side, who has ever pretended that this law was good; but we will find in all the Opposition papers and in the speeches of all those who spoke on the Opposition side the following question: What are the reasons of the expediency of this Bill? The author of the article says: Where are the petitions praying that it should not be adopted? But it is not for those who are in favor of the *statu quo* to give the reasons why the *statu quo* should be maintained. It is for those who wish to alter the constitution of the country to give the reasons why they should be changed. For instance, when Confederation was established, would it not have been unreasonable, ridiculous, even, to say, like the author of that article: It is very true that nobody is asking for Confederation, but on the other hand nobody has pronounced against it; there is no petition asking for it before the Legislature, but neither is there any petition against it; why should we

not vote for Confederation? At the present moment, suppose that the Government should be pleased to propose legislative union, I am not aware that there has been a single petition against legislative union. Would it be very proper to say to those who would oppose it: Why do you ask us to give the reasons in favor of legislative union? It is very true that nobody asks for it, but neither does any one oppose it. The same argument might be invoked for any absurd proposal which would be made here. I will go further; the more absurd is a measure the more we may be sure that no petitions would be presented against it; for we must admit that the people of this country suppose that their rulers are possessed of a sufficient dose of common sense to think it unnecessary to petition them against a measure which is evidently unreasonable. The people suppose that Parliament is intelligent enough not to oblige them to petition, in order to ask that the elementary laws of justice or equity should be respected. It is only when they see Parliament taking a bad course, a course which seems absurd to them, that the electors of this country think it proper to oppose it, and that they begin to petition. But I have never heard that electors were obliged to petition to ask that common sense, justice and equity should be respected, when nobody thinks of attacking them. One of the first reasons, as will be seen, is that nobody has, as yet, sent a petition against the Bill. He adds:

"There are several good reasons for that. Under the constitution, the Government of Canada has no authority whatever over municipal powers. It is lucky that it should be so. The municipal system is the soul of the political organisation of the Provinces; it is the strongest bulwark of provincial autonomy."

Well, this is a point which cannot be denied. It is perfectly sure that this Parliament has no right to encroach upon the municipal system. Still, the author of the article makes a very false application of this principle when he tells us that because the Dominion Government has no control over the municipal affairs the local authorities must be deprived of the right of determining the federal franchise. The opposite of what is said in the paragraph I have just read happens to be established in the Bill itself, which says, that the revising officers must apply to the local authorities, and may compel them to deliver to them the valuation rolls and the voters' list. Therefore, it is admitted that the Dominion Parliament might have a control over the municipal authorities, or that this part of the Bill is contrary to the constitution. And it is not in pretending that this Bill gives an authority over the municipal officers that I oppose it:

"In these conditions, says the author of the article, the municipal officer has no order to receive from the Dominion authorities. Now, suppose that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery should be obliged to issue a writ for the election of a member. He appoints a returning officer, and the latter must provide for the preparation of the voters' lists for the votation. How is he going to procure them if the municipal officer, in whose custody they are kept, refuses to give them up?"

Well, if that reasoning is sound, how will the officer in question be able to procure the voters' lists and valuation rolls which the law compels him to procure, and without the possession of which it will be almost impossible to know who are those who have a right to vote under the clause of the Bill which we are now discussing. If that reasoning was worth anything, it would tend to show that a part of the law which is proposed to us is unconstitutional. He goes on to say:

"This circumstance is perhaps not probable, but that it could be possible is a sufficient reason to justify wise and prudent legislators to provide against it."

This would be legislation of a new kind. This reasoning, which I have just read, I have heard repeated a few moments ago by the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron). He made all kinds of suppositions and went further than the author of the article. He went so far as to suppose that in order to prevent a federal election the local officers would take the trouble of distroying the voters' lists. People suppose things which are impossible, or, at least, if not absolutely impossible, things which are morally impossible, which the most elementary common sense would reject. The same article goes on to say:

"Neither is the strong feeling of hostility which is to-day being developed, rightly or wrongly, between several Provincial Governments and the Dominion Government, of such a nature as to remove our fears on that point."

What is this feeling of hostility of the several Provincial Governments against the Federal Government? I believe that if a feeling of hostility is to be found anywhere it is not on the part of the Local Governments against the Federal Government, but it is on the part of the Dominion Government against Local Governments; because, if we consider what took place a few years ago, we will not find that it was the Local Governments who were wrong in the few conflicts which took place between them and the Federal Government. It was the first who gained all their points, and not the latter. Now, here is what is given as a justification of what has been said:

"The conduct of the Nova Scotia Legislature—whose majority was Liberal—on this question, in 1871, is still fresh in the memory of the public.

"We were on the eve of the Dominion general election for 1872. The Liberal Government of that Province, with a view of causing the Conservative candidates in that Province to lose votes, amended the law concerning the qualification of voters in such a manner as to disfranchise all country postmasters, employees of the Intercolonial Railway, officers in the Customs and Inland Revenue offices. That is to say, by one stroke of the pen more than two thousand electors were deprived of the right of voting at parliamentary elections, a right which they had always exercised until then. The motive of this arbitrary and unjust Act is obvious. It was supposed that the majority of these postmasters and railroad men would be in favor of the Conservative candidates. Consequently, it was a duty, on the part of the Liberal Government of Nova Scotia, to disfranchise them."

And he adds, further on:

"In 1873 the political cards having undergone a change at Ottawa, a Liberal Government, under the direction of Mr. Mackenzie, was organized. That circumstance made a whole revolution in the Liberal Government of Nova Scotia, and brought them back to more affectionate sentiments towards postmasters, workmen employed on the Intercolonial and in Her Majesty's Custom house. They gave them back the franchise on the eve of the federal elections of Mr. Mackenzie, in January, 1874.

"They then supposed that the workmen would go down on their knees before the rising sun and would vote for Mr. Mackenzie's Liberal Government.

"This is history.

"What took place once may very well repeat itself."

Well, I do not know the particulars of this so-called historical fact, but if the Government of Nova Scotia, as it is pretended, had passed a law disfranchising Custom house employees, certain postmasters, Excise employees, that would not have been any worse than that which had existed for a long time in the electoral law of Canada, which preceded that which is now in force in the Province of Quebec, and by which it was provided that all these persons would be incapacitated from voting, even if they had the required qualification, and the law of the Province of Quebec has maintained that provision. The Quebec law has been passed by the most conservative of all the Governments of the Dominion. Never was there a more conservative Government, and it is very improbable that a more conservative Government than was the De Boucherville Government in 1875, can ever exist. It was what would be called to-day a *Castor* Government, a kind of Government which will never exist, if we may judge by what happened to that party some time ago. What did they do? They committed the same crime with which the Government of Nova Scotia was charged, and, for my part, I do not consider that as a crime. Here is what I find in section 11 of the Quebec election law. I leave aside all local disabilities:

"The following will not be electors and will not be entitled to vote:

"1st. Judges of the Court of Queen's Bench, of the Superior Court and of the Court of Vice-Admirality;

"2nd. Custom House officers;

"3rd. Postmasters in the cities and towns, and all the officers employed in the collection of duties payable to Her Majesty, of the nature of Excise duties, including collectors of federal and local revenue."

Thus every employee of the Federal Government who is employed for the collection of duties, either Customs or Excise, is declared by that law to be incapacitated from voting. Will it be said that this law has been inspired by hatred towards the Mackenzie Government, who were then in power? Never has that been pretended either in the press or in Parliament. If the reasoning which has been made in the House a moment ago, and which is made in the article I have just read, was sound, what should the Liberal Government of that time have done? They should have introduced a franchise law, and have stated, as a reason for the expediency of that law, that such a law was necessary because a hostile Conservative Government had, in the Quebec Legislature, passed a law whose object was to disqualify some of the most important officers. But no Liberal ever thought of that. Not only the Government never thought of it, but I am not aware that a friend of the Government ever proposed a Bill with a view to establish a uniform franchise, under pretence that this franchise had become necessary by reason of the legislation adopted by the Province of Quebec. Neither have I ever heard that a single newspaper at that time even suggested that a Bill of of that kind should be introduced. The Quebec Government found that, in view of the peculiar circumstances under which were the officers of the Dominion Government in the Province of Quebec, it was important to deprive them of the right of voting. For us Liberals that settled the question, and the idea never occurred to us that what had been decided on this point by the Local Government might be dealt with by the Federal Government. The article adds the following:—

"What has happened once might repeat itself. The Dominion elections will take place in 1887. The lists prepared in 1886 will be used in the elections of 1887. In view of that fact, the Liberal Government of Ontario has just adopted a new franchise law."

Here the writer betrays himself. It is in view of the elections of 1887 that these new provisions are introduced. It is pretended that there have been a few iconveniences until now. Well, these few inconveniences which, it was sought to point out, are riduculous and are not serious, but it is said that some of them might exist. Alas, if legislation was to be made in view of all the inconveniences which might be imagined, a Parliament sitting twelve months in the year would not be sufficient. Two or three Parliaments would be necessary to make laws which would obviate all imaginable inconveniences. This article also adds—and as I said a while ago, I am anxious to refute the arguments used by the author, because his article is a kind of Ministerial programme published in the organ of the Minister of Public Works:

"The valuation rolls and voters' lists are not always prepared with the greatest impartiality in our Province.

"The proof of this lies in the fact that not a single year goes by without several appeals being made to our tribunals from the valuation rolls or voters' lists.

"We remember a case of appeal from a valuation roll, which came before the courts at Montreal in 1873.

"The valuators, like the good staunch Liberals that they were, had valued an individual's property at $180 for municipal purposes. That amount did not give him a right to vote at the parliamentary elections, which were to come off soon in the county.

"As he had always voted up to that time, he contested the valuation, and at the investigation which took place it was proved that ten days after the valuation made by the partisan assessors, the same property was valued at $400 by the valuators of the trustees of the parish. That was the value of the property according to the sworn testimony of a great number of persons worthy of credit.

"Why this difference? We might multiply the examples of such unjust proceedings, taken by our municipal councils in order to serve their political ends. But the public know all these facts. It is useless for us to repeat them."

I do not deny the fact which is mentioned here. I know that there has been a great number of such cases. But that does not prove against the wisdom of the law of the Province of Quebec. There is a remedy, and the author of the article points it out to us. He says that there is an appeal before the tribunals, and he complains that people should be obliged to have recourse to them; that is just where I find the proof of the wisdom of the laws. Municipal councils are not infallible, neither are they impeccable. They may, under those circumstances, commit injustice, either through ignorance or party spirit. The author might have mentioned a number of cases were Conservative municipal councils have used voters' lists to commit injustice. I, myself, have had occasion to cause injustices of this kind to be redressed, and yet I have never complained about the law; I have found redress for this grievance precisely in what the writer points out, that is to say, the appeal before the tribunals. Therefore, this is not at all a condemnation of the system of local franchise. The article concludes as follows:—

"These are some of the reasons which justify the Dominion Parliament in adopting a *uniform legislation* on the electoral franchise of Canada, and in adapting to it a machinery which will make it work in a manner which will be fair and equitable to all citizens who are interested in taking a part in the good government and good management of the public wealth. We shall speak about these particulars in a future edition."

These are all the reasons given by the writer in favor of a uniform right of franchise. As is seen, there is not one of these reasons which could resist the most superficial examination. It may seem strange that I should stop to quote the reasons given in a newspaper article; but we have heard no other. It was found a good deal more prudent to do nothing to defend this Bill before Parliament and to simply say: We have the majority to pass it, and it is all we want. It is intended to carry out here what took place in the Quebec Legislature not very long ago. There was at that time a Conservative Government, who had a majority as large in proportion as that which supports the Government here; a member of the Opposition was giving unanswerable reasons against a Government measure. And do you wish to know the answer given by the Government? They said: It is useless to discuss with us; we will answer you through our votes. It seems evident to me that the same thing is taking place here. The Government have an argument stronger than any of ours: it is the argument of the strongest. Even if we give all the reasons which can be given against this Bill, even if we prove that it is iniquitous, that it is rejected by all the Provinces, it does not matter; we are answered by the vote; it is the only reason which is given to us. Now, a reason which I have heard given, not in this House, because there was no reason given here in favor of the Bill, and especially in favor of the proposed franchise—is that the Bill would extend the franchise in the Province of Quebec. I have already pointed out what was erroneous in that proposition, and the speech I delivered the other day seems to have surprised some of the hon. members opposite. The hon. member for East Quebec (Mr. Laurier) pointed out the same thing to-night. The other day I mentioned about fifteen small towns of the Province of Quebec where the electoral franchise is to be restricted instead of being extended, and in which hundreds of electors who have a right to vote to-day will be unable to vote in the future. But there is still another point on which I believe I ought to insist, because it has not been noticed, perhaps, on account of its being a point of law. What do I find in this Bill, as regards the franchise, both in cities or towns and in counties? I find that the owner can only be qualified on the real value of his property and the tenant on his rent. Section 2 says:

"Is the owner of real property within any such city or town, of the actual value of three hundred dollars."

So that, in order to vote in a town or city, an owner must have real property valued at $300. If that property is valued at $200 of real value, even if it should be rented at

$30 a year—which happens very often, especially in small towns—he would have no right to vote. Well, in the Province of Quebec, even in the large cities, such as Quebec and Montreal, he would have a right to vote. This will disqualify quite a number of people. As I said the other day, Quebec and Montreal are the only cities for which there exists a special franchise higher than in other localities. This franchise consists of a property of the value of $300, or of an annual value of $30. This applies to the occupant as well as to the owner. For instance, in Quebec and in Montreal, the moment a property is rented at $30, both the owner and occupant have a right to vote, or if the property has an annual value of $30, even if it was only valued at $250, the proprietor has a right to vote; but under the present Bill he has not that right. There is quite a number of these properties at Quebec—in St. Roch's Ward and in part of the Champlain Ward. So in Montreal; there are quite a number of these properties which are rented at $30 or $36 a year, and whose real value has only been estimated at $200 or $250. Well, under the Bill which is now before us, the owner can only be qualified on a property valued at $300 of real value, even if he had a property estimated at $36 of an annual value; if his property is only valued at $250 or $290, he cannot vote. What I have just said about the owner is also true as regards the occupant. In the Province of Quebec the occupant is qualified to vote either if the property he is occupying has a real value of $300 or if it has an annual value of $30. Thus, one of the two values is sufficient to qualify him. If the property is only rented at $25 but valued at $300, he has the right to vote—I am still speaking of Quebec and Montreal. If, on the contray, the property is only valued at $250 but rented at $30, he has still the right to vote. Well, under the present Bill, he will be deprived of that right. Here is what is said in sub-section 5, section 3:

"Is the *bonâ fide* occupant of real property within any such city or town, or part of a city or town, of the actual value of three hundred dollars."

Therefore, the occupant and the owner, under the present law, can only be qualified on the real value of this property, and they cannot be qualified on an annual value of $30, as they are to-day. The difference is still greater in other localities. Outside of Quebec and Montreal the owner, in the Province of Quebec, is qualified on a real value of $200 or on an annual value of $20. And so with the occupier. In other words, in a municipality such as Lévis, whoever occupies a property valued at $20 of an annual value, even if the property should only be estimated at $180, although he would have been qualified to vote under the old law would be incapacitated under this new Bill. In the same way, if the property is valued at $200 but is only rented at $18, he would have a right to vote under the Quebec law, but would be deprived of it under the present Bill. Consequently, do not tell us that this extends the franchise in the Province of Quebec. Throughout the whole length and breadth of the Province this Bill will have the effect of disqualifying a very large number of voters, and the number of those that it will qualify can be counted on the fingers' ends, and will not be found outside of Quebec and Montreal. As a proof of what I have just stated with reference to the law of the Province of Quebec, here is what is said by section 8 of the Election Act:

"No man will be inscribed on a voters' list unless he possess the following conditions:

"3. To be actually and *bonâ fide* owner or occupier of real estate, estimated according to the valuation roll, as revised, even if it has been so revised for local purposes only, to the amount of at least three hundred dollars in real value—"

Mr. LANDRY. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) The hon. member will please to wait a moment. I cannot read all at the same time, but I shall read the rest for him:

"in a municipality of a city having the right to elect one or more members to the Legislative Assembly, and of two hundred dollars in real value or of twenty in annual value in any other municipality."

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation.) The hon. member will perhaps allow me to interrupt him. If I understood him well, I believe he said, a moment ago, that under the new law, in the cities of Montreal and Quebec, the tenant of a property worth $300 or $250 will have no right to vote while he had that right under the old law. Now, the clause which the hon. member has just read proves the contrary.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) He will have no right to vote if the property does not give the required annual value, but what I maintain is, that under the Quebec law the owner and occupant are qualified, either on the annual value or the real value.

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation.) But under the old law what must be the value of the real estate in Quebec and Montreal?

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) When a man qualifies on the real value in Quebec and Montreal the value must be $300 and the annual value must be $30. In other municipalities' the real value must be $200 and the annual value $20. That is the law; or, in other words, a man may be qualified in two different manners, either on the real value or on the annual value. Under the present Bill the owner who, under the Quebec law, may be qualified, either on the real value or on the annual value, can only be qualified on the real value; the same thing applies to the occupant.

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation.) The hon. member said a while ago that if the value of a property was only $250 the owner would not have the right to vote, under the present law, while he would have that right under the old law. I deny that.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) I was reading the law, and I had not finished to read it. Here is the last paragraph:

"Is a *bonâ fide* occupant, paying for real estate an annual rent of at least $30 in a municipality of a city having the right to elect one or more members of the Legislative Assembly, and of at least $20 in any other municipality; Provided, these properties are estimated in real value, according to such valuation roll, at $300 at least, in a city having the right to elect one or more members of the Legislative Assembly, and $200 in any other municipality."

Mr. LANDRY. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) That is to say, in all localities the two values are needed; the real value of $300 or $200, and the annual value of $30 or $20, according to the municipality. I was saying awhile ago that it was difficult to know on what ground a uniform franchise, such as proposed in sections 3 and 4 of the Bill, could be asked for. An hon. member said the other day that it was in view of uniformity, and that that was desirable. Another one says to-night that it is not with a view to uniformity. Well, I say that if there is a Province where uniformity would do harm it is the Province of Quebec. We have not forgotten what took place when Confederation was established; it was especially in view of the exceptional position of that Province, in view of the special laws which the people of the Province did not want to give up, and of which they did not want to be deprived, it was in view of all this that a Confederation was established instead of a legislative union? Let the hon. gentleman read the speech delivered by the hon. First Minister during the debate on Confederation. He stated positively that, as far as he was concerned, he would be in favor of a legislative union, but he added that seeing the hostility manifested by the Province of Quebec, he gave up the idea. He explained very well the reasons why that Province was hostile to legislative union; it is because we have a special system of civil law of our own, which we do not want to give up, and because we do

not want to expose our Province to be plundered by a Parliament in which we would be in a minority. And it is for that reason that the civil laws have remained under the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures. Well, it is perfectly well known that real estate has the most intimate relations to the right of suffrage, and in this Bill a little less than in the former law, but they are still very extensive. What is the basis of qualification under this Bill? It may be said that, generally speaking, it is real property, as in the former law. It is true this Bill admits a few qualifications which are foreign to the property qualification, which have been called fancy franchises in England, and against which there was such an uprising in the Quebec Legislature in 1875, when I had the honor to propose a few of them. People were then very much scandalised at them, but it seems that to-day it is all very well. However, there is no doubt that the basis of the principle franchise of this Bill is real property. Now, when Confederation was established we were anxious to keep the real property under the control of the provincial authorities. Well, is not this exposing us to see the Dominion Parliament interfere with the land tenure? This is evident. The other day we argued on the different tenures which exist; I moved several amendments, which the House saw fit to reject, but these amendments showed what danger there is to give the control of real estate to a Parliament which has no jurisdiction on the matter, and that is just what we would do the moment we would allow Parliament to pass a franchise law while we would be admitting that franchise ought to be based on real estate. Now, when we discussed that Bill for the first time we did not witness the spectacle which is given to us to-day. The only reason given by the First Minister was that the first principles—that was the expression he used—required uniformity in the matter of franchise. Well, these first principles—he is about to give them up. The First Minister has already given up one of them. This first principle which required uniformity has been laid aside to exclude from the right of suffrage the Indians of the new Provinces, namely, the North-West and British Columbia, while this right is reserved to the Indians of the old Provinces, that is, Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick. Now, we heard to-night one hon. member from Prince Edward Island moving an amendment to the section we are now discussing, and if we are to credit the rumor which has found its way, not only in the newspaper, but even among the friends of the Government, it has been agreed with the First Minister that the electoral franchise of Prince Edward Island is to remain unchanged, that this uniform franchise which is to be forced upon the rest of Confederation will not be forced upon Prince Edward Island. Well, Mr. Chairman, I ask the hon. members opposite, who belong to the Province of Quebec, how it is that a uniform franchise can be imposed on the Province of Quebec when that franchise is not wanted for Prince Edward Island? Is not that a proof that there are among the supporters of the Government members from Prince Edward Island who are more independent than those of the Province of Quebec. If I was a supporter of the Government I would insist to have the rights of my Province respected. I will admit that the people of Prince Edward Island are intelligent, although that Province is much smaller than the Province of Quebec; but it will also be admitted that the rights of the Province of Quebec should be respected as well as those of Prince Edward Island. And if we admit for Prince Edward Island a special right, a more extended franchise, the same thing should be done for the Province of Quebec. There is not even the pretext that the franchise of the Province of Quebec was established by a Liberal Government, and that it should be done away with for that reason, for that franchise was given to us by the most conservative Government that ever existed or that will ever exist in the Dominion of Canada. If there is anybody that should complain it is we, the Liberals; but we have so much respect for provincial autonomy and for local institutions that we prefer to keep a franchise which is perhaps too restricted and which was given to us by a Conservative Government, than to have an extensive franchise imposed by a Government in which the Province of Quebec does not predominate. Now, Mr. Chairman, it will not be pretended that this Bill will not introduce a special franchise for the Province of Quebec, because that Province desires the proposed franchise. Before the present Bill was moved, and even until a few days ago, we have not seen a single newspaper article, not even in the Conservative newspapers, pronouncing in favor of this Bill. We have seen many Conservative newspapers and some of the most conservative, pronouncing strongly against the Bill, but not one of them spoke of it in a favorable manner. Every one of them regretted that things were not left as they are to-day. It will not be said that this Bill was forced upon the Government by their friends from the Province of Quebec; the friends of the Government in Prince Edward Island do not want a uniform franchise; so little do they want it that they will succeed in keeping their local franchise, and I congratulate them on their success. I would wish that the Government should have the same consideration for my Province as that which they show for Prince Edward Island. It will not be said that this law is asked by the members from Manitoba. I believe that if the Manitoba vote was taken separately we would be justified in saying that this Bill is not wanted in that Province, where they have a franchise which is more extensive. Now, the members from British Columbia have also a franchise which is more extensive. I am sure that if the Government left it an open question there would not be one single member from the Province of Quebec who would accept the present Bill, and that they would all prefer to keep their local franchise. And the same thing may be said of all the Provinces. If the votes of the members of any one Province were taken separately, with the exception, perhaps, of Ontario, I am sure that the vote would be unanimous against this Bill. And I appeal to the conscience of the members from the Province of Quebec. I am told that they have a conscience, and I hope that it is true. I have myself heard several members from the Province of Quebec, both Conservatives and Liberals, speaking about this Bill, and I have not heard them speak of it as if they had long cherished the hope of seeing it pass; on the contrary, they said that they would have preferred to have left things as they were. I see several of these gentlemen here, and I do not think that one of them will rise up to state that he sees in that Bill the realisation of a desire which he has been fondling for a long time back. There are some of them, among the most faithful supporters of the Government, who spoke eloquently, and who strongly opposed the Bill. They found that it would be such an enormity to pass that law that they thought it their duty to pronounce against this Bill. I am convinced that there are more members from the Province of Quebec, and a great number of them, who are of the same opinion; perhaps they have not the same courage, and I admit that a great deal of courage is needed to pronounce against a Bill of which the Government have made a Ministerial question; but I am satisfied that if the Government said: We will do with the whole of this Bill what we have done for the woman suffrage clause; vote as you like; there would not be five Ministerial members from the Province of Quebec who would vote in favor of this law, or else they would not be speaking in this House as they speak outside of the House, or as their newspapers speak. Well, what is there left in favor of this law? The members from the Province of Ontario. This provision of the Bill is forced upon the Ministerial party of the other Provinces by the Ministerial party of Ontario, because, as it was said by the newspaper which I quoted a

while ago, it is through hatred against the Ontario Government. Well, Mr. Chairman, are the other Provinces to become the victims of the difficulties and of the quarrels which may arise between the Dominion Government and the Ontario Government? Are they to pay the damages done by these quarrels? If people are so anxious not to have the franchise which was established by the Ontario Government, if there is such a desire to show hostility to this Government, let there be a franchise proposed for Ontario, but do not commit an act of tyranny against the other Provinces. Mr. Chairman, I will not say any more on this subject. It is unfortunate that people should try to impose on other Provinces a legislation which they do not want, and I understand very well now why they did not wish to discuss this measure. The true reason cannot be given; a glimpse of it was allowed to be caught in a newspaper article, but nobody would dare to come in this House and state that the object of the Bill is an act of hostility towards the Ontario Legislature, who have the misfortune, in the opinion of the majority of this House, of being Liberal. That is the true reason. It cannot be said that this Bill is required by Nova Scotia, that it is required by Prince Edward Island, that it is asked for by British Columbia, that it is required by Manitoba. Neither will it be said that it is required by the Province of Quebec. Again, I say, that if the vote of these Provinces was taken separately they would be about unanimous against this law. Who is asking for it, then? It can only be the Ministerial party of the Province of Ontario. Well, I think it is going a little too far when people are proposing a Bill whose object can only be to satisfy the hatred and the grudges of a certain class of members of this House who come from a Province with which we have nothing to do.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny.) (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I have a few words to say in answer to the remarks just made by the hon. member from Megantic (Mr. Langelier). I will only point out one of the involuntary errors which he has made in his speech. The hon. member seems to be inclined to say that the effect of the present legislation will be to restrict the franchise in the Province of Quebec—at least that is his contention, and in support of it he compares the Bill now submitted to the House to the legislation now existing in the Province of Quebec. And after having tried to prove that legislation is a restrictive legislation, he concludes in a neatly turned phrase, by saying: "Well, we still prefer the restricted franchise established by the most conservative Government which ever existed in the Province of Quebec since Confederation. We prefer this restricted franchise to a more extensive franchise, which Ottawa wants to give us." By these last words he destroys what he had taken so much pains to build up in his speech. In order to prove to the hon. member that he is completely outside of the question I will take up his own arguments. He says that in the cities of Quebec and Montreal—and he mentioned with pleasure the Champlain Ward in the city of Quebec—the effect of the present Bill will be to diminish the number of voters. How does he prove it? He adds: "The present law requires not only that a tenant should pay a rent of $30 a year, but also requires that the real estate on which this rent is paid should have a real value of at least $300." Now, he says: "If a tenant rents a property valued at $250, that man will not have a right to vote; thus you see that you will deprive of the right of voting a considerable number of voters in the large cities of Quebec and Montreal." To give more strength to his statement, he quotes the law of the Province of Quebec, but the law is against him, for it says:

"No person will be entered upon the list of electors unless he fulfils the following conditions:

3. He must be actually, and in good faith, owner or occupant of real estate, estimated, according to the valuation roll in force as revised, if it has been revised, even for local purposes only, at a sum of at least three hundred dollars in real value in any municipality entitled to return one or more members of the Legislative Assembly, and two hundred dollars in real value, or twenty dollars in annual value in any other municipality, or be a tenant in good faith, paying an annual rent for real estate of at least thirty dollars in any city municipality entitled to return one or more members of the Legislative Assembly, and of at least twenty dollars in any other municipality; Provided, that such real estate be estimated according to such valuation roll, in real value, at at least three hundred dollars in any city municipality entitled to return one or mere members of the Legislative Assembly and two hundred dollars in any other municipality."

Therefore, the law of the Province of Quebec, as it exists to-day, requires not only that the tenant should pay $30 of a rent, but also that such rent be paid for a property estimated at least at $300, this amount being based on the value entered in the valuation roll. Now, under the Bill now submitted to us it is not that valuation which will be taken into consideration, but the real value of the property. We know, Mr. Chairman, that according to the valuation roll now in force in the Province of Quebec it is not the real value which appears, but a valuation of about two-thirds of the real value. Consequently, the very proof which is given by the hon. member establishes, not that a great many electors will be disfranchised, but quite the contrary. In order to establish the value of a property it is not the value entered in the valuation roll which will be taken, but the real value. Therefore, the new electoral law, instead of restricting the number of electors, will give more extension to the franchise. It is this point which the hon. member tried to elucidate, but the document from which he quotes turns against him instead of bearing him out. The hon. member says: "Why, if you go to the Province of Quebec, and if you take the valuation roll, or the real property as a basis, you interfere with the civil right of the Province and in matters which are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Province of Quebec." But how will the hon. member answer the following argument. We have here beside us a House composed of senators. The law says that they shall own an immovable property of the value of $1,000; consequently, it should be said that the law encroaches upon the civil laws of the Provinces. Surely the hon. member is not in earnest; he knows perfectly well that the moment the House takes the real property as a basis it has the right to say what will be the required property qualification. And this is not encroaching upon the civil law. Otherwise, if his argument was worth anything, it would amount to saying Parliament had not the right to determine the qualification of members of the Upper House. The hon. member for Megantic has pretended that the present Bill was an enormity. Well, that may be, if we are to take his own appreciation. But his appreciation is not that of everybody, and if, in his opinion, this Bill is an enormity, we are willing to suppose that he is in good faith, but he must leave to others the same freedom of appreciation, and from this point of view I beg to differ from him. Two things must be considered in the present Bill. There is the general principle, and then there are the details. The general principle is that the Dominion Parliament has the right of passing a law which will determine who are the electors who may elect members of that Parliament. Now, if we go into details, it may be that some of the details will not suit everybody; but we are here to make a general law, and not a special law for the Province of Quebec or for the Province of Ontario. Now, in a general law—as when we established the National Policy—we have to consider the wants of all the Provinces which make up the Confederation; sacrifices must be made on all sides. It is with that condition only that we may live in harmony and that we make a law which will be acceptable to everybody. The hon. member says: Why, you admit yourselves, you Conservatives of the Province of Quebec, what I proposed myself, when I was in the Legislature of the Province of Quebec. You approve to-day what you then considered as an enormity—that is, the vote based on the income, instead of being based on property, for a certain

class of individuals. But, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member should be the last to upbraid us for adopting a proposition which he himself had proposed. On the contrary, he should be glad of it, and the more so because, at that time, his light was very flickering and did not shine on a great many people in the Quebec Legislature. To-day we are making it flash with great brightness, and its rays will reach all points of the Dominion. This is what I had to say on that question. I will not for the present enter into the merits of the Bill. I only wanted to refute a few inaccuracies and a few errors which have found their way into the speech of the hon. member. I reserve my right of making a few remarks later on with regard to the merits of the Bill. The principle of the Bill must be admitted, and there is no getting away from that. We are now discussing the clause which relates to the qualification of voters, and I have no doubt that clause will receive the almost general assent of the House. It may be that some amendments are to be proposed in order to meet the views and objections of some. We will then see what we will have to do. An hon. member from Prince Edward Island wishes to obtain a special franchise for that Province, but I do not think that the hon. member for Megantic can point out an injustice here, for it certainly does not exist. But because the hon. member for Prince Edward Island has moved that amendment it does not follow that the House is obliged to accept it and that there will be a special franchise for that Province. Prince Edward Island will be treated like any other Province in the Dominion, and if that amendment is adopted for special reasons, there will still be open the question whether the other Provinces, and the Province of Quebec in particular, will not also have special reasons for asking for a franchise of their own. The hon. member says that there will be universal suffrage in Prince Edward Island, and, for my part, I am anxious to see the vote which will soon be taken on that point, in order to find out what is to be thought of the statement of the hon. member for Megantic.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) seems to think that I regret to see that my ideas are to be adopted here. I do not at all regret that ideas which I have upheld elsewhere and to which I still adhere should be adopted here. I merely wish to point out the change which has taken place in the ideas of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I merely wish to point out that they are worshipping to-day that which they burned and condemned in the Quebec Legislature. I do not upbraid them for it, but I blame them for coming here to worship their new idol. I, with my friends, pretend that we should limit ourselves to the Local Legislature. Now, if the Local Legislature should pass a law to limit the franchise, the thing should be discussed in that Legislature. I should regret to see the adoption of too limited a franchise, but the question is, whether the mode of suffrage is to be regulated here or at Quebec. I would wish to regulate it, as I proposed to do in 1875, in the Quebec Legislature, but I am surprised to see that views on account of which I was charged with heresy when I expounded them should be adopted here.

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation.) There is another point of resemblance. If we are worshipping to-day that which we burned then, you are burning to-day what you worshipped at that time.

Mr. GAULT. I may mention, in order to show one of the effects of this Bill, that in the city of Montreal, in an office where there are now only three votes, there will be sixteen votes, if the Bill passes. Under the Bill, there are hardly any laboring men who will not have a vote, as $20 rental is a very small one in that city. I hardly think there is a rental in the city of Montreal which does not reach from $4 to $10 a month, so that there will be a large number of laboring men and artisans, and other classes, who will have the right to vote. I might also say that the qualification of $300 of real property is a small valuation in Montreal, and I have no doubt that the effect of the Bill will probably be to increase the number of voters in Montreal by between 1,000 and 2,000. The Bill is one which has my entire approval. I think this Parliament ought to make the franchise for the election of its own members, instead of each of the Provinces making a franchise of its own.

Mr. DAVIES. The clause now under discussion by the committee is the first enacting clause of the Bill. There can be no doubt of its importance, and I fancy the committee understand that if it is carried it affirms a principle which overturns the existing system in all the Provinces, and introduces a system at variance with the one which has been in operation for the last eighteen years. I may also remark that it strikes me as exceedingly strange that, while the clause has had two amendments proposed to it, not a single member of the Government has expressed the opinion of the Government as to those amendments—as to whether they will be accepted or rejected. It is well known that the Liberal party of this House is opposed to the underlying principle of the Bill, and that the principle which is to be found in the clause now before the committee is not simply the assertion of the right, on the part of this Parliament, to take into its charge the control of its franchise in each of its Provinces, but the expediency of so doing. And when we come to affirm the expediency of so doing, I think we should hear some arguments to the effect that the existing system, which has been in operation for eighteen years, has not worked well. I take it, Sir, that those who are in favor of the federal system of government and who are opposed to the legislative system, will be slow to yield up any one strong outpost which distinctly marks that federal system from the legislative system. I take it, Sir, that those who, for the last eighteen years, have enjoyed this right, have not only enjoyed, but appreciated the enjoyment of their right to define by themselves, in each Province, who shall have the right to vote to elect members to this House. I take it, Sir, that the introduction of a different system in this Parliament, the declaration by this Parliament that the right exercised by the different Provinces heretofore has been badly exercised, the declaration that this Parliament does not intend to allow them to exercise this privilege in future will be a declaration upon which every one who values the federal system ought to look upon with abhorrence, and I am somewhat surprised that from the Province of Quebec, at least, and among those who have been loudest in proclaiming their love of the federal system, outside of the gentlemen who have spoken from this side of the House, not one voice has been raised in favor of maintaining for the people the rights which they have for eighteen years enjoyed, and which, I venture the assertion, they have never abused.

An hon. MEMBER. Two have.

Mr. DAVIES. I am reminded that two have, and I thank my hon. friend for the reminder; I had forgotten them at the moment. I am proud to say that two have, but two only—the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) and the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Dupont). They had the manliness to avow and to express by their votes those convictions which they held, and which their compatriots have also declared they held during the two or three years that I have had a seat in this House. I have heard many hon. gentlemen on that side of the House proclaim themselves as strongly in favor of the federal system, and as being ready to be the first, whenever that system was attacked, to rush into the breach to defend it. But on this occasion, an occasion, I will venture to say, when that principle is involved more

than it has ever been involved heretofore, every one of those hon. gentlemen has maintained an ominous silence, or, if not, has given his adhesion to the principle proposed by the right hon. leader of the Government, which is the introduction of the legislative system of Government. When a change so vast is to be made in the manner of electing the members of this House, that change should not be made hastily or without being submitted to the judgment of the people themselves. It is almost a truism that the Parliament which receives a trust from the people should hand that trust back unimpaired. The representatives of Quebec in this Parliament came here elected by the people on a franchise made by themselves; and when they go back to their constituents they should hand back into the people's hands the rights they were entrusted with. They were trusts which the people confided to them to guard and not to surrender, even to the higher power of the Dominion Government, unless under the authority and by the mandate of their constituents. The same remark applies to gentlemen who come from other Provinces of the Dominion; and I ask this House, has there been any expression of opinion from any of the Provinces that they desire to surrender to this Parliament the right they have hitherto enjoyed, of declaring who shall and who shall not vote for members to sit in this House? Has a public meeting been held in any of the Provinces to declare that the rights held by the Provincial Legislatures should not be held by them? Have petitions flowed into this House to ask us to take away from the Provinces the rights which they have hitherto enjoyed, and which, no one can say, they have ever abused? I say it is not so. The people are satisfied, more than satisfied, and are determined, if they can, to prevent their representatives surrendering up this precious privilege into the hands of the Dominion Government. I say there are those here—and I ask them to mark my words—who will vote for transferring to the Dominion Parliament the right of saying who shall and who shall not vote, who will live to see the day when they will rue it. I make the remark because I have noticed that the free people of this Dominion, in all the Provinces, are very tenacious of the privileges they enjoy; and there is none—I speak, at any rate, for the English-speaking people of the Dominion—that they value more than the right to say who shall vote for the representatives they send to Parliament; and I warn those who are laying their violent hands on the constitution now, and are determined to wrest from the people the rights they enjoy, that they are doing it at their peril; I warn them that they will be brought face to face with the people whose rights they are surrendering and violating, and I tell them that it would be more manly and more consistent with the principles they give utterance to, at any rate, with their lips, if they would say to their leader: This is too great an innovation of the existing constitution, and before we can vote for it we will go back and ask our people what they think about it; we have no mandate from them to do this thing, and we decline to do it without their expressed authority. There have been no petitions and no public meetings asking us to do it; the press of the country has been silent; and if this measure is brought forward to gratify a political whim, or a piece of political malice on the part of one or two leading men of the party, those who are doing it are committing an act which they will live to rue before very long. When this Parliament went to the country in 187-, it never was mooted to the people that there was any intention to take from them the right to elect their own members; when you went back in 1882, you expressly told them that the only question on which you appealed to them was the one question, whether the National Policy was to be maintained or not; and I say, to turn around now, after you have been elected on that one issue, and that one issue alone, after deceiving the people, for it is nothing more or less, and leading them to believe that you were going, at the end of your term, to hand back the trusts they committed to your hands—I say, to take away those trusts from them now is to do an act of political violence which every man who takes part in it will regret.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. DAVIES. Hon. gentlemen are accustomed to laugh and sneer, but I think the events of the past year or two have taught them that the time is coming when they will be brought, not only face to face with the public, but with the constituents whose rights they have outraged; and I ask them, with all their loyalty—and I do not presume to question it—is this a time, above all others, when your young men are out fighting the battles of the country in the North-West——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

Mr. DAVIES. This is the very question now before the House. I ask is this a time to lay violent hands on the constitution, when the young men of the country, and the old men, too, are fighting to maintain its integrity? When they are being shot down by those who are up in rebellion against the flag and against the constituted authority, is this a time to come forward and wrest from the people those privileges which they value so highly, and which they have enjoyed from the time Confederation was established to the present time. Perhaps it is a fitting time; perhaps no more fitting time could be taken. If the outrage is to be committed at all, it is fitting that it should be committed at a time which will make it much more outrageous that at any other time. We were told, up to to-night, at least, that the great object sought by this Bill was to establish uniformity throughout the several Provinces of the Dominion; that it was upon that principle that the Bill was introduced. We were told it was highly indecorous, highly improper, that different franchises should exist in British Columbia and in Ontario and in Prince Edward Island, and the great object sought to be attained was to establish a uniform system. What are we told to-night? The hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron), whether inspired or not, I do not know, rises in his place and tells us that the object is not to obtain uniformity at all. What, then, is the object and purpose of the Bill? This Bill is the Bill of the leader of the Government, the emanation of his mind; its object may not be uniformity, but it is to suppress and, if possible, to extinguish one of the great parties of the State. When Bills of this magnitude and importance are introduced in the English Parliament is this the course that is taken? Did you ever hear of an English Premier at the fag end of the Session, dragging in a Bill to alter the constitution of the country, and in the dying hours of the Session trying to pass it through by force; and so far as the majority are concerned, with a predetermination that discussion should not take place upon it? I do not charge all my hon. friends opposite with a desire to suppress discussion; but I do charge large numbers of them with that desire; and I appeal to the historical fact that when two or three of the most important principles of the Bill were under discussion, whether it was not true that instead of discussion we had a dozen or two speeches, all delivered from one side of the House alone. Parliamentary discussion does not consist in the Opposition giving their criticism and the Government allowing them to go unanswered, but in the Opposition offering their criticisms and in those criticisms being replied to. We have had the spectacle in this Parliament of criticisms, which were mainly criticisms that could not be successfully answered, being made, and to this day they remain in the *Hansard* without any attempt being made on the part of the Government to say a word in reply. What arguments have we heard from hon. gentlemen opposite? We have had

from them but a sneer and a laugh, their object being to obliterate the great Liberal party of the Dominion. They may succeed, but I think they will not. I have not read history that way; I find that when a violent and improper or a fraudulent attack is made upon the rights of a people, or upon the rights of one of the great parties of the State, nine times out of ten that attempt recoils like a boomerang upon the heads of those who begin it. They will find that there exists in the minds of the people such a sense of right, such a sense of justice, such an inherent hatred of tyranny and oppression, that they will, by a large majority, refuse to condone or to assent to this outrage which is being attempted to be committed on the Liberal party. Let us see whether the hon. gentleman's statement, that uniformity was not one of the objects of the Bill, tallies with the record. We find that this Bill has been the cherished ideal of the leader of the Government for many years. It is a matter of history. Every one knows that the hon. gentleman has a strong predilection in favor of a legislative form of government. From the time Confederation was established the object of the hon. gentleman's life has been by slow degrees to educate his party up to that pitch when they will accept every principle which it is desirable they should accept to make this a legislative union. Step by step the hon. gentleman has gone on; thwarted here by the great Liberal party; thwarted there by the people, who have risen up in fear at the attempt he has made; thwarted occasionally by opposition in his own ranks, he has steadily and persistently been going on to the one end, the great ambition of his life, to make this what he hoped it would be when Confederation was carried out, a legislative union. So far back as 1867, when the first Parliament of this Dominion met, one of the first measures he promised to bring down was a measure to make a uniform franchise throughout the Dominion. He reached forth his hand to seize upon the rights of the Provinces the very first time he met the first Parliament of the Dominion. The hon. gentleman declared then:

"You will be asked to consider measures for the establishment of uniform laws relating to elections and the trial of controverted elections."

The key-note was struck in the Governor General's speech, a speech prepared by the right hon. gentleman, the very first Parliament that met after Confederation was an accomplished fact. Then, after going on to explain that a Bill of that character, to unify the laws of the several Provinces, was so comprehensive in its character and so filled with detail that it could not be discussed, except a whole Session was given up to such a Bill alone, he goes on further to declare that other matters would prevent it being taken up in the Parliament that Session. In 1869 he again promises that "Bills will be presented to you for the establishment of uniform and amended laws respecting parliamentary elections." In 1870 he again puts in the mouth of the Governor General the following words:

"The laws in force, on the subject of the elective franchise and the regulation of parliamentary elections in the several Provinces of the Dominion, vary very much in their operations, and it is important that a uniform provision should be made, settling the franchise and regulating the elections to the House of Commons, and measures upon these subjects will be submitted to your consideration."

Again he says:

"It is important a provision should be made, settling the franchise and regulating the elections."

Again, in 1873, after Prince Edward Island had thrown in her fortunes with the Dominion, the hon. gentleman put in the Speech from the Throne the following statement:

"By the postponement of this measure from last Session—a measure to make a uniform law throughout the Dominion—you will have the advantage of including in its provisions the Province of Prince Edward Island, now happily united to Canada."

So you see the statement made by the hon. member for

Inverness, that the object of the Bill is not to create uniformity, is a statement at variance with history and with the facts. The facts are, that the object of the hon. gentleman is, and always has been, to take away from the Legislatures of the Provinces every right he could wrest from them, and the intention, from the beginning, was to take away the right of declaring who shall elect members to this House. There has been a good deal of discussion by those who have condescended, from the Government benches, to take part in the discussion as to the right of this Parliament to pass such a law. The principles of the constitution have been invoked, constructions have been put upon it, and we have been asked, in long and voluble orations, to listen to hon. gentlemen arguing that the constitutional right to pass such a law is vested in this Parliament. It is not a question of the power of this Parliament to pass the law; that power has never been challenged by this side of the House. The language of the British North America Act is plain enough. The power under it to pass a law such as is before us, it is clear, is vested in this Parliament. That was never denied; what we deny is the propriety and the justice of exercising that right which the constitution declares, until the time has arrived when you should exercise it, shall be left with the Provinces themselves. I call upon those who say the time has arrived when they shall seize this right to themselves to point out the causes which have rendered it necessary. What Province has abused it? What people have abused the trust? Is it true that it is not to vindicate the power which the constitution gives you that you are attempting to exercise it? Is it true that it is not because the people have abused the right? Is it true that it is not because the people have asked you to make the change? Is the charge true, which has been hurled across the House from this side, and has not been answered up to the present moment, that it is an attempt, a wicked attempt, a violent, wicked attempt, to legislate into power a party which has lost the confidence of the country? That, I say, is the secret; that is the reason why hon. gentlemen who cannot defend the Bill with their voices, but are prepared to vote in favor of it, are urging their leader on to carry it through this House. No man with the experience and reputation and ability of the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, no great party with the prestige which attaches to the Conservative party of this Dominion, would otherwise have dared to propose a Bill outraging, as this does, the principles of common justice, and vesting the right to elect the candidate in the returning officer instead of the people. There must be an underlying cause, and I believe the cause and the motive is by Act of Parliament to declare, so far as they can do so, that the Conservative party shall rule in this country, whether they have the confidence of the people or not. Hon. gentlemen have descanted upon the necessity of uniformity. Uniformity in the franchise is a very pretty thing at the first blush, but uniformity in name is not necessarily uniformity in reality. If you have a homogeneous people, with one set of customs, with one religion, with the same habits, and with a fair diffusion of wealth among them all, it is just possible to have a uniform system of representation; but where you have a country like Canada, with seven or eight different Provinces, with different nationalities, different creeds, different occupations, different languages, different customs and different laws, when you have a heterogeneous mass, such as that, if you attempt to force a nominal uniformity upon them the result is diversity and not uniformity. What may be very right for Ontario may be very wrong for Prince Edward Insland; what may be right for British Columbia may be wrong for Quebec; it may be quite proper to give a man with a certain qualification the right to vote in British Columbia, but it does not by any means follow that it is right to do the same thing in Prince Edward Island. In the one case you

may be enlarging the franchise and in the other you may be restricting it. You have no right to do it. While I admit your legal right, I deny your moral competence to disfranchise the people. In the Maritime Provinces you find many people who make their living in ways which are different from those of the interior Provinces. Those who go down to the sea in ships and do their business upon the great waters, these fishermen may not own much real estate, and you propose to make real estate only the qualification for voting. Why should it be so? The uniformity which you are seeking is at the expense of fair play, at the expense of justice, at the expense of long-established usage and custom; it is a uniformity so glaring, so outrageous, that already one hon. gentleman has risen in his place and proposed that one Province shall be an exception to it. The outrage is such, as far as that Province is concerned, that even he, strong supporter of the Government as he is, cannot submit to it. He knows that, if he did submit to it, and the other members from that Province know it also, the result would be for them political annihilation at the hands of those who sent them here. And what expression of opinion have we had from any one on the Government benches in regard to this important proposal? Has there been a whisper from the Treasury benches that they are going to reject this? The hon. gentleman from Montmagny (Mr. Landry) indicated that he would not vote for it; that, if it were granted, he would insist on the same thing being granted to Quebec. He is right; but I shall wait with interest to see what the result will be in relation to this amendment, about which I shall speak at greater length presently. This principle of uniformity is not one which commands the entire approval of the Conservative party. I know there are men on the other side who do not agree with it. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend) said, that if the Bill took away from the people any of the rights they had heretofore possessed it ought not to pass. Well, it does take away those rights. In New Brunswick it takes away the personal property qualification which has existed there for twenty-five years, and will disfranchise nearly a quarter of the electors in Prince Edward Island; and from Manitoba and British Columbia it takes away rights which they have previously enjoyed. Will the hon. gentleman be true to his words, and will he oppose and vote down this Bill which deprives these people of their rights? In looking over the debates on the Election Bill of 1874, I find that our worthy Speaker himself held opinions similar to those which have been proposed from this side of the House:

"Mr. KIRKPATRICK said he had come to the conclusion that the proposal to leave the franchise to the Provincial Legislatures was the best. The Dominion was too widespread, and the interests of the people too diverse, to make a cast-iron rule with regard to the franchise."

That was the belief of the hon. gentleman who has been elected to the high position of Speaker of this House. I have no doubt that he has not changed his opinion since. I believe in my heart that there are many on the other side who entertain the same opinion now. I believe that many of them would not have remained silent during this long debate if they had been in full sympathy with the provisions contained in this Bill. The amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk asks us to affirm the principle that the Provincial Legislatures are best qualified to decide who should elect the members of this House, and is it not patent that this is the fact? Look at the debates for the last few weeks. An hon. gentleman from British Columbia insists on the exclusion of the Chinese from the power to exercise the franchise because the people of British Columbia desire it. I am the last man in this House to attempt to force upon the people of British Columbia what they do not want. They are the best judges, as the hon. gentlemen from that Province say themselves; but I ask why they do not carry out their proposition to its logical conclusion. I ask why, if British Columbia knows best what franchise suits her, she should not determine it, and, if so, why Prince Edward Island should not do the same. What do the British Columbia members know about the Maritime Provinces? What do they know about New Brunswick and Nova Scotia? What do they know as to the working in those Provinces of the personal property qualification? They know nothing, and the same remark applies to Manitoba. Very few hon. gentlemen in this House have ever visited Manitoba. They do not know what qualification will suit the people there; they are not competent to judge. The interests of the Dominion are so diverse, the extent of the Dominion is so vast, the qualification that suits one part is so unsuitable to the others, that it is altogether improper and wrong for this collective Parliament to attempt to force upon the individual Provinces the franchise, and determine a qualification about which the majority of them know nothing. The whole thing arises from a little bit of jealousy, I believe, a little bit of rivalry, between the right hon. gentleman who controls this Parliament and the hon. gentleman who leads the great Liberal party of Ontario. It is an attempt to crush out the Liberal party in Ontario, and the other parts of the Dominion have got to suffer for his petty jealousy, which is unworthy a man occupying the high position of the right hon. gentleman. Sir, what argument have we coming from the Secretary of State the other day? The only argument he advanced in favor of this Bill was, that it was undignified to let the Provinces determine for themselves who should elect the men they sent here to represent them. Undignified! Why is it undignified? Is the spectacle which he sees to the south of the line an undignified one? He sees forty-five or fifty great States—Empires, some of them—constituting together the United States of America, each one of them possessing, by the constitution of the United States, the absolute right to determine who shall elect members to the Congress of the United States. Has that ever been considered an undignified position? By no means, Sir. The Government of that country is one of the grandest spectacles now to be seen in the world. It is a spectacle of the whole people ruling themselves, and ruling themselves well; a spectacle of the whole people ruling themselves in such a way that freedom flourishes and abounds, and that peace, prosperity and contentment reigns in the several States of the great Union. Why are the people satisfied? Why do peace and prosperity reign there? Because, Sir, of the great boon given them, of being able to say who shall represent them and who shall make their laws. But if they were not allowed to make their laws, if another power made the laws and forced them upon the people, you would not see the same peace, the same prosperity and the same obedience. I say the argument used by the Secretary of State is unworthy of a gentleman occupying the position he does. I say, Sir, this Bill is bad, because it takes away from the Provinces the rights which they have enjoyed the past eighteen years, and not one member has dared to get up and say they have ever been abused. I say it takes away from them the rights which the people value; it is taking them away against their will, and therefore I say that on these grounds, if on no other, the Bill should be condemned by every Liberal, and every man who loves to carry out the wishes of the people he represents. I say, Sir, the Bill is bad again, because, having determined to take to yourselves rights which the several Provinces have enjoyed heretofore, you have placed the franchise on a bad basis. I say that you have ignored intelligence as the basis upon which a man should have the right to vote; you have ignored education as a basis, or a test, which should entitle a man to vote; I say you have ignored citizenship as a basis, or a test, upon which a man should have the right to

vote; I say you have placed that right upon the lowest ground, in my opinion, upon which it can be placed, namely, the possession by the individual of $150 worth of land. Sir, does the possession of $150 worth of land augur the possession of those faculties which a man should possess to entitle him to vote? Does it augur that those who do not possess land have not sufficient intelligence to entitle them to vote? Does it justify the exclusion of those whom you propose to exclude? I say it does not. I say the lines on which your legislation proceeds are improper lines, unjust lines, lines that cannot remain for many years, which must be uprooted and new principles must take their place, if this Parliament determines that it shall continue to keep to itself the rights which you are now usurping from the Provinces. I say more than that; you trample upon the rights which the Province I come from has enjoyed for the last thirty years. Thirty years ago that little Province fought for and succeeded in obtaining the great boon of responsible government, the same boon which people fought for in old Canada—the right of the people to rule themselves. They gained a victory, after a hard struggle, and the first thing they did after gaining the victory was to introduce a Bill declaring that universal franchise should be the rule, and that universal education should also be the rule, in the little island. They were among the first in this country to establish the great principle of free education. Every man's child there, for the part thirty years, has had the right to receive a free education at the hands of the State. They have received a free education; the people are an intelligent people; the people are an educated people. I say the young men who, for thirty years past, those who have grown up from generation to generation and have exercised the great boon which the legislators of thirty years ago gave them, have proved, by the result of their voting and by the legislation of those whom they elected, that they are worthy the great boon bestowed upon them, and it rests with this Parliament, it rests with the right hon. gentleman, it rests with the Conservative party, to stop in and commit the violent outrage of taking away from those people those rights they have enjoyed. What have they done, that they could be so treated? Can you point to one act in their legislation which deserves the punishment you are now seeking to inflict upon them? Sir, you are taking from them rights they value as dearly as any other political privilege they possess—a right which they have fought for, which they gained after a desperate struggle, and which, I tell you, they are not going to lose without a desperate struggle, either. I say, not only in their local politics, but in their Dominion politics, they have done nothing to justify this punishment. I call upon hon. gentlemen who fill the Treasury benches, and who are about to commit this outrage, to justify it, if they can, and give this Parliament the reasons. Hon. gentlemen who come from Ontario may not know why we should be punished. Then, Sir, if there are reasons, if those who are seeking to punish Prince Edward Island know any reasons, let them come forward and give those reasons to the House. They are committing an outrage. They are disfranchising one-third of my constituents. They are doing that without reason. They are doing an act which I believe the people will resent.

Mr. HESSON. Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that one-third of his constituents are paupers; that they are not able to possess $150 worth of land to qualify?

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman who interrupts me may not accept my statement upon that point. But I will read to him from the language of his own leader, and the lieutenant of his own leader. In 1874 the then Chief Justice, the Hon. Mr. Dorion, introduced an election Bill into this House, one of the provisions of which was that for a temporary period, until the Local Legislature passed a registration law, manhood suffrage should cease, and no man should vote unless he possessed $300 worth of real estate. That temporary provision evoked a storm from one end of Prince Edward Island to another—a legitimate storm, a justifiable storm, I say, because, even as a temporary provision it was unfortunate. Upon that occasion I find that Sir Charles Tupper, then Mr. Tupper, rose in his place in this House and read a letter from Senator Howland, protesting against taking away universal suffrage from Prince Edward Island, stating that it would rob three-fourths of the present electorate of their votes, the great majority of whom were Roman Catholics. The hon. gentleman was misinformed. He put the number far beyond what I do; it would not disfranchise three-fourths, but it would disfranchise a great many. Sir John A. Macdonald contended that wrong was being done by placing restraint upon instead of extending the franchise, and that proposal coming, too, from a Liberal Government. He asserted that none of the reasons which urged the Government to make this change were satisfactory, and the country generally, and Prince Edward Island particularly, would be of that opinion, too. That was the opinion of Sir John A. Macdonald, that was the opinion of Sir Charles Tupper, respecting a provision that was only temporary in its character, and was only to last ten months. Mr. Laird, who then represented the island in the Cabinet, informed the House that he had the pledge of the local Premier that a registration Bill would be passed during the then coming Session of the Legislature, when universal suffrage would again be restored to the people. So, even an attempt to disfranchise the people of the island for twelve months was denounced in the most eloquent and forcible language—by whom? By those men who to-day are themselves committing the outrage, and committing it not temporarily, but for all time. The hon. gentleman, in 1874, said that the country would take note of this great violence done to Prince Edward Island, and would be of opinion that the change was uncalled for and unjustifiable. I repeat the language of the hon. gentleman now, and I tell him that any attempt to carry this great change through and inflict a grievous outrage on the people of the island will have the effect, unless retracted, of leading the people of the island to punish hon. gentlemen opposite. In regard to the number that would be disfranchised, I give the opinion of the late Governor of Prince Edward Island, who at that time was a senator in the other branch of the Legislature—Senator Haviland. He said:

"The only thing he felt sore upon in this Bill was the provision with reference to the franchise. This Bill would rob a third of the electors of Prince Edward Island of their votes. They had had universal suffrage in Prince Edward Island for twenty years, and it had given so much satisfaction that if a man got upon the platform there and advocated a retrograde movement to a property qualification for electors, he would not get twenty votes in the Province."

We are one on this questson in Prince Edward Island—Liberals and Tories alike. We say that young men who have exercised the franchise for thirty years have not abused it, but have exercised it fairly well. And we say to hon. gentlemen opposite, that this is an attempt to take away their rights, and to rob them of one of the dearest privileges they possess. This is to be done without reasons being given, without an explanation, and in silence; and I ask hon. gentlemen opposite how such conduct can be justified? It is an outrage upon my constituents, and upon the people of the island as a whole. I took occasion, when this clause was up before, to express my intention to submit an amendment. If the object is attained by the hon. gentleman who has since moved the amendment to the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk, I should be satisfied. I care not how the outrage may be averted, or by whom the motion may be made. I wish the people to continue to enjoy the privilege they have exercised with so much credit to themselves. I gave notice of a motion in

the following words, which I ask permission to be alloweed to read to the committee:

That the provisions of this section shall not apply to the Province of Prince Edward Island, but the qualification of persons entitled to vote for the election of members of the House of Commons in that Province shall be such as is now, or, from time, to time shall be provided by the Legislature of the said Province for the election of members of the House of Assembly of that Province.

Throw away the principle of universal suffrage? No; but embody it in your Bill. Do not hon. gentlemen opposite understand the meaning of language—that in the island now we have universal manhood suffrage, and we desire to retain that franchise.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). And change it, when the Local Legislature wishes to change it.

Mr. DAVIES. Is a man so hide-bound to party as to be averse to allowing the people of the Province to change their franchise if they wish to do so? Not, however, at the whim of a Tory majority in Ontario, but according to the desire of the people themselves. If they choose to change it, why should you object? I deny your moral competency to object. You know nothing of the conditions under which they live, nothing of their social conditions, nothing as to their requirements. You may sneer at the people of Prince Edward Island; but let me tell you they are as competent to manage their own affairs as are the people of Ontario. I denounce this act as unjust. I say it is an outrage on the people, who, when they came into this Dominion, assumed that their rights would be protected, and from one end of the island to the other there will re echo Senator Haviland's words, that not twenty men will be found to endorse a retrogade movement, who will endorse this proposal of the Dominion Government to curtail the rights they have so long and so wisely exercised.

Mr. TUPPER. I do not rise to continue the discussion; but in the absence of the leader of the Opposition I wish to protest against the violence of the language used by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. He spent a great deal of time in denouncing as outrageous any attempt to dictate, on the part of this Parliament, to any Province, as to what men should vote and who should not vote. The hon. gentleman seemed to strive, from time to time, to use even stronger language in denouncing such an attempt. The hon. gentleman must, however, remember that his leader advocated that principle and exercised that right which the hon. gentleman himself admits this Parliament possesses. Everyone who knows anything upon the subject has admitted that the Federal Parliament has the right to dictate to the Provinces what the franchise should be in those Provinces in connection with the election of members to this House. That right is admitted; the propriety of exercising that right is questioned. It is on a proposal to exercise it that the hon. gentleman has denounced the action as outrageous. In 1871, when a Bill was in committee to make temporary provision for the election of members to serve in the House of Commons of Canada, the leader of the Opposition of the present day (Mr. Blake), then a member of the Opposition of that day, actually propounded this very principle, so vigourously and violently denounced by the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies); because, in discussing the question of disqualification or laying down rules as to persons who should not vote, the present leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blake) moved:

"That the said Bill does not provide for the disqualification of voters in Nova Scotia as Government servants.

"That the principle on which the disqualification is based is general, and should be applied to Nova Scotia, whereas in Ontario and Quebec the voting is open."

Now, I say that the amendment of the hon. gentleman is exactly upon a similar principle as the Bill now before the House. Of course, in those days, when the Opposition was led by the late Premier of this country (Mr. Mackenzie), this question was before this House on one or two occasions, and perhaps it was due to his inability to see these things, as they really were presented, or for some reason or other, that this wonderful expression of indignation lay dormant, and that we never heard anything like the expressions of indignation in regard to this outrageous principle ——

Mr. DAVIES. Will the hon. gentleman excuse me. Did he hear me read from the speech of Sir Charles Tupper in 1874.

Mr. TUPPER. Yes, I did; and I was not at all surprised that the hon. gentleman should fall back on the utterances of that gentleman now, to strengthen his position; but the hon. gentleman having interrupted me with regard to that point, it is only necessary for me to remind him that they were not then discussing the question of a general franchise, the question of giving and taking between the different Provinces, which is necessary when a uniform franchise is being discuesed. The question was as to a particular Province of the Dominion, and therefore I cannot see the importance or the relevancy of that letter which the hon. gentleman has dwelt upon. I say that the principle underlying this Bill underlies the amendment which was moved at that time, and that he did by that amendment attempt to dictate to the Province of Nova Scotia what its franchise should be. I merely rose to call attention to this matter, because I did not think he knew it, and I think the leader of the Opposition would have been grived to find so faithful a follower of his rising and denouncing his conduct on that occasion.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not intend to take the ground that the Dominion Parliament has not power to alter or establish a franchise for the Dominion. I do not profess to be lawyer enough to say whether such is the case or not. I have heard able men take both views. But whether the Dominion Parliament has power to do so or not, one thing is certain: the Dominion Parliament has done it already. In 1875 this Parliament provided, in one of the Acts passed in that year, that the franchise in all the old Provinces of the Confederation, as they then existed, or as the Provinces might make them, should be the franchise for the election of members to the Dominion Parliament, and that statute is in force to-day, so that really we have a Dominion franchise adopted by the Dominion Parliament. Now, Sir, while I neither deny nor affirm the right of the Dominion Parliament to establish a Dominion franchise, the question comes up: Is it either expedient or necessary that they should do so? Before such a serious step should be taken, one involving so much cost and such great changes, there should be some strong reasons given for the course adopted. So far as I have heard from hon. gentlemen opposite, from the leader of the Government, and others who have spoken, I have never heard but one tangible reason advanced for passing a Dominion Franchise Bill, and that was that it was necessary to have a uniform franchise throughout the whole Dominion. Well, I am not prepared to admit that there is much in that. It is a mere matter of taste. It may sound well to have a uniform franchise from one end of the Dominion to the other, but there may be difficulties in carrying it out which may render it actually impracticable to do so. And, Sir, we see that that difficulty is beginning to show itself. We have almost the assertion, as regards one Province of the Confederation, that the principle is going to be set aside. There is a motion to retain the present franchise of Prince Edward Island—to make an exception in their favor. Should that be done, the only feasible excuse which has ever been offered for passing a Dominion Franchise Bill falls to the ground, and the only feature which has been pleaded on its behalf is lost. Now, Sir, in the few minutes which I intend to take up the time of the

committee, I shall point out, first of all, one or two of the great objections to such a measure. The first objection is the objection of cost. I have stated already, since this matter came up for discussion, that it is going to involve a very large expenditure. We are going to have another horde of officials saddled on the country, all drawing salaries, all eating up the hard earnings of the people, all living on the earnings of the people, and to that extent diminishing the national wealth. In fact, they are going to be an army of non-producers. The work they perform has no practical utility or usefulness for national purposes. I submit that the present is not an opportune time to incur additional expenditure. I need not remind hon. gentlemen that the finances of the country are not in an altogether prosperous condition; that in the present year we are threatened with a deficit; that the expenses are increasing in every Department; that the expenditures are increasing in every Department of public business, and that in the face of a falling revenue is certainly a sufficient reason why the Government should begin to economise and try to make the receipts equal to the expenditure. And then, Sir, there is another reason, on the gound of convenience. I need not tell hon. gentlemen that the Government is bound, so far as is consistent with the public interest, to consult the convenience of the people, and to see that the people are not put to any unnecessary trouble or expense. Sir, in the introduction of any new measure of this character a great deal of inconvenience must necessarily be experienced. There is all the confusion and trouble of having two sets of franchises, of seeing that the rights of the people to the franchise are preserved, of seeing that no one who is entitled to vote is left off the list of voters. That has been found in the past, in actual practice, to involve a large amount of trouble and inconvenience, and immense amount of expense. I wish to draw the attention of the committee to another fact, that the parties likely to be put to this inconvenience and expense are those who are least likely to be able to bear it—those who, having small amounts of property, will have their right to vote brought into dispute, and those are the ones who are least able to bear the expense involved. And if you look at the provisions of the Bill, and take into consideration the awkward shape in which our constituencies have been laid out for gerrymander purposes, and if you consider the fact that the first appeal is perhaps the only chance of appeal against the voters' list before these revising officers, you will see that the people may be required to travel large distances—in some cases thirty, forty or fifty miles, or further, and you can easily understand how it becomes almost impossible for a poor man, under those circumstances, to assert his right, to have his name put on the voters' list. On these grounds we see serious objections to the enactment of this law at the present time, and I would again urge upon the committee that by retaining the law in its present form all this cost and trouble will be avoided by the people. Now, I wish to say a word or two about the provincial franchise, upon which members have been elected to serve in this House. These, I believe, if carefully examined, will be found, from one end of the Dominion to the other, to be just and reasonable. There is one objection to a uniform franchise for the Dominion, that it makes changes which ought not to be made in the provincial franchises. So far as Ontario is concerned, this Bill, by raising the qualification, disfranchises a number who are now entitled, under the provincial law, to the franchise. I was a little surprised at some remarks made by some hon. gentlemen opposite last evening, who spoke disparagingly of the assessors of Ontario. Gentlemen whom I thought ought to have known better, intimated as much as that these assessors were so partisan in their feelings that they allowed those feelings to get the better of their judgment, and that consequently the assessment roll was not to be depended upon. I am sorry that such an assertion was made. I happen to know a great many of the assessors, and, take them all in all, so far as I am acquainted with them, they are an excellent class of men. The necessities of the case require that they should be such. Their office is one of the most important municipal offices. It is upon the assessment roll made by these assessors that the taxes for municipal purposes are levied; and hon. gentlemen can easily see that it is of the first importance that they should be men of intelligence and of sound judgment, as well as men of integrity of purpose, who will do the right; and I believe that ninety-nine out of every 100 of the assessors of Ontario are men of that character. But if they fail to do their duty properly, there is a remedy. The municipal law provides that if any man's assessment is lowered below what will qualify him to vote, he can appeal to the court of revision. The assessors perform their duties under oath, and the court of revision, composed of five men, are also sworn to do what is right between man and man. That court is held in each township, village, town and city, so that there is every opportunity for anyone who feels aggrieved to obtain redress. The court of revision examine the roll and add names which are improperly left off, or remove those which ought not to be on. If the party fails to procure justice there, he has a further appeal to the county judge. The county judges hold courts for the revision of the voters' lists in each municipality of the riding, and from the class of judges we have in Ontario, every man can fully depend on having substantial justice done to him.

Mr. WHITE. He will have the same now.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Under all these circumstances, if there is a man whose property qualification entitles him to vote in the Province of Ontario, and who is left off the roll, he has no one to blame but himself. It is far different with the provisions of the Bill now before the House. The right of appeal is absolutely denied from the act of the revising barrister; there is simply an appeal to himself against himself; but I intend to show, when the proper time comes, that even that right of appeal is simply a mockery. As I have said already, many constituencies have been left in so strange a shape that when the first revision is held it would be almost impossible for those who feel themselves aggrieved to attend, unless at a great cost and with a great deal of trouble. Hon. gentlemen may say that there is a second revision, but the law is so framed that if the revising officer sees fit, he can render that second revision absolutely null and void. One hon. gentleman the other day objected to using the provincial franchises, on the ground that under the Act lately passed by the Ontario Legislature plurality of voting was denied, that is, a man owning property in different electoral districts was denied the right to vote in each. I cannot see that that is an objection. On the contrary, it seems to me that it is one of the best features of the law. Whether rightly or wrongly, we have made property the test of the qualification to vote in our parliamentary elections; and while that is the case, I submit that the amount or the number of pieces of property a man has is no standard by which to judge of the amount he contributes to the revenue of the country. The fact of the matter is, you will often find that it is the reverse, and it is worthy of note that our tariff is so framed that the poor man, in proportion to what he uses, pays the largest amount of revenue into the Treasury. I happen to be one of those who, under the old law, would have been entitled to a plurality of votes; that is, I could vote in different divisions. I have a near neighbor who could buy me out twice over any day of the week, who owns a large property and farms a large tract of land, and who contributes three times the amount of revenue that I contribute, yet he

has only one vote, while I can vote in different electoral divisions, if I see fit to do so. On what principle of equity or common justice should I have two or three votes, while that gentleman has only one? I consider that one of the best features of the late Act of the Ontario Legislature. But, with regard to the present Bill, there are other features which render it one we ought not to adopt. I was pleased to hear the Premier yesterday somewhat modify the statement he made a few days ago. A few days ago he stated he intended to extend the franchise to all the Indians, wherever they possessed the qualifications prescribed, even to those on the far western plains, such as Poundmaker, Pi-a-pot, and others. Yesterday, however, he very much narrowed that statement, and said he only intended the franchise to be given to the old Provinces that originally formed the Confederation. I am glad to see that he has taken one step in the right direction; but still, the objectionable feature remains, that even in the old Provinces this Bill proposes that the Indians, who remain wards of the Government, are to have the franchise conferred on them.

Mr. WHITE. Many of them are as intelligent as you and I.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Very likely, but still they are in a condition of servitude. They should be placed on the same footing of freedom as the hon. gentleman and myself, and then I would have no objection to giving them a vote.

Mr. WHITE. So far as the Mohawks are concerned, they are independent of any Government, for they are getting the interest of their money.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Who has the handling of the money? Is it not doled out by the agent? Are these Indians not under the same tutelage as others? They have no property that they call their own; every foot of property is under the control of the Government; they cannot sell it or mortgage it; they are debarred from all the privileges of citizenship.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is out of order. We are not discussing the Indian question at all, but whether Prince Edward Island is to be exempted from the operation of the Bill, and also on the main amendment, whether we should adopt the provincial franchise.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I was just about concluding when I was drawn into the discussion of the Indian by the remarks of the hon. member for Hastings. From all the objectionable features in the Bill, it is one that should not be passed by this Parliament. I believe we should still retain the provincial franchises, as we have during the past eighteen years; during all that time we have heard of no cause of complaint, and I think we ought to have left well enough alone.

The committee rose and reported progress.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1:20 a.m., (Wednesday.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 6th May, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SETTLERS AND HALF-BREED CLAIMS—PRINCE ALBERT AND NEIGHBORING DISTRICTS.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders are called, I desire to call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to a return which was presented yesterday in answer to an Order of the House of the 7th March, 1883, for copies of all correspondence and memorials relating to the claims of the inhabitants of Prince Albert and the neighboring districts in the North-West Territories, in respect of the lands they occupied and to other matters affecting their condition. This return was presented the 5th May last, and it has so failed to answer the Order of the House that I am sure it has not received that supervision at the hands of whatever Minister may be responsible for seeing that the Order of the House is obeyed which it ought to have. There was a debate on that motion in which the circumstance of the inhabitants of Prince Albert and the neighboring districts were stated, amongst others, by myself who moved the motion, and that debate is reported in the Official Debates. I refer to the petition of the settlers to this House which had been placed in the hands of the members and was laid on the Table of the House, and still on record as containing the substance of their claims; I referred to the claim that some of the settlers had gone to that territory before its transfer to the Dominion and that they had been promised that their claim would be recognised at Ottawa, but that they had not received their patents or any final solution or their claims. I referred also to the claims of the settlers between 1870 and 1879, to their demand for a land office, to the refusal to allow purchases of improved sections at $1 per acre, and to the allegation that there were purchases over their heads by others. I referred to the claim of some of the inhabitants that they should be placed on the same footing as those resident in Manitoba at the same time, and this claim had reference to the difficulties of both whites and half-breeds, one clause referring to the one and the other clause referring to the other. I referred to complaints with reference to the mail service and the Saskatchewan improvements and the grievances alleged to have arisen out of the operation of colonisation companies. In the course of the same debate, the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) pointed out that there had been a delegation of half-breeds and of pioneers from Ontario to Ottawa, claiming the lands on which they had settled; that there had been surveys without regard to the lines of the old properties which had aroused suspicion resulting in a meeting of the settlers who had represented to the Government the justice of respecting their property; that their claims had in this respect been conceded by the Government and that a land office had also been promised. Now the return which was brought down was presented yesterday, the 5th May. By the papers it contains it appears that it was despatched to the Secretary of State by the Department of the Interior in three parcels, one on the 18th April, the second on the 20th April, the third on the 21st of April. It was prepared as a return by the Secretary of State on the 21st April and bears his signature as prepared for presentation on that day; but it was retained and not brought down to the House during the interval between the 21st April and the 5th May. On looking at it, I find it contains many papers which are subsequent in date to the 7th March, 1883. Probably nine-tenths of the papers embraced in the return being of dates subsequent to that. I do complain of this, for I particularly requested the hon. gentleman that in view of the delay which had taken place in the presentation of the return, he would carry the papers down to as late a date as possible; but I stated it merely to show the House how little of the return comprises the earlier correspondence and papers asked for. Of these which were called for there are hardly any. There was a petition from the half-breeds early in 1878 that was sent through Governor Laird in the summer of 1878, and has been made public, and there was a memorial in the North-West council in the summer of 1878, both of which have been made public. I do not intend, to bar these, to refer particularly to any of these papers I have mentioned to

hon. gentlemen opposite on a former occasion. All the rest of the papers which I am about to refer to appear by the papers contained in this return to exist; we have the evidence that they exist in the return brought down. There is the statement not brought down as to the Order in Council dated 19th October, 1882; there is a statement, shown by the report of Mr. Lindsey Russell of 28th April, 1883, that there had been urgent application by the settlers for speedy titles, those applications are not brought down. The assistant agent, it appears by a letter of the 19th September, 1883, was ordered to take evidence on the French half-breed claims, as being familiar with the language, but no report of his action is brought down. The agent was ordered to discontinue taking entries from these persons, the French half-breeds, until specially informed as to his duty, but no copy of the paper giving him the information or further order is brought down. The letter of 16th October, 1883, shows that there were two letters of the 17th July and of the 25th July, from the Minister of the Interior, but neither of those letters is brought down. The papers show that there was an Order in Council of the 7th June, 1883, but that Order is not brought down. A telegram appears from Prince Albert, from Mr. Pearce to the Deputy Minister of the Interior, Mr. Burgess, but the date is not given, though it is material. So, in regard to a letter from Mr. Burgess to Mr. Pearce in reference to this telegram, the date is not given. So in regard to a letter from Mr. Hall to Mr. Deville, the date is not given, and the reply from Mr. Deville to Mr. Hall is not brought down. Mr. Pearce's report of 12th March, 1884, raises a question which he would not assume himself to decide, as to half-breeds and Indians, states that question at some length, and asks for a solution of it, but no copy of the decision is brought down. The same report of Mr. Pearce states that the half-breeds have not yet made entry for lands at Stobart, Duck Lake, and the South Branch of the Saskatchewan, as they were expecting a resurvey of their property into river lots, but none of the correspondence or orders or reports on the subject of the resurvey or of the survey are brought down. On March 5th, 1881, Mr. Pearce shows that the agent reported on claims made prior to the transfer of the territories; the report of the agent, however is not brought down. Mr. Pearce refers to a letter from the head office to the agent of the 14th January, 1879, as to the survey of the river lots; that letter, however, is not brought down. Mr. Pearce's report also shows that there was laid before the Minister a petition from the settlers as to the river frontage but the petition is not brought down, nor is the reply of the Minister to the petition brought down. Mr. Pearce's report also shows that, on the 11th March, 1882, the agent wrote on behalf of settlers at St. Laurent, asking for a river lot survey to be made, but the agent's letter is not brought down, nor is any reply to it brought down. Mr. Pearce's report shows that the head office replied on the 21st December, 1882, but that reply is not brought down. Mr. Pearce's report shows that there is correspondence on the files showing the intention of the Government as to the river surveys down to the spring of 1883, but that is not brought down. Mr. Pearce's report also shows that, in January, 1884, he was waited on by the Rev. Father Vezreville and the Hon. Charles Nolin on the subject of these river frontages, and that on the 17th January, 1884, he wrote to the Minister at their request on that subject, but Mr. Pearce's letter is not brought down, and no reply to it is brought down. Mr. Pearce's report shows a letter to the agent of the 2nd August, 1881, as to opening the office, but that is not brought down. Mr. Pearce's report shows that, in the summer of 1882, the agent received a copy of the instructions of January, 1882, but the letter covering those instructions is not brought down. Mr. Pearce's report shows that the Hon. Lawrence Clarke, who is a resident at Prince Albert, and I believe a chief factor of the Hudson's Bay Company, wrote to the minister enclosing resolutions passed at a meeting at Prince Albert on the 8th October, 1881, but neither the letter nor the resolutions are brought down. The fifth of these resolutions specifically refers to the half-breed claims and calls for their consideration on the basis that the same consideration should be given to the half-breeds of the territories that was given to the half-breeds of Manitoba by the Manitoba Act. Mr. Pearce's return shows that, on the 22nd of November, 1881, the Minister replied to the Hon. Lawrence Clarke, in full, but that reply is not brought down. Mr. Pearce's report shows that there was other correspondence on that subject, but that correspondence is not brought down. Mr. Pearce shows that, on the 14th April, 1882, there was a letter from the head office, which is not brought down. Then Mr. Pearce's letter of the 12th March, 1884, asks for the plans of Battleford and Edmonton and for the documents in reference to the claims at those points, but no reply to that letter is brought down. Mr. Burgess, as Deputy Minister, telegraphs on the 7th April, 1884, to say that the report of the land board as approved and to require the schedule to be sent to Ottawa. It appears from the papers that those schedules arrived at Ottawa, but nothing appears as to the approval of the schedules and the final disposition of the matter. A telegram of the 7th May, 1884, from Mr. Aquila Walsh to Mr. Hall, the acting secretary or the secretary, is brought down, but that is a reply to a telegram from Mr. Hall, and that telegram is not brought down. A telegram from Mr. Walsh to Mr. Burgess, of the 1st August, 1884, which is a reply also to a telegram from the Deputy Minister, is brought down, but the telegram from the Deputy Minister to which it is a reply is not brought down. It appears from the papers that there had been meanwhile some other correspondence, which is not brought down. There is a letter of the 1st August, 1884, from Mr. Walsh to the Minister, in which reference is made to a letter from the Minister which had modified in some respects the terms of Mr. Pearce's report; that letter of the Minister is not brought down, nor is there anything as to the final approval and issue of patents. And, while this is the case as to the general statement of the claims of the settlers, that portion of the return which the Minister sends in special to the hon. the Secretary of State, dealing with the half-breed claims at St. Laurent and Batoche and so forth, is still more defective than is the return on the other subjects. Inasmuch as this return has taken more than two years in preparation, I hope it will not be considered unreasonable if I ask that these deficiencies, and those other deficiencies which I indicated in a former speech but to which I do not now specifically allude, because I confine myself to what appears on the papers, with the one exception I have referred to, will be supplied at the earliest moment.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. MITCHELL. I desire to ask the Government if they have any information with relation to the recent fight in the North-West. There are rumors to the effect that they have received such information, and I think the public would like to know it.

Mr. CARON. The only information which the Department has received is a telegram from the operator at Winnipeg, confirming the news of the battle fought by Col. Otter on Poundmaker's reserve. There are no details given except those which appeared in the press despatches.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

On section 3,

Mr. YEO. I am very much opposed to this Bill in so far as it applies to Prince Edward Island. In Prince Edward Island we have, for the last thirty years, enjoyed manhood suffrage, and it has been found to work satisfactorily. I do not know what the object of the Government can be in changing our franchise in that Island. When the present Government returned to power in 1878, five out of the six members for that Island, supported the present Government, and if this is the way we are to be treated, if one-third of the constituents are to be disfranchised by the Government, I think it is something they ought to resist. Another great objection to the Bill, in my mind, is the fact that it will entail a very serious expense upon the country; and if the Government have any money to spend, beyond the actual requirements of the Finance Minister, it ought to be spent on public works which will be of utility to the country. So far as our franchise is concerned, this Bill is a retrograde measure, and puts us back to the days of the old family compact that existed in Prince Edward Island thirty years ago. Very few people then had the privilege of voting, but the Liberal party, by dint of hard fighting, managed to secure a majority in the Legislature and succeeded in obtaining responsible government. Soon after they obtained responsible government they gave the young men, and every man on the Island who was a resident, the privilege of voting; and if this Government is now to step in and take that privilege away from a great many of them, which they have enjoyed for upwards of thirty years, I think it is something the people of the Island will resent when the time arrives. It is the old family compact under a new form. In those days all the power was vested in the hands of a few favorites of the Conservative party: but as soon as the Liberals came into power they gave the Island a universal franchise, free education and free lands, and from that day to this contentment and prosperity have been enjoyed by the people of the Island. I think it is certainly a very illiberal proposition on the part of the Government to deprive a great many of our young men, such as school teachers, clerks and young mechanics, of the right of franchise, while they wish to extend it to the Indians. Our school teachers, clerks and young mechanics have always taken a very active interest in public affairs. I have had the honor of running four or five elections in Prince County, and I found, in each case, that the young men took as great an interest in politics as the older ones, and if they are now deprived of the franchise I think they will feel it a great injustice. When we entered the Union, we expected that our position would be improved; we did not expect to be treated in this way and used to meet the exigencies of any political party. It appears that almost everything that was formerly in the hands of the Local Legislature is to be taken away from them; and if this policy of centralisation is to go on much longer, this Government might as well take charge of the Local Legislatures altogether, for their usefulness will be gone. I think that every Province in the Dominion has a right to regulate its own franchise, upon which members are elected to this Parliament; and in view of this attempt of the Dominion Government to deprive the Provinces of that right, I think they should all take concerted action, and petition the Government to allow the franchise to remain as it is. There is no doubt this Parliament has the right to regulate the franchise if it chooses to do so, but when measures of so infamous a character as the one now brought down by the Government, on the very face of which is borne the imprint of iniquity, it is the duty of every honest, thinking man to oppose it and prevent its becoming law if possible. There are many other measures Parliament has a right to deal with if it sees fit, but that is no reason why it should exercise that power when in so doing public interests are sacrificed and the just rights of the people interfered with. I hope there are independent gentlemen enough in this House who will understand the situation of Prince Edward Island, and unite with me in inducing the Government to let us keep our own franchise. Prince Edward Island is differently situated from any other Province in the Dominion, and I hope the amendment of the hon. member for King's will be adopted. Some hon. gentlemen hold that the Bill is all right, except in so far as it concerns Prince Edward Island. But I think every one should speak for his own Province and not for others. As I said before this Bill will entail a great cost upon the country, and the Government, instead of wasting money in this way, ought to use it in improving our harbors and other public works, which are fast going to ruin. Even the small amount of the fishery award that was awarded to Prince Edward Island has been withheld by this Government, which the Island requires for local purposes. I hope all the Island members will be united on this point, no matter to which party they belong, and see that justice is done to the Island.

Mr. FISHER. I think that in consequence of the developments that have taken place, since the second reading of this Bill, this clause should be reserved for further consideration, When the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) offered his amendment, it was discussed in very short words by members of this side of the House; but the amendment now proposed by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) deserves a little better treatment, and will certainly require a little different argument, in consequence of the fact that the state of the Bill has materially changed since that time. It might be said that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House were wasting time were we now to deliver again the speeches which we made at that time, but under the new developments which have occurred, from the admissions of the leader of the Government who introduced this Bill, from the proposition which has come from the member for King's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Macdonald), and from admissions made last night by the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) and the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Laudry), I think the question assumes a new aspect, and therefore deserves anew the consideration of this House. When the First Minister introduced this measure he propounded the necessity of uniformity, although he qualified that necessity by saying he did not wish to advocate pedantic uniformity. I do not know what are the definitions the hon. gentleman would give to the words pedantic uniformity, but I presume they must mean some kind of uniformity—that even uniformity which was pedantic would still be uniformity. One of the purposes for which this Bill is introduced is that the franchise of the Provinces should be the same for this Dominion Parliament. I remember that during the first debate on this Bill it was said that, when people qualified under one franchise in one Province, and people qualified under another franchise in another Province, those sets of people were not equally and fairly represented here. If that is the basis on which this claim to uniformity is grounded, it is very evident that uniformity of the franchise must mean a franchise with uniform qualifications for the various Provinces. The hon. member for Prince Edward Island who has proposed this amendment says in effect that he desires that the Bill shall not extend to Prince Edward Island. If that means anything at all, it means that Prince Edward Island shall still continue to possess the right to have its own franchise. I do not contend for an instant that that Island has not a just and indefeasible right to regulate its own franchise; but if that is granted to the Province of Prince Edward Island, in justice and honesty every other Province should possess the same right. The amendment also declares as an inevitable and legitimate conclusion that the Bill under consideration is an infringement of the rights of the Provinces and is an attempt to do what was acknowledged by one of the

speakers to be unjust. As this uniformity seems to have been disturbed, let us consider for a few minutes what adherence to mere uniformity will mean. It will mean, as was aptly said by the Secretary of State, that while in one Province a little rise might be made in the political franchise, in another a little lowering might take place, and uniformity can only be gained, by doing a little bit of injustice to each and everyone, so that on the whole we can come up to one plane. I think that is one of the strongest arguments why this uniformity is not desirable. Is it desirable that we should legislate and place a law on the Statute Book which would do injustice to anyone? I say no. It is the part of a wise Government which cares for the good of the country to try and legislate so that no injustice should be done to any individual in the whole Dominion. I acknowledge quite frankly and fully that if it is necessary for the good of the whole, some slight injustice may be done to individuals or a small part of the community; but if that is to be justified the proofs must be shown that it was absolutely necessary for the general good of the community that this should be done. What have we heard in the shape of argument from the supporters of the Government as to the necessity of this Bill? The First Minister has said that it does not comport with the dignity of the Dominion Parliament that Local Legislatures should regulate the franchise by which this Parliament is elected. The hon. gentleman has said that it is an anomaly that one member should be elected on manhood suffrage qualification, and another, possessing equal rights and powers in this Parliament, should be elected on a property qualification franchise. Is this anomaly such an evil that it is absolutely necessary that it should be taken up? If so, a great evil must have existed for a long time previously, and the First Minister, who for the greater portion of the last 18 years has ruled the destinies of the country, must have allowed a grave injustice to continue without endeavoring to put an end to it. If this is the case it carries with it the condemnation of hon. gentlemen opposite that this Bill was not put through a long time ago, and not kept to this time, a time when the country is in difficulty, when public attention is diverted from the affairs of Parliament to matters of absorbing interest in the North-West. An hon. member from Prince Edward Island has asked that this Bill shall not apply to his Province, and the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) who spoke immediately afterwards, stated, in reply to the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), who argues that if that was the case the Bill should not apply to the other Provinces, that this Bill was restraining the franchise in the Province of Prince Edward Island and therefore it was right and proper that the Bill should not apply to that Province, the hon. member by implication, at all events, arguing that where it broadened the franchise and increased the number of voters it was perfectly right and just. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to extend that principle to all the Provinces? And are the Government prepared to lay this down as a basis on which they are going to apply the Bill? If that be the case the Government must not apply the Bill to towns in the Province of Quebec, because the Bill would narrow the franchise in them. This argument would not only apply to the people of Prince Edward Island and the people of some portions of Quebec, but it would apply to Manitoba, because the Bill would restrict the franchise there, and it would apply to British Columbia for the same reason. There are even parts of Ontario where to-day there is a very wide franchise, and this Bill would restrict certain parts of the franchise there. We know, Sir, that in the Province of New Brunswick, and also in the Province of Nova Scotia, there are certain classes of electors who will be disfranchised by this Bill. Does the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) say that so far as this Bill restricts those franchises, it is not to apply? If that reasoning is to carry through the whole Bill, there will be so little of it left that the right hon. gentleman who introduced it will not be able to recognise his own child. But, Sir, the hon. member for Montreal Centre seemed to be willing that this Bill should not apply to the Province of Prince Edward Island, and still he said he was content to accept it for the Province of Quebec. The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) showed more independence of spirit. He got up yesterday evening, and he said he would vote against the amendment of the hon. member for King's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Macdonald). He wished to retain the Bill in its integrity. He was not prepared to do away with this franchise; he thought it was necessary that there should be a uniform franchise in the Dominion, and he was prepared logically to vote against the amendment of the hon. member for Prince Edward Island. Mark you the conclusion to which the hon. gentleman came, and I contend it was a logical and legitimate conclusion of the argument—the conclusion from which there is no escape. He went on to say that if the amendment of the hon. member for King's, Prince Edward Island, were passed, and that Province were excluded from the operation of this Bill, then he would ask that the Province of Quebec should also be excluded. There I contend that the hon. gentleman was logical; he was coming to the just conclusion of the argument which the hon. gentleman from King's, Prince Edward Island, applied to the consideration of this Bill. I would like to ask hon. members on the opposite side of the House, who are supporting the Government to-day and who have supported the Government in the past—those of them who come from the Province of Quebec—if they are going to accept the reasoning of the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) or follow in the steps of the hon. member for Montreal Centre. Hon. members who sit on the Government benches, from the Province of Quebec, have asserted over and over again that they have great influence with the Government and great influence with the party which to-day supports the Government. If, Sir, they have that influence, now is the time to exert it. If they have that influence to-day of which they boast, an influence of which we saw the effect last year, let them now come forward and exert it on the Government which leads them. Sir, this Bill is put forward by the right hon. gentleman for what reason and for what excuse? I know not, Sir, except it be on the flimsy excuse which I noted at the commencement of my address. But I believe there are other reasons. I have closely watched the course of the debate on this Bill, and I have seen that the members of this House who are particularly anxious to get the Bill through the House, who are so intensely interested that the Bill should carry, are the Tories of the Province of Ontario, and I believe it is in consequence of the pressure which they have brought upon the Government of the day, that this Bill, which is going to do an injustice to every Province of the Dominion, has been proposed by the leader of the Government. Hon. gentlemen opposite from the Province of Quebec may boast of their influence, they may say that they can control the Government, but I think this Bill proves that their influence must pale before the influence of the Tories of Ontario. It was not long ago that we saw the influence of the members on the other side of the House, from the Province of Quebec, exerted upon the Government to force the Government to do what they wished, to do justice to the Province of Quebec. Let them now stand up and exert their power, if they have that power, and put an end to the domination of the Tories of the Province of Ontario, which is being exerted on the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues. Now is the time for these hon. gentlemen to show that they have power and control—that they can get justice for their Province; because, Sir, I maintain that this bill will do an injustice to the Province of Quebec, if

the suggestion made by the hon. member for Montmagny is not conceded. If, Sir, the right hon. gentleman is prepared to say that as the Province of Prince Edward Island is exempted from the operation of this Bill, every other Province at the same time shall be exempted from its operation, then, sir, I say the right hon. gentleman would make his Bill moderately acceptable to this side of the House. But until he does so I do not think he will be doing justice to the various Provinces, and specially to the Province of Quebec, from which I have the honor to come. I speak especially of the Province of Quebec and why? Because this Bill, I believe, makes more difference in the franchise of the Province of Quebec than in the franchise of any other Province in the Dominion, except, possibly, those Provinces in which there is universal suffrage. In the Province of Quebec we are pledged to a principle of suffrage which bases the qualification entirely on property. We have there a moderately high property qualification,—higher, I think, than is the case in any other Province. I am not going to discuss the justice, or the rights, or advantages, of the qualification of the electors in the Province of Quebec, because I do not think it is proper to do so in this chamber, but when I compare the provisions of this Bill with regard to the Province of Quebec, with our franchise in that Province, I find that it makes a great and radical change in that Province, and, therefore, I say it is especially the duty of the members coming from the Province of Quebec that they should not allow this Bill to pass. And, Sir, another thing about this Bill is this—that it has developed from the time it was read the second time is shown by the fact that the right hon. Minister himself, when introducing this Bill, said nothing as to the extent to which the Indian clause would go. The right hon. gentleman the other night, when we were discussing the Indian clause, said he had no intention of applying the word Indian to the Provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia. Here again the right hon. gentleman showed that the Bill is not uniform as applied to all the Provinces.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not at all to address myself to the committee on the question before the House that I interrupt the hon. gentleman. I have just received a telegram from Superintendent Herchmer, who commanded the Mounted Police with Colonel Otter. In his telegram, which is sent here to the office of the Mounted Police, he speaks more particularly of his own corps, as is natural. I will read the telegram:

"*From Superintendent Herchmer, dated Battleford, May 3rd, received at Ottawa, May 6th*, 1885.

"Column fought Poundmaker for seven hours and demolished his camp. Police behaved beyond praise, receiving first fire, holding position while column formed for attack and remaining there throughout engagement. Our loss as follows: Killed—Corporal R. B. Sleight, Corporal W. H. T. Laurie, Trumpeter P. Burke. Wounded—Sergeant G. L. Ward. Total brigade loss, eight killed, fifteen wounded. Moved eighty miles in thirty hours, seven of which we were fighting. Enemies loss, killed and wounded, fully one hundred."

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

Mr. FISHER. It is satisfactory to hear that the result of the fight, which we heard of at a late hour last night, seems to have been greatly to the credit of our young troops who were engaged in it. I was on the point of suggesting to the right hon. gentleman—who, when he introduced this Bill, spent eight and a half minutes in explaining its provisions, and since that time has given us only little gleams and glimpses of what is intended by the Government—that it would be for the benefit of the House if he would vouchsafe to us a little more explanation in regard to his Bill. The right hon. gentleman first of all introduced his Bill on the pretence that the franchise by it was to be made uniform; but he has allowed one of his supporters to propose that this uniformity shall be broken. The right hon. gentleman himself has announced that when he introduced the Bill he did not intend that the franchise as extended to Indians should be uniform; and he since implied that the Indian clauses would not be applied to the Provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia. Now, I think it would be to the advantage of this House and would save time in the debate, if some member of the Government would inform us if the principle of uniformity is to be abandoned in the same way that the right hon. gentleman informed us when he introduced the Bill, he was going to abandon woman suffrage. The right hon. gentleman at that time got up, and in a most gracious, kind and condescending manner, told his followers that he would allow them to vote on woman suffrage just as they liked. His followers, I must say, seemed to be very glad of that opportunity to vote as they pleased, they seized upon that unwonted permission, and showed themselves so universally opposed to the hon. gentleman's own desires that I think he was left with only ten supporters on his side of the House in favor of woman suffrage. Now, if the hon. gentleman would allow his followers in the same way to vote as they like on the question of uniformity, perhaps we should find the same thing occurring again; perhaps we should find that some of his followers are not so much wedded to uniformity, even if it be not pedantic, as the hon. gentleman himself is supposed to be. I say supposed to be advisedly, because in consequence of the developments of the discussion on this Bill, I should not be surprised to-morrow to hear that the hon. gentleman had given up the principle of uniformity. We find one of his supporters moving to do away with the uniformity of the Bill; and we find another devoted supporter of the right hon. gentleman from the Province of Quebec, saying that if uniformity is given up in one place, it must also be given up in another place. The hon. member for Inverness, N.S. (Mr. Cameron) said that to his mind uniformity was not so absolutely necessary, but that it was absolutely necessary that this Parliament should hold the control of the franchise by which it is elected; in other words, I presume he meant that this Parliament should be allowed to hold the franchise all over the Dominion in the palm of its hand, whether it is uniform or not. At the same time he went on to argue that instead of being under the control of this House at present, the franchise by which this House is elected is under the control of the Provincial Legislatures. Hon. gentlemen opposite have constantly and repeatedly said to us that it was not right or decent or fitting that this Parliament should be elected by people chosen by another legislative body. Those hon. gentleman who dwell on this point forget one thing, and to my mind it is a very important thing. The Local Legislatures have not the power to create the franchise by which this Parliament shall be elected. The Local Legislatures by the present arrangement create the franchises by which they themselves shall be elected. Nobody here contends that they have not that right, or questions the expediency of that arrangement; and what does the electoral law of this Dominion to-day say? Does it say that the Local Legislatures shall have the power to determine the franchise by which this House is elected? No; it says that the franchise by which this Parliament shall be elected shall be the franchise by which the Local Legislatures are elected; and under that arrangement we have this safeguard, that any change which the Local Legislatures make in the franchise by which this House shall be elected, must be a change for their own election too. It is not possible, under these circumstances, to conceive that the Local Legislatures shall do an injustice to any class of the community. Hon. gentlemen opposite throw out hints, if they do not make plain accusations, that certain Local Legislatures in

the country have changed their own franchise for the express purpose of influencing the election of members of this House. Sir, I do not think for an instant that this is a fact. I do not believe that any Local Legislature would be so stupid as to change the franchise by which it is itself elected for any other purpose than to regulate its own election ; and if it does that, all that the present law says is, that we shall take that franchise for the election of members to this House too. The two things I have stated are so different that I believe they completely dispose of the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite, who are afraid that the Local Legislatures will for purposes of their own change their franchise to help their own friends and to influence the complexion of this House. Now, Sir, the amendment before us is an important amendment. But if we are asked to exempt the Island of Prince Edward from the operation of this Bill, and therefore we are asked to establish in the Island of Prince Edward universal suffrage. If this amendment is carried by this House—and I confess that I for one hope that it shall be carried—this Parliament goes very far indeed towards committing itself to an endorsation of universal suffrage; and I wish to bring it home to the attention of the members representing the Province of Quebec in this House that if this House commits itself to an endorsation of universal suffrage, it would be very hard for these men to prevent universal suffrage from becoming the law in the Province of Quebec. I am not going at this point to discuss the question of universal suffrage; but I wish to point out to this committee, and especially to the members from the Province of Quebec, that the Local Legislature, which represents that Province as fully as the members of the Dominion House represent it—I think more fully —has decided that for the Province of Quebec there shall not be universal suffrage or an extended suffrage ; and yet any gentleman who on the floor of this House supports the amendment to allow the Province of Prince Edward Island to regulate its own franchise, that Province having universal suffrage, goes very far towards endorsing the principle of universal suffrage. I fully believe that if it be necessary to have a Dominion franchise, if it be necessary that we should take up a general franchise for the country, it will be, as was inferred by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) the other day, but a very short step indeed until we find ourselves absolutely forced to make that franchise a franchise of manhood suffrage. The hon. members who represent Quebec in this Parliament had better look closely into that question; they had better take it home to them, and reflect that if they insist upon this Dominion Parliament arranging a franchise for the whole country, they will very soon come to a point when this Dominion Parliament will be absolutely forced, whether it will or no, by the course of events, to make that uniform Dominion suffrage a manhood suffrage. Now, I contend that the Provinces can better arrange their own franchises than the Dominion can arrange them for the Provinces. It follows as a self evident conclusion that if the Dominion is to arrange one general uniform suffrage over the whole Dominion, some one or the other, probably all the Provinces will have to give way a little. In other words you are asking that each Province shall suffer a little from its connection with the other Provinces, and thereby you are putting an additional strain on the links which bind our Confederation together; a strain which it is inexpedient under any circumstances to put ; a strain which, under the circumstances of to-day, it is specially inexpedient to put, because I contend it is a necessary duty ofthe Government of this Dominion that it should remove all such strains as much as possible. If the various Provinces are allowed to arrange their own franchises, no strain will be felt; if the various Provinces are allowed to keep or to change their franchises, as they think best under their own circumstances, under the peculiar conditions of society and property within their own limits, there is no necessity that any one Province shall suffer in consequence of the differences of circumstances and social condition of any other Province. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) proposes that a provincial franchise shall be constituted, that the Provinces shall be allowed to continue their franchise just as they like, and that the present arrangement by which those franchise are adopted for the election of members to this House shall continue. I do not know that it is necessary to enter into any elaborate argument why the present state of affairs should continue ; I think the onus is thrown on hon. gentlemen opposite to prove why it is necessary the present condition of affairs should be changed; and so far they have not given any argument, which appeals to my mind, at all events, to prove that contention. The other night a question arose with regard to the Chinese, as to whether the franchise should be given to the Chinese, and what did we see? We saw the members from British Columbia getting up and denouncing the Chinaman, saying he was not fit to vote, and contending that because there were so many Chinaman in their Province it would be dangerous to them—not to the Dominion but to that Province—if the Chinamen there should be enfranchised, and that therefore he should not be enfranchised either in the other Provinces. On the other hand we saw the hon. member for Montreal West (Mr. Gault) rising in his place and stating that in Montreal there were several Chinamen who had shown themselves well qualified to exercise the franchise. He considered those Chinamen were good citizens and ought to be encouraged in his constituency; he claimed that in consequence of their industrious habits they were a good class of people who ought to be encouraged by giving them the franchise. If the amendment of my hon. friend from North Norfolk is accepted, the hon. member for Montreal West (Mr. Gault) can give the franchise to his Chinamen and encourage Chinamen to come to Montreal as much as he likes, and I have no word to say against him for that. Probably he knows them, and knowing the condition of the labor market in Montreal, he would be glad as a large manufacturer and employer of labor to see an influx of Chinese into that city, so that he might obtain a sufficiency of good labor at low rates. If the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk is accepted, the hon. member for Montreal West will be able to enjoy the fruits of Chinese labor.

Mr. GAULT. I do not desire at all to see Chinamen take the place of our own people. We can get plenty of our own people without getting Chinamen.

Mr. FISHER. I have no wish to attribute to the hon. gentleman motives which he is ready to disclaim; I have no desire in any sense to misrepresent him, but I can only speak from what he said the other day. He intimated there were Chinamen in his constituency who had a good right to vote, and he would be glad to give them a vote, and I presume he would be glad to give the right to vote to other Chinamen coming into his constituency. The franchise is the greatest privilege we can give to any people coming into this country, and if the hon. gentleman is prepared to give this great privilege to the Chinese coming to his constituency, I take it for granted he is favorable to their coming and settling there. As this Bill stands, the hon. gentleman cannot have his Chinamen. Why? Because the members from British Columbia say no; because they say the existence of Chinamen there is a menace to them and to the working people of British Columbia. If the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk is accepted, the members for British Columbia can refuse the vote to their Chinamen and the hon. member for Montreal West can give the vote to his Chinamen. That is a fair speciman of the advantages which will flow from the

amendment of my hon. friend and of the disadvantages and injustices which must result all through the country from the passage of the Bill as it stands. The question with regard to the Indians is, as we have shown clearly, a difficult one. We contend that certain Indians should have the franchise, and that others should not; but hon. gentlemen opposite have risen to their feet and said that certain Indians, such as those in the constituency of Brant, should have the right of the franchise, that they are well educated and qualified to exercise it. I am not familiar with the Indians, either in Ontario or Manitoba or British Columbia, but if the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk is accepted, Ontario can deal with her own Indians. She has already dealt with them in a way which I believe to be just and right and can continue doing so. Quebec can deal with her own Indians; New Brunswick can deal with hers, and the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), who spoke so well and so strongly the other night about the Indians, saying that the Indians in New Brunswick were debased and unfit to exercise the franchise, can do as he likes. British Columbia can also deal with her Indians and refuse the franchise to her semi-civilised barbarians if she chooses, if the amendment of my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is accepted; but if this Bill passes through in its entirety, the Indians of the good and well managed and advanced reserves in Ontario and Quebec must either suffer in consequence of the backward state of the Indians in other parts of the country, or the whole country must suffer because those backward Indians must be advanced in conjunction with those from the well cared for reserves in Ontario and Quebec. This is only a small portion of my objections to this Bill in its present form. My hon. friend from Norfolk has introduced an amendment by which the provincial franchises shall be retained. That means that the present state of affairs should continue, by which each Province decides what is best in its individual circumstances, and by which we have one voters' list in each Province. If this Bill is put through, instead of having one voters' list on which both the great elections of the country are held, we shall have two, and our political machinery will be doubled in its complication. Instead of the ordinary elector being obliged to see that his name is properly entered upon the voters' list of his municipality or constituency, that unfortunate individual will be forced to see that it is properly entered upon two voters' lists. I suppose there is hardly an individual in this House who is not well aware of the manipulation which goes on in relation to the voters' lists. I heard hon. gentlemen on the other side tell us that the whole municipal elections in Ontario turned upon political questions, that the assessors were appointed for political purposes, and the municipal councils were elected to appoint assessors of the right political stripe.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). It is true.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend from Leeds says it is true. If this Act passes, the labor referred to by hon. gentlemen opposite will still have to continue. My hon. friend from Leeds will still have to see, in view of the local voters' lists, that the right assessors are appointed, and the right municipal councillors elected, that labor will still be thrown upon those hon. gentlemen who boast here of the influence they have used in the municipal elections in order to obtain their own returns, and in addition to that they will, I suppose, manipulate in the same way the revising barristers who manage these other lists. I suppose they will see to it as to the work and management of the secretaries who are appointed under these revising barristers; I suppose they will see to it as to the whole manipulation of the voters' lists under this law, as they boast they have already seen to the manipulation of the voters' lists under the local franchise. It matters not to me if the politicians of the country have to do double work, if hon. gentlemen opposite, who seem to have been so much concerned in the manipulation of their own voters' lists, have their work doubled. It is for them to decide whether that is a good thing for them or not, but I look thoughtfully and carefully upon the work which is going to be entailed upon the honest and intelligent voter of the country. I suppose the average voter, who in Ontario apparently, is driven in a herd and induced to vote according to his political stripe, will not have much more work than he now has, but, when it comes to the intelligent and honest voter, who will not allow the political machinery of one or the other party to influence him, who will not allow himself to be looked after and controlled, if he has now to look after his interest and will have to see that his name is placed upon two instead of upon one list, so much the greater will be that man's work. It is the duty of every man here to care for that man most carefully. That intelligent and independent and honest elector is a man who in the aggregate decides upon all the political questions. It is he who really rules this country. It is not the elector who goes in droves and votes as he is told by the political managers of his party, but it is the floating voter who is honest and independent and intelligent, and which decides for itself; and it is these men, whose work will be doubled by the introduction of this second voters' list. He will not only have to look after the present assessment roll and the transference of his name from the assessment roll to the voters' list, but will have to watch, like a cat watching a mouse, the operations of the revising barrister, who is not amenable to him and his fellow-citizens, from whose decision there is no appeal as to questions of fact, who has the appointment of his own secretary and his own creatures, and who can find out his information on which he bases this voters' list how, when, and where he pleases. It is a much more difficult thing for the average intelligent and honest voter to do than the old system, under which he only has to look after the assessment roll upon which he is taxed, and the voters' list which is made from it. I know well enough the difficulties which attend the proper correction, revision, and eventual enforcement of assessment rolls and voters' lists. I know that it is so great that it is hard to get the average elector to attend to it himself, and, if you put upon him a double burden, it will be so impossible to get him to attend to it, that it will really put into the hands of the political partisans of the Government the whole arrangement of the voters' lists. Is it possible that it is for this purpose that they wish to pass this measure, to wear out the honest and intelligent elector and get only their partisans or those whom they can control on the voters' list? Until some better argument is advanced than we have yet heard from the opposite benches, I am afraid I will have to take that as the true reason why this Bill is pushed through so energetically and determinedly. If the amendment of my hon. friend from North Norfolk is accepted, we shall have only the one voters' list which has been in existence for a long time, and which I think will be a more true and honestly prepared list than the one proposed by this Bill. In connection with this, I would allude to the remarks of the hon. the Minister of Customs the other night as to the returning officers. The returning officers to-day are the same for the Local and for the Dominion elections. They have the right to arrange the voting subdivisions in each municipality and constituency. They have a right to change those voting sub-divisions. The hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), I think it was, remarked that the revising barrister would have complete power over the voting sub-divisions of the municipalities. It is true, he will be able to change those sub-divisions just as he likes, and probably there will be

great confusion in consequence of that. The Minister of Customs interrupted my hon. friend, and said that the returning officers now have that power. But I would call his attention to this fact that in future there will be two sets of voting sub-divisions, and two sets of officers whose actions in this respect will have to be watched by the average elector; and the elector will be subject to the confusion which arises from two different sets of sub-divisions for voting purposes, and will not know which polling place to go to, in a great many instances. I say by this Bill the possibility of mistake on the part of the elector is not only doubled in consequence of the fact that there are to be two sets of sub-divisions; but it is more than doubled, because, whereas before there was only one sub-division, and now there will be two, and he will not know where to go and will not know where the divisions are bounded. I think the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White.) said the other day: There are municipal elections and local elections, and another kind will not cause more confusion than if there are only two elections? The proposition is absurd on the face of it, and can be answered out of the mouth of the hon. gentleman. If there are three in the future, it follows, as matter of course, there will be more confusion and a greater danger of mistake, than if there are only two. I do not know how it is in the Province of Ontario, but in my own Province there is no confusion between the municipal and the parliamentary elections. In the municipal elections the voting is all done at one place, and everybody has to go to that place, where the secretary-treasurer of the municipality records their votes. In the parliamentary elections polling sub-divisions are scattered all over the municipality for the convenience of electors, so there can be no confusion at all between a municipal and a parliamentary election. But when we consider parliamentary elections and elections for the Local Legislature, I contend there is much danger of great confusion arising. I have known in my own experience, in the recent municipal elections in my own township, that confusion arose from the fact that people did not know whether they were on the municipal lists only, or on both the municipal and the voters' lists. We had, in the month of January, our usual election for municipal councillors, and within two days of that an election on the Scott Act. As hon. gentlemen know, the voters for the Scott Act are the same as the voters for parliamentary elections; and, Sir, we found that people were greatly confused. They went to vote in the municipal election on the second Monday in January, and on the following Wednesday they were asked to vote on the Scott Act. Some of them who were refused and not permitted to vote in the municipal elections, in consequence of their not having paid taxes, or other reasons for which to vote for the Scott Act, although the lists were entirely they were not on the voters' lists, thought consequently that they were unable different, thus showing that the unfortunate accident by which two elections came close together materially affected the voting—not the result of the election, because that was beyond question. This instance shows that there is confusion under such circumstances, even when the arrangements are very different under the municipal code from the arrangements under the electoral law. But there will be still greater confusion when there are two electoral laws. Now there is another point, and that is the question of expense. I contend we are not justified in imposing upon this country a large additional annual expense, unless some forcible reason is given why it is absolutely necessary, and I think nobody will deny that this Bill must entail a very large additional cost. Now, under our present electoral law in the Province of Quebe, our voters' lists cost absolutely nothing. The lists are based upon the assessment roll and the municipal assessors have to make out an assessment roll whether the voters' list is based upon it or not. It is done for taxation purposes; the compilation of the voters' lists really cost the country nothing. But under the arrangement which his Bill proposes, the voters' lists are going to cost a great deal. We have to pay the salary of the revising barrister, we have to pay the salary of the secretary to that revising barrister, we have to pay the salary of the bailiff, and the expense of getting witnesses, or getting information and evidence of which that revising barrister proposes to make up his voters' lists.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). That has got to be done now.

Mr. FISHER. But I have just stated that in the Province of Quebec that does not cost one cent. I do not know how it is in the Province of Ontario. From the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to their own Province, I am led to believe almost everything and anything of the Province of Ontario. Judging from the way they decry their own Province, I should suppose that its municipal affairs were managed in the worst possible way. I tell the hon. gentlemen that such is not the case in the Province of Quebec. In the Province of Quebec this work is done for nothing, and the voters' lists do not cost us one single cent.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The hon. gentleman has never heard me say one word against the municipal institutions of Ontario. I know all about them. I have been living there a long time and have been reeve for some years, and I say our municipal institutions have worked very well.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman says they work very well, but one of his colleagues told us the other night that the municipal institutions of Ontario were conducted on a political basis.

Mr. HESSON. I take the responsibility for making that statement, and I am perfectly correct.

Mr. FISHER. I am glad there is one hon. member opposite who has the courage of his convictions, one hon. gentleman who will come in this House and tell us that the municipal council of his municipality is elected on a political basis, who will say that the assessment roll of his constituency is made up on a political basis and I suppose it is in consequence of their municipal councillors doing their work so well, that he has been elected for this House. The hon. gentleman from East Hastings says that he did not make any such assertion. Of course, I accept his word; but the other night when this question was being discussed, hon. gentlemen were so active in interrupting us that it was difficult to determine what any of them said, or who said it. The other night, however, we were told by hon. gentlemen opposite that the municipal arrangements in Ontario were worked on a political basis, that the assessors were appointed for political purposes, that the municipal councillors were elected for political purposes, and I suppose that is the reason why those hon. gentlemen opposite succeeded in getting themselves elected to represent that Province in this House.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The majority of the councillors in every township in East Hastings, is Reform.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then that is the reason you want this new list.

Mr. FISHER. Now we have found out why the hon. member for East Hastings is so anxious to have this Bill passed. He says the municipal councillors who manage the voter's lists are not in political sympathy with him, and he wants to have a revising barrister who will be in sympathy with him.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I am not going to have a revising barrister, I am going to have a judge.

Mr. FISHER. As I see the right hon. Premier in the House now, I may say that I have heard on the floor of this

House, I have heard it all around the corridors, that changes are to be made in this Bill, and that the judges are to be appointed revising barristers. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman if that is the case.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When we reach the clause, as I have several times said, I will be able to make a full statement. I have already said, not only this Session, but in previous Sessions, so long ago as 1870, that, with respect to those Provinces that have county judges, those county judges will be utilised wherever they can be. You must understand, however, that in Ontario for instance, there are 92 constituencies and only 40 county judges.

Mr. FISHER. No doubt the hon. member for Hastings will be very well off in his own county by having a county judge who can act as revising barrister; but it is evident that in a large portion of Ontario this cannot be. More than that; I call attention to the fact that it is absolutely impossible that county court judges can perform this work. The committee have been told that judges are going to do the work in Ontario, and therefore it is all right, and the accusation brought against the revising barrister's clause must fall to the ground. But there are other Provinces which will come under the operation of the Bill besides Ontario. In the Province of Quebec the judges cannot do this work; and if this Bill is framed entirely with a view to its operation in Ontario, that of itself is a good reason why the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) should be adopted, and the matter left in the hands of the Local Legislatures. If it is possible that the revising barristers appointed in Ontario can be judges, well and good; let Ontario have them. But in Quebec it is impossible. There are not judges sufficient to do the work, and we should therefore allow Quebec to make up its voters' list as it may see fit. During the discussion of this Bill I have noticed that the First Minister nearly always refers to the law in Ontario. I have no objection to the law of Ontario, if it is a good law, being taken as a model; but I do not see any reason why the law of Ontario, in view of the circumstances under which it was passed, and the wide difference of that law from that in other Provinces, should be forced upon other Provinces in the way this Bill is designed to force it. The other night I was corrected in regard to a certain point, because another hon. member looked at the matter from an Ontario point of view alone, while I was looking at the matter from a Quebec point of view; I was corrected as to the assessment roll and the voters' lists being made from that roll. I was right as regards Quebec, but it appears the practice is different in Ontario, and therefore the argument I presented was supposed to fall entirely and utterly to the ground. This goes to show that this Bill is being pressed, not in accordance with the wishes of hon. members of Quebec or from Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Prince Edward Island, but this Bill is being forced through by the members of Ontario, because they fear that at the next general election they will not be able to come back here, and they are accordingly endeavoring, I say, to force through a measure which is distasteful and unasked for by the other Provinces. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that it is the right of this Parliament to pass this measure. No one on this side of the House has denied that Parliament possesses the legal and technical right, but the expediency, the justice and the necessity of doing so we deny utterly and absolutely; and we have proved there is no necessity for the Bill, no justice in it and no expediency which justifies it. Last night the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) stated that the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) had moved an amendment in 1871 to a Bill then before the House with respect to the electoral franchise, which showed that he thought this Parliament had a right to apply the legislation to one of the Provinces. The hon. gentleman made that statement without quoting the words from the Journals of the House. I refer to the Journals of 8th April, 1871, and find the following:

"The hon. Mr. DORION moved, in amendment, seconded by the hon. Mr. Holton, that all the words after 'the' to the end of the question be left out, and the words 'Bill be now recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of amending the same, by providing that any permanent public officer or employee receiving a salary from the Dominion Government shall be disqualified to vote at the election of a member for the House of Commons, and every such officer or employee who shall vote at an election shall be liable to a fine of $200 and his vote shall be null and void,' inserted instead thereof."

The committee will observe that that is simply an assertion on the part of the House that it has the right to control the franchise of its employees, that it has a right to say that the men employed by Parliament and the Government shall vote or shall not vote in whatever Province they may live. That is a right which no one has denied; that is a right in the law of the land; it is incorporated in this Bill. But it is not proposed to interfere with the local franchises or to impose a certain franchise on any of the Provinces. The record goes on to say:

"Mr. BLAKE moved in amendment to the said proposed amendment, seconded by the hon. Mr. Holton, that the words 'Bill be now recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of amending the same by providing that any permanent public officer or employee receiving a salary from the Dominion Government shall be disqualified to vote at the election of a member of the House of Commons, and every such officer or employee who shall vote at an election shall be liable to a fine of $200 and his vote shall be null and void,' be left out, and the words 'said Bill in effect provides for the disqualification as voters in Ontario and Quebec of all officers of Customs and Excise, postmasters in cities and towns, and judges of the Superior and County Courts. 'That the said Bill does not provide for the disqualification as voters in Nova Scotia of Government servants. 'That the principle on which the disqualification is based is general, and should be applied to Nova Scotia, whereas in Ontario and Quebec the voting is open.

"That the said Bill be recommitted in order to provide for the disqualification as voters in Nova Scotia of the same classes of Government servants as are disqualified in Quebec and Ontario,' inserted instead thereof."

That is to say that Parliament shall have a right to determine whether its employees should have the right to vote for members of Parliament or not, and that the same law which was in force in Ontario and Quebec should apply to Nova Scotia. That was not an interference in any way with the provincial franchise. It was simply with reference to the employees of this Government and this House, and I contend that that was a different thing from insisting on a Province taking up a new franchise which that Province does not wish or has not made by its own legislation. Sir, there is one other thing to which I wish to allude. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend) the other day said that the machinery under this Bill, the machinery of the revising barrister, the machinery to make out the voters' lists, was necessitated by the fact that there was to be a Dominion franchise. If that is the case I am tempted to say, in the words of a well known journal, supporting the Government, though applied to a different purpose and under different circumstances—I am tempted to say, that if this Dominion franchise necessitates revising barristers, so much the worse for the Dominion franchise. That is a point which the hon. member for Cumberland did not seem to think of, and it is the argument which I would take from any such assertion as the one he made. I am not quite sure that the Dominion franchise absolutely necessitates revising barristers, and I am not going to discuss that question now. The hon. member for Cumberland, and I believe most hon. members on the other side seem to think that the necessity of a Dominion franchise justifies any iniquity the Government may choose to propose, providing they can show that it is necessitated by the Dominion franchise. I go on a different principle. I contend that if it is shown, as I think we have shown, that a Dominion franchise seems to necessitate iniquity, then we should withdraw the Dominion franchise, give up all thought of a Dominion franchise, and do away with the

iniquity of supporting it on the ground that we want a Dominion franchise. And we find that it is not even going to be uniform, or, at all events, we do not know whether it is to be or not. Members on the Government benches have given us no intimation of whether it is to be uniform or not. The hon. the First Minister said when he introduced the Bill that it was going to be uniform, but that it would not be pedantically uniform. The hon. member for King's, Prince Edward Island, says it shall not be uniform. Why do not the Government intimate whether they are willing to give up uniformity or not,—at all events why do not they tell us whether they are going to allow their own followers to vote as they like or not. It makes no difference to us what the Government are going to do, or what they want; we act and vote as we think right and best, but I would like to know for the sake of knowing what hon. gentlemen opposite are going to do, as to whether the Government will allow them to vote as they choose, or whether they intend to accept the amendment of the hon. member for Kings, P.E.I. If the leader of the Government would say this, so that we would know his inclinations, perhaps we would be able to judge better of the future conduct of the Bill, and what is going to become of it. The Secretary of State said that reasonable amendements would be accepted. Does the hon. gentleman think that it is a reasonable amendment that the Province of Prince Edward Island should be exempted from the operation of this Bill; and if so, how can the Government justify, making their supporters from the other Provinces, vote against making an exception of those Provinces from the operation of the Bill? But, Sir, I think the amendment of the hon member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), is the only safe resort on this question. Innumerable difficulties have already been foreshadowed. Already points have been raised, during the short discussion on this Bill, and although we have not yet got beyond the third clause—difficulties have arisen which were not anticipated before, and therefore I think it is absolutely necessary for the safety of the reputation of the hon. gentleman who leads the House, that the principle of the Bill should be abandoned and the amendment of the hon. member for Norfolk accepted. But, Sir, I cannot pretend to put that point forward very strongly or very eloquently; and I think I cannot do better, in summing up the argument which I wish to impress on the House, than to allude to the words used by a much more experienced, and a much more eloquent and a better speaker than myself. I allude to the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), who at the time when a franchise Bill was formerly discussed in this House conducted and managed one of the great organs of the then Opposition—a gentleman whose ability as a writer was then incontestible, and whose ability as a speaker has since been shown to be very great, on the floor of the House and elsewhere. I am not going to read his words, but simply to allude to the fact that the hon. gentleman in 1874 announced in the editorial columns of the journal of which he was the editor, very great and very good reasons why a Dominion franchise was not desirable —reasons which have been put forward by hon. gentlemen on this side in humble imitation of—or, at all events, following, if not imitating—the hon. member for Cardwell. What were those reasons? I need not detail them, but I confess I am sorry the hon. member for Cardwell is not in his place, because I would like to ask him to give us the reasons which he considered sufficient for changing his mind. In 1874 he objected to a Dominion franchise. He showed then, as we have shown since, that the provincial franchises are infinitely preferable, infinitely more practical, infinitely more convenient, infinitely cheaper. A few days ago the hon. member for Cardwell discussed this question and gave his adhesion to the second reading of the Bill. The hon. member for Cardwell in doing so did not give us any grounds or reasons or arguments for his right about face.

Mr. FISHER.

He has not yet done so, and I would like to hear, before the conclusion of the debate, some reasons for his making this great change. It is not my place or my desire to impute any motives to him. I suppose the hon. gentleman has seen good reasons for making this change. I suppose he has thought the matter out and has come to a different conclusion from those he came to in 1174; but I contend that if that is the case, and if the hon. gentleman has such reasons, it is his duty as a representative of a constituency in this country on the floor of the House, to give us the benefit of those reasons, to come to the assistance of the right hon. gentleman, and show the House why what is to-day being done is right, while, when the same thing was talked of in 1874, it was entirely wrong. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not come to the assistance of the right hon. gentleman, in defending the Bill. Hon. members on this side have argued again and again, and shown clearly and I think conclusively, that the principle of this Bill is inexpedient and mistaken, and what has been the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite? A few of them have come forward and spoken, but not one of them has given one good argument for putting this Bill through. They have spoken on all sorts of subjects; they have alluded to what we have been speaking of, but they have not given one clear, consecutive argument for putting this Bill through the House. I confess when looking at a number of members on that side of the House, it strikes me, without making any reflections on those who have spoken, that in the front ranks of the party opposite there are a great many men who are reputed to stand high as speakers, debaters, reasoners, and lawyers, but how many of those men have dared to stand up in their places in this House and defend the principles of this Bill? I do not believe one of them has; and in saying this I do not wish to cast any reflection on those who support the right hon. leader of the Government. I dare say some have supported it who have good reputations, and who stand well in the House and the country; but the men who generally take the lead in supporting the Government side of a question have not taken part in this discussion, and have shown by their silence that they are not in sympathy with the Bill or with the way in which the Government are pushing it through. Mr. Chairman, I have detained the House much longer than I intended to do. Perhaps some hon. members will say that I have spoken rather strongly; but I have not spoken a whit more strongly than I feel. By the introduction of this Bill at this stage of the Session with what I cannot characterise otherwise than as indecent haste, the right hon. leader of the Government has not shown either the respect he owes to the House and the country, or the astuteness with which he is generally credited. If the right hon. gentleman were asked to give a good reason for the opposition which has been roused against this Bill, he has given it by the manner in which he has introduced it, and the manner in which he has tried to carry it through. While I am quite prepared to support the amendment of my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Macdonald) to give the right of regulating the franchise in that Province to the Provincial Parliament, it is only just and right, and a legitimate conclusion from my vote on that subject that I should vote also for the amendment of my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), which announces the principle that every Province in this Dominion should have that right which it has enjoyed for 18 years, and which I consider it expedient that it should continue to enjoy.

Mr. HACKETT. Before the question is put, I desire to give my reasons as briefly as possible for supporting the Bill now before the committee. I believe it is of great importance to any electoral body to have the power of regulating its own electorate. It is of vital importance that

this Parliament especially should not be subject to the whims and fancies of the Local Legislatures, and that we should take out of the hands of the Local Legislatures the right to fix the franchise for the election of members to the Dominion Parliament. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat says that the Local Legislatures have not that power, but this Parliament has declared by the election law of 1874 that the qualification of electors for members of this House shall be their qualification for the election of members to the Legislatures of the different Provinces, so that we have given them the power to change the franchise at any time and to regulate the qualifications of electors. I therefore support the Bill, because I believe it is very essential that we should have the power to regulate our own electorate. Another reason why I support the Bill is that it provides for the registration of voters in all the Provinces of this Dominion. At present that matter, in some of the Provinces, is left in the hands of the municipalities. In the Province from which I come there is no registration of voters.

An hon. MEMBER. There was.

Mr. HACKETT. There was, but the Local Legislature of that Province concluded that there was no necessity, so far as their elections were concerned, for having voters' lists, and they repealed the Act. Consequently, there is no registration of voters there. Now, Sir, I ask what reason or right has this Parliament to ask the electors in the different Provinces to provide for registration for the election of members to this House? If we want voters' lists, is it not the duty of this House to pay the expense of providing those voters' lists? I say it is. Now, the Government and the people of Prince Edward Island felt that they, having open voting, did not require voters' lists. Each elector came up to poll his vote; the candidates were there with their agents and could question him as to the way he voted. But the usage under the ballot is quite different. When an elector goes to the poll he asks for his ballot, and the candidates or their agents are in the dark as to which way he votes; but in order to prevent corruption and to properly carry out the law, there must be a registration of voters; there must be voters' lists; and this Parliament, having passed the Ballot Act, ought to provide for a registration of voters. Another reason why I support this Bill is that it extends the franchise in most of the other Provinces. So far as I am aware, it very materially extends the franchise in the Province of Ontario.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no; yes, yes.

Mr. HACKETT. Hon. gentlemen may contradict my statement; but I say that the electorate which sent them here in 1882 will be very largely increased by this Bill.

An hon. MEMBER. Of Indians.

Mr. HACKETT. And of white people as well. I believe that the Legislature of Ontario, at its last session, provided a wider franchise; but so far as the electors who sent those hon. gentlemen here in 1882 are concerned, this Bill, so far as I know, will very materially extend the franchise in that Province. It extends the franchise in the Province of Quebec by giving farmers' sons, mechanics and others, votes, which they had not before. It extends the franchise in the Province of New Brunswick by giving votes to farmers' sons.

Mr. WELDON. No.

Mr. HACKETT. Will the hon. gentleman say that farmers' sons have the franchise at present? They have not; and it is very important that these young men, the bone and sinew of the country, living with their fathers on their farms, should have the privilege of recording their votes and exercising a voice in the affairs of the country. It will also extend the franchise in the Province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. VAIL. No, no.

Mr. HACKETT. The hon. gentleman says it will not, but it is the fact that it will.

Mr. VAIL. You do not know what the law is.

Mr. HACKETT. As this Bill extends the franchise in all the Provinces, with the exception of one or two, I support it. Now, I come to the Province of Prince Edward Island. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Macdonald) moved last evening that that Province should be excluded from the operation of this Act. For the last twenty-five or thirty years we have had in that Province, Prince Edward Island, a system of manhood suffrage. Every man in that Province, twenty-one years of age and a British subject, having paid a certain poll tax and performed a certain amount of statute labor, is entitled to a vote. That system has become very popular in the Province of Prince Edward Island; the people there have become very much atttached to it; they have made very great progress under it, and they are very tenacious of their rights in that direction. There is no privilege or right that they cherish so dearly as the right of exercising this franchise. In 1874, when the present election law was under consideration, an attempt was made by hon. gentlemen opposite, who then had the reins of power, to restrict the franchise in Prince Edward Island, and I regret to say that attempt was successful, so far as this House was concerned, but I am happy to say it was frustrated in the Senate. It was provided in that Bill that an exception should be made of Prince Edward Island. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that all the Provinces should have the right to make their own franchises, but in 1874 they, in this election law, attempted to make an exception of that Province. While they allowed the other Provinces the right to say that the electors who voted for the election of members to their Legislative Assemblies should also vote for the election of members to this House, they sought to make a different rule with regard to Prince Edward Island. They declared that the electors who voted in that island in the elections of members to the House of Assembly should not exercise that right in the elections of members to this Parliament, but that the voters for the Legislative Council, who required to have a freehold property qualification of £100, or about $330, should alone vote for members for this House. Had that provision become law, it would have disfranchised two-thirds of the electors of the Province of Prince Edward Island, as regards this Parliament. Now, the hon. member for Queen's spoke warmly and pathetically on the subject of disfranchising the people of Prince Edward Island. I dare say he was quite sincere; I do not believe that if he had been in Parliament in 1874 he would have given his assent to this proposition, but there were other gentlemen in this Parliament at that time from Prince Edward Island who supported it. The hon. gentleman who spoke this evening (Mr. Yeo) supported this proposition in 1874, to disfranchise two-thirds of the electors of that Province from which he comes; he was willing then to disfranchise a large proportion of the intelligent men who voted for him in 1874. To-day he is quite tenacious of the rights and privileges of the people. He speaks of this Bill, although it gives a very large addition to what was proposed in 1874, as being an outrage and an imposition on the people of the island. I was surprised that he should raise his voice here at all. After his course in 1874, how can he now declare that this Bill is an imposition? But he had an object in what he did in 1874. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) referred to the fact that Sir Charles Tupper, who had a seat in this House in 1874, vindicated the rights of the people of Prince Edward Island. To his honor and credit, and to the honor and credit

of the right hon. the First Minister, they stood up here and defended the rights of the people of Prince Edward Island. The hon. gentleman quoted an extract from the speech of Sir Charles Tupper on that occasion, in which Sir Charles read a letter written to him by the hon. Senator Howland, stating that if the Bill then before Parliament became law it would disfranchise two-thirds of the people of the island, and would bear more hardly on one class of people in that Province, the Catholics, a large majority of whom, for many years, were under great disadvantages and disabilities, which were not experienced by their Protestant neighbors, and being, therefore, not so well off in worldly goods as the latter, this proposition would have the effect of disfranchising a large portion of them. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Yeo) had an object in remaining silent on that occasion, when he supported the then Minister of the Interior, the Hon. David Laird, who represented the island in the Cabinet, on that question. His object in remaining silent and supporting that proposition was to disfranchise the Catholic people of the island. There is no such object in the Bill now before us. It is, although not so free as I would desire to see it, a very fair and free franchise. Under it the tenant can vote, the farmer's son can vote, and a man can vote on his income. Well, the very men who sat in this Parliament in 1874 and supported a measure that would disfranchise two-thirds of the people, a measure which stated that no man in the island could vote unless he had a property qualification of £100, say the Bill now before us an outrageous one. The hon. Senator Howland knew on the occasion what he was speaking about; he knew that when Prince Edward Island was granted away in one day to certain parties in London, one of the conditions of the grant was that the island should be peopled within a certain period by Protestant people. The Catholics were excluded altogether in that grant. The people for whom the grant was made undertook to carry out that provision, but did not succeed. The Acadian's, driven out of Nova Scotia after the massere of Grandpré, after having been expelled from the home of "Evangeline," sought, a number of them, refuge on the shores of Prince Edward Island. A large number of them settled on the island and established their homes there. They were a very honest and industrious and intelligent people; they labored under great disadvantages; they were aliens, living, as it were, in a foreign land; they adhered to their customs and religion; and it was not until the time that manhood suffrage was granted that they had a voice in the laws of the country. For a number of years they labored under great disabilities; up to twenty-five or thirty years ago, the idea that one of these people should occupy a high position or belong to any of the professions, or be a member of a Government, was something unimagined; but the moment they received the benefit of manhood suffrage, the moment they could have a voice in the legislation of the country, they came to the front, and we find them now occupying seats in the Local Parliament, we find them members of the Local Government, we find them doctors and lawyers, and otherwise holding high positions, showing that these people, although severely oppressed, came to the front and progressed very rapidly the moment they had a voice in the affairs of the country. The object of the proposed legislation in 1874 was to deprive those people again, so far as this Parliament was concerned, of the powers and privileges they then enjoyed and now enjoy. The hon. gentleman also knew that the immigrants, Irish and Scotch Catholics, who were settling on the island, men with bold hearts and strong arms, carving out for themselves homes, becoming tenants of those landlords, while others, more favorably circumstanced, were freeholders, and whose sons settled around them, would have been deprived of the franchise. The hon. Senator Howland, knowing all those matters, brought them before this Parliament, and I am glad to know that, although a mechanical majority in this House passed the measure, when the Bill came to the Senate that branch of our Legislature, so much abused by hon. gentlemen opposite, but which may be called the protection of the smaller Provinces, eliminated this vexatious feature of the Bill, and the people of Prince Edward Island have enjoyed, up to the present, the right of exercising the franchise. To the credit of the hon. Senator from Prince Edward Island, who supports hon. gentlemen opposite, a gentleman of great intelligence, he felt that this Bill was so iniquitous, that it was so tyrannical, that it was so intended to oppress the people of Prince Edward Island, that he had the independence to rise above party feeling and party prejudice, and to vote with other hon. gentlemen that that obnoxious feature of the Bill should be struck out. I refer to the hon. Senator Haythorne. The people of Prince Edward Island have but one feeling in regard to that hon. gentleman, in consequence of his independent action on that occasion. What reason did the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) give for this special legislation with regard to Prince Edward Island? He said the reason was that there were no voters' lists in the island, but the moment the voters' lists were made up every man could vote. These hon. gentlemen speak of provincial rights. To hear them now you would think their hearts were bleeding for the different Provinces, and yet, on that occasion, they tried to coerce Prince Edward Island to spend a large amount of money in the preparation of voters' lists. I have had some correspondence this winter in the press, with an hon. gentleman who, at that time, represented one of the constituencies of the island in this Parliament, the uncle of the hon. member for Queen's, the Hon. Daniel Davies. He stated, in a letter to the press, that the object of that measure was to coerce Prince Edward Island into preparing voters' lists. What will hon. gentlemen opposite say to that? How does it correspond with their idea of provincial rights, that this Parliament, that the Government of 1874, led by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), should, by an Act of Parliament, endeavor to coerce Prince Edward Island into the expenditure of a large amount of money in the preparation of voters' lists to return members to this Parliament? It was something unheard of, that anything of the kind should be mooted. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the cost of preparing voters' lists under this Bill will amount to about $500,000 a year. What expense would they have forced upon the people of Prince Edward Island if their Bill had become law? The hon. member for Queen's, when he was leader of a Government in Prince Edward Island, passed a ballot Act. That Act was something similar to the Bill now before the House. It provided that the county court judge should be the revising barrister, that there should be no appeal from the decision of the county court judge, but that it should be final. The people tried it for two or three years; it worked well enough, but it cost a large amount of money; it was too expensive a plaything for them and they repealed it. If you would compel them, as hon. gentlemen opposite say, to pay a proportion of the expenditure of $500,000 a year, the amount of expense which the Government of this country would have imposed upon Prince Edward Island would be $12,500 per annum, the island having a fortieth of the population of this country. And these are the gentlemen who speak so loudly of provincial rights, who seem to have no word in their vocabulary hard enough, nor epithet strong enough, to apply to supporters of the Government on this subject. We had to thank the Senate for defeating that measure. The hon. member for Queen's referred to the question of education, and said that in Prince Edward Island there was a free system of education, and that that system was introduced at the same time that manhood suffrage was given to the people of that Province. The hon. gentleman

is correct. There is a very free system of education in Prince Edward Island, and the younger class of the people of that Province are very intelligent and well educated, but the hon. gentleman knows that he himself very materially interfered with the education of the people of Prince Edward Island. In 1876 the hon. gentleman mounted the Protestant horse. He formed a Government composed exclusively of Protestant gentlemen. In a Province of which the population is about half Catholic, he thought it his duty to form a Government exclusively Protestant and to exclude all Catholics from the affairs of the country. He did that ostensibly for the purpose of passing an education law, but it was more for the purpose of imposing a very obnoxious assessment upon the people of that Province. He knows that he interfered with the separate schools of that Province. His Lordship, Bishop McIntyre, who is respected by everyone who knows him, had a system of separate schools. The French people of that Province had, for a number of years, separate schools; but, by the Act which the hon. gentleman passed in 1877, he took away their rights from those people, and would further grind down those poor people to whom I have referred before. I hope that this House will support the amendment of my hon. friend, and exclude Prince Edward Island from the operation of this clause. We want in that Province certain portions of this law. We want the revising officers, we want the voters' lists; we think it only proper that this Parliament should have the control of its own electorate; but while we go that far in support of the Bill, we think that Prince Edward Island, under its peculiar circumstances, being apart, almost, from the rest of the Dominion, shut out for a large portion of the year from the mainland by almost impassable barriers of ice. Having no floating population, being pretty well filled up, there would be no danger at all in continuing to it the manhood suffrage so long enjoyed by its people. While I favor manhood suffrage in Prince Edward Island, I think it would hardly be right to apply it to the whole country. There are large cities where there are manufacturing interests and a large floating population coming and going, and it is quite possible that, in those cases, there might be a great abuse of the privilege of manhood suffrage; but in our Province I think there would be no danger; they have not abused their franchise; no corruption has taken place at any elections there that I know of. I do not believe $20 have been paid for votes by any candidates there in the last twenty-five years. In the last general election, in 1882, a protest was entered against the election of the hon. member for King's (Mr. McIntyre), and it was proved on that occasion that certain gentlemen, agents of the hon. gentleman, went through the constituency, having in their carriage certain black bottles which were called black ducks, who supplied the whiskey pretty freely to the electors. That is the only case I know of where any corruption at all was practised. A protest was entered against the hon. gentleman's election, and the Chief Justice of the Province decided that, as it was the custom of the people of the Province to treat at elections, there was no breach of the law. I do not know whether the courts would have any right to question the decision of the Chief Justice on that occassion. I do not suppose that because he was appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite he would give an unfair decision. But my opinion has always been that that law was passed to prevent these corrupt practices, and if possible to prevent the people from going through the country, taking black ducks in their carriages to corrupt the electors. Now, as I said before, we want the voters' lists. I believe that under the ballot system we cannot properly carry out a system of voting unless we have the lists I refer to. Down in Prince Edward Island there has been no corruption; the people have honestly exercised the franchise. They are a very intelligent people, but they are very fond of imitating their neighbors, to a certain extent, and although no such thing as the ballot box trap, contrived in the Jacques Cartier election, has been introduced there, still the innovation may be made very shortly, and we want to prevent that if we can. Where the people are corruptly disposed we cannot prevent it at all, but in order to prevent fraud at elections you must have voters' lists, and the money to pay for these voters' lists should come from this Government. We saw by the papers this morning that Mr. Gladstone narrowly escaped defeat in the British House of Commons on this very question. He desired that the municipalities should prepare the voters' lists, and a motion was made that the Government should prepare these lists, and in a House of nearly 600 members Mr. Gladstone's proposition was only carried by a majority of three, showing that in England there is a very general feeling that the Government should defray the expense in connection with the general election of members of the House of Commons. We support this Bill because one of its essential principles is that this House should regulate its own franchise. Another principle, and a vital principle, is that the expense connected with the preparation of the voters' lists should be met by this Parliament. I support this Bill, again, because it very materially extends the franchise to people of the different Provinces, although it restricts it in a small degree in the Province from which I come; and I hope that this House will support the amendment of my hon. friend, which would retain the present franchise in Prince Edward Island, and then I think no harm can come of it. An exception made in favor of Prince Edward Island can scarcely be called a breach of uniformity, as that island, on account of its insular position, is, for a large portion of the year, separate from the rest of the Dominion, by the ice in the Straits of Northumberland. Therefore, I trust that the Government will accede to the proposition of my hon. friend. I can assure those who will vote for this amendment that they will be long remembered and long revered and respected by the people of Prince Edward Island. There is no privilege they cherish so dearly as the privilege of exercising manhood suffrage. The man who will continue that privilege to them will be held in the highest esteem by them for all time; and the man who, as in the case of the Hon. David Laird, attempts to rob them of that franchise, will always be execrated by them. We know that the Hon. David Laird, after returning from his governorship, believed he was as strong as ever in the intelligent county of Queen's, P.E.I., and in 1882 he offered himself as a candidate to represent that county in this Parliament. We know the result of his attempt upon that occasion; he was 400 or 500 votes behind his colleague, the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), who sits opposite. We know that the people of that island had such a disgust for the hon. gentleman, knowing that he had betrayed them, that he had attempted to rob them of this privilege they cherished so dearly, that they loved so well, that he received the retribution which he so well deserved at their hands. Sir, I say again that I hope the amendment of my hon. friend will carry, and that every hon. gentleman in this House will see his way clear to vote for it.

Mr. DAVIES. I rise merely to refer to a point raised by the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. He has referred to the action taken by the Hon. Mr. Laird in introducing a clause in the election law of 1874 which would have had the effect, if carried, of temporarily disfranchising a certain number of the people of Prince Edward Island. I do not think the hon. gentleman has done justice to Mr. Laird's conduct in that particular; because he knows, and it has been repeated a dozen times and never denied, that the leader of the local Conservative Government of the day gave Mr. Laird a written pledge at the time he pro-

posed such a law that he would at once carry through the Local House a registration Act; and the moment that registration Act passed, if that law had been carried, not a single man in the island would have lost his franchise; the local franchise was to be maintained intact. While I do not pretend to deny that the clause was unfortunate, and while I would have opposed it if I had been here, I think it is but fair to put the facts before the House. The hon. gentleman says, I assume, and I will assume for the purpose of argument, that this Bill will entail an expenditure on the country of $500,000 annually; and that if the Local Legislature is compelled to pass a registration Act of their own it will cost them some $4,000 or $5,000. Does he know that the proportion which Prince Edward Island would have to pay of the $500,000 is $12,000? Of every dollar that is spent by the country on account of this Bill, Prince Edward Island will have to pay its fortieth share, whether it comes under the Act or whether it does not; and the hon. gentleman, therefore, will see that the reason he gives for supporting the Bill is the very reason why he should vote against it.

Mr. HACKETT. The hon. gentleman says that Mr. Laird, when he was in this House, in 1874, received a pledge from the leader of the Local Government, that he would pass a registration Act if this Bill of 1874 became law. Now, while I do not at all doubt the truth of the statement of the hon. gentleman, I want to say that I have been reading Mr. Laird's speeches on that occasion, and the excuse he repeatedly gave was that as the Conservative party had the Local Government of Prince Edward Island in their hands at that time they could, if they desired, pass an Act for the registration of voters, and thus prevent the disqualification of Conservatives. That was the reason he gave, and it looks to me somewhat absurd that the leader of a Conservative Local Government should be in communication with a Minister of the Liberal Government of the Dominion. The hon. gentleman says that Prince Edward Island will pay the fortieth part of the expenditure incurred under this Bill. That is what I said, precisely. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that this Bill would impose an annual expenditure of $500,000 on the people. Now, if Mr. Laird's measure had become law, and if Prince Edward Island had been forced into the preparation of the lists, according to the idea of hon. gentlemen opposite, they would have had to tax themselves $12,000 a year.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the House rises at six o'clock, I would say that I hope the Government has taken steps to secure a list of the names of those in the forces who have been killed or suffered casualties in the recent engagements in the North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

The committee rose and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

Mr. RINFRET rose to continue the debate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would say to the hon. gentleman that I was going to move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. I desire, among other things, to get through some of the other Bills, which, I think, will take only a short time, to give some work for the other House to do, as they have been waiting long and patiently.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose none of the more important Bills will be taken up without any notice having been given to this side. The hon. gentleman said he would go on with the Franchise Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will take them as they are on the Paper.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know how they are on the Paper. If it was intended to go on with them it would have been reasonable to have communicated to us that this course would be taken.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not think we will talk of formality on one side or the other.

Motion agreed to, and committee rose and reported.

EMPLOYMENT OF PRISONERS.

Mr. CARON moved second reading of Bill (No. 87) to amend the Act 40 Vic., chap. 36, intituled "An Act to provide for the employment without the walls of Common Gaols of prisoners sentenced to imprisonment therein."

Mr. MILLS. Explain.

Mr. CARON. When I moved the first reading of this Bill I explained that it was to provide for the employment of prisoners without the walls of common gaols. The object of the Bill is to amend the Act 40 Vic., chap. 36, by repealing section 2, and inserting the following:—

After such regulations are made, the Lieutenant Governor of the Province in Council may, from time to time, direct or authorise the employment, upon any specific work or duty, beyond the limits of any common gaol, of any prisoners who are sentenced to be imprisoned with hard labor in such gaol, for any crime against any law of Canada.

In committee I will propose to amend the Bill by inserting the word "prisoner" instead of "prisoners," and the word "offence" instead of "crime."

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman intend by this Bill to deal with anything else than offences against the laws of this Parliament.

Mr. CARON. The scope of the Bill is quite obvious. A prisoner in a common gaol, after an Order in Council has been passed by the Lieutenant Governor, may be employed on works outside of the limits of the prison. Heretofore, a prisoner could only be employed upon works within the prison walls.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will inform us in what way the prison labor is proposed to be employed outside of gaol, as the cost of guarding the prisoners will be almost more than the value of their labor.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman will perceive that the matter is altogether left to the Governor General in Council, who will determine the works upon which the prisoners may be employed.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The hon. gentleman misinterprets the object of my question. I pointed out that the cost of superintending the prisoners outside gaol—for it cannot be supposed they will be fettered—will be more than the value of their labor.

Mr. CARON. They are under the control of the local authorities, who will utilise that labor and will provide for its management.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

THE LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions:

Resolved, that it is expedient that hereafter the officers and servants of the Library of Parliament should consist of:

1. Two officers, one to be called the General Librarian, the other the Parliamentary Librarian, and to hold a joint commission as "Librarian of Parliament," and to have equal powers.
2. Two first-class clerks.
3. Two second-class clerks.
4. Three third-class clerks.
5. One chief messenger.
6. Three messengers.

Resolved, that the salaries of the officers holding said joint commission shall be fixed at sums not exceeding the sum of three thousand dollars ($3,000) per annum for each officer, and that of the chief messenger shall not exceed seven hundred dollars, and that the salaries of the other officers and of the servants of the Library shall be fixed from time to time by Order of the Governor in Council, according to the scale of salaries provided for in any Act or Acts relating to the Civil Service which may be in force at the time of passing the said Order.

Provided always, that the salary of any officer or servant now employed in the Library shall not be diminished.

He said: The object of the resolution is to alter, in some degree, the constitution, and increase the staff of the Library. Instead of having one Librarian, as before, it is proposed that there shall be two officers, who shall hold a joint commission, one to be known as the General Librarian and the other as the Parliamentary Librarian. This subject of the Parliamentary Library has been discussed again and again in this House, and as we all know that as it is mainly a Parliamentary Library, it has far exceeded the limits and bounds of such a collection of books. A Parliamentary Library proper is a library that contains all the works necessary for the use of members of Parliament. But here, as in Washington, we have no British museum, no general library, considered as a national one, but under the name of a Parliamentary Library we have increased the number of books so much as to make it become a national one. It has grown so vast that we think it ought to assume that position in every respect. In order to carry out that project, if it is satisfactory to the House, it is proposed that there shall be two Librarians, holding a joint commission, one to be known as the General Librarian, whose special duties will be to look after the Library as a whole, as a scientific and literary institution, and the other to be a Parliamentary Librarian, the object being that he shall apply himself specially to parliamentary precedents, and see that the latest and best works connected with constitutional law and history and political subjects generally are obtained. The staff has been considerably increased from that of the Act which was passed relating to the Library, as long ago as 1871. Since that time the development of the institution has been so great that the staff has been regularly increased, with the sanction, more or less regular, of Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. I have been entirely at a loss to understand on what principle it was that the hon. gentleman was about to propose this alteration. I cannot, myself, conceive anything more likely to produce confusion, inconvenience and embarrassment of all kinds, than the establishment of two heads, of equal powers, in the same room, and with reference to the same collection of books. It seems to me to be a plan devised to produce those jealousies and difficulties which are likely, and almost certainly, to arise, under such circumstances. If you were going to propose that we should have two libraries, a general library, as the hon. gentleman called it, and a Parliamentary Library, in separate apartments, for which there were to be separate funds of money, with separate staffs, I could understand the proposal that there should be two different heads of those two different institutions. I believe, at Washington, there are two, if not three distinct libraries, each one of which—at least so far as two of them are concerned—is larger than ours. But that is not our case. In our case we have one Library, and for that one Library we should have one head. The proposal of the hon. gentleman involves a very considerable increase in cost. He proposes that there shall be those two officers, each to receive $3,000 a year. As to the rest of the staff, he proposes, according to the modern fashion he is introducing so largely into our legislation, that Parliament shall not fix the salaries of the other officers, but the Governor in Council shall fix them. We are not to know what this scale of expense is—the Governor in Council is to have the opportunity of fixing it. That I think highly objectionable also. Now, if the hon. gentleman had found that there was some difficulty due to the character of this Library in the past, we, I suppose, would have heard from him what that difficulty is. We have heard from him not infrequently remonstrances, when it was proposed to have a larger vote for the Library than he thought was proper—remonstrances against the notion that our Library should be other than what he calls a strictly Parliamentary Library, and he has not infrequently pointed out that we were not attempting to establish a national library, in the large sense of the term. I do not understand that we are attempting to establish a universal or general library in that sense but that in the absence of any such convenience we undertook to enlarge the bounds of our collection of books beyond the requisites of a strictly Parliamentary Library, and to a greater degree than if there had been a general library in the city of Ottawa. I think it would not be unreasonable that we should take a larger and more liberal view of the scope of our collection of books than would have been necessary if there had been another and a large general library in this city. But there is no such library; it is not expected that there will be, and therefore we have adapted ourselves for these many years to the circumstances in which we stand, and we have bought more books and of a wider scope—sometimes, perhaps, rather foolishly, and at other times perhaps wisely—than we would under other circumstances. Now, are we going to divide the appropriation for the purchase of books into a fixed sum, of which a certain proportion shall be under the control of a Parliamentary Librarian, and a certain portion under the control of the General Librarian? Is there to be a fixed division of the appropriation? if there is not to be a fixed division of the appropriation—we know the tendency of men to magnify their offices—how is it to be divided? How much of the joint vote appropriated in each year to the purposes of the Library is to be devoted to the Parliamentary Library, and how much to the General Library? There is really no distinction. We are not going to have two rooms, and we are not going to have the books separated in this particular room which is used for our Library. It is to be one Library still, and I suppose it is to be one vote still. It seems to me the hon. gentleman has made no defence whatever of this proposal. I believe the plain English of it is that there was a question as to who should be Librarian, and of what tongue or nationality he should be, and this is the unhappy solution of the difficulty the hon. gentleman has proposed. I think it is about the most unhappy solution that could be proposed. The former Assistant Librarian, if he be, as he is, competent, ought to be promoted to the position of Librarian; that is the plain and practical solution of the question; but to propose to us, because there is a difficulty in hon. gentlemen's minds as to how the position should be filled, to meet this difficulty by proposing that two gentlemen should hold the joint commission—not a joint office, but to have equal powers, but divided spheres of duties, though divided by no marked lines, because we know the lines are impalpable—is indefensible. Where will you draw the line between the Parliamentary Librarian and the General Librarian? It is true you can point out some books which belong and some which do not strictly belong to the Parliamentary Library, so-called; but there are an enormous number of books which, as to which, according to a liberal definition of the term, you can not decide whether they belong to the Parliamentary or to the General Library. It seems to me the hon. gentleman has given us no reason whatever for the proposal for the appointment of these

officers, which will involve, as I have said, an increased expense, confusion, embarrassment, and rivalry between the different officers in the Library; and all to avoid the diffiulty, as I judge, of appointing one individual as Librarian. I repeat, that the proper solution was to have appointed the right man—whether he was of one nationality or spoke one tongue or the other—to the position of Librarian, and the hon. gentleman has given no reason whatever for the proposal for which he asks the favorable consideration of the House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the hon. leader of the Opposition is wrong in his statement that the expenditure will be increased under this new arrangement. The proposed salaries of these joint Librarians are to be $3,000 each, making $6,000. The salary of the Librarian heretofore has been $3,200, and that of the assistant $2,400, making $5,600. The difference is just $400. But there is an office, costing over $1,200 a year, which it is proposed to change to an ordinary office, costing $400; so that, taking these two changes together, a considerable reduction will be secured in the expenses of the Library. The hon. gentleman says that the Government reserves to itself the liberty to fix the salaries of these officers. He may not be aware that it is the intention of the Government to propose to Parliament that the officers of the Library, as well as the officers of the House of Commons, may be placed under the operation of the Civil Service Act; so that Parliament will know exactly every year what the salaries of these officers are, and the increases as well. The hon. gentleman says he does not see why we should have two heads to that Library. Well, previous to the death of Mr. Alpheus Todd, we had the Principal Librarian and the Assistant Librarian; they had different titles, but they were really two Librarians, the Assistant Librarian having had his share of the work in the library, and the Principal Librarian having had his. We must not suppose, because they will have the same title, that there will be difficulties between them. Those officers are not children; they will, no doubt, be men of position, worthy of the office they will be called upon to fill; and they will no doubt, do their best, as officers in such circumstances should do, to act in harmony, and fulfil their duties to the best of their ability and in the interest of the public service. I have no doubt that these officers will, after a short time, see exactly what their respective duties will be, in accordance with this resolution, by which one will have the special management of the Parliamentary Library, and the other the management of what may be called the General Library. True, we have not two rooms or two edifices for the Library, one for the Parliamentary and the other for the General Library; but I think the hon. gentleman has given us a good reason why we should not leave matters as they are now, because he says there are a large number of volumes that we know perfectly well should be put in the Parliamentary Library, and a great many others that should be put in the General Library; but that there are a number of works with regard to which there might be a difficulty in deciding whether they should be placed in one or the other. Well, as they are all in the same room, that difficulty cannot arise, and the only question is, as to some of these books, whether they should be under the charge of one Librarian or the other. Still, I do not think that difficulty will arise; and if it does, I am sure the hon. gentleman, with his usual ingenuity, will help us to solve it. It is very important that there should be two men in that position.

Mr. BLAKE. Why?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. For this reason: when you have one Librarian, and he is busy with the Parliamentary Library he is also busy with the General Library. Well, if he is there as the Principal Librarian, you put another as an assistant, and give a second grade to the other; whilst, if they are on the same footing, you give them the same authority, and the one may go to the one Library while the other goes to the other. My hon. friend says that the First Minister seemed not to wish to have the Library increased beyond what we may call a Parliamentary Library. Whether the First Minister wished so or not, it is a fact that the increase has been allowed to go on, and if we were to make an inventory of the books, showing what books are for the Parliamentary Library and which are for the General Library, you would find the former much the smaller of the two. There is no doubt that the two libraries have been assented to, avowedly or tacitly, by Parliament, and we have the two in the one room. The suggestion, therefore, that we should have two Librarians, one for each, is a proper suggestion, and I have no doubt hon. gentlemen will agree it is one that should receive the assent of Parliament. As to the division of the appropriation: when the Librarians are appointed, they will no doubt see what are the wants of the two Libraries. There are a number of books published every year, annual books, which we must have in order to keep our collection complete; then, there are a number of new works published, works of great importance, that a library such as this one, either parliamentary or general, should have; for example, a parliamentary work such as the work the learned Clerk of this House (Mr. Bourinot) published lately, naturally finds its place in the Library. There may be a historical or geographical work or any scientific work of any great importance, and this will also find its way to our Library. Though I must say the amount voted by Parliament is not an extravagant one, the amount should be used with great prudence and great care, and the two Librarians will, no doubt, also take care that the division of money may be made in such a way as to be as useful as possible for the object for which the money is voted by Parliament. I have very little doubt that after a certain number of years, perhaps not a great many years, Parliament, when we see our revenues very large, may find it a proper thing to have a separate Library as a General Library. When that time comes, Parliament will give us the money, and the Government will see that the General Library is built. In the meantime, I think the room we have will be sufficient for some years yet to receive the books that will be purchased, but though in the one room, the number of books having increased largely, it is proper we should have two first-class officers to fulfil the duties of Librarian.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman seems to suppose I was proposing we should have two Libraries. I was only pointing out that we have not two Libraries but we are about to have two Librarians.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I had not the opportunity of listening to the First Minister, but if his arguments are not stronger than those presented by the Minister of Public Works, I do not wonder that my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Blake) should have dissented from them. I cannot conceive why we should require to have two librarians for a Library of the size of ours, and requiring the expenditure ours requires. I am perfectly convinced, from what I have seen of the management of the Library, that the gentleman who is Acting Librarian, Mr. DeCelles, is perfectly able to conduct all the affairs of the Library, and for my part I would be glad to see him named Librarian. I think there is a great deal to be said for giving to subordinate officers, who have shown themselves capable in the discharge of their duties, any of these vacancies which occur, and there are very great objections to lugging in by the head and shoulders persons from outside, with whom the House has no acquaintance, and who have no special aptitude or familiarity with the duties they are expected to discharge. The hon. gentleman, the Minister of Public Works might have remembered the maxim of the great Napoleon

that one bad general was better than two good ones; and even if Mr. DeCelles was a bad Librarian, which I do not believe he is, but on the contrary believe he is a very good one, it would be very much better to have one man, even if somewhat inferior, than two, with joint authority. We know well what these joint authorities result in. Within a short number of years, long before the revenue attains the state the hon. gentleman anticipates, we will have two Librarians, two heads of a Department, with two staffs, and a very large addition to the permanent expenditure; and that once settled will go on. It will not be reduced; we will find it then declared as an essential thing that we must always have two Librarians. I cannot conceive for the life of me what possible use there can be for two Librarians, a Parliamentary Librarian and a General Librarian. I have not heard the right hon. the First Minister's explanation, but I utterly fail to understand, from the explanation of the Minister Public Works, what possible service these gentlemen can render. I do not think they will be in the slightest degree better or more efficient than either Mr. Todd was during his life time or than whoever may be appointed his successor is likely to be, alone. Moreover, I beg to call the attention of the House and the Ministers themselves to this fact. Not only has Mr. DeCelles been able, as I understand, to discharge all these duties, but his time has not been fully occupied. Mr. DeCelles was employed by the Secretary of State to discharge very laborious duties in connection with the Civil Service examinations, unless my memory deceives me. How can it be pretended that we want two Librarians, when during the past seven or eight months the Acting Librarian was not only able to do all his duties but to discharge other very important and extensive duties besides? There can be but one thing to be said about this, that it is a job pure and simple, and a job of the most offensive sort, and there could never be a worse time for perpetrating it than this. Does not the hon. gentleman know well that a huge deficit is impending this year and next year? Is this the time to be making unnecessary new officers, and adding thereby to the expenditure of the people? It is just such things as this that disgust the people. They understand the utter uselessness of appointing two Librarians at a salary each of $3,000 a year. If I would wish to injure hon. gentlemen opposite, I would say: Go on making these unnecessary appointments which you cannot defend; go on showing the people you are utterly indifferent to the present state of the finances of the country; go on showing your indifference in just these ways, that we may be able to call their attention to the extravagant manner in which, in the teeth of known financial difficulties, the affairs of the country are being administered. I have still another reason to urge against this proposition. I think it is very unfair, very hard and very unjust to faithful officers, that they should be deprived of their just promotion. If, as it appears he is, Mr. DeCelles is perfectly competent to discharge those duties, a grave injustice is done to that officer by depriving him of the promotion to which he ought to be entitled.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman, in the first place, says this is a job, that it is going to increase the expenses immensely. It is going to decrease them, and my hon friend who sits beside me has proved that. In the next place, Mr. DeCelles is not deprived of his promotion. He is to be made Librarian, and instead of $2,400, which is his salary now, he will get $3,000, and I have no doubt that Mr. DeCelles, if he could be consulted, would say he was perfectly satisfied with the arrangement. The efficiency of the Library will be greatly assisted by the division of labor. With one head, responsible for every department of the Library, the Assistant Librarian must be subordinated; he is responsible in a lesser degree, and if any subject arises in one branch of the whole system, as to maintaining or classifying the Library, and as to the management of it, he is not responsible for it, and a great portion of the burthen must fall on the one man. By division of labor the work can be more efficiently performed. Eventually, as I have again and again said, I hope we shall have two Libraries, the National Library and the Parliamentary Library, and we have in effect, so far as the number of volumes goes, two Libraries now; we have a library of science and general literature, and a Parliamentary Library proper. The efficiency of the management will be greatly increased by one of the joint Librarians applying himself to one great branch, keeping up the maintenance and the classification of the Parliamentary Library, and moreover, making it his study, as he ought to do, and being a means of affording information to the members of both Houses on parliamentary subjects. That was the great virtue of the late Mr. Todd, our late Librarian, whom we all regret so much. He was more important as a general reader and authority on constitutional law and constitutional history than he was remarkable for the talent of organisation and classification of the Library. He was very valuable in that regard. By having the two, as I have already stated, we will have two competent men, one looking after the scientific and literary portion and the other the parliamentary and constitutional portion. Then the hon. the leader of the Opposition stated that there would be a confusion of powers. There will not be a confusion of powers if there is not a confusion of duties, and by a complete severance of duties there will be no confusion. But, in case of a conflict, what does the present Act say?

"The direction and control of the Library of Parliament and of the officers and servants connected therewith, shall be vested in the Speaker of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Commons, for the time being, assisted, during the Session, by a joint committee of the two Houses."

There is the system of control. If any possible confusion should arise—it will not arise, it cannot arise between two men of common sense—but if, unexpectedly, these men of common sense should come to a different opinion, there is a reference to the two Speakers during the recess, and to the joint committee during the sitting of Parliament. Not only that, but the next clause provides that:

"The Speakers of the two Houses of Parliament, assisted by the joint committee, shall have power, from time to time, to make such orders and regulations for the government of the Library and for the proper expenditure of the money to be voted by Parliament for the purchase of books, maps, or other articles to be deposited therein, as to them shall seem meet, subject to the approval of the two Houses of Parliament."

This committee, then, Session after Session, will appropriate the parliamentary vote for the Library in such proportions as they think proper for each section of the Library. If at any time they find that the appropriation in any given year for the literary and scientific portion had been excessive, and the Parliamentary Library had suffered, in the next year they will shorten the appropriation for the one and augment the sum to be given to the other. Then, the hon. gentleman has stated that the Government were taking powers, which they were very glad to do, by which the salaries of the other officers and servants of the Library should be fixed from time to time by the Order of the Governor in Council, so that you could not know what the expenditure was. Now, the object of this is quite the reverse. The salaries we fixed are too large for those who enter. A good many years ago, in a very able report, a Library committee recommended that those who entered at the foot of the list as junior clerks in the Library should commence with $800 a year. The junior clerks in the other Departments commence at $400. We do not see any reason why that difference should occur, and why a junior clerk in the Library should not enter at the same amount as the clerks in the other Departments connected with the Government. The number of clerks is fixed by the Act; they

cannot be increased, if these resolutions are embodied in an Act, and the salaries are to be according to the salaries affixed to the different orders and classes in the Civil Service, which will materially reduce the expenditure. So much will this have the effect of reducing the salaries that a proper proviso is included in these resolutions:

"Provided always, that the salary of any officer or servant now employed in the Library shall not be diminished."

Those who are in now will keep their present salaries, but the future officers will receive the salaries according to the scale of first, second and third-class clerks.

Mr. MILLS. The First Minister has informed us that this is really an attempt at economy, that the expense will be less than it has hitherto been; but at the same time he tells us that this economical period is to begin at some indefinite time in the future; that there is to be no diminution in the salaries of the present officials.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course; we never do that.

Mr. MILLS. But at the same time he proposes to put in two officials, two Librarians, each of whom shall receive very nearly the same salary that the original Librarian received. I wish to call the attention of the House to the facts connected with this whole subject. The House is well aware that the late Librarian, Mr. Todd, was a man of literary tastes, that he devoted a very large portion of his time to his literary pursuits, and that, notwithstanding that fact, he and his Assistant Librarian had no difficulty in discharging the duties that devolved upon them. Then we find that, since Mr. Todd's death, the Assistant Librarian has, according to the statement of the Secretary of State, devoted at least three months of the year to other pursuits than devolves upon him as Acting Librarian. That is well known. The hon. gentleman informed the House that the Acting Librarian was enabled to devote, I think, three months of the year to the preparation of the examination papers and the examination of parties seeking admission into the Civil Service.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I never said anything of the kind.

Mr. MILLS. I think the hon. gentleman told us that there were 1,200 persons who were applicants for admission and who came up for examination, and that the examination of these 1,200 took at least three months. I think the published *Debates* of this House will show that the hon. gentleman made that statement. If that statement is not correct, the hon. gentleman can correct it now; but it is clear that we have at present one Acting Librarian, and that he has been able to devote a large portion of his time to other pursuits than those which pertain to his duty as Librarian. We have here a Library, I believe, of not much over 100,000 volumes. The Library of Congress, at Washington, contains about four times that number of books. Mr. Spofford is the Librarian there, and the staff act under him. Among the Libraries of London you have the British Museum, containing twice as many volumes as our Library, and you have a single Librarian there. It is true he has a larger number of officers under him than we have here, but you have the one Librarian, who is responsible for the direction and control of that Library. There is no reason in the proposition of the hon. gentleman. If Mr. DeCelles is competent, and I believe he is competent, it was the duty of the Government to appoint him to this position under the law as it now stands. He ought to have been the Librarian. The hon. gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches in the interests of the public, would have appointed him, but political exigencies required otherwise, and this proposition is the outcome of those exigencies. Now, Sir, I say if Mr. DeCelles is competent, he ought to have been appointed Librarian, and the place of Assistant Librarian ought to have been filled by a competent man. Everyone here knows that in consequence of the unsettled condition of things that has prevailed, the Library has not been as satisfactorily conducted during this Session as it might have been, and would have been, had the Librarian had proper control given him by hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has said that he hopes to have a division of the Library, that he hopes to have a General Library and a Parliamentary Library. Well, I think, if that division were made, it would be extremely inconvenient. I believe there is a very large number of books that will be found necessary in the General Library, that are necessary in a Library such as we have. Take all the works of English history, take all the biographies of English and French statesmen, take all those works relating to Parliamentary law and government, all of which are important in a General Library, and all of which are important in a Parliamentary Library. If it were thought necessary to have such a division it would not be the business of the hon. gentleman to provide for it at present. That responsibility will rest upon those who have control of the affairs of the country when the time for a division comes. That time, the hon. gentleman says, has not yet come. Let us, then, deal with things as we have them now. We want a single Librarian to take control of that Library, and it is our business to give him such assistance as he requires. Look at the condition of things. There is the Minister of Agriculture, who has an important branch of a public library under his control, the archives of the country. Now there is a staff established for taking charge of these archives. I believe it is necessary to collect the materials for the history of this country, although I think it ought to have been a branch of the Library. You have a library in the Geological Department amounting now to 5,000 volumes, and growing constantly. You are obliged to have a staff to take charge of that; and so with all these divisions, and all the expenses incident to them. We find we are in the condition of those parties who undertook to take up a collection for the support of Ginx's baby. Some £2,000 were collected; £200 or £300 went to pay for advertising, nearly the same sum to hire a hall, nearly the same sum to secure the attendance of the public, and there were only £20 left in hand to support Ginx's baby. Now, we are going upon very much the same principle. We are taking large portions of the money that is required to replenish our Library and using it to pay officials that are not necessary, to pay men who are pressing upon the Government for appointments, and for whom the Government thinks it necessary to provide at the public expense. My hon. friend from South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) has called attention to the condition of the finances of this country at the present time. We know that a large deficit is staring us in the face; we know that deficit this year will be very much larger than the cooked accounts of the hon. gentlemen will show. Why, Sir, we know that in connection with the Intercolonial Railway you have some $1,400,000 charged to capital account that everyone knows should be charged to the ordinary expenses of the year. Our deficit will exceed, perhaps, $3,000,000, and yet in face of the enormous burden upon the people, of the straitened circumstances of the public revenue, the hon. gentleman proposes to adopt a system that will necessarily lead to an increased expense. The hon. gentleman says now that it is in contemplation to divide the Library.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, no.

Mr. MILLS. That is what he said.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I said that, eventually, I had no doubt, it would be so.

Mr. MILLS. Yes, eventually; but the hon. gentleman proposes to provide beforehand for the expense aris-

ing from that division. The hon. gentleman is taking time by the forelock instead of by the *queue*. He proposes to provide here for a large and expensive staff. He proposes to make it a double-headed staff; he says by-and-bye it will be a double staff. I say that it is unnecessary; that instead of promoting it will diminish the efficiency of the service. The hon. gentleman says that we are paying these men large sums of money in consequence of there port made by the Library Committee, and that there is no reason why these officers should be better paid than those in the other branches of the Civil Service. All that was considered at the time by the committee who made that report. If a clerk is to be employed in that Library he ought to be a person of higher literary attainments than is absolutely necessary in ordinary Civil Service duties. He requires to be a person of superior education. If he does not possess that, he is not fit for the position, and it was because of that, that it was deemed expedient to propose a larger sum than was necessary in the ordinary branches of the Civil Service. Now, looking at the present condition of the country, I do not believe the people will sustain the course the hon. gentleman proposes to take. It is not in the public interest; it is not in the interest of this House. This proposition arises out of party exigencies, and this House ought to reject the proposition, and the Government would be fulfilling its duties by filling up the vacancies that now exist under the provisions of the present law.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am at a loss to know whether the hon. gentleman and his friends who have spoken upon this subject have the general interest of the people at heart, or whether they are not rather giving vent to some concealed spite connected with some intended appointment. They appear to be always singing the old song with respect to expenditure. According to their notions, this increased expenditure, which will amount to something like $300 in all, is going to drive the country into bankruptcy. I know not whether the Acting Librarian will think their utterances are very sincere. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) has said that the Government, in this instance, have sacrificed public interest for the sake of political exigencies. He, the hon. gentleman, has sacrificed the public interest and the good of the Library in order to satisfy political spite. I knew there was some concealed reason why hon. gentlemen have been so hot in their discussion of the new state of affairs which is proposed by this Bill. The hon. gentleman, in making his statement, took the opportunity, not of exactly telling an untrue thing, but of speaking in such a way as to make the House understand as true what was untrue. The hon. gentleman made it appear as if the Acting Librarian had been absent for three months from his duties in the Library, on the Civil Service work in which he had been engaged. I tell the hon. gentleman I never said that; I have never said it. You will look into the *Hansard* in vain for it. I will repeat what I said. The hon. gentleman knew I had not said that, but what I said was this——

Mr. MILLS. I object to what the hon. gentleman now says. I did not know it; I believed the hon. gentleman said it; and notwithstanding his denial, I believe it still. I believe he is mistaken.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I said the hon. gentleman knew what I had said. I had repeated it several times during former debates to the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey). I said that the Acting Librarian as one of the Civil Service examiners, had done work which had been estimated as equivalent to three months work. That is to say, that the hours given to that work would reach about eighty days of the ordinary work of a civil servant. The hon. gentleman has stated that this measure will bring the Library into a state of disorder, which will be contrary to its interests and those of Parliament. Strange to say, the change that is proposed by the promoter of this Bill is one which is advocated by the prospective Librarians themselves. The present Acting Librarian, who has fulfilled his duties, I am sure, to the great satisfaction of every member of the House, and whose position during this Session has certainly not been a sinecure, stated that it would be conducive to the good order of the Library if the duties of the different officers of the Library were divided, some having charge of the General Library and the others of the Parliamentary Library. Hon. members very well know that one of the important duties is the purchasing of books; and this financial and material part of the management deserves special attention. The management of that portion of the library which relates to science and general literature, other than that which is used by members for parliamentary purposes, also constitutes a very large portion of the duties of the Librarian. The Acting Librarian has suggested this: That the Library be divided as proposed, and that each officer should have under his surveillance sub-officers, whom they will train specially in the lines of knowledge required, either for discussions in this House or for other information which we are likely to seek from the Library. Is there any great difference, then, between what is proposed now and what has been in existence? A line of division has always existed. There were the works concerning French works on history, politics and science. We are so situated in this country, in having two languages, that it is not to be expected a single officer can attend to both branches with equal thoroughness. The present Acting Librarian might attend to both; but it would be imposing too much upon him, and the work would not be so efficiently done as if the duties were divided. In former times the deputy was, in fact, as independent in discharging his duties as the Chief Librarian is now. The Parliamentary Librarian will be acting jointly with the General Librarian, but there will be a division of duties. If there was a great difference involved in the expenditure of the Library by this scheme, I would say it is worth considering. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat contradicted the statement made by the Minister of Public Works and the First Minister, in saying there would be a reduction in the expenditure. The hon. member for Bothwell said: You spoke of economy and of reducing the expenditure, and yet in the next breath you provided for two Librarians. The statement of the First Minister was quite true. In regard to new nominations, and we know they occur frequently, not less than two officers are now wanted, the First Minister said we would try to enforce the provisions of the Civil Service Act; and with respect to those entering the service, the intention of the Government is to secure good men, but to admit them at lower salaries than those at which they now enter. That, of course, would effect a reduction of the expenditure. I repeat that hon. gentlemen on the other side cannot contend that the work will not be better done, that the classification, which is as good there as anywhere else, will not be conducive to the efficiency of the Library. We have not to discuss here the question of whether the Library should be absolutely divided. Perhaps, in the future, the Library would have to be divided. We know that the Library contains a large amount of literature which is not necessary for a Parliamentary Library—I do not call it frivolous, because that would be censuring the past Librarian, but that literature, for ordinary reading, takes up a large portion of the time of some of the officers of the Library, and it is intended, or at least has been suggested by the Acting Librarian, to have regulations to prevent too much of the time of those officers being taken up in that branch of the work. The hon. gentleman has said that the British Museum has only one Librarian, and that the Library at Washington has only one Librarian. I do not say that it is impossible to work under one

Librarian here, but I say that there can be no objection to the division under two heads, and that no wrong is done in dividing the Library in that way. The hon. member for Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) has alluded to the saying of Napoleon, that there should be only one command, and that one bad general is better than two good ones; but I think in ordinary experience he will find that that paradox does not always apply. I think it will be found that two Librarians, one having certain fixed duties to perform and the other having entirely distinct duties to perform, will be able to do the work better. The commanding power will be outside of the Library, in the hands of the Speaker and the others who assist him in that duty. In a word, economy is respected in this arrangement, and the increase of expense is only in the mouths of the hon. gentlemen. I do not think that even in their minds it seriously exists, and I think that upon reflection they will agree with me that the service will be better done under the arrangement which is now proposed.

Mr. DAVIES. If the speech of the hon. Minister of Public Works failed to convince the House that this proposal is unnecessary, I think that there can be no doubt about it after the speech of the Secretary of State. That hon. gentleman has advanced no reason whatever to justify the proposed increase of public expenditure. He has intimated, or thrown across the floor, the suggestion that there was some concealed reason on the part of the Opposition for opposing this measure. The hon. gentleman must have known, for he was in his place when the leader of the Opposition spoke, the reasons for which we oppose this proposal; they are patent and plain on its face. In the first place, we say that the proposal will increase, to a large extent, the burthens of the people. In the second place, we say that where we now have a responsible head of the Library, responsible to Parliament and to the Committee of both Houses, who advise with that head, we will hereafter have two heads, neither of whom will be responsible; and that the responsibility will be shuffled from one to the other, so that Parliament will not know whom to look to. We hear hon. gentlemen speak about a Parliamentary and a General Library, but there is no such thing in existence. The whole Library is a Parliamentary Library. The Minister of Public Works says that it is a splendid way to solve the problem. What is the problem? There is no problem. These hon. gentlemen create the problem themselves, and then they ask us to look at their statesmanship in solving it. Was there any problem in the time of the late Librarian—any complaint that that gentleman could not discharge his duties fairly? Was there any such complaint came before the Committee of both Houses, which Committee is more competent than anybody else to advise this House as to the manner in which the Library is conducted? Have they ever hinted as to the necessity or advisability of having a divided responsibility? No, Sir. Who ever talked or heard of any such a proposal? It is simply party exigencies which have prompted the hon. gentleman to bring down this proposition to Parliament. I maintain that where you have one head of a Library, with a parliamentary committee to advise with him, it is monstrous to say that when you have the disbursing of $10,000 a year he must have associated with him another gentleman in the management of the Library. The hon. gentleman says there is to be no increase of expenditure. Well, Sir, the present assistant gets $2,400 and you are to give him $3,000, and another gentleman is to have $3,000 more. Is that no increase? Then the hon. gentleman has added a proviso to his resolution, that no existing officer in the Library shall have his salary reduced, so that there is not only a decided increase of expenditure, but there is a provision against any reduction of expenditure; you have, in the first place, increased the public burthens, and, in the second place, you have divided the responsibility for the management of the Library, which will certainly result in difficulties. To whom are the parliamentary committee to look; whom are they to censure if anything goes wrong; upon which particular one of these Parliamentary Librarians is this House to pass a vote of censure if the work of the Library is not properly done? We have now somebody to whom we can look, in the person of the Librarian, who has officials under him to do the work and they must obey his orders. But how are these subordinates to act now? Whom are they to obey; and supposing there is a clashing between the two heads of the Library, which one of them is to rule? I maintain that the proposition is utterly indefensible, and I say that it is on a par—and I hope hon. gentlemen will mark it—with the policy which clearly marks the line the Government are taking in every Department of the public service. Last year a similar proposition was made. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, whose Department is a decreasing Department came, without reason or rhyme, with a proposal to increase the number of deputy heads to two, at great expense to the public. They were not needed; it was an indefensible proposition; they could not defend it and they did not defend it. It was simply called for by party exigencies. So far from dividing responsibility, or dividing up our Library, I say we should be consolidating our public Libraries. In the Archive Department we have a Library, and with what result? Those of us who are on the Library Committee know that it has happened more than once that the gentleman at the head of the Archives Department, when a library is offered for sale in some part of the Dominion, has positively gone and bid against the gentleman in the General Library, so that we had the spectacle of two public officers bidding against one another with the public money, and therefore I say that it is disgraceful, and that the object should be the consolidation of these Libraries into one, with a head over them responsible to Parliament, and to whom Parliament should look. Then we have a large library in the Geological Survey, and another at the Supreme Court, with a librarian there, and I suppose, in a few years, there will hardly be a Department in the public service without its having a separate library and a librarian at its head. The hon. gentleman asks us to have faith that the salaries will be decreased. But I would ask any hon. member of this House if he knows an instance in which the salaries, or the number of officers of any Department, have been decreased. My observation has been, since I have been in Parliament, that the salaries are being increased year after year, that the number in the service of the Departments is being increased, and that the pressure is constant on the Government to increase those salaries and increase the numbers of officials in the Departments. I say that those who are in favor of economy and efficiency should set their faces sternly against those propositions which tend to increase the public expenditure in any of the Departments.

Mr. CASEY. This proposal, on the face of it, seems to be merely a proposal to divide the responsibility for the management of the Parliamentary Library; but taken in connection with the explanations which have been given, it is really a proposal to create two Libraries. We are told that there is to be a Parliamentary Librarian and a General Librarian. We have heard allusions to a Parliamentary Library and a General Library, which are to be under the care of those two gentlemen respectively. Now, although the Premier says that this provision is an eventuality of the future, it is quite clear that the whole defence of the appointment of two Librarians has been based on this coming division of the Library, and that the appointment of two Librarians is merely a preparatory step in the division of the Library into two separate Libraries. As my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island said, it would be much

more seemly to collect the scraps of libraries that exist in the various Departments under the care of one Librarian than to propose still further to divide the collection of books which we have at present in the Library attached to this House. If it were merely a case of divided control the objections to the proposal would be extremely great. I do not know that they could be put better than they were by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island; but I think that it is proper that I should endorse his statement of the evils arising from that division, and that every person who feels as I do should urge upon the Government that it is absurd and monstrous that there should not be some one person responsible for the management of the Library. It is quite certain that these two gentlemen cannot always agree in matters connected with the management of the Library, and one must prevail over the other; or else, if there be a dispute that cannot be settled by them, it must be referred, as the hon. Secretary of State says, to the parliamentary committee, which is to be the supreme authority. Now, Sir, a parliamentary committee is not a desirable head of a Library; it is not desirable that the parliamentary committee should have the power to decide questions of mere Library management. Of course, it must decide the policy of the Library—what class of books the vote should be expended for; but in questions of mere library management, there should be some person employed by the House, and responsible to the House for his action, in whose hands the final decision should rest, and not in the hands of the Library committee, which is not in the same sense responsible to the House and the country for what it may do. Of course, it is responsible in some sense, because it is composed of members of the two Houses; but it would be impossible to hold the members of that committee responsible or to do anything by which we could censure them for any mistake they made. It is just as essential that the Library should be under the control of one head as that any other department should be. I cannot understand what lines the proposed division of the Library is to follow—what is to distinguish a Parliamentary Library from a General Library? I can quite understand that books of a political character and parliamentary books of reference would naturally belong to the Parliamentary Library; but I am quite at a loss to understand what kind of books are to be excluded—whether books of general science, of history or of travel, or literary works, of no value as works of reference, but merely for their literary excellence, would be excluded from the list of a Parliamentary Library. I think they certainly should not be; and I do not suppose the hon. Secretary of State or anybody else would wish to exclude such books from the list of a Parliamentary Library. If he did, it would become a very small collection of volumes. The object of those who choose books for a Parliamentary Library should be to make it include not only books of reference, political works, and works of literary excellence, but works of a scientific character, which are too costly to be obtained by ordinary libraries. Beyond this, I do not think a Parliamentary Library ought to go. If it is proposed to have a general literary library, consisting largely of works of fiction, I say it is entirely unjustifiable. There is no reason why a library of light literature should be maintained by this Government, which would be really providing a public library for this city, and not for the public at large, or its representatives. I quite agree with the hon. the Secretary of State that we have gone perhaps too far in that direction already; but, if it is proposed to form a General Library as distinct from a Parliamentary Library, we must go much further than we have gone, and maintain a library of light literature and fiction. There is another reason why I am opposed to this division of authority. I have always advocated the principle that promotion should be the rule in the public service—that when the highest place in a Department is to be filled it should be filled by the best qualified officer in a lower rank, if a person can be found in the Department qualified to perform the duties at all. I do not need to urge that Mr. DeCelles was qualified to perform the duties of Librarian, for the right hon. gentleman will no doubt urge that he is; therefore, we may take it for granted that he is. If we were not satisfied, from our general knowledge of that gentleman, the fact that he has performed the duties of Librarian for the past year is a sufficient proof that he is competent. Why, then, is he not promoted to the position of Chief Librarian? The only answer is that the place was wanted for some one else—that a political friend of the Government wanted a place, and a place not being vacant, one must be made for him. The Ministers did not dare to continue Mr. DeCelles in his present place, and commit the glaring injustice of appointing an English-speaking Librarian over his head, and they did not dare to appoint Mr. DeCelles Chief Librarian, and give him a corresponding salary, because somebody else wanted the place. The place has been left open for a year, and now the dispute has been settled, not in favor of one or the other, but by doubling the offices and salaries. I protest, in the name of the principles on which our Civil Service is supposed to be conducted, against the neglect to promote Mr. DeCelles and against dividing the office to make a position for a political friend. The hon. Minister said that possibly we could get along with one Librarian. Possibly we, with our 105,000 or 110,000 volumes, do not need any more supervision of our Library than does the Washington Library, with its 250,000 volumes, or the British Museum Library, with its million volumes or more! Possibly, the hon. gentleman says, very naively and pleasantly, our Library does not need absolutely any more supervision than do these. That admission is very amusing. Not only has Mr. DeCelles been able to conduct our Library on his own responsibility, but he has had sufficient spare time to give the equivalent of three Civil Service months to other work. But, says the hon. Minister, no one officer can be expected to understand equally well French and English literature and to select books in each with equal efficiency. Nobody ever supposed he could, but there is nothing to prevent our obtaining, if we have a French-speaking gentleman as head of the Library, the services of an efficient Englishman as Assistant Librarian, who could give all the advice necessary for the selection of English works. The hon. gentleman says the work will be better done with two heads. That is absurd, on the face of it; it is absurd to say that two persons, with concurrent authority and no arbiter to decide between them, will do the work as well as one. There has been no complaint hitherto of the work being ill done; there has been nothing to warrant the Government in making this change. We all know how the work was done in Mr. Todd's time; that gentleman was a perfect encyclopædia of information; you will not get two or five Librarians, for years to come, who will be one tithe as efficient in that respect as was Mr. Todd. There were no complaints of the management of the Library under him; there have been no complaints under Mr. DeCelles; although no one will pretend he is as highly qualified as his predecessor. Therefore, if under the late Librarian, who was a gentleman very far advanced in years, there was no complaint, and if under the management of the Acting Librarian, Mr. DeCelles, there has been no complaint, the proposal to appoint two men to do the work is one that can only have its origin in the desire to find a place for a political friend. As to the question of expense, I cannot at all follow the calculation of the Secretary of State, who says it will be only an increase of $300 or $400. I do not see that the Library staff is reduced by this resolution; certainly the salary cannot be reduced, and I fail to see that the substitution of two salaries of $3,000 each, instead of the

one salary, which could not go higher than $3,200, will make an increase of only $300. I should say it will make an increase of at least $2,800 in the expenses of the Library. Although there is a rider that the salaries of the present employees shall not be reduced, there is no assurance that they will not be increased. They are to be fixed by Order in Council.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. According to the Civil Service Act. There are two vacancies which will be filled by officers drawing less salaries.

Mr. CASEY. That only makes my case stronger. With only an Assistant Librarian, and when there are two vacancies, we do not feel the need of any extra staff, and yet it is proposed to appoint two Chief Librarians. If we have been able to get along without a Librarian at all, and when there are two vacancies on the staff, it is a strange conclusion to draw that we must appoint two Librarians and fill the vacancies too. The hon. gentleman says the vacancies will be filled according to the Civil Service Act. I admit that; I am not prepared off-hand to say how far the present salaries will compare with those which are to be received under the Civil Service Act, but I am prepared to take this position: that even if there were no extra expense at all, the division of authority, the discouragement of the service by failing to carry out the ordinary rules of promotion, the encouragement of partisanship by making this special provision for the relief of a faithful servant on the press, all these things will be quite sufficient to condemn the scheme.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). This looks to me to be just about as transparent a job, on a small scale, as any hon. gentlemen opposite have yet attempted to justify to Parliament. The hon. Minister of Public Works addressed the House, as also did the hon. Secretary of State, and yet neither ventured to submit to Parliament a single excuse or justification for the creation of this additional office. There is no necessity for it; the public has not called for it; the members of the House have not called for it; we have not found any inconvenience from the absence of an additional Librarian. What, then, is the object of this proposition? Everybody knows that the sole object is to provide a soft spot for a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite. The office of Librarian ought to have been filled long ago, and would have been filled long ago had the Government been able to reconcile the conflicting claims of those who aspire to the position. The claims of the Acting Librarian could not be ignored. He is an efficient officer, and ought to have been appointed to the office long ago; the vacancy should not have been allowed to exist for a period of fifteen months, but unfortunately, another person had some claims to the position. He ventured to advance his claim upon the Government, and the Government could not afford to ignore his claims, and therefore, for fifteen months past, this office has remained unfilled. Now, in order to satisfy these two claimants, hon. gentlemen resort to this dodge of appointing a Joint Librarian, of appointing two Librarians to discharge the duties which were formerly performed by one, and to pay them $6,000 instead of $5,400 or $5,600, which was formerly paid, thus causing, at the lowest estimate, an additional expense of $400 to the country, without any corresponding increase in the advantages, or in the benefit to members of the House, or to the public, who are interested in this Library. We all know perfectly well that hon. gentlemen had to satisfy the claims of the ex-editor of the *Mail*. He was dismissed from the editorship of the *Mail* for his consummate lies and abuse of all the public men of the country, and he had thus claims upon the Government which they could not resist, those claims being—abusing, slandering and vilifying the Opposition. They could not resist those claims, so they promised to give him this position; they could not resist the claim of the Assistant Librarian. There was a power behind the throne that they could not resist, and so they had to resort to this transparent dodge, in order to gratify the ex-editor of the *Mail*. I wish hon. gentlemen every joy of the appointment they are making, especially the appointment of the ex-editor of the *Mail* newspaper, who was dismissed from the position of editor because the respectable members of the Conservative party could not stand the persistent lying of the editor of the *Mail*, his constant abuse of public men, who did not think as the Government thought, and could not see with the same eyes as the Government and their supporters. So they had to provide a place for him, and they propose to do it by foisting him into this position, where he will feed at the public crib at an annual salary of $3,000. It is time that the country understood this. I hope they will understand it, and I think they will. They will understand that this is the way in which the Government reward their camp followers; and that the more abusive they are, the more they vilify the opponents of the Government, the better office they will get. If a man is sufficiently abusive he will be rewarded by being foisted into the public service at a large salary of from $2,000 to $5,000 a year. It is nonsense to say that this is not increasing the expense. It is increasing the expense. You cannot have two men doing the work of one without increasing the expense. You cannot get the Assistant Librarian and the ex-editor of the *Mail* to do the work of Mr. Todd at the salary which Mr. Todd received. It is time the House and the public understood that this is nothing but one of those transparent jobs which the Government are in the habit of perpetrating, and of attempting to justify to Parliament, but which they cannot justify to Parliament.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 1,

Mr. MILLS. I called the attention of the House, before you took the Chair, to the fact that the Assistant Librarian, according to the statement of the Secretary of State, had devoted at least three months of the past year to his duties as Civil Service examiner. The hon. gentleman denied that statement, and I have taken the trouble to turn to the speech which he made on the 27th February of this year, when the Bill was under discussion which he was then promoting. He said:

"They (that is the examiners) have heretofore been paid at the rate of $5 a day, provided the number of days did not exceed sixty days in the year. This amount has proven to be not only inadequate, but completely out of proportion to the amount of work necessarily imposed upon the examiners."

And further down, in the same speech, he says:

"During last year the examinations of the month of June alone actually took, of the time of the Civil Service examiners—counting the number of hours, because some of them belonged to the Civil Service—over eighty days for the completion of their work."

So that one examination took nearly the whole three months, and subsequently the hon. gentleman, in the discussion of the Bill, declared that a less time could not be taken; that it was wholly impossible that these gentlemen could discharge their duties in a shorter period of time. There are several other examinations beside this one in June, so the committee will see that my recollection was entirely accurate and the recollection of the hon. gentleman himself was altogether erroneous. I mentioned this statement, because it shows that there is no excuse or pretext for this double-headed organisation which the hon. gentlemen have now submitted to the attention of Parliament. I do not know—the hon. gentleman may have studied the Government of Japan and learned something of the functions of the Mikado and the Tycoon before introducing this

Bill, but I think it will be found that it will be wholly unjustified by the country, and will be extremely mischievous if it is carried through this House and is acted upon.

Mr. BLAKE. The clause you have now put to the committee provides, as to these two officers, that one is to be called the General Librarian, the other to be called the Parliamentary Librarian, and they are to hold a joint commission as Librarian of Parliament, and to have equal powers. Being jointly the Librarian of Parliament and having equal powers, of course they have equal powers over the whole range of the Library. There is no proposal here—and, to avoid any misconception that may have arisen formerly, I may say that I am not suggesting that there should be such a proposal—to divide our books into two parcels, and to draw a line which it would be difficult, and I think practically impossible, to draw. There is no proposal of that kind, and therefore you find two officers under a single name as the Librarian of Parliament, with equal powers and equal range. I have not heard the hon. gentleman say that, in any other library in the world, such provision as this is made. I have not heard him give us any precedent for this proposal of his. He says it would be a great improvement, but it is not an improvement, so far as I know, which is supported by any evidence that it has been attempted in the past; still less, that it has worked well in the past; nor has it been pointed out by him that there is any evil in the course which has been pursued heretofore, which it is proposed to cure. On the contrary, I fear that evils will be created or exaggerated by this plan, which may more or less exist in the present one. I have said that the clause proposes to call these two officers the Librarian of Parliament, and to give them equal powers, but their separate denomination as General Librarian and Librarian of Parliament indicates, to some extent, what the scope of their separate functions is to be. Now, the great danger is, I apprehend, with the pressure which exists on the part of the good people of the city of Ottawa, and on the part, if I may say so without offence, of one or two members of Parliament, that we may have a straining of the grant towards what may be called the General Library against the Parliamentary Library. My opinion is that the Parliamentary Library is, and has for a long time been, extremely defective. I think there are many books missing which are wanted in a very narrow sense of the term to the Parliamentary Library, and I think very many of these books are books which might be obtained without any or at very slight expense. I refer to very useful works, what we call blue books, but they are not blue books with them, compilations of many kinds, conveying useful information, in many of the State Legislatures, and also in many of the other Governments of the world. I have often had occasion to endeavor to obtain information of that kind and have found the Parliamentary Library defective in these regards. It is defective, also, in many other respects which belong particularly to its character as a Parliamentary Library, as a library of those works which are requisite for good law making, for the knowledge that is required to make the good laws on the various subjects with which we are dealing. Now, more than one hon. gentleman, speaking on the other side, has said: We have gone too far towards a General Library. One hon. gentleman said, there is a good deal of light literature, a good deal of frivolous literature. It is quite true; there is a good deal of that, and how much more is that going to be increased when you put one man over the Parliamentary Library and another man, in contradistinction to him, over the General Library, whose business it will be to press the interests of general literature as against the interests of parliamentary literature. That plan is proposed for the division of the funds? My own theory of the use of the parliamentary grant is, that the first primary use towards which it should be devoted, and towards which all that is necessary should each year be devoted, is to secure those things which are essential to the Library as a Parliamentary Library strictly; and that it is only such surplus funds as the liberality of Parliament may allot that can with reason be devoted to what you may call as general, as distinct from a Parliamentary Library. In a word, a Parliamentary Library is the primary thing, and the rest is more or less important; you may adopt a larger, or less liberal view as to that; but you must supply, first of all, what is strictly the Parliamentary Library. Now, we are going to create difficulties in carrying out this plan, because you are setting up a dignitary, an officer with coequal powers to those of the Parliamentary Librarian, who is to be called a General Librarian, and whose interests are to be in that direction. It has been said that there must be some division of labor. There has been a division of labor, but it has been infinitely more intelligible than is now suggested, a division of labor which must, to some extent, exist still, which will not be divided, and cannot be probably divided efficiently, between these two officers at all, and part of which each must take. That division of labor is due to the existence of the circumstance that our Library is in two great languages, the English and the French languages. Of course, there are books in some other languages, but speaking broadly, it is in the English and French languages. Of course, it is natural, unless you get a very good man indeed, that if you have two chief officers of the Library one should be more familiar with one language and one literature than the other would be, and the other officer more familiar with the other language and literature. This is natural and reasonable, and it is, perhaps, essential, so long as you intend to do justice to those two great divisions of the Library. But these divisions are not co-extensive with the range of a General and Parliamentary Library. You will want parliamentary books in the French language, and you will want works of general literature in the English language; and the division will not be co-extensive with the division of the great officers; and if you think that a special knowledge in French or in English literature is required for a proper choice and supervision of the books in each language, these officers' functions will overreach one another and run into one another, and the Parliamentary Library will have to deal with a certain class of the General Library in the language with which he is not familiar, and so with the General Library. That division is not an unreasonable division, but it will not work in with this proposed division, and it will create and intensify the difficulties which it is proposed by this plan to create. Now, it is said these two persons are to hold a joint commission as Librarian of Parliament. They are to be Librarian of Parliament, and to have equal powers. They are going to have under them eleven servants. Now, it does seem a curious arrangement that you are going to have given to those men with co-equal powers, eleven clerks and messengers, who are to be subordinate to them, and one man's work will require attention at one time and another man's work will require attention at another time. Is there to be any subdivision amongst these various officials? Are they also to be ranked, and some primarily to be at the service of one of the officers, and the others at the service of the other? or are they all to do one joint and single kind of work? If they are all to do one joint and single kind of work, it is because the whole work is unique, is of one character, and if of one character, therefore placed under one head. But if they are to be divided, how are they to be divided? Are you going to allot some to one man and some to another man? How is the question to be settled, whose services are to be obtained, and by what order the services of the different clerks are to be obtained, by each individual? It seems to me that there has been no indication that either the experience of other

countries in the conduct of a single library, or the experience of our own country in the conduct of this, or any other of its libraries, proves that there is an evil to be redressed, and still less proves that it is to be redressed by these means, of appointing two men with equal powers under the one commission as joint Librarian of Parliament.

On paragraph 2, resolution 1,

Mr. BLAKE. I would ask whether the present staff are ranked in classes. Under the resolution of the Library Committee, approved by Parliament, these clerks rank as of first, second and third-classes.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; their salaries are ranged with reference to their position, if this Act passes, as first, second and third-class clerks in the Civil Service.

Mr. BLAKE. That is to say, at this time there are two persons who have salaries which would be the salaries of first-class clerks under the Act, and two who would have the salaries of third-class clerks.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, I think so. Mr. Laperrière has a salary of $1,800, which is the maximum When he disappears, his successor, probably, may have up to $1,400.

Mr. BLAKE. Then I understand the hon. gentleman to say there are two persons who would now properly rank as first-class clerks, by their salaries?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Do I understand there are two persons in the service who would rank as second-class clerks, by their salaries?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think so. As I said, Mr. Laperrière has $1,800. Mr. Todd is a first-class clerk, and he has $1,400. Mr. James Fletcher, second-class clerk, $1,100; Mr. Campbell, who, unfortunately, died, $1,100; Mr. Sylvain, third-class clerk, $1,000; Mr. Thayne, extra clerk, $800—not permanent, but a very valuable officer. In consequence of the decease of Mr. Campbell and the infirmity of another officer, two or three officers are employed temporarily until this Act passes.

Mr. BLAKE. There are two first-class clerks; there are two second-class; but Mr. Campbell's decease leaves a vacancy of a second-class clerk, which has not been filled. Are there three third-class clerks?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Smith is employed temporarily.

Mr. BLAKE. If you are going to fill Mr. Campbell's place, it is clear you are going to increase the staff.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are six clerks, besides the Librarian and Assistant Librarian.

Mr. BLAKE. Then you are proposing that the permanent staff shall include seven clerks, whereas the present staff is composed of only six clerks. Then it is plain that after making two heads, you are going to increase the staff by a third-class clerk. That is additional economy.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is the additional man. I did not observe until now that there is a junior clerk, who is attached to the Supreme Court, Mr. Ternent. He is called a clerk.

Mr. BLAKE. It is news to us that Mr. Ternent is called a clerk. I do not know who made him a clerk.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He is on the return of the Librarian.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Ternent is a messenger and in charge of the books of the Supreme Court. I do not know when he was made a clerk.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He is paid out of the Library vote.

Mr. BLAKE. Then there is not an additional man. If we are going to regulate the staff, we had better set this matter right. I do not think our Library vote should be charged with a clerk or messenger who is in charge of the books at the Supreme Court. That is really part of the cost of the Supreme Court, for the cost is incurred because the books are there.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The books belong to the Library here. They are lent to the court, and under the arrangement we can send for them at any time. It is of very little consequence whether this salary be charged to the Supreme Court or to the Library.

Mr. BLAKE. I trust some enquiry will be made into this matter. If it is proposed to turn Mr. Ternent into a clerk and provide for $50 a year increase, and that he may ultimately become a first-class clerk, I should like to understand it. If he is to be admitted as a third-class clerk, it is clear he will occupy a new relation to the Civil Service from that he has occupied up to this time. He was a messenger a little while ago.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; but very frequently our messengers become clerks.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not objecting to it, but it should be done by proper persons, and in a proper way.

Mr. CASEY. From my experience of the service in the Library this year, there is no necessity for increasing the staff by filling up Mr. Campbell's place. We have got along very well. We have not had any complaints of members not being served, and I never noticed, when in the Library, that the clerks were overworked.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have extra clerks.

Mr. CASEY. The officers are certainly not overworked; in fact, I do not think they work so hard as other officers, although they certainly have extraordinarily long hours. But it must be remembered that there are three messengers, all of whom are competent to do part of the clerks' work. Mr. Caseault, Mr. Dunlop and Mr. Ratté give out books and enter them, and in fact do everything connected with clerks duties, except, perhaps, the final posting. So the whole staff of eleven persons must be regarded as performing clerical duties. I think it will be quite possible to get along without having so many first and second-class clerks as are proposed. I do not desire to strike any from the list, but simply not to make an appointment of a second-class clerk in place of Mr. Campbell.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. I have received complaints. I have had a couple of letters from the Librarian, saying that very bitter complaints have been made by members of the House because the service was not satisfactorily done. The Librarian said the officers were kept perfectly busy, and certainly he had not more than he required.

Mr. CASEY. Of course, I was mistaken in saying positively that there had been no complaints. I only meant that I had heard none, and that I had none to make myself. The fact of complaints having arisen might come from the incompetency of some of the appointees. Of course, they cannot be fully competent when they enter the Library at first, and although there might be complaints this year with the same number of employés, next year there might be no cause of complaint, and probably there would be no complaint, as they would be more familiar with their duties. It must be remembered that out of the Session these clerks have comparatively little to do.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They cannot do anything else.

Mr. CASEY. No; but there is little for them to do, except during the Session, and we are making a permanent staff which is to cover all possible sessional exigencies, and proposing to keep it up the year round.

Mr. MILLS. I understood the First Minister to say that Mr. Laperrière was getting $1,800, and that would be increased to $2,400.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I did not say that. $1,800 is the maximum.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I desire to say a few words. I believe that if this Bill carries the effect of having two Librarians will be to materially impair the efficiency of the Library. The tendency to multiply offices is becoming alarmingly great. We have seen it in every Department this Session, and I hope that in the present condition of the affairs of the country the Government will not needlessly multiply offices which are going to place heavy burthens on the people. We have a large library at the present time at the Supreme Court, and there seems to be a tendency to have a library in every Department. Last year nearly $3,000 was spent in the different Departments for books of reference. As the General Library is easy of access, I do not see why they could not get their books there, instead of duplicating copies in each Department. This tendency to multiply offices and to have libraries in every Department is something the people of this country cannot stand. They are not going to put up with that sort of thing. I find that for books of reference there were spent by the Governor General's Department, $252.29; the Stationery Office, $22; Privy Council, $31.25; the Department of Justice, $322.85; Militia Department, $34; Secretary of State, $339.46; the Department of the Interior, $113.40; Indian Department, $10; Auditor General, nothing; Treasury Board, $82; Stationery Office, Finance Department, $122.20; Customs, $78.20; Inland Revenue, $390.25; Public Works, $149.75; Post Office Department, $292.05; Department of Agriculture, $207.56; Department of Marine, $92.82; Department of Railways, $431.26; or, in all, $2,962.58. And yet the Government come here deliberately and propose to add another office to the Library, and one which is calculated to destroy its efficiency and usefulness. It is impossible to have a Library under two heads and prosper. The Minister knows the difficulties which are caused by such an arrangement with officers whose duties may clash, and the consequence will be that instead of having a harmless rivalry between them you will have them pulling apart, in different directions, so as to impair the usefulness of the Library. At the present time, I say it is an outrage on the people of this country to have an additional officer placed there, when ministers are now establishing the neuclus of libraries in each Department, with one in the Supreme Court, besides the General Library, to which we are now appointing an additional Librarian. If the gentleman they propose to put in the Library as Librarian has been dismissed from the editorship of the *Mail*, it would be better that they should superannuate him at once than place him there. It would be better for the country, better for the Library and better for all parties concerned. I could not allow this Bill to become law without protesting, on behalf of the people of this country, as I believe its result will be injurious to the public in every conceivable way. This is being done at a time when the public service is being increased in an alarming proportion, and in a way which should cause the people to consider well whither we are drifting.

On resolution 2,

Mr. BLAKE. This is rather an important resolution. I should like to know whether it is intended to bring the Library staff technically within the ranks of the Civil Service. If that is to be done we will require to know, of course, how it is to be done. Is there to be another Bill to accomplish that object? What rank is this Joint Librarian, this double-head—this Siamese twin——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Double-headed-eagle.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; that would be a good name for the hon. gentleman's friend, and he might give him the franchise though he is a Librarian. Is he to have the rank of a deputy head, or of two deputy heads, or what? If it is intended to bring the other officers within the ranks of the Civil Service, which I think is a good thing, I think it would be better done by this measure. The language of the resolution ought to be to give the Governor in Council just the same, and no more, power with regard to these clerks, than is given to that useful and exalted functionary with regard to other clerks, while this appears to give larger powers. I do not see why the Governor in Council should have more power in fixing the salaries of these men than he would have with reference to other new appointments, and that would be within the limitations of the Civil Service Act, under which the salaries must be voted by Parliament. The language seems to be wider than that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not intended to be so. We cannot go beyond the scale laid down in the Civil Service Act.

Mr. BLAKE. No; but the scale in the Civil Service Act is a rather elastic scale; it commences at a minimum and goes to a maximum. If a new second-class clerk, for instance, is appointed in the place of Mr. Campbell, is it the intention that he should commence at the minimum salary of a second-class clerk?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; no doubt.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have not spoken on this subject yet, but it seems to me that there will be some confusion in the working out of this plan and that you will impair the usefulness of the Library, and will add to the expense. There is one chief messenger arranged for; to which head will he be responsible, or from which will he take his orders?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The chief messenger is under the Librarian.

Mr. PATERSON. Who is the Librarian?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are two agencies forming the chief agency of Librarian.

Mr. CASEY. And if the chief messenger is to be sent down town by one, and up into the galleries by the other, I suppose you will have to put two heads on him. I wish to call attention to the appointment of chief messenger. As I understand, the present chief messenger is getting $900. As I pointed out, he is doing clerical work. If his successor should be a man as capable as he is, he will do the same kind of work. I pointed out a few minutes ago where I thought the economy of one salary could be made amongst the clerks. As a corollary of that, I think a little more liberality should be extended to the messengers. I think the chief messenger of the Library should be entitled to a higher salary than the chief messenger of a Department. I understand that the salary of $700, put down here because it is the maximum, is the maximum salary of the chief messenger of a Department.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No. Mr. Caseault gets $900 and a free residence, which is valued at $300, making his income $1,200 a year; and in the Bill it is proposed that after him the chief messenger shall not get more than $700, that is $200 less than Mr. Caseault gets. There will be a saving of $200 there.

Mr. CASEY. Then there will be no promotion for any of the other messengers?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the messengers prove themselves fit to be clerks they are frequently promoted.

Mr. CASEY. If one of the junior messengers should be promoted, in case Mr. Caseault retires, he would get no increase of salary, as the messengers in the Library now get $700.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He would get the residence.

Mr. CASEY. The messengers in the Library are really, to some extent, clerks. They require qualifications higher than those of messengers in the Departments, and their hours during the Session are very much longer, and as long during the rest of the year, with the exception of any holidays they get, which I do not know of. For my part, I would not be sorry to see the messengers in the Library treated on a more liberal scale than the departmental messengers, considering the class of duties they perform and the long hours they have to put in during the Session.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman points out, as one of his economies, that when Mr. Caseault disappears, which I hope will not be for a long time——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAKE—$700 will be paid to his successor. The Library Committee recommend that Mr. Caseault should be treated as he is, because he is really a valuable clerk in the service. Although he is chief messenger, he has acquired a great degree of familiarity with the books; and as he was known to the members of the Library Committee to be really doing a clerk's work, we suggested in our report that his special qualifications justified what would appear to us a culpable proposal otherwise, with regard to a messenger, even though a chief messenger, that he should receive $900; and considering that in the future it was quite unlikely that a new chief would possess those special qualifications, we thought it prudent to fix the maximum salary at a lower figure. Knowing the tenderness of a Government, we thought it well to say, when we treated Mr. Caseault in that special manner, that we did not mean his case to be accepted as a precedent to be applied to all future chief messengers.

Resolutions reported, read the first and second times, and concurred in.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 139) to amend the Act in relation to the Library of Parliament.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 140) respecting the North-West Mounted Police—(*from the Senate*).—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

CONSTITUTION OF THE TREASURY BOARD.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the second reading of Bill (No. 104) to amend the sections of the Act therein mentioned relating to the constitution of the Treasury Board.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time; and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In all these cases an odd number is better than an even one. There seems to be no necessity for calling in this number six. The Secretary of State may be necessary, although I doubt the desirability of enlarging the number, but the five would work better than the six according to my experience. There would be more difficulty getting together four than three, as the First Minister knows, when the majority of the Ministers are likely to be absent from this city.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As regards an odd number being better than an even, I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. If there are six on the board, no resolution can be carried unless by four to two.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not myself see why the number should be increased to six. It is practically a great mistake to increase it to six. There may be reasons for having one other number, in view of the difficulty of sometimes procuring three out of four, but I believe in practice the efficiency of this board would be considerably enhanced by its being kept as low in numbers as is consistent with the possibility of getting a quorum. A large board will be a conflicting board, composed sometimes of one set of three men, and sometimes of another set, and the continuity of knowledge in those details of practice which come before a board of this kind, the continuity of a line of decision, is extremely important. The greater the efficiency produced and the larger the sense of responsibility the smaller the board is. Here is a proposal to add the Secretary of State to the board, and I presume that is really that he may be able to exercise in this respect, as in others, that tender and careful supervision over the Civil Service of the country he appears to be so anxious to exercise. He has obtained the supervision of the Civil Service Board of Examiners, and the Treasury Board has to do with recommendations very largely for examinations, affecting intimately the life of the civil servant, and I suppose the Secretary of State would like to have his finger in that pie. That makes five. Then you propose to add an odd man to be named by the Council. The Finance Minister, when he introduced the Bill, was asked his reason for introducing it. The only reason he gave was that it was necessary to enlarge the board, in order that more of the Provinces might be represented on the board. After a little discussion the First Minister was obliged to agree with me that it was not of great consequence that many of the Provinces should be represented on the board. He did not say so, because his colleague had just stated that as a proposition; but I do not think he differed very much with me in the view that it would be a very mistaken opinion to adopt the suggestion of the Minister of Finance, that we should create a sectional or provincial representation with reference to the Treasury Board. I said then and I repeat now that our object ought to be to get rid of the sectional or provincial notion, to a very considerable extent, as it was first established with reference to the Cabinet at large, and we are far from doing that when it is proposed openly on the floor of the Parliament, as the reason for increasing the board to six members, that it is essential that the different Provinces should be represented on the Treasury Board. As to provincial representation, I said then, and the hon. gentlemen took the same view, that there is a large sense in which it is important, in which regard should be had to the feelings of the Provinces and the conditions of large sections of the Dominion, but they will have the opportunity, in revising the decisions of the Treasury Board in Cabinet, of dealing with that; but I hope that the view that sectional representation on the Treasury Board is essential will not be averred again as the reason for the increase of the board to six, and no other reason having been given, I do hope the hon. gentleman will modify his proposal, leaving the Secretary of State, if he pleases, which will make the number five.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have had some experience, and the result of it is that it would be convenient to have six. With regard to the officers now specially mentioned, I think we shall all agree that they should be

on the board. The Minister of Finance, the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Inland Revenue, having large staffs under them, ought to be on the board. Then it is absolutely necessary to have the Minister of Justice on the board, as there is continual reference to him, and there would be consequent delay if he were not present. The Secretary State has been put on really for the reason the hon. gentleman has just mentioned. He represents the Civil Service in his Department, and in view of questions relating to the Civil Service he ought to be there. The object of having the other Minister is, first, to ensure a quorum, and in the next place, there may be a Minister holding one of the other offices who may be specially adapted, who may have held one of these offices at former times and may be specially fitted, in the opinion of his colleagues, to sit on the Treasury Board, to be a balance wheel. After some little experience we came deliberately to the conclusion that it would be well to have the six.

Mr. BLAKE. I shall not prolong the discussion on that point, but I was surprised to hear the reason given by the hon. gentleman in regard to the officers first named. He said they were on the board because they had large staffs under them. I have always supposed that the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Inland Revenue were selected because they were the officers who really represented the financial concerns of the country.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is true.

Mr. BLAKE. They are the receivers of the public revenues; they represent the revenue departments; the Minister of Justice represents the legal department; and there you had it complete. Now you propose to put in the Secretary of State as representing the Civil Service, and then it is still more complete, and after you have attained that absolute completeness, you propose to put in an excrescence.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I take exception to some words used by the hon. gentleman. He said I had imposed myself to the supervision of the Civil Service Board, and that now I wanted to have a finger in this pie. When I put in the Act that the Civil Service Board should, in regard to its officers, be under the supervision of the Secretary of State, it was not in order to take an improper control of the Civil Service examinations—the examinations are conducted and controlled by rules and regulations to be made by the Governor in Council; but as the officers of that branch of the service had to be attached to one Department, the expression "supervision" in the Bill meant only that the responsibility of that branch of the service and the control of the *personnel* of that branch should appertain to the Department of the Secretary of State, which I explained at the time. The hon. gentleman can take any exception he likes, but I challenge him to find in the administration of the Civil Service anything objectionable in the modest part taken by the Secretary of State. I have explained that the reason why it was asked that the Secretary of State should be added to the Treasury Board was that many cases connected with examinations and appointments were referred to the Board, and that it was better for the chief of the Department in which the Civil Service was to be present at that board. There was another reason, which the hon. gentleman has insinuated: that is, the representation on that board of certain large divisions in the country which should be represented and which were not represented at the time. I never pretended to monopolise anything, or to have my finger in every pie, and I do not think the hon. gentleman was justified in making use of such expressions.

Mr. BLAKE. The expression is not an offensive one, but is of very common use in our language, and it is a very nice pie to be in.

Bill reported, and read the third time and passed.

COMMERCIAL BANK OF WINDSOR.

Mr. BOWELL moved the second reading of Bill (No. 117) respecting the Commercial Bank of Windsor.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Was this through the Committee on Banking and Commerce?

Mr. BOWELL. No; this is the second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. BOWELL. I do not think it is necessary to send the Bill to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. It is simply to legalise the actions of the bank for a few years past. The bank was incorporated in Nova Scotia, and afterwards came under the provisions of the general banking Act of the Dominion, but it neglected to issue the notice in the official *Gazette*, and consequently, when all the bank charters were renewed, a year or two afterwards, this one was not included, from the fact that it had never given the necessary notice, and under the advice of the Minister of Justice it is recommended that this short Act should be introduced in order to legalise the actions of that bank.

Mr. BLAKE. That may be a very proper thing, but it seems to me very dangerous to say that it shall not go to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. The hon. gentleman's statement is that this bank's charter has lapsed, that it has been, in fact, a dissolved corporation for a number of years, and it is proposed now, and properly so—I do not say anything to the contrary—to give it relief and vitality, and to validate the obligations and agreements into which the compny may enter. It is essentially a matter in which many private interests may be concerned, and it seems to me that it is impossible to deal with it except as a private Bill. How can it be dealt with otherwise, on the statement of the hon. gentleman? The schedules not being included in the Act, the charter was not extended, as the hon. gentleman has said, and then the charter lapsed. Now private rights are certainly concerned here, and therefore this must be treated as a private Bill. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman not to move it to-night, so as to give us an opportunity of looking into it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is exceedingly unfortunate. They took every step to bring it within the range of the Dominion Banking Act, but by some mistake the notice was not properly given. Still, they have been coming on in good faith.

Mr. BLAKE. It is obvious that the question is of vast consequence. When private rights are concerned we should adopt those forms which are designed to give private individuals an opportunity of stating their case. It may be necessary for this bank to present a petition.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Will the hon. gentleman allow it to be referred to the Committee of the Whole, with the understanding that it can be moved, so as to leave it on the Paper?

Mr. BLAKE. All I desire is that we should have an opportunity of considering whether the Bill can go through except as a private Bill.

Mr. BOWELL moved that the Bill be referred to the Committee of the Whole, to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

Mr. COSTIGAN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 118) further to amend the Acts relating to Weights and Measures.

Motion agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the repealed section?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The repealed section reads as follows: "Two gallons shall be a peck, eight gallons shall be a bushel, and twenty-five gallons shall be a barrel." The present clause drops that part saying what a barrel is. The reason is, that retaining the barrel as a measure of capacity for liquids, as we do at present, creates a great deal of confusion. By the Inspection Act we have the flour barrel, for instance, we have the fish barrel, and we have another sort of barrel for pork and beef; we have another barrel for pearl and pot ash, all differing in dimensions. With all these barrels the capacity is based more upon the weight that they shall contain. I think it is evident that retaining the barrel as a measure is not required, and leads to confusion. We simply drop that measure out of the Weights and Measures Act.

On section 2,

Mr. COSTIGAN. There are two alterations. In the first place the 17th section is changed. That section reads as follows: "In any contract for the sale or delivery of any of the undermentioned articles, the bushel shall be determined by weight, unless a bushel by measure is specially agreed upon." Now, we make this change; these words are added to the clause I read: "Unless conveniences for weighing are not available." And these words also are added: "Unless a bushel by measure is specially agreed upon by writing;" because disputes often arise where verbal agreements are made, and any contract of that kind should be made in writing.

Mr. DAVIES. There is no change in the standard weights?

Mr. COSTIGAN. No.

Mr. JACKSON. I observe that oats are placed at 34 pounds. The standard weight for oats on the American side is 32 pounds, and that is nearer the weight in our section of the country. Timothy seed is also placed too high. It should be placed at 45 pounds instead of 48. It is true that an extra quality will weigh 48, but as a general rule the weight will be 45 pounds. General satisfaction would be given to the farmers in western Ontario if timothy seed was placed at 45 pounds and oats at 32 pounds.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The Winchester bushel is used in the United States, while we use the Imperial bushel. When these facts are considered, it will be found that the proportions are about the same.

Mr. JACKSON. Oats are sold by weight. I have bought thousands of bushels in the United States and in our own markets, and 32 pounds is nearer the weight than 34.

Mr. WALLACE (York). In our part of the country a bushel of oats will average 36 or 37 pounds.

Mr. FERGUSON. Thirty-four pounds is according to the standard Imperial bushel. The American 32 pounds is on the basis of the Winchester bushel. If, in the part of the country from which the hon. member for South Norfolk comes, the oats weigh only 32 pounds to the bushel, it shows that it is a poor oat-growing country. Our oats average 35 or 37 pounds.

Mr. IRVINE. I hold the view that this is a question which properly belongs to the practical men of the country. Their interest should be consulted. When cars are loaded and sent from here to the United States, the weight of the bushel should be assimilated. I brought this matter before the attention of the House three years ago, and I felt ashamed to mention it again to-night, on account of the reception my remarks received at that time, as I was but a practical man, and held a practical view on this subject. Before I brought it forward, I made enquiry of a farmer of my own Province, who is also a member, as to the matter. He said: I do not raise any oats, and when I buy them I want to get 34 pounds to the bushel. In Maine the weight is 30 pounds; but in all the other States, from the seaboard to the far west, the weight is 32 pounds. It must be remembered that only the poorest farmers in our country raise oats for sale, and their views should be consulted. The hon. member for Leeds stated that oats were sold to Montreal buyers at 34 pounds, and were resold at 32. How does this occur? Simply because there is an American trade. I am aware that in the Minister's own constituency the people want our bushel to be made the same as the American bushel. Gentlemen in that constituency consulted me in reference to petitioning Parliament to make the change. As an agriculturist I do not care a straw about this matter, because I do not raise oats to sell. They are not a paying crop to sell direct from the land. In regard to a bushel of timothy, I called attention to that matter three years ago. On the continent of America, at Boston, New York, Portland, Philadelphia, and the great marts of trade, timothy is sold at 45 pounds. If you will go down to the Ottawa market you will find it sold at 45 pounds. I cannot see why this question should not be submitted to a committee of practical men, members of this House, who would determine it in a common sense way and in accordance with the rules of trade. It is said that in New Brunswick the weight is 45 pounds to the bushel. There is not one man in fifty knows that 48 pounds is the standard weight, and not having large orders they might forget and consider that the standard was 45 instead of 48, and why, then, not make the change in accordance with the custom of the trade? With regard to oats, it would, of course, be convenient to make the standard the same as the American bushel. I might mention that in New Brunswick, before we came into Confederation, the standard was 33½ pounds to the bushel, and as they were sold by the pound or the bushel it was more convenient than 34.

Mr. JACKSON. In some parts of Ontario, especially where the soil is sandy, oats will not average more than 32 pounds to the bushel, though there are kinds now sown which weigh heavier. But taking the average, 32 pounds is the standard, and that being the universal weight on the American side, it would be very convenient to have the two similar. The Americans, of course, do not know anything about the Imperial bushel, so that I think it is very important that the weights should be similar. With regard to timothy, I am satisfied that in either country the average is not more than 45 pounds to the bushel.

Mr. CHARLTON. There is one advantage which I could point out to hon. gentlemen in favor of retaining the present standard of weight as to oats. In all the American ports the standard was 32 pounds to the bushel, and when they come to make comparisons between the United States and Canada as to the price of oats with reference to the National Policy, it is quite an advantage to the hon. gentleman to think that the Canadian standard is 2 pounds more than the American, so that there is an advantage of about 3 cents a bushel, and the public is deceived on that question. However, if he consults public convenience I think he would make the same standard as the United States, though 34 may be nearer the absolute weight than 32. I think it would be better to have a uniform standard of comparison, so that prices might be compared on a fair basis.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I thought you were opposed to uniformity.

Mr. HESSON. The same difficulty existed before as now exists with regard to the weight, and I do not think the weight should be disturbed to suit the National Policy. I think it would have an injurious effect instead of a beneficial effect on the price of oats. If we reduced the standard it would follow that the price would necessarily be lowered with the standard, and is 34 pounds seems to be pretty clearly established in western and northern Ontario, at all events, as the average weight of a bushel of oats, I think it would be unwise to reduce the standard, as it would likely be followed by a reduction of the price. If not, why is it that a higher weight involves a higher price? As we have not heard that the dealers or farmers have asked for such a change, and as in the great oat-growing districts of Ontario oats will maintain the standard of 34 pounds, and frequently 36, I do not think we should follow the standard of the United States, where, perhaps, the quality is not as good as ours.

Mr. IRVINE. The hon. gentleman is generally correct on other questions, but he has certainly a strange way of grading wheat. I would ask him if wheat is graded according to the bushel—does the bushel vary in weight to fix the grade? The bushel is 60 pounds, and the wheat is graded No. 1, 2 or 3, so that the weight of the wheat is not shifted to suit the grade.

Mr. HESSON. There are some grades which will go over 60 pounds.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should think, Mr. Chairman, that there is a great deal to be said in favor of the view of hon. gentlemen behind me, as to the desirability of having, as near possible, a uniform measure in articles which are largely dealt in, as between ourselves and the people of the United States. Personally, I have no doubt that if the bushel is reduced from 34 to 32 pounds, in all my dealings with the farmers I shall have to give just as much for 32 pounds as for the 34. I really think that the argument is deserving of attention; that for commercial purposes there is no doubt that, as nearly as may be, the standard of weight should be uniform with that of the other side.

Mr. BOWELL. How could that be possible, if the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Irvine) is correct? I understood him to say that the weight per bushel of oats, in Maine, was 30 pounds. Is that correct?

Mr. IRVINE. Yes.

Mr. BOWELL. Maine is the State which affects the Province from which he comes, and it is from his practical experience in the interchange of that particular commodity between Maine and New Brunswick that the hon. gentleman speaks. Now, the hon. members from the county of Norfolk deal almost exclusively in Michigan, in which they carry on lumbering operations, and there the standard is 32 pounds to the bushel, while here it is 34. Therefore, unless you make it 30 pounds to the bushel, as applied to New Brunswick, and in other parts of the Dominion 32 pounds to the bushel, you will not meet the views of gentlemen opposite, and if this be done, what becomes of the uniformity that is asked for?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Maine is the solitary exception, I believe, as in all the other States it is 32; and the quantity of oats, so far as my memory serves, as shown by the Trade and Navigation returns, sent to the State of Maine, as compared with what is sent from the other Provinces to other parts of the United States, is infinitessimal.

Mr. BOWELL. That may be. The exportation of oats from the Province of Quebec, and also from the western Provinces, would not meet the views of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Irvine.) if the bushel were declared to be 32 pounds.

Mr. GAULT. The city of Montreal is the very centre of the oat market for the Province of Quebec. We ship no oats from Montreal to the United States, that I know of. In fact, the total shipment of oats from Canada to the United States last year was under 25,000 bushels. In Montreal we expect to get 36 pounds to the bushel, which is the weight of the very best quality; but in general 32 pounds is the standard weight.

Mr. JACKSON. What is the weight of peas in Montreal?

Mr. GAULT. Sixty-six pounds, I believe. It would be far better that all these things should be sold by weight instead of by measure.

Mr. WATSON. I think oats, wheat and peas are all sold by weight. A bushel of wheat is supposed to be 60 pounds of wheat, and a bushel of oats 34 pounds of oats. So far as Manitoba is concerned, I think we ought to have a special grade for oats as well as for wheat, for our oats go 40 pounds to the Imperial bushel. If oats weigh 36 pounds to the bushel when the standard weight is 34 pounds, they are worth just so much more a bushel. Wheat is graded in the same way. If a standard is established for oats, there ought to be a special grade for Manitoba. A country is a very poor country that will not grow oats that weigh more than 34 pounds to the bushel.

Mr. WALLACE. In reference to a remark made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that fixing the standard weight at 34 pounds, instead of at 32 pounds, as in the United States, is giving an advantage to the National Policy—it would just amount to one-sixteenth of the price; and if you add one-sixteenth to the price of oats in Chicago to-day, and the freight from Chicago to Toronto and Montreal, you will find that there is 5 cents difference in the price of oats at Toronto and Chicago, after the duty is paid.

Mr. IRVINE. I have not looked at the Trade and Navigation returns to ascertain the quantity of oats that was shipped to the United States last year. But I remember that, when I dealt with the question some three years ago, I stated that we exported, I think, some 4,000,000 bushels. I know there was a falling off last year. Of course, any practical farmer who is in the habit of raising grain is just as good an authority on this subject as I am; but I hold that any merchant, or lawyer, or doctor, or statesman, or politician, who is not in the habit of doing this is not as good an authority as I am. There are a dozen different varieties of oats; one variety will weigh 38 pounds to the bushel, and another perhaps not more than 30 pounds. The oats we raise are the White Russian variety, which is an early and splendid oat, and weighs about 32 pounds to the bushel. We find it more profitable than either the black oats, which are grown in Prince Edward Island, or the potato oats. I am only speaking on behalf of the poor pioneer, who goes into the woods and clears up his land, and who has to sell his oats as soon as they are up; and I would like to see you deal a little more liberally with these men. If there is anything in making the weight 32 pounds instead of 34 pounds, let the poor man have the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. STAIRS. I would just say to the hon. gentleman, that it will not make very much difference to the poor what the weight of the oats will be, because the price will vary accordingly. If the oats weigh 34 pounds to the bushel he will get a few cents more per bushel than he would if they weighed only 32 pounds; so that it does not make very much difference what the weight of the bushel is, so long as it is a settled thing. If the weight in the past has been 32 pounds, I think it would be wise not to make any change. As to any advantage we might gain from trade with the United States in oats, a reference to the Trade and Navigation returns shows that the trade in oats with that country

is so small that it need not be taken into consideration at all. I find the exportations from the different Provinces to be as follows: from Ontario, 964 bushels; from Quebec, 20,383 bushels; from Nova Scotia, 68 bushels; from New Brunswick, 1,567 bushels, and from Prince Edward Island, 3 bushels, worth a dollar.

Mr. SPROULE. The argument of the hon. member for Carleton will not hold good in the interest of the farmer. Speaking from my knowledge of the custom in my part of the country, it would be to the disadvantage of the farmers to reduce the standard weight to 32 pounds, because the farmers, who very frequently send oats to the doctors and lawyers, and professional men of whom he speaks, measure them themselves; and if a bushel was declared to be 32 pounds instead of 34 pounds, the farmer would be losing 2 pounds on every bushel. I do not see anything in the argument of the hon. gentlemen who say that we should assimilate the weight of our grain to that of the Americans. I think we should have some national standard of our own; there is no reason why we should accommodate the Americans by assimilating everything to their system. Our people are accustomed to our weights and measures; in my part of the country a great many of the farmers do not use scales at all, but use the measure for everything, and it is found that of good wheat 60 pounds make a bushel, of ordinary fair oats 34 pounds, and of timothy seed 48 pounds. When they are accustomed to these weights it would only create confusion to make a change.

Mr. JACKSON. It is evident the hon. gentleman does not sell.

Mr. SPROULE. On the contrary, I have been selling as a farmer, and buying and selling as a grain merchant.

Mr. JACKSON. I claim it is of very great importance that we should have a uniform weight. In my part of the country the farmers sell by the bushel entirely, but they do not measure it; they sell by the bushel by weight. If the farmer had a weight of 32 pounds to the bushel he would receive as much money as by weight of 34, because he is paid by the bushel. Of course, when we come to ship to a foreign market, and the foreign market's bushel is less in weight, it would make a difference, but not in our local market. In order to benefit the farmer and for the convenience of trade, oats should be 32 pounds to the bushel.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.). Our shipments to the United States are but 32,000 bushels, about what good a farmer could carry himself. The hon. gentleman might as well say we should have a standard to suit the English market of 304 pounds to the quarter. I would be glad to benefit the farmers, because I am as much interested in the farmers as any man in this House, but it is quite immaterial whether the standard is 32 pounds 34 or 36 pounds; the price will be regulated according to the price of the foreign market.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As a matter of fact, it is not at all certain that the returns given under the heads of exports to the United States in these matters can at all be relied upon. The Customs returns state every year that 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 of this class of goods, apparently, are calculated to be exported under the head of short returns. If that be correct, it is exceedingly probable that all along the frontier a considerable quantity of such articles as these, and I dare say the Minister of Customs is aware of the fact, are exports of which no record is kept. That is the case along the New Brunswick frontier to a considerable extent, and I am told also along the Eastern Townships frontier, and no doubt along our whole frontier, wherever it is close to the frontier of the United States. Of course it is impossible for us, on the evidence given to us, to tell what proportion of these 3,000,000 or 4,000,000 claimed as short returns to the United States belongs to this or that particular article, but there must be a considerable quantity of each. As to the contention of the hon. member for Grey, that it is desirable for us, lying close to the United States, to have different standards, that would be a very strong argument for going back to the old standard of pounds, shillings and pence, instead of dollars and cents. As a commercial people, we ought to assimilate our standards in these matters with those of our leading customers as much as we can.

Mr. JENKINS. I think that if the hon. gentleman who has just sat down will consider for a moment what the duty on oats is in the United States, he will see it is very likely the figures given by the member for Halifax are correct. The duty is 10 cents a bushel, and when you compare that with the price in Chicago, which is 25 cents a bushel, I do not see how there can be any trade.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Take Boston.

Mr. JENKINS. Well, the price in Boston or New York is less than in Canada; how then can there be trade between Canada and the United States, when the price is higher there, and besides there is a duty of 10 cents a bushel to pay? The few bushels of oats that are sent from here to the United States are sent as a change of seed. It seems to me we are fighting mere straws. It makes no difference to the farmer who sells or the purchaser who buys oats what the standard is. In Prince Edward Island oats are sold by the pound. A man takes a load of oats in, it is weighed, and he gets so much a pound for it. It is time we should get rid of the word bushel altogether. It is absolutely unnecessary, when you sell by the pound. We should go by centals.

Mr. IRVINE. I like the logic of the last gentleman very well, that is, that it makes no difference what the weight of a bushel is. I quite agree with him and the hon. gentleman from Halifax, and the other hon. gentleman from Prince Edward Island, but there is just this difference between us, that I am contending for the poor creature who has to go into the woods and clear up the land, and they are contending for the merchant who buys the oats. If the hon. gentlemen acknowledge that it makes no difference whether the bushel is 30 pounds or 34 pounds, would it not be as well to give those poor creatures the benefit of the doubt and make it 32 pounds. Let the hon. gentleman try it for one year, and if there is a petition from the farmers next year for its repeal, I will vote for repeal.

Mr. COSTIGAN. Why make it 32 pounds? Why not make it 30 pounds?

Mr. IRVINE. Then make it 30.

Mr. FERGUSON. The hon. gentleman declares he is talking on behalf of the farmer. I think he is talking on behalf of himself. The hon. gentleman's neighbor gave away the whole case when he stated that a bushel is a mere nominal expression; that it is the weight that gives the value. No farmer expects to get as much money for 32 pounds of oats as he would for 34. I do not know what class of farmers he has, but I know mine can tell the distinction very quickly.

Mr. WATSON. An hon. gentleman has paid a compliment to my small firm hand, but I may tell him that I am a farmer and have considerable knowledge of handling grain. In Manitoba we used to import American oats, which were 32 pounds to the bushel, but the man who shipped them in had to add so many pounds to the bushel when they came into Manitoba, where they are sold at 34 pounds to the bushel. I do not see that it will make any material difference to the man who grows the oats whether the bushel is 20 or 30 pounds. If it were worth 1 cent a pound and the bushel was 20 pounds, it would be worth 20 cents, and if it was 34 pounds it would be worth 34 cents. There is a difference in the size of the Winchester bushel

and the Imperial measure, and if you still kept the Imperial measure and lowered the standard of our oats you would lower the grade of our oats in the outside markets. If the Imperial measure is adhered to, the standard should not be lowered.

Mr. CASEY. I do not intend to enter into the relative merits of the 32-pound bushel and the 34-pound bushel, but I wish to support the remarks of my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Jenkins), in favor of doing away with the name "bushel" altogether as a measure of weight. Twelve years ago we passed an Act here looking in that direction, and providing that a bushel should not mean any particular weight and encouraging the use of the word "cental," and of the measure known as a cental or 100 pounds, in the sale of grain. That practice has been adopted in London, Ontario, for over ten years, and has been found very convenient. It appears to me to avoid all these difficulties as to how many pounds should go to a bushel, and also the difficulties arising from the different qualities of grain. When you buy 100 pounds of grain you get 100 pounds of grain. If you buy 2 bushels of wheat, you would be entitled to 120 pounds weight under this Act, but there might be such a difference in the quality of the wheat in different specimens that in buying one kind of wheat you would get more than 2 bushels measure, and in buying another, would get less, for your 120 pounds. These questions raise a number of smaller questions, but if you adopt the "cental" you would be freed from all these. The custom of buying and selling by the cental is very convenient in computing the price, as, if you have a decimal system of currency, and of weights and measures as well, all difficulty is obviated. The convenience of the system has been shown by experience in London. Even the market reports in the papers of that city are given in that way, and I think the experience has shown that the introduction of the cental as a unit in buying and selling grain would be extremely useful, and would facilitate the comparison of qualities of Canadian grain and foreign grain.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If I understand aright, we are making considerable change here which, I think, requires more explanation from the Minister. In the old Act no penalties are imposed, that I can see, for the violation of the law as to the sale of any of these article by measure instead of by weight. We now propose to impose penalties on any one who does that, but it is a question how far it will go. The Bill provides: "unless the bushel by measure is specially agreed upon in writing." "In writing" are new words in this section, and if a farmer was selling grain and made the delivery by the measured bushel, unless he had the contract made in writing to do it in that way, he would be liable, under the Act we are now passing, to a penalty not exceeding $25, and, for subsequent offences, not exceeding $50. There may be many complications from the words, "unless conveniences for weighing are not available." First, you make it a penal offence, but there is a proviso, if scales are not convenient. The question whether it should be made a penal offence at all is one to be considered; but, if so, the excuse might easily be pleaded that no scales were convenient. In the second sub-section of the Bill, you will notice that the Governor in Council may, from time to time, add to the foregoing lists such other articles, etc., as are equivalent to a bushel, as to him seems fit, and this Order in Council is to be published in the *Canada Gazette*. Now, the farmer never sees the *Canada Gazette*; he knows nothing about it; merchants, even, do not see the *Canada Gazette*, and here you are giving power to the Governor in Council, by proclamation in the *Canada Gazette*, to say that such and such an article must be sold by weight, and if you do not sell it by weight you are liable to a penalty. It seems to me there is, in the points I have mentioned, room for some consideration.

Mr. CASEY. I wish to call attention to the exact words of the provision in the Act to which I referred. It was passed in 1873 by the Government to which many members of the present Government belonged, and they will, therefore, remember it. This Act is chap. 47, of the statutes of that year, and provides:

"The bushel measure known as the Imperial bushel, containing eight Imperial or standard gallons, shall be the standard measure of capacity for commodities sold by dry measure, from which all other measures of capacity in respect of such commodities shall be derived, computed and ascertained, and all such measures shall be taken in parts or multiples of certain proportions of the standard bushel.

"But until the 1st day of January, 1874, in contracts for the sale or delivery of any of the articles in this section mentioned, the standard bushel shall be taken and intended to mean the weight of a bushel, as herinafter mentioned, and not a bushel in measure, or according to any greater or less weight, unless the contrary appears to have been agreed upon by the parties."

Then it goes on to give the weights for nearly all the articles that are included in this section. The end of the paragraph states:

"And from and after the 1st day of January, 1874, all the above mentioned articles, when bought or sold by weight, shall be specified by the the cental and parts of a cental."

Now, this Act does not appear ever to have come very fully in force. The only instance in which I have known it to be carried is the one which I have mentioned, in the city of London.

Mr. MILLS. I would call attention to the weights mentioned in this section. The hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, I think, introduced a Bill relating to weights and measures in 1873, adopting the Imperial measure of capacity instead of the Winchester bushel. Now, all the weights of different kinds of grain mentioned here are weights that experience shows attached to the Winchester and not to the Imperial bushel. While the Imperial bushel was adopted as the measure of capacity, the Winchester bushel is retained as the actual bushel. The Winchester bushel of wheat is 60 pounds. A bushel of corn, Winchester measure, is 56 pounds, so that when you undertake to state what a bushel of wheat is, you give that weight which the Winchester bushel has, not that which the Imperial bushel has, although you abolish the Winchester bushel altogether. You have set aside the Winchester measure and adopted the Imperial measure, and you retain the Winchester measure when you are giving the weights per bushel of different kinds of grain. Either we should go back to the old condition of things that existed at the time of Confederation, and is practically adhered to, or we should make the weight correspond to the new measure of capacity which we have adopted.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The same difference exists between the Winchester bushel of wheat and the Imperial bushel of wheat, as between the Winchester bushel of oats and the Imperial bushel of oats. This clause has been in force ever since 1874, and up to the present time no complaints have been raised, and nothing has been said about it, except in the discussion which took place here on one occasion, when the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Irvine) drew attention to the Bill. There has been no petition and no communication complaining of the present system, and therefore I saw no reason to alter the state of things that I found existing. I have only undertaken to deal with such features of the measure as were complained of. I agree with a good deal that has been said by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson)—not as regards the penalty, because I think we must have a penalty of some kind. As to the second sub-section, providing that the Governor in Council may, from time to time, add to the foregoing list, I have no objection to taking out that second sub-section.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has not alluded to that portion of my hon. friend's argument which pointed out the difficulty of making a crime, or a penal offence, at any rate, of the fact of selling by weight, unless the conveniences for weighing are not available. It seems to me that would be a most extraordinary provision.

Mr. COSTIGAN. It would be hard to say that a man who was living in some place not convenient to scales should have the same penalty imposed on him as a man living alongside a pair of scales.

Mr. BLAKE. Has some practical inconvenience been experienced, to cause the hon. gentleman to propose these two modifications?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Whoever draughted the Act evidently had in his mind that hardship would be imposed on a person who was not convenient to scales if he were subject to penalties. That provision, however, will give rise to very great difficulty, because a person would simply plead that he had not convenience for weighing. But this difficulty would be obviated if you gave the party making the sale the option of selling by the bushel measurement.

Mr. MILLS. I again call the attention of the Minister to this fact: If he looks at the Act he will see that the measure of capacity is the Imperial bushel. Here the weight does not correspond to the measure of capacity, the hon. gentleman has adopted a weight corresponding to the old measure of capacity before modern legislation was had. With an Imperial bushel there is no danger in selling by measurement instead of by weight, because you insist that the measure shall be the Imperial measure. When you provide what the weight of the bushel shall be, you adhere to the old Winchester bushel. The Imperial bushel of wheat is 70 pounds, one-sixth more than this bushel; the Imperial bushel of corn is that much more. You ought to change the law and restore the old Winchester bushel, so that the weight and measure should have some relation, and make the weight correspond with the new measure you have adopted.

Mr. CASEY. We do not need the penalty clause, and I do not think the Government should insist on a seller using either of the methods described. If there are no weighing appliances available there is no reason why the parties should not agree to sell by the bushel measurement.

Mr. COSTIGAN. That is provided for here.

Mr. CASEY. The agreement between the parties must be in writing. But it will very seldom happen that two farmers exchanging grain in a barn would have writing materials at hand. I would urge upon the Minister to strike out the penal clause, and adopt the cental as the unit of measure instead of the bushel. I desire particularly to obtain the Minister's views on the cental question, and the reason why he has not seen fit to carry out the provisions of the various laws in that respect.

Mr. DAVIES. It will never do to leave the provision that the agreement has to be in writing.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I propose to strike out the words "in writing," and I move accordingly.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CASEY. Perhaps the Minister will give his views on the cental question.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not think it is desirable to occupy the time by discussing the cental question. The whole tendency of the Act is to allow people to sell by weight, though we still leave the machinery for those who wish to sell by measure.

Mr. COSTIGAN.

Mr. HICKEY. I would point out to the hon. member for Bothwell that although the Imperial bushel is the standard, the Winchester should be the one to fix the weight of grain, as thereby it would have a tendency to encourage the selling of grain by weight, which is a desirable thing.

Mr. MILLS. I do not agree with my hon. friend behind me, with regard to the adoption of a system of selling by weight, as I think the people should be left free to sell as they wish, and in most parts of the country the people still adhere to the bushel in preference to the cental. I say, however, that it is inconvenient to have the Imperial bushel as a measure of capacity. The ordinary farmer uses his peck and bushel measures, and if he has not scales to weigh he has to calculate the difference in the weight between the Winchester and the Imperial bushel, and he follows the Winchester bushel. The theorists have adopted the Imperial bushel, and we have had to follow them, but it is only followed in theory and not in practice. Now, in passing this Act would it not be well to adopt the original measure, which is the measure of capacity all over this continent.

Mr. CASEY. I agree with the Minister that the effect of this Act is to encourage the sale by weight, because the weight and the measure of a bushel are made inconsistent, and in such a way that it would be more profitable for a farmer to sell by the bushel weight than by the bushel measure. The whole drift of my argument has been to point out the inconvenience and difficulty which arise from having two meanings to the word bushel, one as a measure of capacity and another as a measure of weight. A bushel should mean simply a measure of capacity, and should not mean so many pounds. The Act says so many pounds to a bushel, but you do not know from that what quantity of grain you are getting. But if you are going to sell by weight you should either sell it by the pound, by the 10 pounds or by the 100 pounds—by the decimal system—so that your measure and your currency should be assimilated. The old law of 1873 is preferable in that respect, because it provided that an Imperial bushel should not mean any particular weight, but that it should be a measure of capacity—one unit was put in that Act for capacity, and another for weight, and the people were allowed to choose either. But by the present Bill there are really two standards for a bushel, one of weight and one of capacity, and they are different. You thus introduce a large amount of uncertainty into the law.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood the hon. member for Bothwell to say that a bushel of wheat measured by an Imperial bushel would weigh about 70 pounds. Now, the difference between the Winchester and the Imperial bushel is between 1½ and 2 pounds. Barley is 48 pounds Imperial measure, and in the United States the bushel is about 46 pounds by the Winchester. I buy a great deal of grain every year, and I find that the average difference is about as I have stated. Barley averages about 48, oats 34, or over, peas generally overrun, and our wheat runs about 60 pounds.

Mr. MILLS. The Act provides that 2 gallons shall be a peck, and 8 gallons a bushel. Now, these gallons are Imperial, and the difference is not by these weights but much greater.

Mr. TAYLOR. I might say that I asked Mr. Mills if my contention is not correct, and he says it is. I know that the Board of Trade of Oswego put in their circular every year that the barley test is by the Winchester bushel, which is a pound and a-half less than the Canadian bushel.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I propose to strike out the objectionable words, "unless conveniences for weighing are not available," which leaves the clause just the same as that in the old Act, and I think will remove every objection.

On section 3,

Mr. COSTIGAN. I propose to strike the word "hard" out of the second line, which will not render it necessary that barrels should be made of hardwood.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does the Minister know if the size of the barrel mentioned here is the same size as that of the flour barrel?

Mr. COSTIGAN. Yes, the same size. That was thought best, so that second-hand flour barrels might be used for apples.

Mr. PLATT. The clause provides that all apples packed in Canada for sale shall be packed in barrels. Does that include apples sold between farmers or between a farm and a market town? It seems to me that the clause should not apply to apples sold within a reasonable distance from where they are grown.

Mr. COSTIGAN. There may be something in the objection the hon. gentleman has raised. Of course, it is not the intention of the Act to interfere with the sale of small quantities of apples between neighbors, and I will amend the clause in that respect.

Mr. CASEY. I think it would be well to amend the latter end of the clause, which requires, when the heads of barrels are removed for the purpose of displaying the contents thereof, that they must be replaced in a certain manner. I think that is unintentionally severe. I may call his attention to the fact that apples are often brought into the markets in barrels, set in waggons, and it seems unfair that the vendor, in such a case, should be liable to a penalty if he failed to head up the barrels before delivery.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I move to strike out sub-section 3.

On sections 4 and 5,

Mr. COSTIGAN. I move that these sections be struck out. There is a notice on the Paper now, and those sections, in accordance with that, should no longer form part of the Bill.

Committee rose and reported; Amendments concurred in.

COMMERCIAL BANK OF WINDSOR.

Mr. SPEAKER. With reference to the Bill relating to the Commercial Bank of Windsor, I have looked into the Bill and think it is one of the character called hybrid Bills, partaking of both a public and private character. It is a private Bill, inasmuch as the necessity for it arises because this bank was omitted to be mentioned in a public Bill passed a few years ago—the Act relating to Banks and Banking—but it is also of a private nature because it relates to contracts with the bank. I think, therefore, it should be treated as a hybrid Bill, and should be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, so that private rights may be guarded.

Mr. BOWELL. In that case, I move that the order be discharged and the Bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1 a.m., Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 7th May, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, What was the amount of the floating debt of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on the 1st May, 1885?

Mr. BOWELL. The Government has no means of knowing what the floating debt of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was on the 1st of May, 1885.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, What sum has been paid or advanced to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, either as interest or subsidy or otherwise to date of enquiry?

Mr. BOWELL. The sums paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway, to the date of enquiry, are: Subsidy, $21,274,641.87; and on the 5 per cent. loan, $20,097,600.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, Has interest due to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on 1st of May been paid?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The interest due by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on the 1st May, has not been paid. The Government have come to the conclusion that at present it is preferable to allow the company to expend all their funds on the finishing of the road rather than pay this interest. The Government has power at any time to pay itself this interest.

Mr. BLAKE. The first part of the question of which I had given notice has already been answered, so I will only ask the last part: Has any, and what, arrangement been made as to the payment of the last gale of interest due by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to the Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No arrangement has been made, the Government having ample authority to pay themselves when they please.

Mr. BLAKE. Why have not the papers on which the proposed Canadian Pacific Railway resolutions are based been laid on the Table? Is it intended to lay them on the Table, and when?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Now; not to-morrow.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the Government intends to present to Parliament any papers, or to propose any scheme in connection with the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Quebec city or beyond?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It does.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES.

Mr. CHARLTON (for Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT) asked, What were the receipts and expenditures (as per usual *Gazette* statement) during the month of April last?

Mr. BOWELL. The following is the statement of the revenue and expenditure on account of the Consolidated Fund of the Dominion of Canada, as by returns furnished to the Finance Department to the night of the 30th April, 1885:—

Revenue—	Amount.
Customs	$1,459,146.09
Excise	525,498.64
Post-Office	188,555.77
Public Works, including Railways	242,475.31
Miscellaneous	52,538.07
	$ 2,468,213 88
Revenue to 31st March, 1885	23,249,079.13
	$25,717,293.01
Expenditure	$ 2,161,965.'5
do to 31st March, 1885	22,525,053.57
	$24,687,018.72

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, What has been the cost of the expedition recently despatched to the North-West, so far as ascertained, to date of enquiry?

Mr. CARON. It is quite impossible to give the information which the hon. gentleman requires. The expenses are going on daily—large expenses for the transport, and provisions for the troops—and it would be quite impossible for me to bring down that information at present.

Mr. BLAKE asked, When does the Government propose to bring down the papers in relation to the North-West affairs, promised to be laid on the Table?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All the papers that have not yet been brought down, are in progress of being prepared, and will be laid before the House.

COLONISATION COMPANIES.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Is it intended to propose to Parliament any modifications in the arrangements with any of the colonisation companies? Is it intended to make any such modification?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The question between the colonisation companies and the Government is now before the Government, and we hope to have an early solution of it.

SHORT LINE RAILWAY.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the Government intends to propose to Parliament further grants in connection with the schemes for shorter railway lines between points in the Province of Quebec and points in the Maritime Provinces?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, This question is rather an unusual one, anticipating the action of the Government. However, I have no objection to state that the Government intends to propose to Parliament a further grant with respect to the Short Line.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. BERGERON. I rise to a question of privilege. I find in a paper published in the city of Toronto, the *Toronto News*, an article, which I will read to the House, and which is written in a very bad spirit. I may say that, a few weeks ago, the very same paper, and another paper published in that city, I believe, published an infamous article against the 65th Battalion of Montreal. No one at that time took the trouble of answering those articles, because it would have been an honor for those papers to receive an answer. That battalion is well known, and can answer for themselves when they are back, and they are answering to-day in the North-West such slanders by their loyal and brave conduct. As far as Col. Onimet is concerned, everyone knows that he can answer for himself if he chooses. He has been doing honor to himself and to our country, and stands high in the esteem of his countrymen. The man or the men who wrote those articles, having had no success in that attempt, have come again to the rescue, and this time they not only attack one battalion or one gentleman, but they aim at a whole race, which forms one-third of the whole population of Canada, and which I am sure is held in esteem by everybody. I mean the French Canadians. This article reads as follows:—

"FRENCH AGGRESSION.

"Ontario is proud of being loyal to England.

"Quebec is proud of being loyal to sixteenth century France.

"Ontario pays about three-fifths of Canada's taxes, fights all the battles of provincial rights, sends nine-tenths of the soldiers to fight the rebels, and gets sat upon by Quebec for her pains.

"Quebec, since the time of Intendant Bigot, has been extravagant, corrupt and venal, whenever she could with other people's money, and has done nothing for herself or for progress with her own earnings.

"Quebec now gets the pie.

"Ontario gets the mush, and pays the piper for the Bleu carnival.

"In the Franchise Bill, the Liquor Act, and every available statute passed by the Dominion House, Quebec is made an exception to the rule, and pains are taken that her local laws are not interfered with.

"When Ontario men ask for the same exemption for their Province they are voted down.

"Yet, like cowardly curs, the Ontario Tories vote that Quebec shall have all she wants.

"Railway subsidies,

"The purchase money of railways already built,

"Refund of money spent on local improvements,

"These are granted to Quebec and refused to Ontario.

"Hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent in maintaining the French language in an English country.

"Ontario is getting sick of it.

"Ontario taxpayers are about to take a tumble.

"An anti-French party is springing up in all the Provinces except Quebec.

"As the Republicans said, after the war of secession, 'if we are to have a solid South, we must have a solid North.'

"If we in Canada are to be confronted with a solid French vote, we must have a solid English vote.

"If Quebec is always to pose as a beggar in the Dominion soup kitchen, she must be disfranchised as a vagrant.

"If she is to be a traitor in our wars, a thief in our treasury, a conspirator in our Canadian household, she had better go out.

"She is no use in Confederation.

"Her representatives are a weakness in Parliament, her cities would be nothing but for the English speaking people, and to-day Montreal would be as dead as the city of Quebec but for the Anglo-Saxons, who are persecuted and kept down by the ignorant French.

"In New England factory towns French Canadians are no more popular than the Chinese, and in Canada they are doing no more for the progress of the nation and the well-being of the Dominion.

"We are sick of the French Canadians with their patriotic blabber and their conspiracies against the treasury and the peace of what without them might be a united Canada.

"Right now they are at their old tricks of embarrassing Sir John and forcing him to buy railways for them and from them.

"If Edward Blake got into power to-morrow Quebec would be astride his neck and saw his mouth with the bit of their arrogance, superstition and knavery.

"With Quebec holding the balance of power Canada isn't safe a moment

"The constitution, or the British North America Act, which is our alleged constitution, must be altered so as to deprive these venal politicians of their powers or else Confederation will have to go.

"As far as we are concerned, and we are concerned, and we are as much concerned for the good of Canada as any one else, Quebec could go out of the Confederation to-morrow and we would not shed a tear except for joy.

"If Ontario were a trifle more loyal to herself she would not stand Quebec's monkey business another minute."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not rise in my seat in Parliament for the sake of answering such nonsense; but I am glad to read here the answer of a newspaper published in the city of Quebec by an English speaking Canadian, whom everybody here knows, I suppose, Mr. Foote, who has taken it upon himself, as he knows well the French Canadians of the Province of Quebec, to answer this article, and here is what he says:

"A SEVERE ARRAIGNMENT OF QUEBEC.

"The Toronto Daily *Evening News* which only the other day published a most violent attack on the 65th regiment (Mount Royal Rifles) of Montreal, returns to its congenial task of belittling our French Cana-

dian compatriots. The *News*, though a Canadian journal, is not at all Canadian in spirit, tone or sentiment. Its preference for American institutions are most marked, and it never misses the opportunity of ridiculing British manner and customs, and in advising our people to go in for annexation. For Canadians generally, the editor seems to have the loftiest scorn, but for French Canadians he has only feelings of contempt. His cruel attack on the Montreal regiment, which is composed largely of Frenchmen, has been shown a hundred times since it appeared, to have been groundless and false in every particular, and yet no explanation or apology has appeared in the columns of our contem orary. On Saturday last the *News* out did itself in an assault on French Canadian character and morals. The editorial is most unjust and insulting to at least a quarter of the entire population of Canada. How unjust and insulting it is, our readers will discover for themselves, as we print it below in order that they may see the article in all its coarseness and brutality. The Toronto *World* has had two articles already, within the last few days, in the same key, and the Toronto *Evening Telegram* never hides its hostile feelings for anything French or French Canadian. It is rather odd that all the anti-French, anti-Quebec assaults should come from the newspapers of the Queen City of the West. A determined stand appears to have been taken by the Toronto journals against what they are pleased to term Quebec aggression. Articles of the sort can do no good in a community like ours. They but foment heart burnings and prejudices, and fan into life a flickering flame. True Canadians, if they be wise, will have no internal differences. The country is large enough, and the blending of the two races ought to have a good effect on the well-being of society. Such articles as we print here are harmful in principle, and we must regret their publication at a time like the present when there is so much need for a united Canada.

And he then reproduces the article. Mr. Speaker, the reading alone of the article, and a refutation of it in an English paper, would be enough, and I am not going to say any more about it. I am only sorry that such a thing has happened. The man who has written that, I see by the name at the top of this paper, is called Sheppard—a very bad shepherd he must be. But, as a member of Parliament, as a representative from the Province of Quebec, I think I may ask the two leaders of the House, the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition, what they think of such a paper, and whether they consider it, the Toronto *News*, as being the political organ of either of them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, it is a Tory organ, certainly, "yet, like cowardly curs, the Ontario Tories vote that Quebec shall have all she wants." It is a very disgraceful article, but it bears its own answer upon its face. If my hon. friend feels, as a French Canadian, that he is at all annoyed by this, he should imitate my course and be patient. I have been abused very much by newspapers, but I have never been abused more coarsely, more vilely, and in a more disreputable spirit, than by this same newspaper, the Toronto *News*.

Mr. BLAKE. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has brought up this question, and before adverting to the article which he refers to, I wish to say a word with reference to prior articles which he alluded to, relating to the conduct of our respected and now absent colleague, Col. Ouimet. I doubly regret to hear any such allusions in the newspaper to which he has referred. I am sure that every man in this House, no matter what his political views may be, must feel the deepest sympathy for Col. Ouimet, who is in the most painful situation in which a brave and honorable man could possibly be. We all regret to know the physical debility, or illness, which prevents him from being at the head of his troops, and must long, from day to day to find him so far restored that he may be able to take that place, which, I am sure, he is burning to take. Now with reference to this article in question. I do not think it was necessary for the hon. gentleman to have called upon the leaders on either side of this House to say a word about it. For myself, I think I may say that my efforts have been, during the time I have taken a part in public life, to secure that our divisions, if divisions there were to be, should not be on questions of nationality or of creed. Every word I have said in public, every exhortation I have made in private, has been in that direction, feeling, as I did, that it was absolutely essential, in order that we may become one people in heart and spirit, that we should put down that spirit of sectionalism, that spirit which would divide our people upon questions of race, or upon questions of creed. In one sense I am glad that the hon. gentleman has alluded to this paper, simply because I noticed in a very important organ of the hon. gentleman's party, the *Minerve*, a statement to-day in which this sheet is called the *grite-rouge* organ, and in which another paper, the Toronto *World*, is also spoken of as a paper that was formerly an organ of my own party. I never had the remotest connection with it personally, politically, pecuniarily or in any other way. As to this particular paper I occupy the same relation to it, and my party occupies the same relation. It never was in any shape or in any sense an organ of the Reform party. I may say that if hon. gentlemen opposite have been abused by it, I have also been the victim of very foul abuse myself. We have both suffered from the *bouquet de mille-fleurs* this editor pours out; but to call it a Grit organ, under existing circumstances, is really an outrage. The fact of the matter is that the *Daily News* was established by the proprietors of the Toronto *Mail*; that it was published in the *Mail* office by the proprietors for a very considerable time, and lately under the editorship of Mr. Sheppard, who is the present nominal proprietor; that ultimately it was sold by the proprietor, Mr. Riordon, the chief proprietor of the *Mail*, to Mr. Sheppard; and that for the price and chattel mortgage dated 9th December, 1884, was given by which Edmund Ernest Sheppard mortgaged to Mr. Charles Riordon, of Merriton, in the county of Lincoln, manufacturer, all and singular the newspaper published in the city of Toronto called and known as the *Evening News*, together with the good-will, subscription list, trade name and copyright thereof—also the goods, chattels, newspaper plant, material and appliances, particularly mentioned and described—in fact everything belonging to the newspaper, for the sum of $75,000, with interest at the rate of 7 per cent, payable 1st December now instant—that is now past. Therefore Mr. Sheppard is nominally the proprietor of the *News*; but, really, inasmuch as the *News* is not worth one-half or one-tenth of that amount, Mr. Riordon, the principal proprietor of the *Mail*, is the proprietor of the *News*.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am very sorry the hon. gentleman has somewhat detracted from the effect of the patriotic speech he made a little while ago. It is evident the hon. gentleman prepared himself in this way.

Mr. BLAKE. I received this paper, not knowing it was here, since the hon. member spoke.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then some one else behind the hon. gentleman had got it ready. If the hon. gentleman has not prepared himself, he draws from some one else. That is his habit. The hon. gentleman gets up and utters denunciations, and his people behind him prompt him continually. I have no hesitation in saying that. With respect to this matter: When the *Daily News* began to abuse me and the Conservative party generally, and to show itself to be a Republican paper, I took occasion to enquire about it, because I knew the *News* was originally the evening issue of the Conservative *Mail* newspaper. Mr. Sheppard was an employé on the *Mail* He is a clever fellow, I believe; he writes with a good deal of ability, and has been on the press. He is, however, from long residence in the United States, a Republican, I was going to say of the worst description, but of the most decided description. As a matter of business this paper did not pay, and ultimately, as it was not found convenient for the *Mail* to continue that paper as the *Evening Mail*, Mr. Sheppard bought it from the proprietor, Mr. Riordon. It was sold to him, and he gave a mortgage upon it for what he did not pay. There is no relationship, so far as I understand, between the proprietor of the *Mail* and the proprietor of the *News*, except that of debtor and creditor. The *Daily News* is now obviously, ostentatiously, a Repub-

lican paper, a democratic paper, a disloyal paper, and a Grit paper——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!——

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—a Grit paper, I say, endeavoring to attack, and failing, that party which draws its inspiration from British institutions.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The First Minister has no right whatever to insinuate in any way that any members of the Reform party are responsible in any shape or form for the utterances of the *News*. I will tell him this: If there be a man in Canada who is responsible for stirring up strife between the two races, he is likely to be the man. Nor has he the faintest right to insinuate that the hon. member beside me is afraid to formulate charges. If the hon. gentleman wants to give us an opportunity, and chooses to afford it to us in the regular course, he will find us not the least reluctant to formulate our charges against him.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to explain that I had not in any way prepared for this matter. It was subsequent to the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) addressing the House that the paper was handed to me, and I did not know it was here. That is literally the fact. I received it without asking for it, without knowing it was here at all. I take all the responsibility for having used it—how could I help it? I used it because I thought it proper to use it, because I thought it was essential that the House and the country should know the facts. I take all the responsibility for having used the paper; but it is not a fact that I prepared myself, or that I knew it was here.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. member for Wheeler, the *aide de camp* of the hon. gentleman, the manager and organiser of that party, had prepared himself——

Mr. CHARLTON. I must protest against this gross breach of parliamentary decorum on the part of the First Minister. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) has been designated as the hon. member for Wheeler. That is a breach of parliamentary decorum which ought not to have been permitted by the Speaker of this House. The right hon. gentleman owes an apology for that breach of parliamentary decorum.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman called the hon. member for West Ontario the hon. member for Wheeler. Is that in order, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is not in order to call any member by that name. I did not know that the right hon. gentleman referred to any member.

Mr. BLAKE. He said the hon. member for Wheeler, and he must therefore have meant a member.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I withdraw the expression; it is unparliamentary, and it is a serious charge to make, I admit, against any member, that he got his seat by having another man bought out.

Mr. EDGAR. If there is any individual in the House to whom I am indebted for my seat here it is the First Minister. By his statesmanship he carved out certain ridings in order to make five constituencies safe for the Conservative party and one for the Liberal party. His statesmanship had a very different result from what he anticipated, and it not only left us with all the seats which the hon. gentleman intended to take away from us, but it also gave me the opportunity of sitting where I am.

Mr. BOWELL. By getting the Local Government to buy out the members for you.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). That is not so bad as buying out Riel in order to get a seat for a colleague.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 118) further to amend the Act relating to Weights and Measures.—(Mr. Costigan).

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the electoral franchise.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for King's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Macdonald) was yesterday very eloquently praising up the Franchise Bill which is now before the House. To hear him speak, one would think that this was one of the best measures which was ever introduced in Parliament. However, if I may judge by the conclusion to which the hon. member arrived I would be inclined to think that the Bill is one of those blessings which a man would rather have falling on his neighbour's head than on his own head. In fact, after having spoken at great length on the subject he wound up by asking that Prince Edward Island should be exempted from the operation of this Bill. Mr. Speaker, I completely agree with the opinions of the hon. member on that question and I have enough of sympathy for Prince Edward Island to ask that it should be exempted from the effect of this Bill, but at the same time I will venture to claim the same exemption for all the other Provinces in the Dominion of Canada. This amounts to saying that I shall vote in favour of the sub amendment of the hon. member for King's, and also in favour of the amendment which was moved by my hon. friend the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I have already had occasion to say in this House that the basis of our constitution is the representation by Provinces. Each Province in Confederation has a right to send a certain number of representatives to this Parliament. This number has been fixed at sixty-five for the Province of Quebec, and to an undetermined number for the other Provinces according to the corresponding population of each of them. But when Confederation was established, there was one right or rather one privilege which was left to each of the Provinces and which allowed them not only to send a certain number of representatives to the Dominion Parliament, but also to send each of these members in the manner which they would deem proper. I am inclined to think that if, at the time of Confederation, a uniform franchise such as that which is proposed to-day had been sought to be imposed on each of the Provinces, several of them would have refused to join it; and I have no doubt that if in 1873, when Prince Edward Island joined the Confederation, if that Province had been asked, as a first condition to give up the universal suffrage which it enjoys to-day and adopt a uniform franchise proposed by the other Provinces in Confederation, that Province would have refused to join it. I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that in 1867, if what is sought to-day to be imposed on the Province of Quebec had been proposed to it, if a Bill containing universal suffrage in some of its provisions, a Bill containing revolutionary ideas such as those which are contained in the hon. First Minister's Bill, if such a Bill had been proposed to that Province, I have no doubt whatever that that Province would have refused to enter into the Confederation. I desire to point out that the Province of Quebec to which I have the honor to belong, occupies a special position towards the other Provinces in the Dominion. We are in favor of the federal principle; we are united to the other Provinces in a very intimate manner both as regards the commercial interests which are common to all the Provinces and as regards the defence of the country. And I am happy to admit that Confederation has been very useful, not only to the other Provinces but also

to the Province of Quebec from a commercial point of view. Confederation has developed our interprovincial trade, it has built our canals, it has increased our navigation and increased, in a general way, the trade of Canada. Apart from this, as regards the defence of the country, we have common interests with the other parts of Confederation, and the French Canadians of the Province of Quebec have proved that when their services are required to defend their country they only form one nationality with the citizens of other Provinces. We have proved it when the Fenians tried to invade Canadian territory some years ago, and we are proving it again to-day by going with the other nationalities to defend Canada in the North-West. But, if there are certain points on which we have common interests with the other Provinces, there are others on which we differ from them. There is one essential point of which we must not lose sight, it is that in the Province of Quebec we have not the same nationality as the other Provinces; we do not speak the same language, we do not profess the same creed, we have not the same ideas nor the same aspirations; neither have we the same habits nor the same manner of living as the citizens of other Provinces. Well, Mr. Chairman, these aspirations, this creed, these special ideas of the Province of Quebec, the other Provinces of the Dominion are bound to respect if they wish to maintain the union which exists to-day. I say that if the other Provinces desire that we should live in harmony with them, they must not force upon us a law which is contrary to the political opinions which prevail in the Province of Quebec. The measure which is now before the House is an encroachment upon the rights and privileges of the Province of Quebec; it contains ideas which cannot be accepted by our population whose ideas are not the same as those of the population of the other Provinces. What are the reasons why this Bill which we are now discussing is sought to be forced upon us? The only reason which has been given until now—and it is not a reason, it is only a pretext—is that a uniform franchise law is necessary for the whole Dominion of Canada. Well, Mr. Chairman, it has already been said by several members who have spoken before me, that this uniformity cannot be given by this Bill. It has been proved that, under the present Bill, we have not had a uniform franchise, and that we have not a uniform mode of valuation of property throughout the Dominion. For instance, the Bill establishes special qualifications for the fishermen of Nova Scotia, and for the Indians. And, as regards the valuation of property, it has been proved by my hon. friend the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Auger), that it is impossible to make a regular valuation in the different Provinces of the Dominion. Therefore, uniformity—which is the pretext given for the introduction of this Bill—does not exist; and if the motion in the sub-amendment, which is now before the House, is adopted—and it is likely that it will be adopted, because it was moved by one of the friends of the hon. First Minister—if that motion is adopted, I say, then, that the uniformity will completely disappear, and this is quite evident to everybody. Besides, Mr. Chairman, we do not need uniformity. Uniformity is just what we do not want in the Province of Quebec; it is one of the reasons for which we have Confederation to-day. We have Confederation because, before 1867, we thought that uniformity in the legislation was an encumbrance for Upper and Lower Canada. It was found that what suited one Province would not suit the other, and that is one of the great reasons why Confederation was established. The hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), while speaking about the establishment of Confederation, has brought before this house the name of Sir George Etienne Cartier. I will venture to remark that this was a very bad occasion to recall that name. He said that Sir George Etienne Cartier, when he established Confederation, left to the Dominion Parliament the right of having a uniform franchise for the whole Dominion of Canada. But there is a fact of which nobody can lose sight, and it is that, while Sir George Etienne Cartier occupied in this house the seat which is now occupied by the Minister of Public Works, there was never any encroachment upon the rights and privileges of the Provinces. As long as Sir George Cartier occupied a seat in this House, the idea never even entered the mind of the First Minister to try and force upon us Bills of this kind, and to endeavor to encroach upon the privileges of the Province of Quebec as he does by the present Bill. In fact, these encroachments upon the rights of the Provinces only commenced in 1879; such a thing was never thought of while Sir George Etienne Cartier was in the House. The first encroachments were made somewhat carefully. There was first the disavowal of a Bill passed by the Province of Ontario, and two years ago there was a new encroachment with regard to the License Bill. Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. First Minister having so prepared the opinion of the House for legislative union, has afterwards run the risk of bringing down the Franchise Bill such as we have it to day; but I am certain of one thing, and that is, that a few years ago, before the idea of legislative union had gained any headway, the First Minister would never have had the audacity of introducing such a measure as the present Bill before the Parliament of Canada. The hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) has laid particular stress in his speech on the particular fact that the Dominion Parliament has the right of passing a law to render the franchise uniform in all the Provinces of the Dominion. That right was never denied. I do not know a single member of this House who has ever pretended that we did not have the right to legislate and to impose such a law as this on all the Provinces. But what we do maintain, we the members of the Opposition, is that if it is not an encroachment upon our rights, it is an encroachment upon our privileges, and I believe, that it is practically the same thing, at least as far as the Province of Quebec is concerned. A couple of years ago, when the License Bill was introduced a certain number of members, who are in favor of legislative union, supported this Bill, and declared that we had the right of passing laws to regulate the granting of licenses. Thus the Province of Quebec, and all the Provinces of the Dominion were deprived of the right of regulating the granting of licenses themselves. The legality of this Bill is to-day questioned before the Privy Council, and is not yet decided. But, I will ask it of all the members of this House, who sincerely desire the maintenance of Confederation, whether the Provinces have the right to issue licenses or not, is it not true that by giving this power to the Dominion Government, the Parliament of Canada encroaches upon one of the privileges which we have enjoyed without contestation since the establishment of Confederation? Mr. Chairman, with regard to Confederation there are a number of points upon which light has not been made as yet. There are a number of obscure points. On each of them, Mr. Chairman, we invariably see the hon. leader of the Government and his supporters from the Province of Ontario construing these dark points in favor of the central power, because they are in favor of centralisation. There is one fact which is perfectly known, and that I should have no need of recalling here, and it is that the hon. First Minister has never been in favor of Confederation. Although in the Province of Quebec he has often been called the Father of the Confederation by his friends who were desirous of increasing his popularity, we all know that it was George Brown and Sir George Etienne Cartier who achieved Confederation through the union of the Conservative party of the Province of Quebec with the Liberal party of Ontario. And the day on which the Act of Confederation was passed the present leader of the Government underwent the most humiliating defeat, perhaps, that he

ever experienced in his political life. And what was it that took place afterwards? As long as Sir George Etienne Cartier occupied a seat in this Parliament, the enormous influence which he exercised, not only on the members from the Province of Quebec but also on those from all the other Provinces, prevented the hon. First Minister from endeavoring to destroy Confederation in order to establish legislative union. But, for a few years back, from the time Sir George Etienne Cartier disappeared from the political arena, we have seen the ideas of the First Minister coming back with more force, and probably he will devote the last years of his life to the crowning of his dream, which is the legislative union of all the Provinces of Canada. The Province of Quebec, to which I have the honor to belong, cannot be in favor of the Franchise Bill which is now submitted to us, and I am convinced that most of the Conservative members who support the Government cannot approve of all the clauses contained in this Bill. In fact this Bill contains ideas which are essentially radical and essentially reactionary. I am happy to say that the Province of Quebec is neither radical nor reactionary. Among the radical provisions, I see the universal suffrage, or rather the tendency to universal suffrage, and among the reactionary provisions I find the appointment of revisers appointed by the Government; Mr. Chairman, can there be anything more radical than the woman suffrage contained in this Bill? So radical is that provision that it has not even been proposed by the French and Italian Radicals. I may be told that this provision has only been made by the hon. First Minister subject to the approbation of the House, and that it has been withdrawn by him; but if the majority had been in favor of woman suffrage, is it not true that that provision would have been imposed on the Province of Quebec which does not want it at all, and that the people of that Province would have been compelled to submit to it? What guarantee have we that even next year a member of this House will not rise from his seat and propose woman suffrage and universal suffrage? The moment the introduction of such a measure is permitted, the moment power is given to the federal power to legislate on electoral franchise, the door is open to all these abuses; and I repeat that if one of these radical measures is proposed by a member we will be obliged to submit to it, if it is supported by the majority of the House. I say that this Bill contains reactionary principles, and I find another proof of this in the Indian suffrage. I believe that in the United States where the dispositions of the Indians are well known, this provision of the Bill will be appreciated in a peculiar manner. I believe it will appear very strange that a civilised assembly like ours should vote in favor of the enfranchisement of Indians, who are under the guardianship of the Government, especially when it is found that special privileges are established for this class of individuals, privileges which are refused to the other electors of the Dominion. I spoke a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, of the appointment of revisers by the Government. The powers conferred on these revisers make this one of the most reactionary propositions which could be introduced in a Parliament. In fact, by these extraordinary powers the election of members is actually put into the hands of these revisers. So much so that a newspaper, speaking on the subject some time ago, said that it would be much more simple to give the revisers the right of appointing the members themselves, and thus save the expense of revising the lists. One fact is well known, Mr. Chairman, and it is, that if the voters' lists are between the hands and in the power of one of the two political parties, that party will be pretty sure of carrying the elections. It has been said that this provision of the revising barristers, was counterdrawn from the English law, but it has been proved, Mr. Chairman, that the English law does not contain any provision which might be compared to the provisions of this Bill which we are discussing to-day. In fact, the lists in England are prepared by assessors and these lists are afterwards revised, the revisers being appointed by judges; so that the Government has nothing to do with the assessors nor the revisers. This appointment of revisers by the Government is an encroachment on the privileges of the municipal councils. Until now, the lists have been prepared by the municipal councils, and I can affirm that nobody complained of that system. It is true there have been abuses, but there will always be abuses whatever system may be adopted. In the municipal councils the lists are prepared in a friendly way, so to speak; each elector goes to the municipal council and gets his name put on the list, if it should happen to have been omitted, or if there should be any irregularity; but with the exception of a few parishes in which there are occasional quarrels everything goes on smoothly. At the present time, the valuation is made by valuators appointed by the municipal councils. These men are farmers, and I have noticed that in my parish and in the neighboring parishes, great care is always taken to appoint as valuators people who enjoy public confidence and credit; these men are sworn, and I may say nine times out of ten their valuations are perfectly made. What will happen with the revisers who are to be appointed by the Government? These men will be advocates chosen in the cities, and I believe it is perfectly well established that the lawyers who will accept such a position as that, will not hold the highest rank in the profession. Indeed the best lawyers in the Province will not accept such a poorly remunerated position, which will give them such a large amount of work. These lawyers will be charged with the duty of valuating the properties and preparing the voters' lists. It has been pretended that they might use the valuation rolls prepared by the muncipalities; but if that is the intention of the Government, why did they not accept the amendment which we proposed a few days ago, and the object of which was to compel the revisers to use the valuation rolls prepared in the municipalities. The fact that the Government declined to accede to that demand, clearly proves that their intention is that the revisers will prepare not only the voters' list but also the valuation roll. Mr. Chairman, all the abuses resulting from this system are readily seen. In almost every municipality there are a certain number of properties which might be valuated at $150 or $160, which is the amount determined to give the right to vote. But if the reviser appointed by the Government is not an honest and conscientious man, if he is too anxious to serve the interests of the Government, this man will estimate at $140 a certain number of properties which are worth from $150 to $160, when he will know that the holders of such property are Liberals. On the other hand, he will value at $150 properties which will only be worth $25 or $100, when he knows that the proprietors will be supporters of the Government. So that, in this manner, it will be very easy to make a change of five or ten votes in a parish, in the relative situation of both parties. Now, suppose that the same thing is repeated in all the parishes of a county, which sometimes comprises about twenty parishes, the majority might be changed by 100 or 200 votes; that is to say, in the counties where the parties are about equally divided, it will be possible to give the Government a majority of 50 or 100 votes. The right of appeal was also spoken of. The Government has allowed the right of appeal on questions of law, while withholding it as regards questions of fact, and even on legal matters there will be an appeal only with the permission of the revisers. I maintain that this appeal is a delusion; in fact the reviser will refuse the right of appeal whenever he shall find that his judgments are erroneous. But supposing that there should be an appeal, do you think it will be very easy for the courts to decide whether a property is really worth $125, $140, $150 or $160. The result of an election may

occasionally depend on the skilful management of these valuations by a partisan and dishonest reviser. Now, Mr. Chairman, that I have spoken of the preparation of the lists by the revisers, I have an objection to make to the system proposed for the preparation of these lists on the ground of what they will cost to the country. It has been proved by several members that it would be a very expensive system to have the lists prepared by the revisers. These men will be obliged to travel several times over a county in order to make the valuation of properties and to prepare the lists; they must have secretaries, bailiffs, and a host of officials who will cost a great deal to the country. It has been estimated that the probable cost of the preparation of the lists by the revisers will be something like $600,000 or $800,000. But I am not exaggerating when I say that the cost of preparing the lists will be about a half million of dollars or from $2,000 to $2,500 for each county of the Dominion of Canada. Why not maintain the mode which exists to-day? Everybody is satisfied with it or at least nobody complains of it, and it offers the great advantage of not costing anything. The municipal councils are obliged to prepare the voters' lists for the Local Government, why not use them for Dominion elections? By admitting the lists prepared for the Local Legislatures the extraordinary expenditure of $500,000 would be saved to the Dominion of Canada. I do not intend to take up much of the time of the House. I cannot, however, resume my seat without remarking that the measure which is now submitted to us is so objectionable, it is such an infamous Bill that we hardly see any Conservative members rising to defend it. It is true we saw a few Ontario members defend it, but it is a well known fact that the members from Ontario who are supporting Sir John are ever ready to defend any of his acts. But I must be grateful to the Conservative members from Quebec for not having stood up to defend this measure in this House, although I very deeply regret that a large number of them are too submissive to the First Minister, and that they should have voted for the second reading of the Bill. However, I am glad to make an exception in favor of the hon. members for Rouville (Mr. Gigault), and for Bagot (Mr. Dupont), who have separated from their party on this question. I shall quote an extract from the speech delivered by the hon. member for Bagot before the second reading of the Bill. He said:

"Mr. Speaker, I would be ashamed to go back to my constituency after having sanctioned by my vote, such a monstrous principle as that which is consecrated in the Bill now before us. I would prefer to be defeated in any electoral contest, with three-fourths of my party than to achieve a victory which might be suspected of being the result of such a tyrannical law as that which is now before us War comparisons are in order in time of war, I shall make one: It would be better for the general of an army to lose a battle fairly and while knowing the result before hand, than to employ, in order to achieve victory, destructive weapons which are prohibited by the laws of civilised warfare. If he employs these destructive weapons which are forbidden by the international law, he will have against him the whole world who will march against his army, and will crush him if he has been victorious. On the contrary, if after having fought fairly and loyally, he is beaten after having shown that courage which one has a right to expect from the chief of an army, then he will, at least, have the consolation of saying with the illustrious vanquished of Pavia: 'All is lost save the honor.' Just so in political contests. Never should any party do anything which is not according to the law of nations in order to get the control over straightforward opponents. Now, I consider that the present Bill is an infringement on the law of nations. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, could any one imagine a law which would be more contrary to the principles of constitutional government, a more arbitrary law? A law so extraordinary in fact, that I believe that even if we should use the means which it puts at our disposal to control the electorate, we would be crushed in the next electoral contest; because, in my opinion, this law will have the result of stirring up against us our own followers, who will say: If to-day we deprive our opponents from their liberty, tomorrow they may deprive us from the liberty we now enjoy."

It will be seen by this extract from the speech of the hon. member for Bagot, that a certain number of Conservative members are opposed to this measure because it is contrary to the law of nations. I am wondering what may be the object of such a Bill as this, for what reason is it sought to be forced upon us, when nobody wants it and when a large number of Conservatives are opposed to it. There can be but one object and that is to gag the electorate, and prevent the expressions of public opinion at the next elections. One thing has been remarked, and it is that at each election since 1872, that is in 1872, 1878 and 1882, the First Minister has had at his disposal such means as he has to-day to gag the electorate. We remember the corruption which he practiced in 1872, and which resulted in the Pacific scandal. We also remember the scheme of a new legislation which had been initiated before the elections of 1878 and by which promises were made to the great commercial corporations. In making these promises, the First Minister has been able to collect enormous subscriptions to carry the elections which brought him to power. In 1882, he introduced the famous Bill for the re-distribution of seats, by which he changed the electoral divisions for the purpose of gaining some fifteen or twenty counties in Ontario. To-day the Government see that public opinion is turning against them, and once more they have recourse to great means. They propose this Bill in order to gag the electorate. What will be the effect of this Bill if it becomes law? I must admit that it is very difficult to calculate what will be its consequences, because if this contrivance, which is proposed by the Government, is destined to cause the defeat of a great many members, we must admit that it will stir up public opinion against the party in power. There is no doubt that in the Province of Quebec there will be such an uprising of public opinion that it will, in a great measure, counteract the pernicious effect of the injustice about to be committed. But, unfortunately, I am told that it will not be so in the Province of Ontario. I am told that every Tory there in Ontario is just as slavish as the Tories who support the First Minister in this Parliament. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I believe that these consequences are easy to foresee. We have every possible reason to suppose that its effect will be to bring back a majority of Ontario Tories in this House. An omnipotent Tory majority in this House means the incorporation of the Orange lodges in all the Provinces of Canada, and within a few years the establishment of legislative union. I hope that when it comes to that we will see the Conservative members of the Province of Quebec show enough patriotism to try and control the influence of their friends, the Ontario Tories, but will they be able to do it? There is one certain fact which ought not to be forgotten, and it is that each Liberal member from Ontario, who will be defeated by the effect of this Bill, is a good soldier lost by those who are in favor of French Canadian influence in this House, and of independence of the Provinces. There is one possible fact, Mr. Chairman, if this Bill has the disastrous effect which we are pointing out to-day, there is one man in this House who may, perhaps, have to atone in the end for the iniquitous provisions of the measure which he is trying to force upon us. If this Bill causes the election of a large majority of Tories in Ontario, through the obnoxious provisions which it contains, on the other hand, I hope that it will awaken the patriotism of the Province of Quebec, and will bring about a split in the Conservative party, which is so powerful to day. And I would not be surprised if that infamous Bill, which is sought to be forced upon us, would fall back on the head of the First Minister; and if the members from the Province of Quebec would abandon him in the end, to punish him for the absolutism shown by him on the present occasion.

Mr. GUAY. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak for the first time in this House I am happy to have an opportunity of claiming the rights of the Provincial Legislatures. In fact, what is the object of the sub-amendment moved by the hon. member for King's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Macdonald), and of the amendment moved by

my hon. friend the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) if it is not to maintain for each and all of the Provincial Legislatures, the right which they have always enjoyed until now, the right of deciding what will be the qualification of voters at the elections of members of the Dominion Parliament? There is no doubt that under the Act of British North America, this Parliament has the power of adopting a Franchise Bill for the whole Dominion. Nobody denies that right, Mr. Chairman; but what is loudly proclaimed by the amendments now before you, what I have reason to point out, is the inexpediency of such a legislation, of a legislation so unacceptable to the members of this House. Is this a proper time to establish such a measure? Have petitions been presented to the House by the electors of the Dominion of Canada? Are there pressing and important social reasons militating in favor of this legislative innovation? Have petitions been presented to members of Parliament praying that they should, for the future, leave aside the provincial franchise to adopt a uniform qualification for the whole Dominion? No, Mr. Chairman, never has such a petition been made by the electors of any of the Provinces of the Confederation. It is a postive proof *primâ facie* that they are satisfied with the present state of things. I will say more, they would see with regret, with indignation even, Parliament forcing upon them this franchise Act, which is so little in harmony with their social status, and with their wants, at least in the Province of Quebec. But if the electors of the Dominion do not desire such a change in their electoral franchise, has the Government any important reason to propose it to Parliament? From what I have heard, up to this day, from the hon. First Minister and his friends who addressed the House in favor of this Bill, I presume that it has been prepared with a view to simplifying the preparation of the voters' lists, of qualifying a greater number of citizens in the Dominion, and of establishing a uniform franchise throughout the country and throughout all the Provinces. I will state, in a moment, Mr. Chairman, what, in my opinion, are the reasons which must have led to the framing of this famous Bill, which is intended to revolutionise a whole system which has been long established, and which has always given full and complete satisfaction. Well, Mr. Chairman, I will venture to tell you that all these reasons are as many pretexts, and that they are merely delusive. In fact, the Franchise Bill, instead of simplifying the preparation of the voters' lists in the Provinces will, on the one hand, render them more difficult, and more costly, and, on the other hand, will make them more inaccurate and more unsatisfactory. I shall not speak at length on the manner in which the voters' lists are prepared in the Province of Quebec. The hon. members who have preceded me in this House have made that point sufficiently clear. I may say, however, that these lists are made from the valuation roll which is in force, and that nobody can have his name put on the voters' list if such a name does not appear on the valuation roll either as owner or tenant. And this valuation is made with such great care that any man in the municipality who has a right to be inscribed as owner or tenant is necessarily inscribed on the valuation roll. Well it is one of the easiest things in the world. It is very simple work for the secretary-treasurer of the municipality to prepare the valuation roll and voters' list. These lists are fyled during thirty days in the office of the council and the electors are invited to go and examine them and to make whatever remarks they see fit to make. And when the thirty days are expired the council decides without appeal whether these lists have been well made. The council meets, hears the reasons which are given by all parties and whoever thinks he has been wronged by the omission of his name from the voters' list, or by the insertion of a name which should not be there, is heard before the council. I am convinced that the voters' list in the Province of Quebec are exceedingly well made and do justice to everybody. Well, with the institution of the revising barristers, I am quite sure that these lists will be very badly made, in the first place because these officers have absolute power, and again because they know neither the persons nor the properties, and so a great number of owners and lessees will be omitted from the voters' lists. I may be told they will have a right to appeal, when the revision day will come, but I am convinced that these revising barristers will not be credited with more fairness than they will deserve, and if they have the courage to act unfairly they may not have the courage of altering their judgments. Therefore, I maintain that the first reason which has been given for introducing this Bill, which is to make the preparation of the lists easier, is altogether worthless, and that the system which we have always enjoyed in the Province of Quebec is preferable by far to that which is provided in the present Bill. Now, will this Bill grant the right of franchise to a greater number of persons in the Dominion? I must state here that the First Minister has completely attained his end if Parliament finally, so far abdicates its dignity as to give the right of voting to the thousands of Indians who are wandering over the plains of the North-West, of Manitoba and of British Columbia, and who are giving us so much trouble to-day. But the hon. First Minister is paying us a poor compliment, when he forces upon us through the majority he commands, the introduction in our legislation of an Act so little in harmony with our ideas for the sole purpose of increasing the number of his political supporters. It is unfair that the hon. First Minister should take such unavowable means to increase the number of his political followers whether they are civilised or not, whether they are emancipated or not, or whether or not they are under the guardianship of the Government who have complete control over them. But if I consider the result which will be produced by the passing of this Bill I find that the hon. First Minister completely failed to attain his end. In fact there is a class of citizens, owners and tenants in the Province of Quebec who under the Electoral Act of Quebec have always enjoyed the right to vote and who will be unjustly deprived of that right, if the amendment of my hon. friend, the member for North Norfolk is not accepted. I refer to the owners in the cities whose properties are only valued at $200. Under the new law, I am convinced that a great number of citizens in the Dominion will lose their franchise because their properties will not be valued at $300. And I can speak of it with a knowledge of the facts: In the County of Levis, which I have the honor to represent, is found the town of Levis. Well, as a representative of that electoral division, I believe it is my duty to protest against the fact that a great many of my electors will be deprived of their votes, whether these electors vote for me or against me; what I desire is, that justice should be done to them. On the other hand, there are in the Province of Quebec a great many citizens who are separated by marriage contract as to property for their wives; there are a great number of them in my parish, and there is also a considerable number of them in the town of Levis. The Bill now under consideration, will deprive these persons from the right of voting and I say this is an injustice towards them. Perhaps I may be told that there is in the present Bill a clause which provides for that class of electors. Well, I have heard the hon. member for East Quebec (Mr. Laurier) and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), asking for explanations from the First Minister, and asking him to define in a positive manner whether these husbands would have a right to vote on the property belonging to their wives under the Bill which is submitted to us. I know not for what reason he has not deigned to answer them, but what I do know is that we have had no satisfactory answer on this point. I suppose it was preferred to surround the Bill with a certain obscurity; the law was draughted in obscure

terms in order to give full sway to the revising barrister in construing the law in his own way, and in putting on the lists only those who shall have confidence in the Conservative principles. The hon. First Minister when he proposed that famous Bill, thought that he would give the right of suffrage to a greater number of citizens, but, I believe, that as regards the Province of Quebec, at least, he has completely missed the mark, and it will be the same thing in all the Provinces of the Dominion. Now, will this Bill have the effect of establishing uniform franchise throughout the Dominion? No, Mr. Chairman. In Prince Edward Island nearly one-third of the population would be disfranchised; and so true is this that the hon. First Minister saw fit to cause an amendment to be proposed by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Macdonald), in order that this Bill may not have any effect in Prince Edward Island. But then uniformity is completely destroyed. But if this new law is not in harmony with the provincial institutions of Prince Edward Island, it is not any more in harmony with those of the Province of Quebec. Mr. Chairman, why then should it be forced upon the Province of Quebec. We, also, are satisfied with our provincial franchise. We are satisfied with the manner in which things have been managed in our elections. By what right does the Dominion Parliament assume the power of depriving us from that which is just as dear to us as it may be to Prince Edward Island? Mr. Chairman, the electors of the Province of Quebec are anxious to keep their electoral franchise and I deny to the members from other Provinces in the Dominion the right of forcing upon us a franchise which we reject, and which we do not want any more than the inhabitants of Prince Edward Island. The members from British Columbia would think it very unjust and odious if this Parliament would enfranchise the Chinese of British Columbia; they have protested, and with reason, against the interference of Parliament. Well, the members from British Columbia must do the right thing for us if they wish that we should do the same thing for them. They are perfectly right; I am ready to support them, but only so far as they will do us justice on this question. Well, Mr. Chairman, the Bill introduced by the hon. First Minister is not destined to create uniformity. It cannot realise the primary object for which it has been proposed. Therefore the hon. First Minister has only been following his lifelong dream: the centralisation of the federal power. The introduction of this Bill, if such a legislation is adopted, is an encroachment on provincial rights; it is a step taken towards legislative union. But, as the hon. First Minister is an exceedingly practical man, I am convinced that he had another object in view, which was to injure, as much as possible, our friends from the Province of Ontario, who have Indian reserves in their counties. That hon. gentleman thinks that by forcing the adoption of this Bill, all the gallant champions of the Liberal cause, whose acquaintance I have had the honor to make within a few days, all these brave defenders of the rights of Provinces will find it impossible to be re-elected. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. First Minister will fail in his attempt, and that at the next election every Liberal member from Ontario will be re-elected to defend the rights of the great Liberal cause.

Mr. McMULLEN. I consider that we have reached a very important point in the discussion of this very important question, and I think it is desirable that we should give it our very serious attention. We have reached that point where it becomes necessary for us to decide whether we will adopt a Dominion franchise, or continue to avail ourselves of the franchise under which we have been operating for years. In the first place I say that the present franchise which was passed in 1874 has been in force some ten years. During that time there has not been any evidence which has come under our notice sufficient to convince us that any change was necessary. There has been no case of a contested election, in which the man who secured the seat could find serious fault with the franchise under which he secured it. It has worked well, it has been a cheap system, and it has been generally acceptable to all the Provinces. In the face of these facts it is highly proper that we should consider whether it is necessary that we should alter our present system, and inaugurate an expensive and cumbersome system which would prove a very serious drain on the revenue of this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite have stated that it is not desirable that the Provinces should fix the franchise for the Dominion. I am quite prepared to admit that. But we claim they do not fix the franchise for the Dominion, but that at the present time the Dominion largely controls the whole machinery. In the first place the Dominion makes the constituency in all the Provinces. In the next place, the Dominion claims the right to say how many inhabitants shall be in each constituency, and when the number of inhabitants increases or decreases, to readjust that constituency and make it of any shape, or form, or number of inhabitants to suit themselves. The Local Legislatures or the municipal organisations are only permitted to put on the rolls, out of the number living in those constituencies, those who shall be entitled to vote. Now, I cannot see that it is a matter of very great importance to this House whether a certain percentage of increase or decrease of that particular constituency shall or shall not vote, so long as the constituency is permitted by this House to send a member. I think it would make very little difference in the Province of Ontario, for example, under the constituencies as they are formed, whether the ladies in each constituency were permitted to vote or not. It might in some cases, but, after all, the constituency can only return one member. The constituency is composed of municipalities chosen and fixed by the Government in this House, which has the choosing and the fixing with regard to the number of population it shall contain. The only one point which is maintained by the municipality is the enfranchisement of those within the constituency who may vote for municipal purposes. I hold that that is fair, that it is a matter of justice extended to the people themselves, and I hold that the present system of enrolling the people and permitting them to exercise the franchise is a better system, a more prudent and a juster system, than anything which will be inaugurated under the operation of this Bill. Take a minor municipality: it elects a reeve and four councillors. In most cases a municipality is divided into wards. Each man runs for his own ward, and after the elections have taken place an assessor is appointed, who is sworn to go from house to house, assess every property, enrol each man in the municipality for the property he owns, real or personal, to enter upon his roll every young man of the full age of twenty-one years, for the purpose of getting the poll tax. He is sworn to enter every male in every house, and he has to make a return of the list to the municipal clerk. That clerk gets the list, and he has to hang up a copy in several public places for the inspection and investigation of those who choose to examine it. After a certain time has passed the Court of Revision is held. Each member of that council comes from his own particular section, and the roll is gone over from beginning to end. Every member of the council is there, in the interest of his own particular section. He is there to see that his friends are on the roll and to see that every piece of property in the whole municipality is properly and proportionately assessed. The whole roll is carefully investigated, and after it has been subject to the investigation and criticism of those five men, along with the clerk who undoubtedly in most cases is an experienced man, it is finally confirmed. After it is confirmed the voters' lists are printed. As soon as they are printed a certain number are sent to each member of Parliament, to municipal

councillors, to the judge of the County Court, the county attorney, and some other county officials. After the lists are issued there is then an opportunity, if any person feels aggrieved, if he has not been properly assessd for him to appeal. That appeal can be held before the county judge. It is well known that almost in every county we have what are known as Division Courts. The county judge comes round quarterly for the purpose of holding these courts, and in our county the appeals are heard after the court is over. In that way our lists are perfect. I hold that the voters' lists in that way, in the Province of Ontario, as produced at the present moment, are as perfect and complete as they possibly can be under any system. I know there are gentlemen in this House who have stated that they are not prepared to accept the assessment roll produced by any Grit assessor, and I was sorry to hear that remark endorsed by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert). For my part I have known Conservative assessors whose roll I would be perfectly willing to accept, and I think we have Reform assessors who have more respect for their oath and more respect for their duties than to purposely violate their obligation for the sake of any partisan politician. I admit that there are some men who are very rabid politicians, but I am glad to say that in all cases where the assessors are either Reform or Conservative you do not find them so rabid as to bury their consciences for the time being to serve their political party. But if the hon. gentleman is not willing to accept a Grit assessor, I ask him in common fairness, is it right to ask us to accept an entire host of Conservative assessors? The revising barriater will be even more than an assessor. An assessor has to return his roll, and that has to be investigated and passed by the council; but the revising officer is virtually the assessor for the riding, and his power is absolute. He can put on or take off whom he pleases. If he likes to revalue the property he can do so. He may take the assessment roll as the basis; but if he choose he may merely accept it as a guide to a certain extent in forming his own opinion. Now, I would like to know whether the assessor of a municipality, who goes around for the purpose of valuing property for the purposes of taxation, is not more likely to arrive at a fair and honest value than a man who is going around for political purposes. Every man in the municipality has an interest in seeing that his neighbor's property is fairly and honestly assessed, because the more equitable the assessment is, the more justly and proportionately will the taxes be levied. At present, in most cases, an equitable assessment is made; but the revising officer has a very different purpose in view. He may take information from various parties; but I am inclined to think that he will not be likely to open his ears to suggestions from any Reformer, any more than hon. gentlemen opposite are disposed to listen to suggestions from this side of the House. We have been discussing this Bill for two weeks, and have been making suggestions which we thought were in the interest of justice and fair play; but hon. gentlemen opposite have turned a deaf ear to every one of those suggestions. They have a cast iron law that they want to get passed in its present form, and they will not listen to any remonstrances or advice from us. Even those who held different views on former occasions have found it very convenient to change their views with respect to this measure. They are now in perfect accord with the Government, and are apparently bound to press this Bill through from clause to clause, and to insist that we shall accept it as the law under which we shall go to the country at the next general election. Well, the Conservative party in this country have a record, and I tell you that in years hence, when those who occupy these Chambers are gone, and other men come to take their places, they will look back with feelings of regret and of disrespect at the amount of trickery that we have witnessed in the halls of this Legislature since 1867, and that it should be continued to be perpetrated from Parliament to Parliament. In not one single year that you have gone to the country since Confederation have you gone honestly. You never would go——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order. The hon. gentleman will please address the Chair.

Mr. McMULLEN. I shall do so, Mr. Chairman. I have said that not in one year from 1867 have you ever gone to one political contest to which you have gone honestly. You have always endeavored——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order, Order. You will address the Chair, please.

Mr. McMULLEN. I bow to your ruling. I say that all through the political contests that we have had since 1867, you have always had the advantage of us. You have always been in the position to give us——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order. The hon. gentleman is out of Order. He will please address the Chair.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was trying to address myself to the question of the franchise, and in order to present the argument that I considered it my duty as a member of this House to present, I have been referring to the elections that have taken place in the past. It is highly desirable that in our elections, at least, we should display that spirit of fair play and true British liberty that we want so much in this House; and while we as politicians may hold different views on public questions, and may fight for those views very keenly here, it is to be admired in either party that when we appeal to the country, we appeal on fair and equal terms, and no one party endeavors to take advantage of the other. I hold that it is desirable that that should be the case, and when one party attempts, by laws enacted under the power that they have vested in themselves, numerically, to place the other party in a disadvantageous position, it reflects discredit on that party; and when we have left the active sphere of political life, such an action will bring discredit on the party that is guilty of it. Now, I was referring to the appeal of the county judge. At present any person who feels aggrieved can give notice to the county judge when he goes around attending to his duties on circuit, and listening to appeals and adjusting them. In that way, I claim we have as perfect a system at present as we can hope to have under this Bill. I hold that to appoint a revising officer in each county, who will have the absolute power to put any names on or to strike any off the list that he chooses, is an unwarrantable and unfair advantage assumed by one political party; and it is not creditable to that party to assume that advantage, because the revising officer will use the power that is placed within his reach in order to serve the party whom he desires to serve. It is better that we should accept matters as we find them, because we are more likely to get a free and untrammelled expression of opinion from the electors under the lists we now have than we could under lists prepared under the operation of the Act. I hold that this right is dear to the people themselves. They are entitled to be permitted to exercise their franchise without being trammelled. Some years ago, when the Attorney General of Ontario passed a license law for the purpose of licensing parties to sell liquors throughout the Province, serious fault was found with that law by hon. gentlemen opposite, because under it he took power to appoint all the license commissioners and all the inspectors. They claimed that the law was used for political purposes, that Conservatives did not receive licenses unless on certain terms, and that the officials who exercised the power vested in them as commissioners and inspectors used it for political purposes. The hon. First Minister of this

House said that he was going to give the Provinces a more perfect law, that he was going to pass a Dominion law, that he was going to take the whole power into his own hands, and was going to give the municipalities something to say in the matter. He would appoint one commissioner, the county judge should be another, and he would allow the municipalities to appoint their warden as the third. I ask why is he not disposed to act in the same fair way in reference to the election law? He controls two points out of the three at present—why is he not satisfied? He controls the right to adjust the constituencies; he can gerrymander them into any shape he chooses; he can say what number of population they shall contain; he fixes them to suit himself. The only power held by the municipalities now is the power of saying what certain percentage of the people shall vote; they only hold the power, under the assessment law, to put on the list those who shall exercise the franchise. The hon. gentleman is going to take that power from them. Why is he not disposed to be as fair in this case as he was in the other? I suppose it does not suit his purpose; he would not be able to carry out the measure if he did. Hon. gentlemen opposite want to control the whole thing; they want to shape the constituencies to suit themselves. And in addition to that, they want to have a revising officer to whom all the inhabitants of that constituency must bow, to whom all must bow who will be given the privilege and right to exercise the franchise. I think if hon. gentlemen opposite were in our position they would resent that law as keenly and as bitterly as we do. I am informed, and I believe rightly informed, that the hon. the First Minister stated his own private opinion in regard to the Gerrymandering Act after that Act became law, and his opinion was that if he had been a member of the Opposition, he would have fought it to the death before he would allow it to pass. I believe hon. gentlemen opposite would have made a much more determined opposition to it than perhaps our friends did, and if there is any one thing to-day that tells against the members of the Reform party, who then occupied the Opposition benches, it is that they permitted this Gerrymandering Bill to become law without a thorough exposure of the system it was intended to operate. There are some peculiarities in connection with the Act to which I wish to call attention. In the first place, if a man is living upon a farm and has sons, his sons will be permitted to vote provided the real estate is assessed at a sufficient value to enable them to vote; but if the value fixed by any revising officer is not sufficient, the farmer's sons will not be allowed any consideration for any chattel property they may be possessed of. That is unfair. In the case of the fishermen, they are allowed to vote upon such property, while the farmers' sons are not, though, in many cases, there are farmers who live upon small farms and do not rely altogether on the produce of the soil for their yearly subsistence, but engage to a considerable extent, in stock raising. Under the operation of this proposed Act, if the farm is poor enough, or the improvements on it insufficient enough to furnish the revising officer with the slightest excuse for reducing the value, these people, no matter what chattel property they may possess, will not be allowed to be assessed upon that. If chattel property is to be taken into consideration in the case of the fisherman, it should also be taken into consideration in the case of small farmers. I hold it is an impossibility to frame a law of this kind that will equitably and fairly reach all the inhabitants of the Dominion, because a man may be earning perhaps $250 at a certain point, when a man with equal facilities and business, at another point, would only earn $150. A horse in one place will be worth $100 more than the same animal would in another, and a farm at one point, say of 20 acres, would be worth four times as much as a similar farm at another. So long as this diversity of values exist to the extent it does exist at present, it is an utter impossibility to make an equitable and a just franchise law based upon property. In one of the Maritime Provinces, where manhood suffrage has been in force for some time, it will be impossible to frame a law such as this, a law applying to the whole Dominion, that will enable the people there to continue enjoying the rights they now possess, and the consequence would be that a large number of these people, who, under this measure, will be excluded from the franchise, will undoubtedly feel keenly their exclusion and deeply resent it. There is another point to be considered in connection with the powers that are to be invested in the revising officer. He has not only the power to make a revaluation of the property, but to reorganise all the wards in a township if he chooses. In my own riding there are townships in which the wards are divided in such a way that one ward gives a majority of Reform votes and another an almost equal majority of Conservative votes, so that when the polls are closed and the votes counted the one about balances the other. The Reform portion of the riding is situated in the north end and the Conservative in the south end. If the revising officer, for any particular reasons of his own, should decide that the township is wrongly divided, he would make up his mind to divide it in another way, say north and south, instead of as it is, east and west, and thus compel all the farmers in the north portion to travel 10 or 12 miles to the south portion to record their votes, giving, by this means, the Conservative portion an opportunity of recording the votes of its electors at their own doors while the Reformers would have to travel 10 or 12 miles to do so. Many people would of course say: Has not the revising officer the power to do as he pleases? Has he not the right to decide how the township should be divided? And attempt to justify his action by the authority hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to give him. One poll may be held on one side of the road and another opposite, and the Reformers who live in one end of the townships, will be put to the trouble of going all the way to the other end to vote. No doubt, hon. gentlemen will say that is drawing the line too severely, that no man will be found who will act so unjustly, but the thing has been done before. Our experience has taught us some very queer lessons. We have known such things to happen when the control of the election was perhaps in the hands of those who were willing to lend themselves to a trick of that kind; and such things having happened before, they will, in all probability, under the present rule occur again. It is a dangerous power to place in the hands of any one man. It is an infringement on the rights of the electors to say they must submit to the decision of one man appointed by the Government as to whether they shall have the right to vote or not. It is unfair when we have exercised the rights which we have as Canadians, it is untrue to the principles of British legislation to place such enormous power in the hands of one man to worry and annoy the electors. It is trampling upon the people's rights and taking an undue advantage of them. It is wrong, because we are here to do the country's business, to place a law upon the Statute Book which will deal unjustly with the people who sent us here. The liberties of the people are dear to them, and any attempt to trample upon those liberties ought to be, and I hope will be, resented. The yeomanry and the laboring classes of this country have worked hard to gain the little comforts they enjoy, and, if you are going to place over them a man who will have the right to deprive them or their sons or their relatives of the right to go to the poll untrammelled and record their votes for any man they choose, you are interfering with those rights which they have enjoyed in the past under their municipal institutions and are doing them an injustice which I hope they will resent. The power which is placed in the

hands of the revising officer in regard to the alteration of the wards is a very dangerous one, and will only cause confusion where it is exercised. In 1871, when the leader of the Government proposed to add a number of representatives to those returned from the Province of Ontario to this House, although his scheme was questioned by our friends on some grounds, still he declined to interfere with municipal boundaries. He said that a young man first became a member of a municipal council, and after that perhaps a reeve and perhaps the warden of his county, and, when the people in the county became aware of his abilities, after some time perhaps he was elected to be their representative in the Local House or in this House, and it was therefore desirable that those municipal boundaries should be preserved, and he positively refused to interfere with those boundaries. When I read those remarks, I thought they were well put, but, in 1882, I felt sorry that, when it became his duty again to readjust the constituencies in the Province of Ontario, in place of adhering to those views, he broke up the boundaries of almost every county in the Province.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. member will please confine his remarks to the subject under discussion.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am trying to show——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. You cannot discuss another Bill except in its bearing upon this.

Mr. MACKENZIE. He can use it by way of illustration.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Yes, but he cannot go into details.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. gentleman is merely indulging in a retrospective view of the history of the country.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order. I have called the hon. gentleman to Order.

Mr. McMULLEN. I was referring to that measure in order to show why I thought it desirable that the boundaries of townships and wards should not be interfered with, why I considered it desirable that the present arrangements should not be disturbed, and why the revising officer should not have the power to alter the wards. By the changes which took place in the years I referred to, the voters were put to a great deal of confusion and inconvenience. I have known voters to drive first to one poll and then to another, not knowing which to go to in order to record their votes. I have known men who were in such confusion with regard to the county they lived in that afterwards they did not know but that the township they lived in had been added to another county. I was adducing these arguments to show that the power of alteration given to the revising officer should be limited to as great an extent as possible. Farmers are not in the habit of studying a franchise Bill, and are frequently not posted as to how to record their votes, and it is very hard to get them drilled into the way to record their votes when an alteration is made. When the ballot was introduced a large number of the ballots first cast were spoiled, though one would suppose that, from the very plain and explicit directions which were given, people would understand how to record their votes. I have been trying to impress upon hon. members the necessity of avoiding these changes, and I hope, when the clause is reached, it will be amended so as to accept the polling sub-divisions in any township where they have been made. The question of expense is going to be the most important item in connection with this whole Bill. Above all things, seeing that our population is not increasing, and the influx of immigration is not increasing as we should like to see it, we ought to try in every possible way to avoid increasing the amount of the people's burdens, and this Bill will undoubtedly tend in the direction of increasing them. We have a great many public works which are costing the country a great amount of money. The Canadian Pacific Railway has been costing large sums of money, though probably it is a work which will be of advantage to the Dominion, but, where anything can be done without a great increase of expense, it is highly improper that we should incur such an expense. I have made a calculation as to the amount this measure would cost in the constituency which I represent. There are eleven municipalities in North Wellington, and, estimating that a copy of the voters' list for each municipality would cost $20, that would be $220. I do not think you will get any person to copy the assessment roll for that amount; then, again, there is the printing of the list, the present cost of which is about $285 for the whole 11 municipalities; and I do not think it will be possible for the Dominion to get a list printed for less than that. Now if you allow the revising barristers, say, $50 for each municipality, for his services, or $550 for the county, and allow the constable $250, and the clerk $600, you can get an idea of what it is going to cost. I presume the clerk would have to be kept continually employed, for it is desirable, whoever may be appointed, that he should keep his position from year to year; and you cannot get men who will do that work for less than $600 a year. Then take the stationery and printing, $200; notices, bills, posters and everything connected with the duties of the revising officer, the clerk, the bailiff, and we have a total amount for that constituency of $2,105. For the whole 211 constituencies you will have a sum total of $444,155; that would virtually be half a million dollars that it will cost the country for the purpose of getting up those lists. I know it is said that it will cost more the first year than it will subsequently, but I think you will find that once you inaugurate a staff of officials for that purpose and name their salary, you will have great difficulty in reducing the sum named at first. We all know that once men get a position at a certain salary, they insist upon its being continued and resist any reduction. Besides that, the man who happens to sit for the constituency, let him be Reformer or Conservative, will be subjected to the influence of these men to have their salary kept up at the point at which it was at first fixed. This revising officer and clerk will be very important officers, and will exercise considerable influence, either for or against the candidate; and I have no doubt that when hon. gentlemen come back to this House they will do their very best to secure to the revising officer, the clerk and the constable, an increase of salary, if possible. So if we anticipate a reduction in the amount that it is annually going to cost the country, we are anticipating something that will not be realised. Now, this is a very important consideration and I believe if there is one thing in connection with this Bill that will bring it more pointedly before the people than another, and will do more to secure their condemnation of it, it is the question of expense. There is no necessity for it; it will put the people to a double expense. At the present time the people of the Provinces cannot accept the rolls prepared by the Dominion for their provincial elections; the municipalities cannot accept that roll because they have to have a different roll of their own for assessment purposes. They have to go round from year to year and assess the different municipalities for the purpose of levying the rates, and consequently must have an assessment roll of their own; therefore the people will be put to the expense of making two rolls, one for the purpose of electing members to this House, and another for the purpose of electing municipal officers and members to the Local Legislatures. It costs the people a good deal now to prepare the rolls under which members are elected to this House and to the Local Legislatures; and instead of spending money to make another roll, I think it would be better to

spend it in some way that would benefit the people. Hon. gentlemen opposite say they fear that some irregularity, some injustice, might arise in some county, to the residents of that county, and they want to legislate in advance so as to protect the people against injustice. Well, Sir, I am only sorry that they have not viewed many other questions in the same way, that they have not taken the same precaution to prevent the troubles in the North-West, and taken pains to attend to them earlier. If they had done so the people of this country would not now be put to the expense and trouble of putting down an insurrection, and our sons would not now be forced to fight the battles of our country in maintaining the authority of the Government. But they were not so anxious about that matter as they are about the election law. The election law appears to be a very important matter just now, and to have a particular attraction for the hon. gentlemen opposite at this juncture. We have learned from the First Minister and from some of his supporters that this Bill is so very important that the political life of the Conservative party largely depends on its becoming law. Now, I do not think they should be so scared. They have reason to be tolerably well satisfied with their success in the last two elections. The National Policy carried them through the last election, and if they think they still retain the confidence of the people, as they pretend, I think they ought to have the courage to meet the people face to face again on fair terms. If they think the people of this country are as well satisfied with the results of the National Policy as they pretend, they ought to be willing to go back to the country on the same terms they did before, they ought to be willing to appeal to the people on equitable terms. But I believe hon. gentlemen are not prepared to go to the country on those terms. They are afraid to meet us fairly. For ourselves, we have got to commit our case to the people of this Dominion, and we are willing to trust ourselves in their hands. We are willing that the people should have full opportunity to discuss the merits of this whole question. We believe there is a fairness in the people of this country, and we believe that spirit of fairness has been awakened. We believe that when the people understand what the operations of this Act are likely to be, they will rise up and condemn it. It is a glorious thing that we have got the ballot. I have no doubt there are many men in the country who are quietly keeping their opinions to themselves on this matter; but there is a spirit of true British liberty among the electors of this country, and when they record their votes they will exercise the spirit of liberty and fair play. I know, Mr. Chairman, that at the last general election hon. gentlemen opposite did not accomplish all that they expected to accomplish through the operations of the Gerrymander Act. I know constituencies which had previously returned Conservatives, but the people felt disposed to resent the injustice done to certain sections and to certain candidates, and therefore they abandoned for the time old political lines, and thus disappointed the hopes of hon. gentlemen opposite. No doubt the same result will occur at the next general election. I have great faith in the spirit of justice among the people. Nothing can arouse them more than to have their rights and privileges tampered with. When they see kid-gloved gentlemen appearing in the constituencies for the purpose of revising the voters' lists and deciding who shall and who shall not vote, and when they find they have to come and almost request as a favor that they be placed on the list, they will begin to resent this interference with their rights. I hope they will resent it. Whenever a party attempts to take advantage of the other party the people will resent it. We have seen in the United States that during a number of years the people were careless as to their political interests, and in some sections politics have been conducted with nothing short of fraud. But at the last general election the people became aroused and elected men of their own choice. Our people will after a while teach a lesson to politicians not to interfere with the vested rights of British subjects, and when an attempt is made to interfere with their privileges as free men the people will not submit to it. Politicians will then learn to deal very carefully and tenderly with the people's rights. I hope we shall have evidence of this in the manner in which the people will resent the action proposed in the present Bill. Hon. gentlemen opposite are conducting this debate on a cast-iron rule under which the whole responsibility of discussing the measure devolves on members on this side of the House. We have to point out the different objectionable features; but I am afraid that is all the good that will be done. Hon. gentlemen opposite are not prepared to accept our amendments. When the Election Act of 1874 was before Parliament the leader of the present Government, who was then in Opposition, made several suggestions by way of amendment, and they were willingly and courteously accepted by the Government of the day, the object of the Government being to secure as perfect a law as possible. In contrast with this. I point to the course of hon. gentlemen opposite during this debate. They have not accepted any of our suggestions, and in fact they have treated us with scant courtesy. Even although the Government do not adopt a single amendment proposed from this side of the House, we shall have the satisfaction of knowing that we have discharged our duty fully and fearlessly in endeavoring to prevent the House passing a Bill that is most objectionable. I believe the system of revising officers proposed in the Bill will cost the country not less than $500,000 a year. I deny the power of the House to pass this Bill. Under our present system hon. gentlemen are returned to this House by a certain body of voters, and they ought to be willing to accept a franchise which will cover the class who have sent them here, and they have no right to disfranchise a portion of those electors. I hold that such a course is a direct interference with the rights of the people. It would surely be unjust for the members from British Columbia to come here and pass an Act which would disfranchise a large number of the electors by whom they were returned. And the same remark would apply to representatives from the Maritime Provinces. I would like to know if it would be right that those people should be permitted so to alter the law that they would go back to the men who elected them and say: I felt it to be my duty to disfranchise you, you did vote for me in the last election but you shall not vote in the next. Supposing that they would be able to go back to their opponents and to tell them: You exercised the franchise last time, and voted against me, but I have put a law on the Statute Book now so that you cannot be permitted to vote against me again. I say it is wrong; I say that the franchise which is in force at the present time in the Provinces is a proper franchise. For my part I would be willing to accept an amendment which would provide that if we adopted the provincial franchise with the understanding that no change made in any of the Provinces of a restrictive character should have any effect on the elections to this House without concurrent action of this Parliament. I would be willing to say, supposing you take the Franchise Bill which was recently passed in the Ontario Legislature, take the franchises which are in operation in Quebec and the other Provinces as they now stand, adopt those franchises as the franchise for this House, but provide that the Provinces should not make any further provision, directly or indirectly affecting the franchise by which the members should be elected to this House, unless concurrent action shall be taken by this Parliament in adopting that change. By such a proposition we would be able to protect this Parliament against any attempt on the part of the Local

Legislatures after the next election, to pass a law disfranchising a portion of the population, and I say in the face of the increased expense which it will cost the country to adopt a new franchise and carry it out, such a course would be a wise one for this Parliament to adopt. I say that the expense for carrying this Bill into operation would be a very serious one, and I believe and trust that the people of this country will condemn it. I know that a certain percentage of them are condemning it, because there has been no evidence of any necessity for this Bill. You cannot point to a single instance in which a law was put through this House without some evidence of its being needed, but because this law is regarded as necessary in the interests of a political party, hon. gentlemen opposite proceed, without any single evidence, without any proof of its being required, to pass this law through the House. The law is to be placed on the Statute Book for the reason that it is regarded as being in the interests of hon. gentlemen opposite, and they are bound to carry it out, and I say that it is unfair, unjust and discreditable, to treat us in that way.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock—go on.

Mr. McMULLEN. I understood it was the intention of the Speaker to call it six o'clock, but if it is desired that I should proceed I am quite willing to go on.

The committee rose, and it being six o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a few remarks on the Bill which is now submitted to us. The object of the first amendment which was placed in your hands is to maintain the electoral franchises such as they now exist in the Provinces, and the object of the sub-amendment is to give to Prince Edward Island only the privilege of maintaining the electoral franchise which it possesses to-day. I will say, in the first place, that I perfectly agree with the views expressed by the hon. mover of this sub-amendment, and, as a direct consequence, by sound reasoning, and in all justice, we ought to extend this right to each of the Provinces which claim it. The discussion which has taken place until now has not been useless; on the contrary, I think it has been very useful; and by prolonging it in a reasonable manner, in order to elicit the opinion of each one of the members of this House, we will arrive at a conclusion which will be satisfactory to the House and to the country. It is to be regretted that a greater number of members—and especially of members from the Province of Quebec, have not taken a more active part in the debate, especially in the discusssion of the two amendments which are now before you. It is to be regretted that on questions which so deeply interest the Province of Quebec we notice the absence of a great many members—and their complete abstention. We do not even know, at this moment—we can only perceive—the position which the Government is to take on the sub-amendment moved by the hon. member for Prince Edward Island. Will they accede to that demand, or will they reject it? Until now the Government and their supporters have remained silent on this question. It is true that if we consider the course followed by the Government with regard to this Bill we must conclude that the Government is not ready to accept this amendment. Consequently, as this side of the House and the members for Prince Edward Island are anxious, and rightly so, to maintain the privileges which that Province now enjoys, we must make all our efforts to do justice to that part of the Dominion and, at the same time, as a logical consequence, arrive at the conclusion that the Province of Quebec has also the right to maintain the privileges which it possesses at the present time. Well, what does the Government intend to substitute for the mode of franchise of Prince Edward Island? It is sought to give that Province a system which prevails in part in other Provinces, and which will be more or less developed in that island—the uniform system which is proposed by this Bill. But the able and eloquent manner in which the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) has claimed the rights of his Province, induces me to support him with all my might, in order that he may obtain the rights which he claims for his island. The Bill now laid before the House by the Government has been attempted several times in the past. It was in vain that the Government tried to lay their hand on what I shall call the ark of alliance of Confederation. The hand was raised to touch it, but until now nobody ever had the courage or the audacity to attack the electoral franchise which exists in the different Provinces. The Government have developed their views to a certain extent when the Bill was introduced, but I believe the Bill is inexpedient, and that it is introduced under circumstances which are exceedingly difficult for the Provinces. I believe that we ought to oppose this with all our might. Is the present system good? Is it adequate to our wants? Is it the best, under the circumstances? It is always dangerous, and it is often inexpedient to change the existing laws. It is a sound maxim of legislation not to change the laws; it is even better to suffer from the defectiveness of a law than to touch it, without a great necessity. The customs of the people, the general satisfaction which has been given by the present law, form, so to speak, part of our habits. People get accustomed to the laws which govern them, and when they understand them they carry them out better and better every day. What advantage can we gain by changing the present system? Does not that system work as well in the Province of Quebec as any other which might be established? Will that so-called uniform system which is sought to be established counterbalance the disadvantages which will result from a really revolutionary system? I do not think that the people desire a new system, and I do not believe that it is in their interest to offer it to them without their asking for it. When we consider our present system we are perfectly satisfied that by leaving it in the hands of the municipal officers it is in as good hands as it can be. And if we change it, difficulties will arise in all counties, owing to the confusion which will exist between the two systems. It will happen that each elector may, in one case, be on the voters' list, and in the other case be eliminated from the list of voters. Then what will be the effect produced on the people? Here is an individual who will be deprived of his vote for the election of members of our House, and the same individual will have the right to vote to elect a member of another House. There will certainly be an injustice somewhere. These two systems will create uncertainty and discontent. If it can be shown that the present system is a faulty system, that it does not meet the desires of the population, that it is subject to abuses, what is wanted is to reform the abuses and not to destroy the system. But when it is proposed to do away with it, is there anything better to substitute for it? Is it possible to substitute for it a system which would be preferable? I intend to show to this committee that the system which is sought to be inaugurated is not at all preferable to that which we have now. On the contrary, it opens the door to a host of abuses. It will expose the people to the necessity of asking the repeal of this law, which repeal will be asked sooner or later. It will be apt to create grievances, not to mention a host of other objections which have been raised, with a great deal of talent, in the course of the debate. I do not, for the moment, speak of the expenses which will follow and which, under the circumstances, are useless to the country—expenses which are a great deal too high for the wants of the moment.

I will merely state that if we wish to adopt a new electoral system we must have a system which will involve a material change, and which will be evidently preferable to that which we have now. Now, with the system proposed to-day, what is the most notable difference with which we will meet? There is a difference of a sum of $200 or $300 on property qualification. I will remark, by the way, that it is intended to base the franchise on real estate, and on real estate only, without keeping account of intellectual qualification. So that the idiot, provided he has a property worth $300, or an annual income of $20, will have the right to deposit his vote in the ballot box as well as the most intelligent man in the country. Such a system is faulty and absurd, and for my part I cannot approve of it. But, nevertheless, I am ready, as long as no other changes are to be made besides those which are proposed now—which are to maintain, so to speak, the present system—I am ready to adopt that system as long as it belongs to the Province of Quebec, for which I am specially speaking at this moment and which desires to maintain it. We cannot conceal from ourselves, Mr. Chairman, that the unanimity of this side of the House is adverse to the Government scheme. Neither can we conceal from ourselves the fact that the very great majority of the other side of the House see this scheme with the greatest possible reluctancy, and that a great many of the hon. members on that side of the House do not dare to express their opinion. However, it will be admitted that those who had the courage to express their views, such as the hon. members for Rouville (Mr. Gigault) and Bagot (Mr. Dupont) have expressed themselves with great vigor. And I am glad to recognise to-day their independence of character; they certainly deserve the gratitude of the country for having achieved this act of courage, in abandoning for the moment the ranks of their party to express loudly and proudly their opinions on this question. I say so the more willingly that, in this House, it is very seldom that we see a member independent enough to leave his party, for the time being, at least. When such independence of character is seen among certain members of this House we can not be too loud in praise of such an act. Well, Mr. Chairman, supposing that this Bill introduced could become law in this country, will we obtain the desired result—that is to say, the uniformity for all the Provinces by putting them on the same level? The first impression which one has while listening to this discussion is that it is impossible, under the present circumstances, that this uniformity could be carried out. On the contrary, it appears on the very face of our deliberations that the moment claims have been made by British Columbia, the moment that Province demanded a certain representation, which suited her people, and for which I am far from blaming them, the Government had to adopt her view and give way, under the pressure of the members from that Province. Will it be the same thing as regards Prince Edward Island? That is what the vote will show very soon; but in the mean time let me say that if an exception has been created in favor of British Columbia, it logically and necessarily follows that the claim of Prince Edward Island, who claims the maintenance of her franchise, such as it exists at the present moment, through the sub-amendment now before the House, should be favorably received. We have heard the several members from that Province. What was their opinion? Do they not all severally claim the maintenance of their privileges? And what right have we to take them away from them? But it is said we have the right to legislate on that question. No doubt the constitution permits in fact to legislate on the electoral franchises, but does it follow because this power exists that we ought to use it? Does it follow that it is expedient to use this power after it has been in existence for eighteen years, during which time nobody ever had the audacity, so to speak, to attempt an attack against the electoral franchises of the different Provinces? Therefore, I say—and I specially call the attention of the members from the Province of Quebec on this question, because they are more interested than anybody to maintain the integrity of their autonomy and the privileges which they enjoy, and I invite them, in the name of their Province and of their future interests, to give their serious attention to this attempt, which is an infringement on their existing rights. The moment this first invasion shall be made, when and where shall they stop? If to-day we have the right to choose our representatives, why not maintain that right? To give way to a pressure? Why should we give way to a deleterious influence? Why should we, above all, do so with the motives which are supposed and denounced to-day, motives which are animating the Government of the day? It seems to me that with a little reflection and patriotism it would be seen that it is only with the most serious precautions that people should allow themselves to meddle with the representation, such as it exists to-day. In fact, what is the basis of our constitution? It must be remarked that the vote is not an individual vote in this country; it is not the vote of the individual, but it is the vote of the community; it is the vote of the county, it is the vote of the Province as a whole, whose influence must be felt in the House, and consequently that vote must be given by the Province itself. And if to-day it was attempted to carry the Government's pretension to its utmost limit, what would hinder them from saying: We will regulate the electoral franchise in another manner; we will say, for instance, that it is the mayor of a municipality, representing the community of the inhabitants, representing the interest of the council of which he is the chief, who will make the elections of the municipality. We will only have one vote, the cumulative vote. Nothing would prevent the Government from doing that; the moment they enter upon this mode of proceeding they may just as well say that the mayor, who is elected by the majority of the inhabitants of a locality, will be the person who will vote for the Dominion representation; the moment we allow them to invade the rights of the Provinces we cannot foresee where they will stop. I give this example as being in the order of things which an iniquitous Government may possibly establish at any day. If a majority wishes to pass a Bill against all sense of justice and equity, nothing will prevent this system from prevailing, one day or the other. Therefore, we must all be on our guard, especially we French Canadians, on account of this first attack against the electoral franchise of the Province of Quebec. I said, in the beginning of my remarks, that the length of the debate had not been without usefulness, and we have had a striking example of that towards the end of last week. After the debate had lasted for a whole week we saw that the members who support the Government, who had taken part in the discussion—a long, elaborate and continuous discussion—did not yet understand the bearing of the Bill.

Mr. VALIN. That is something new.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) Well, we will see whether my assertion is true or not. Facts will speak, and facts are stubborn things. Have we not seen the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), who has certainly given a great deal of attention and study to this question, judging from the manner in which he has dealt with it, have we not seen, at the last hour, his opinions entirely contradicted by the hon. First Minister? Have we not seen the hon. member for Kent, N.B. (Mr. Landry), after having discussed the question with all the intelligence, which I am happy to recognise in him, and with all the skillful resources which he possesses; have we not seen him, also, at the last hour, in direct and flagrant contradiction with the First Minister? Have we not also seen the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster) display all his eloquence to demonstrate a

proposition which was positively contradicted by the First Minister? Am I in error, then, when I say that after eight days of discussion this Bill was not yet thoroughly known and investigated? On the contrary, I say that the more the discussion is prolonged on that subject the more light is thrown upon it, and that light may some day shine forth in all its brilliancy. If the discussion is continued for some time yet, it is quite possible—at least we ought to hope so—that the Bill may be withdrawn. Perhaps the Government will persist to the end, but if they persist I may predict that the whole population of the Province of Quebec, to whom this Bill is exceedingly repugnant, will not fail to pronounce against them as soon as they have an opportunity to do so. Give us an opportunity to take the sense of the population and you will see hosts of petitions coming into this House from municipal councils, praying to be allowed to continue to make their own voters' lists. Let this law be passed and you will see, at the next Session, a host of petitions asking the House to repeal it. And what I state here I believe I state with a pretty certain foresight into the future; at least, I have indications which show, in a visible manner, that this Bill is not only unpopular in this House, but that it is also quite unpopular with the great mass of the electors of the Province of Quebec. I sincerely regret that the members from the Province of Quebec, who are supporters of the Government, do not deem it proper to express their views on the question. I am convinced that we would still have the same spectacle as that which has been given to us by the three members whose names I mentioned a while ago. I believe that if we could take the opinion of well-informed persons, men who understand constitutional law, men who, by their lucidity of thought and eloquence, are able to defend their ideas, such as the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Bossé), who is one of those who could throw the most light on this question; and there are others in this House. I believe that if these gentlemen would give us the benefit of their views, they might perhaps convince us that we are wrong on this side of the House and that we ought to adopt their course. It is by comparing opinions that we may arrive at a conclusion; it is by working together that we may know whether the interest of the country requires that we should adopt the Bill in question. That Bill is so important that I do not at all regret the discussion which has taken place on this subject. I do not wish to repeat a great number of arguments which have been brought on this side of the House, but I say that if these changes are made it will only throw discredit on the whole population of the Province of Quebec who take part in the municipal affairs. They are in possession of an absolute right. The inhabitants of that Province have confidence in themselves and in their municipal officers. They have confidence in the preparation of their voters' lists. They have confidence in the judges who are called upon to revise these lists. Well, if you change the system which exists to-day, you put them in such a position that they may say that you have no confidence in them. It is an act of discredit which is thrown in their face. It is, so to speak, an insult thrown at the whole of the electorate of the Province of Quebec, who are satisfied with the present system. Why should it be changed? In whose interest? Is it to substitute for it an entirely new system, which offers *primâ facie* all the disadvantages, which is arbitrary, which is unknown, which would take a certain time to work without clashing, and which would, moreover, be a very expensive system, of which the elector would have to pay the cost. Do you believe that the elector from the Province of Quebec, who, to-day, sees the voters' list prepared, without any expense whatever, without any cost to the municipality—do you believe that the people would be glad to be called upon to pay each year $400, $500 or $600, or perhaps more, to prepare a voters' list in each county? I say that from this point of view alone the Bill will be received with the greatest reluctance in the Province of Quebec. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to detain the committee beyond fair limits, but I say openly, in conclusion, that we ought to grant to Prince Edward Island the privilege which it claims; and that as a necessary and immediate consequence, we ought also to grant to the Provinces who require it the power of maintaining their present franchise system.

Summing up in English what I have said in French, I may say that I think Prince Edward Island should retain the franchise which she has to-day, and I think that all the other Provinces should also be allowed to retain their provincial franchises. At the same time, if the other Provinces beyond Quebec do not desire it, I would allow every Province to do as it chooses; but I maintain that the old system is the best, the most advantageous, the most economical and the most satisfactory to our population.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I understand, Sir, that the question of a Dominion franchise is the substantive question before the committee, to which an amendment has been moved by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in favor of a provincial franchise, and that an amendment has been moved by one of the hon. members for Prince Edward Island, providing that in so far as that Island is concerned, the franchise which it enjoys to-day, and which I understand is a manhood franchise, shall be continued. Now these are all very important questions, and they should be considered with the care and deliberation with which Parliament should be invited to consider every question of this kind, and I am glad to know that they have been approached by gentlemen on both sides in the spirit of earnestness and fair play. The speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite indicate very clearly, at this stage of the discussion, the very great importance of this whole question to the country. The discussion has not been confined to the gentlemen who sit on the Opposition benches, but has extended to hon. gentlemen who sit on the other side of the House. At the earlier stages of this discussion we heard but rarely from these hon. gentlemen, but more recently the gag seems to have been withdrawn, and now these hon. gentlemen speak freely upon this great question. The lips of the supporters of the Government have been unsealed, and we have heard the opinions they have pronounced upon this question of the different franchises. We are delighted to have hon. gentlemen express their opinions, because it gives us some idea of the line of argument by which the policy of the Government with respect to this Bill is attempted to be supported. There is one thing which strikes me in listening to the discussion on both sides of the House, and that is the fact that there does not appear to be much harmony on this subject among the supporters of the Government. It is quite clear that upon this question they are not united. They are not all at one upon the sort of franchise we ought to have, nor upon the necessity of a Dominion franchise at all. They are not all at one upon the important principles involved in this Bill, and they are very clearly not at one as to the important and material details of the Bill itself. Now, Sir, those supporters of the Government from the island of Prince Edward who have addressed the House on this question have pronounced strongly against the principle of the Bill; and so far has that oppinion been carried that one of the hon. gentlemen from that island has ventured to place in your hands an amendment, the effect of which, if carried, would be to destroy this Bill entirely—the effect of which would be, at all events, to give the island of Prince Edward a franchise which the hon. First Minister does not propose to give to any other Province of this Dominion. We have those views expressed very clearly and very strongly by some hon. gentlemen from that island. On the other hand, we have other supporters of the Government, notably, I

think, the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry), declaring that the island of Prince Edward is not entitled to be excepted from the operation of this Franchise Bill, and that if the amendment of the hon. member for King's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Macdonald) is carried, he will find it his duty, although he is an unswerving supporter of the Government on most occasions, to record his vote against it. Now, Sir to show the want of harmony and unity of opinion among gentlemen supporting the Government, one need only refer to the statement which was made by the hon. First Minister on Thursday afternoon of last week, in reply to the question submitted to him by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mill), when he declared in the most distinct and positive language that under the provisions of this Bill he proposed to give the right of voting to unenfranchised Indians, to Indians who still continue in their tribal relations, to Indians who are pagan as well as those who are Christianised, to Indians who are uncivilised as well as those who are civilised. It will be remembered that three or four unswerving supporters of the Government gave their interpretation of the 5th sub-section of the clause now under consideration. The hon. member for Algoma, (Mr. Dawson) the hon. member for King's, New Brunswick, (Mr. Foster) and the hon. member for Kent, New Brunswick, (Mr. Landry), all, in very decided, very distinct, and very unequivocal language declared that the interpretation the opposition placed upon the clause giving the right to vote to the Indians, was a misinterpretation, and that the only Indians proposed to be enfranchised by the Bill were Indians who had by their own industry, perseverance and economy, acquired sufficient property to entitle them to exercise the electoral franchise the same as white men. The hon. member for Kent very clearly laid down that proposition, and the hon. member for King's, New Brunswick, laid it down still more emphatically and distinctly. He had no doubt as to the proper interpretation to be put upon this clause; he had no doubt that the hon. First Minister never contemplated that it should extend to the Aborigines, or that it should be so construed as to give the right of voting to any but the Christianised and civilised Indians. The hon. gentleman went further: he stated that if the interpretation put upon this clause by gentlemen on this side of the House were the proper interpretation, he would find it his duty to record his vote against the Bill. Now, Sir, the hon. First Minister, in reply to the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) the other day, reaffirmed the statement made in reply to the queries of the hon. member for Bothwell, and declared distinctly again, so that the House should have no doubt as to what the intention of the Government really was, that he proposed that the Indians whose relations with their tribe were unbroken, should be entitled to exercise the franchise. I say one need only refer to this discrepancy between the statements of the hon. First Minister and those of his followers in Parliament to see the utter want of harmony and of unity among them upon the interpretation to be placed upon this statute. Sir, there is no unity, no harmony among them. One cannot tell what the Government mean to do except from the language of the hon. First Minister. From the language of his supporters, I for one, if I believed that the interpretation put by these gentlemen upon this provision of the Bill, were the correct interpretation, I would, so far as this portion of this clause is concerned, be disposed to sustain the First Minister, because I repeat, and it cannot be repeated too often, in view of the fact that the press of hon. gentlemen opposite is attempting to put the Opposition in a false position with respect to the Indian qualification, that the desire of the Opposition, is that every Indian qualified to exercise the franchise should have the right to exercise it. Every civilised Indian, every Indian who has severed his connection with the band and acquired the necessary property qualification, should be entitled to vote. I am aware, as every member of the House is aware, that in the creation of a franchise, difficulties of a most formidable character will spring up. It is a difficult matter in a country like this, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, with the interests of its numerous Provinces so different, to frame a franchise which will prove acceptable to every portion of this wide Dominion. What might be suited to the peculiar circumstances and wants of a Province situated as British Columbia is, might be very unsuited to the peculiar circumstances of a Province such as Nova Scotia; what might be admirably adopted to the Province from which I come, the great Province of Ontario, might be utterly unsuited to the peculiar interests and wants of Provinces such as British Columbia and Prince Edward Island. There is no doubt, therefore, that difficulties of a most formidable character arise at the very threshold of an attempt to create a Dominion franchise, difficulties which no Government, no matter how strong it may be, will find almost impossible to surmount; and I venture to say that the First Minister, so far, has found the difficulties which stand in his way to be difficulties of a most formidable character. The protests, the solemn protests we have had from the Island of Prince Edward against this proposed Dominion franchise have been re-echoed by every Province in this wide Dominion; the almost solid band that supports the First Minister from the great and intelligent Province of Quebec have not been in harmony with him and his Government on this question; my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works, has had, over and over again, since this discussion commenced, the most pointed, the most direct, and the most pressing protests against the Government proceeding with this Bill; the Province of Nova Scotia, with its large delegation here supporting the Government, has protested against the franchise that the Government proposes to impose upon them; the Province of New Brunswick, through its representatives here and its leading men out of Parliament, has protested against this franchise which the First Minister is now for the first time persistingly trying to force through Parliament. From one end of the Dominion to the other, from British Columbia, in the far west, down across the Rocky Mountains to Manitoba, down to the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, down to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and to the Island of Prince Edward, solemnly, earnestly and forcibly protest against the proposition which the hon. gentleman is striving to force through this House. All this shows the difficulties that must be encountered in attempting to create a franchise of this kind; all this shows the difficulties that lie in the way of the haphasard experiment to which the hon. gentleman has invited the consideration of Parliament. The hon. the First Minister cannot fail to see the dangers and difficulties which lie ahead of him when he finds his own friends, in the House and out of the House, in caucus and out of caucus, solemnly protesting against his proceeding with this Bill. I am not going to state that if he should succeed in forcing this measure through Parliament the continued existence of this great Confederation will be in danger. It will take a good deal to shatter this Confederation; I do not mean to say that hon. gentlemen opposite have not done a good deal to shatter it, to strain it, but still I have an abiding, a living faith in the good sense, the sound judgment, the practical wisdom of the people of this country. If they find a Ministry acting in antagonism to the best interests of the people they know there is a remedy in their hands. That remedy is at the polls, and unless the people at the polls are handicapped by legislation that no other Parliament in a free country would adopt, they will not fail to use it. The difficulty of establishing a Dominion franchise in a federation composed of so many Provinces as this federation is composed of, are

great, almost insurmountable. Now, it is important, when the Government are attempting to establish a Dominion franchise, to consider carefully the true principle that a Parliament should observe in conferring the suffrage. We have several propositions before us. We have the proposition of a uniform Dominion franchise; we have the proposition of a provincial franchise; we have the proposition of manhood suffrage before us; and all these are now open for discussion in the present state of these proceedings. I have said that it is important we should consider the true principle upon which the franchise should be conferred in the Dominion, if we insist upon establishing a Dominion franchise. Should every man, without consideration of race, or nationality, or color; should every man, without any restrictions or without any conditions; should every person who lives in this country, every person who enjoys the protection of our laws and who has reached the full age of twenty-one years, and is a British subject and a resident, be entitled to vote? Should we have a limited suffrage? or a manhood suffrage? or a universal suffrage? This is the important question that meets us at the very threshold of this discussion, the question whether, in conferring the franchise, there should be any test of capacity whatever; and if that question is answered in the affirmative, if we declare that there must be some test of capacity, as I apprehend there must be, then the next question is, what should that test of capacity be. That there must be a test of capacity I think is clear; nobody, so far as I am aware, disputes it. You cannot adopt a universal suffrage; it is not proposed to Parliament, so far, nor has it been adopted by any country in modern times. Under universal suffrage everybody would be entitled to vote. Male and female, learned and unlearned, literate and illiterate, wise and unwise, the idiot and the lunatic, and the criminal, would have the right to vote. Nobody proposes a franchise of that kind. If we make a franchise broad enough and liberal enough to meet the most advanced views of the most advanced Radical, a suffrage such as that advocated by my hon. friend who, I am sorry to say, is not present, the hon. the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), still there must be some restriction, some condition, which this Parliament, if called upon to grant an electoral franchise, must impose. The real difficulty to be encountered, the difficulty which meets us at the very threshold of the discussion, is where to draw the line. The line, at best, is arbitrary, I do not care where you draw it, unless you grant universal suffrage. But it must be drawn somewhere, and our object ought to be to draw it so that the least possible injury should be done to the great mass of the people. The Government propose to draw the line at a limited property qualification, in most cases, quite irrespective of the mental capacity or fitness of the man they propose to enfranchise for the exercise of the right to vote. A man to-day may have the necessary property qualification and to morrow he may be called upon to exercise the electoral franchise and he can vote because he has the necessary qualification; but twelve months hence the property qualification is gone, and when he is called upon to exercise the franchise, he cannot do it on that account. The man is the same; his intellectual power and moral energy are the same, but because he happens to have lost the property upon which he was qualified, he cannot vote. That alone should convince reasonabe men that the place where we draw the line is not the proper place. There is no principle upon which you can justify drawing it at a real estate qualification of $150. Why do you make it $150? Why not make it $149; why not $125; why not $100; why not $50? By what process of argument can you propose to justify fixing the right to exercise the franchise at a property qualification of $150? It is justified by no principle, and this Bill is justified by no necessity and warranted by no complaints from the electoral body. I say that the property qualification should not be the test. It should not, of course, exclude any person from the right to vote; the test of capacity to exercise the franchise should exclude no man of ordinary industry and intelligence in his craft or calling or of ordinary prudence and care in the position in life in which Providence has placed him. It is not necessary that the suffrage should be given to every person under the proposition I lay down; it is not necessary that it should be universal; it is not necessary that you should give the suffrage to lunatics or criminals. The law of every country where manhood suffrage prevails has drawn the limit there, and that limit can be justified on sound principles. What is the basis on which the electoral franchise is exercised? The theory is that a man who lives in a country under the protection of the law is entitled to have a voice in the making of the laws, and no one is entitled to that who cannot exercise a reasonable judgment or who has made himself amenable to the criminal law. That would exclude lunatics and criminals. Every individual who enjoys the protection of the laws for his property and his person is, in justice and fair play, entitled to have a voice in the moulding of the legislation and in sending members to Parliament. The obligations of the State to the citizen and the citizen to the State are mutual. The State owes the citizen protection in his life and property, in time of war as well as in time of peace. The citizen owes to the State a duty which the State calls upon him to discharge. It calls upon him to serve it in various capacities. He is called upon to discharge the important functions of a petty juror, to discharge important functions in connection with the grand inquest of the nation, and under our trade policy and our financial system, every man pays more or less to the revenue, every citizen owes this obligation to the State, and can be called upon to discharge it in time of peace. In time of war every citizen is called upon to discharge these important obligations, and more; he has to shoulder his rifle, if occasion requires it, in defence of the Sovereign authority, and to meet the enemies of the country in the battle field. The obligations, then, are mutual, resting upon the same principle. The rights of the individual, of the subject of the Crown living under the British flag, must be respected and of those rights there is none more sacred than that of exercising the elective franchise. That right should not be restricted, except in the cases I have referred to. Every male subject of Her Majesty living in this colony, enjoying the protection of its laws and possessing all the benefits that necessarily result from living in a free country, having a sane mind and not being a criminal, is entitled, upon every principle of fair play and justice, to exercise the franchise. This is an important question, one that has been discussed by advanced thinkers for the last hundred years, it is one that has made great headway in the mother country, and I am glad to say is making still greater headway in this portion of Her Majesty's dominions. It speaks well for the intelligence of the people who live upon the Pacific slope that they have adopted this franchise, and it speaks well for the intelligence of the Island of Prince Edward that such a franchise has been adopted there. I only regret that in the great Province from which I come, although we have made advances in the direction of that suffrage, we have not gone exactly as far as we ought to have gone. Practically and substantially, the Ontario suffrage, according to the strict letter of the law, is a limited franchise, but the franchise is so broad and so extensive that almost every individual that will come under the class that would be entitled to vote under manhood suffrage is entitled to vote in the Province of Ontario. What do you propose to do by your Bill? You propose that those men who, after careful consideration; who, after the exercise of mature judgment; who, after having the experience in exercising that fran-

chise of the neighboring Republic for nearly one hundred years; who, after the most careful consideration, have adopted that franchise—you, propose, by a stroke of the legislative pen, to deprive them of the rights they have long exercised. I say that is a species of tyranny that no people in a free country should submit to. You propose to confer upon them a franchise that they do not want; you propose to make them submit to your opinion and views on a question that ought to be peculiarly within the judgment of those most concerned in the administration of our public affairs in the various Provinces. Sir, in looking over some authorities in the Library, I was struck with a communication of a late Duke of Richmond, grandfather of the present Duke, addressed by him to Col. Sherman, living in Ireland, in which he very fully discussed this whole question. What struck me more than anything else in it was, that one of the nobles of England, one of the wealthiest of English peers, one of the aristocrats of the old country, should, one hundred years ago, have been so advanced in his views upon the subject of the electoral franchise as the Duke of Richmond of that day. I propose quoting a passage or two from this noted letter that appears in a pamphlet that I have. The Duke, after discussing various points, not necessarily connected with the question now under discussion, writes as follows:—

"The subject of a parliamentary reform is that which, of all others, in my opinion, must deserve the attention of the public, as I conceive it would include every other advantage which a nation can wish. I have no hesitation in saying that from every consideration which I have been able to give this great question, that for many years has occupied my mind, and from every day's experience to the present hour, I am more and more convinced that the restoring the right of voting universally to every man, not incapacitated by nature for want of reason, or by law for the commission of crimes, together with annual elections, is the only reform that can be effectual and permanent. I am further convinced that it is the only reform that is practicable."

Now, Sir, with the larger portion of this extract I heartily concur. Neither you nor I will agree with the Duke of Richmond as to the advisability of introducing the feature of annual Parliaments. We find once in five years is quite often enough to open the question of who to send here. Upon the question as to who should send us here, I trust, Mr. Chairman, that you agree with the Duke of Richmond. I know that the sentiments expressed by the Duke of Richmond one hundred years ago are entertained by the great mass of thinking men to-day; these sentiments are in keeping with the progress of the age, and in keeping with our surroundings, and with the position in which we are placed. After referring to the corruption then existing in England, and to the impossibility of the people securing anything like fair play and justice at the hands of what he was pleased to call a corrupt Parliament, the Duke goes on to observe:

"It is from the people at large that I expect any good."

Sir, there never was a nobler sentiment than that: "It is from the people at large that I expect any good"—from the great mass of the people, the people whom you propose to disfranchise under this Bill, or the people whom you propose to cut off from the franchise by this Bill. It is from the people at large that the Duke of Richmond expects any good. Sir, it is just as correct and just as true as the sentiment uttered by Mirabeau, that "when the people complain, the people are always in the right." Sir, we say now that the people of this country whom we represent, the Liberals of this country whom we represent, complain, and when the people complain, the people are always right:

"It is from the people at large that I expect any good, and I am convinced that the only way to make them feel that they are really concerned in the business is to contend for their full, clear, and indisputable rights of universal representation. * * * But in the more liberal and great plan of representation, a clear and distinct principle at once appears that cannot lead us wrong!—Not conveniency, but rights."

Observe, Mr. Chairman, "not conveniency, but right"—not a matter of expediency, not proposed as a matter of petty political triumph, but because it is just and right—one that can be justified upon reasonable grounds:

"But in the more liberal and great plan of universal representation, a clear and distinct principle at once appears, that cannot lead us wrong—not conveniency, but right. If it is not a maxim of our constitution, that a British subject is to be governed only by laws to which he has consented, by himself or by representative, we should instantly abandon the error; but if it is the essential of freedom, founded on the eternal principles of justice and wisdom, and our unalienable birthright, we should not hesitate in asserting it. Let us then but determine to act on this broad principle of giving to every man his own, and we shall immediately get rid of all the perplexities to which the narrow notions of partiality and exclusion must ever be subject."

I wonder if the First Minister, in framing this Bill that has caused so much discussion in Parliament, and so much excitement out of Parliament, ever read this letter of the Duke of Richmond. I am afraid, if the First Minister read this letter before preparing his Bill, he paid but little attention to the sound principles of justice, of honesty and fair play, laid down in this noted letter. The franchise ought not to be conferred for a party advantage; it is not given as a mere convenience; it is a sacred trust that the Parliament of the country reposes in the electors of the country, a trust they have no right to barter, a trust they have no right to trifle with, a trust to be conferred upon some sound principle that can be justified by reason:

"In the digesting a plan on this noble foundation, we shall not find any difficulty that the most common understanding and plan will not easily surmount. It does not require half the ingenuity of a common tax bill; and, as a proof of my assertion, I myself drew the form of a Bill for the purpose, which I presented to the House of Lords in 1780; not as a perfect work, but merely to show how easy the objections to the practicability of the plan and the inconveniences that are suggested might be got over."

I was struck with reading that passage. If you propose a Bill founded upon the principles of fair play and justice, a Bill that gives the right to exercise the franchise to every man who has attained the age of twenty-one years, and who is a British subject, and who lives in the country, you have the simplest and most logical form of franchise, without any complications, without any difficulties in understanding of it, and involving the least possible expense to the country at large. You create such a franchise as is contained in the Bill, and you give us a franchise of the most complicated character, with almost endless litigation and an enormous expenditure of money from the public Treasury to carry it out. Give us a Bill founded on the principles laid down by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) and you have a proposition of the simplest and plainest character, a proposition that does justice to every man who lives under the protection of the British flag in this colony, a proposition in effect the simplest, cheapest, and fair and just to all members of the community, a principle that receives my entire approval, and for which I shall vote. The Duke of Richmond goes on to say:

"An account of the whole number of males of age in the Kingdom is to be taken and divided by the number of members to be sent, which will find the quota of electors to choose one member; from the best account I can now give, it will be about 2,600; these are to be formed into districts or boroughs, from the most contiguous parishes; and by having all the elections throughout the Kingdom on one and the same day, and taken in each parish, all fear of riot and tumult vanishes."

One hundred years before we adopted in Canada the wise system of holding elections all on one day the Duke of Richmond advocated it in his letters. There is no difficulty in adopting this franchise. Take the proposition of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), adopt a manhood suffrage, let the lists be based on the assessment roll, and you have there every man who pays taxes for municipal, provincial or any purpose, and thus you have the simplest form of franchise and the simplest kind of machinery in order to make out the voters' list, without any expense to the candidates, with little expense to the constituency and

with no expense to the community at large. Adopt that plan and you have the simplest and most economical form of representation that the ingenuity of mankind has been able to devise in the ages that have gone by. One more quotation from this celebrated letter:

"Another subject of apprehension is, that the principle of allowing to every man an equal right to vote tends to equality in other respects, and to level property. To me, it seems to have a direct contrary tendency. The equal rights of men to security from oppression, and to the enjoyment of life and liberty, strike me as perfectly compatible with their unequal shares of industry, labor and genius, which are the origin of inequality of fortunes. The equality and inequality of men are both founded in nature, and whilst we do not confound the two, and only support her establishments, we cannot err. The protection of property appears to me one of the most essential ends of society; and, so far from injuring it by this plan, I conceive it to be the only means of preserving it, for the present system is hastening with great strides to a perfect equality in universal poverty.

"It has been said that this plan of extending this right of voting to every individual creates much uneasiness in the minds of quiet and well-disposed persons; and that if paupers, vagabonds, and persons of no property were left out, there would be no objection to extend it to all householders and persons paying taxes; and that the same divisions into districts might take place. My answer is, that I know of no man, let him be ever so poor, who, in his consumption of food and use of raiment, does not pay taxes."

The whole principle is there in a nut shell. Every man who lives under the law, and enjoys the protection of the law, who contributes to the revenue, who in times of peace is under obligations to serve Her Majesty, and who in time of war is under an equal obligation, every man of that stamp, I contend, upon every principle of fair play and justice, is entitled to exercise the electoral franchise. But, as I have said, this manhood suffrage, in contradistinction to the suffrage proposed by this Bill, is entitled to the claim of simplicity and economy. I know there are strong objections made in some quarters to the proposal to extend the franchise to every individual in the community. But one of the strong objections we make to this Bill, and that every person makes to this Bill who has considered it fairly, fully and carefully, is that it is a complicated franchise, that it creates many peculiar franchises, depending upon complicated facts and upon difficult questions of law; and that it is based, as I have intimated, upon no principle and founded upon no necessity. That it is a complicated franchise is clear to any one who has taken up this Bill and read its sixty odd clauses. The whole principle upon which the Bill is founded is complicated, and the more you examine into the details the more satisfied one will become as to the fact that the details are of the most complicated character. To show the committee how complicated and difficult to understand the principles and provisions of the Bill are, I need only refer again to the fact that for four days and nights we discussed the Indian question, and up to this hour we do not agree as to what the real meaning is. I venture to say that if the First Minister will divide his own forces he will find they are about equally divided as to what is meant by the proposal to enfranchise every person who occupies a piece of ground, whether under lease or occupation, from the Crown or from an individual, or under any agreement. There are not ten men in this House who will agree exactly as to the true interpretation of that clause. And so with many others of the franchises proposed to be created by this Parliament. They will involve enormous trouble, the consideration of difficult questions of fact, and still more difficult questions of law. This Bill opens up—and it is one of the objections we have to it—the widest possible field of discussion on questions of law and of fact. You take the freehold suffrage. The hon. gentleman's Bill declares that every owner of property—and his interpretation of the word "owner" is a proprietor in his own right, or in the right of his wife, of freehold estate, legal or equitable, in lands and tenements held in free and common soccage—shall be entitled to vote. We pointed out to the First Minister over and over again, the difficulties that were likely to result from that interpretation of the word "owner." We pointed it out in vain. I venture to predict that when the Bill comes to be worked out before county judges, revising barristers, or whoever is appointed to put it in operation, it will be found that most complicated and difficult questions will necessarily arise under this interpretation, both as to law and as to fact. We know perfectly well that many estates are not held by that tenure; that many freeholds are not held in free and common socage. Why should the hon. gentleman limit the right to exercise the franchise on the part of owners to those having freehold estates in free and common socage? Where was the necessity of using technical terms of that kind and involving trouble and difficulty before the courts and before the judges, after you pass the revising barristers, in order to settle that interpretation. Sir, these complicated questions will necessarily come up if the hon. gentleman proceeds with this Bill and provides all the machinery which is provided for by this Bill. Take the case of the suffrage which is proposed to be given to a tenant. It is right that every tenant occupying a piece of ground should be entitled to the franchise, and it should be sufficient that every tenant paying rent at any time or in any way should be entitled to the vote, if the hon. gentleman is bound to have a property qualification as a basis for the franchise. But the First Minister does not say so. He says that it is only tenants by the month, the quarter, the half-year, or the year, or who pay their rents at these periods to the landlord, and who pay either in cash or by some of the proceeds or revenues issuing out of the land, that are entitled to have this franchise. The hon. gentleman, as a lawyer, must know, if he has paid any attention to the Bill, that the creation of a franchise of this kind will necessarily result in great difficulties, that it will involve a constant reference to the law courts, and an expenditure of large sums of money. The hon. Minister proposes by this Bill to disfranchise every single tenant who does not pay his rent in cash, or in the proceeds or revenue of the land, and if the man pays it by any kind of work or labor he is disfranchised. The hon. gentleman proposes to give the right to vote to every occupant of land who is in occupation under a license of occupation, or under an agreement with the Crown or with an individual. If you read sub-section 5 of section 3, you will find that it is one of the most extraordinary provisions that was ever proposed in any Bill. I will read that portion of it which relates to my argument. It is as follows:—

"Is the *bonâ fide* occupant of real property within any such city or town, or part of a city or town, of the actual value of three hundred dollars, whether such occupation is under a license of occupation or agreement to purchase from the Crown, or from any other person or corporation, or exists in any other manner, except as owner or tenant."

You will see by this clause that the occupant's right to vote depends not only on his having a license of occupation, or an agreement with the Crown, or with any other person, but it may be a right which exists in any other manner, except as owner or tenant. You, Sir, as a lawyer, must see the difficult and complicated questions of both law and fact which are sure to arise under this clause, for it may mean that a person living on property of the Crown may exercise the right to vote simply by possession under a verbal assent of the Crown. You may say that that is not law, but there is the provision of the Bill, and under it the revising officer may allow all such persons to vote. Do hon. gentlemen opposite realise fully the responsibility resting upon them in sanctioning law of this kind? Do those of them who expect to be candidates at the next election, realise the enormous burthens which will be placed on them, when the complicated and difficult questions which will necessarily arise must be adjudicated in the courts. If my interpretation is correct, every lock-tender, every lock-keeper, every laborer, living on any portion of the public domain, or on the canals or other public works of this country, who does not pay a farthing of municipal or provincial taxes, who pay taxes for no purpose whatever, and pay no rent, will be entitled, under this Bill, to

exercise the electoral franchise. I was of opinion, on cursorily looking over this Bill, that the First Minister required the dividing up of the Indian reservations into parcels, before the Indians should have the franchise. But I am satisfied that upon a proper interpretation of that clause he can give the right to vote to every Indian who lives on a reserve in any of these Provinces, without the necessity of parceling it up, and without the necessity of enfranchising the Indians. They are living on the public domain, and all the First Minister has to do is to have that property valued at $150 for each Indian on the reserve and they then become voters. The result, is that if you have 100 adult male Indians on a reserve, all the revising barrister has to do is to assess that property $15,000 or value it at $15,000, and thereby 100 Indians will have votes on that reserve. It does not require the dividing of the land, under the Indian Act of 1884; all that the hon. gentleman requires to do is to get the revising barrister to value that property in the way I have mentioned, and every male Indian of twenty-one years of age is entitled to a vote. Is that what hon. gentlemen contemplated? Is that what Parliament contemplated? Is that what the people contemplated? I dare say that one or two members of this House desire that it should be so. I have no doubt they do, because it will inure to their benefit, though not to the benefit of anybody else. But the Bill goes further, as I pointed out a minute or two ago. Under the occupation clause, no matter whether the property is private or public property, if the proposed voter lives on the land, and the land is valued at $150, no power in this country can deprive him of the right to vote. Let the First Minister amend the Bill, if he is bound to have a Dominion franchise. Let him do away with all those complicated and difficult clauses of the Bill, and the difficult machinery which it provides, and let him adopt a franchise which is plain, simple and inexpensive, and gives a vote to every man in this country of the age of twenty-one years, who is a British subject and living under the British flag. By that means, in contradistinction to the proposition submitted by the First Minister, you will have the benefit of simplicity in the machinery; you will have the further benefit of minimising the chances of fraud on the people of this country; and, taking it all in all, it is a franchise that I think the great mass of the people of this country will not object to. Now, Sir, I have said that this franchise is the simplest, that it is the least expensive, that it will minimise the chances of fraud, that it is founded on every principle of justice and fair play between the individual and the State; and I say that we ought either to adopt the franchise mentioned in the proposition submitted by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), or the franchise that prevails in the island of Prince Edward Island. Either of these franchises I think would meet with the approval of the people of this country. But you adopt neither. If you adopt the franchise embodied in this Bill, you adopt the most complicated and expensive franchise you can have. Now, I say that the manhood suffrage franchise ought to be accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite, because the Conservative party in the Province of Ontario, after due deliberation, have committed themselves to that franchise. The leader of the Opposition in the Legislature of Ontario, the first lieutenant of the First Minister, although not objecting to the franchise of the Bill passed by that Legislature during the last Session, thought it did not go far enough; and he moved, in amendment to the motion of the Premier for the third reading of the Bill, that it should not have a third reading, but that the Parliament of Ontario should resolve that a manhood suffrage was the proper franchise for that Province. Every Conservative in the Legislature of Ontario voted for that proposition. Some of them spoke in favor of it; all of them voted for it. Are hon. gentlemen in this House, who support this Government, going to vote against a proposition which has been ably supported by the Conservatives of the Province of Ontario? I hope not; I hope there is no difference in the camp; I hope there is harmony there; I hope no difficulties or quarrels are likely to spring up between the leaders of the Conservative party in the Province of Ontario and the leaders of the Conservative party here. Sir, a prominent member of the Conservative party, who represents West Toronto in the Local Legislature, when the Ontario Bill was under discussion, made use of the following language:—

> Mr. CLARKE (West Toronto) was not afraid to build on the rock of manhood suffrage. He once believed in the property qualification, but he had become a convert to manhood suffrage. He had found, in the course of his electioneering that many stupid and ignorant men had the right to exercise the franchise, while many intelligent men were deprived of the franchise, on account of the property qualification. The property qualification once did mean something, but as we have had it for the past ten or twelve years, it meant nothing."

These are the sentiments expressed by Mr. Clarke, the member for West Toronto in the Local Legislature. Now, Sir, I say they are correct sentiments; I say they are opinions that ought to prevail; and I say that this Government ought to adopt the views of the members of the Conservative party in the Legislature of Ontario. Now, if you adhere to the Bill submitted to Parliament, what will the effect of it be? It will be to exclude from the franchise, in round numbers, 150,000 people, who are entitled to exercise the franchise under the Ontario Act. Let us see, for a moment, how I make this up. In cities and towns the property qualification under this Bill is $300; under the Ontario Bill it is $200. Every man in the Province of Ontario who owns a property valued at between $200 and $300 will not be entitled to vote; it may be worth $299, and yet, under the provisions of this Bill, he will be deprived of his vote. I ask you, is it not the most absurd nonsense to talk of this Bill as one founded on principle, when one man, because he owns property worth $1 less than another, although he is, perhaps, the more intelligent of the two, is deprived of the right that is sacred to every free man? In every village and township, every man whose property is worth less than $150 is deprived of a vote by this Bill. Every man whose income is less than $400 is deprived of a vote; he may have $399 of income, and yet he has no right to vote; every wage-earner, every mechanic, every laborer, whose yearly wages do not run up to $400 clear, is not entitled to exercise the franchise, under this Bill. Every man whose income is derived from any investment in bank stocks, or who has pluck and energy and public spirit enough to invest his earnings in mining speculations or in railways, is deprived of a vote under this Bill. Every man who is a tenant by the month, or by the quarter, or by the half year, or by the year, and who does not pay $20 a year, is deprived of a vote. Every landowner's son—and there a large number of them in the Province of Ontario—is deprived of a vote. Every farmer's son, whose property is valued at less than $300, is deprived of a vote. Every landowner's step-son, grandson, and son-in-law, every one of whom has a vote under the Ontario Bill, are deprived of a vote by this Bill. Therefore, in round numbers, the proposition now before us, if it becomes law, will disfranchise 150,000 people in the Province of Ontario. What will be the case in the Province of Manitoba? There the property qualification is $100; it is $150 under this Bill; and every man whose property is valued at less than that is deprived of a vote. What will be the effect in the Province of British Columbia, where they have manhood suffrage? Every man who has not the property qualification required by this Bill will be deprived of a vote. And what do you do in the island of Prince Edward? Unless the prayers and the entreaties of the hon. members from that Province will prevail against the positive statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, every man on the island of Prince Edward who

has not the property qualification required by this Bill, is deprived of a vote. Unless the prayers and entreaties of those members will avail them in the other Chamber of Parliament—as I understand attempts have been made to induce that Chamber to come to their relief, if this House should refuse to exempt that Province from the operation of this Bill—the people of that Province will be deprived of exercising the franchise they now have. We shall see, when the proper time comes. This House will vote down the proposition; I dare say the proposition to exempt the island from this Bill will be concurred in in the other Chamber, and that it will come back for our ratification here. If it does, we shall see how supporters of this Government will vote on that proposition. This Bill should not pass through Parliament now, because even at this hour it is not understood. I say that in the country, in Parliament and out of Parliament, it is not understood. The greatest diversity of opinion exists as to the proper interpretation of the Bill, its principles and its details. We have hon. gentlemen opposite differing with the First Minister as to what its interpretation should be. We have heard five or six of them declare it is one thing, and the First Minister declares it is another thing. Why is it not understood? The leading organs of hon. gentlemen opposite have not ventured to publish one line of this Bill; they have been constantly concealing from the people its real nature and its real effects and its ultimate consequences. Not one line of this measure has appeared in any of the leading newspapers that support hon. gentlemen opposite; they have kept the people in absolute ignorance of its meaning. Their arguments, if they can be called arguments, are simply wholesale abuse of hon. gentlemen on this side. We say to the House and the country: Why do you not adopt the provincial franchises? Why do you not adopt manhood suffrage? How are we answered? We are answered with a great deal of abuse in the House and a great deal of abuse in the press of hon. gentlemen on the other side—not simply with abuse, but with positive misrepresentation of the arguments used by us, and with positive distortion of the facts. We say to the Government: Why do you propose to give the tribal Indians the right to vote? How are we answered? Fairly enough by some hon. gentlemen here, but outside of the House by misrepresentations, by lies, by concealment of the true principles of the Bill. We ask: Why do you deprive the wage-earner, the workingman, of his vote? and how are we answered by the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite? The *Mail* newspaper, the principal organ of the Government, published on the 5th of this month an article in its editorial column, from which I quote the following extract:—

"There will be the same failure now. What is there in the policy and protests of Mr. Casey, Mr. Cameron (of Huron), Mr. Charlton, and of Mr. Paterson (of Brant), to cause the people of Ontario to petition against the enfranchisement of thousands of workingmen in this Province? That is what is asked. The franchise Bill enlarges the franchise of Ontario. The Grits oppose the enlargement and they ask the people to oppose it, too; the people are not such dupes."

I say that the man who wrote that article wrote what was untrue, and what he knew to be untrue. The man who wrote that article knew that the Liberals in this Parliament and outside of this Parliament have been and still are in favor of enfranchising the wage-earners, the laborers of this country; and yet the *Mail* newspaper, inspired from Ottawa, has the audacity to tell its readers, and some of them see no other paper, that the Liberal party have been, for the past two weeks, seeking to deprive the wage-earners and the laborers of the franchise. That organ gives the First Minister some advice. It ventures to advise the First Minister, and I hope he will take the advice, to dissolve Parliament and appeal to the people. It says:

"We do not know what Sir John A. Macdonald will do, nor that he will consider our advice at all prudent. Put this is what we should do. We should advise a dissolution of the House * * * We should force through all the necessary measures, sacrificing everything not essential to public business, and drag these Grit traitors and treason-mongers to the foot of the polls, which the people of Canada would speedily convert into a gallows. That would teach them a lesson in loyalty, as understood by the people of Canada"—(by the Tories, it should have been).

That is just what we want. I hope the First Minister will take this advice. It is good advice. I hope he will dissolve this Parliament and appeal to the people at the polls, and whatever the verdict of the people may be, we, on this side of the House, representing the liberal element of the country, will cheerfully submit to it. The *Mail* says further that we have gone twice to the polls and been twice defeated. So we have, but we went to the polls handicapped in the race, as the Government proposes to send us now. We went to the polls, in 1878 and in 1882 handicapped in the race, and the First Minister, by this proposition, now proposes to send us handicapped to the polls again.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CAMERON. Is there a point of order? I would like to hear it. What we want the First Minister to do is to submit this question, and every other public question that deserves public attention, and is now receiving it, all the questions now before this Parliament—the railway policy, the North-West policy of the Government and this Bill—to the electors of this country, but let us go with our hands untied, let not the First Minister go with every trump card up his sleeve, with loaded dice, as he has gone to the polls on two or three occasions before. All we want is an honest appeal to the people at the polls; that the First Minister won't give us. The First Minister knows better. I say the conduct of the First Minister and of the Government with relation to this Bill is unparalleled in the history of modern times. There is no parallel for it in any history, except, perhaps, in the history of ancient Rome. The only parallel I can find is that of the famous Roman general Sylla, who, when he returned from one of his victorious battles, found the public offices and the places of trust in the hands of his rivals. What did he do? The first thing he did was to proscribe them. Sylla, upon returning to Rome from one of his victorious wars, in order to retain place and power, as the First Minister is now attempting to do, proscribed the Liberals of that day. No less than 4,700 Romans, men of fortune, men of means, men of education, men of intelligence, such as those whom I see around me on this side of the House, were proscribed by that general. What was the offence they had committed? It was the possession of estates and wives that their neighbors coveted. What is the offence which we, the Liberal party of Canada, have committed? Our offence is that we are possessed of estates, own constituencies, which hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House covet, and in order to secure them they take a more summary method than was adopted by Sylla, the Roman general—they adopt the summary process of an Act of Parliament to capture our estates—our constituencies. The Liberal party of ancient Rome declared that they had rights that ought to be respected and protected as well as the rights of the patricians, the nobles and the senators, but the answer they received was exile, proscription, blood, death. What answer do we receive? Not proscription, not exile, but political decapitation, by an Act of this Parliament, forced through this Parliament in the closing hours of the Session by the numerical power of gentlemen on the other side of this House. Four thousand and seven hundred of those noble Romans fell under that proscription, men of education, men of intelligence, men of advanced ideas; and their estates were partitioned into 120,000 allotments, and divided among the soldiers—the camp followers of the Roman general. The First Minister proposes to divide our constituencies among his camp followers by an Act of this Parliament. I say, Sir, there is no parallel in the history of any country to the course of conduct the hon. gentleman

is pursuing in respect to this Bill, except the one which I have feebly attempted to adduce. If the First Minister forces this Bill through Parliament, as he proposes at this late hour of the Session to do, I hope the day of reckoning will come. I know a day of reckoning will come for gentlemen on the Treasury benches. I believe firmly in the triumph of Liberal principles and in the triumph of the Liberal party. We may be checked in the march onward, we may be handicapped in the race by the hon. gentleman forcing through Parliament this unjust and obnoxious legislation, but ultimately the Liberal party and their principles must prevail; and, believing so, while I will offer every opposition to the proposition of the hon. gentleman opposite, at every stage of this Bill, I will never despair of the ultimate triumph of Liberal principles and the ultimate success of the Liberal party.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I am induced to say a few words by the experience of the committee during the discussion that is now in progress, and particularly from the fact that, after a session lasting about fifty-seven hours, it was discovered that the features of the Bill that were most prominently discussed were really not known to many of the gentlemen opposite who professed an acquaintance with them. If a like result is to follow the discussion of this clause, there is some justification for the attempt of myself and other hon. gentlemen to place their views before the Chair. I am disposed, in the first place, to favor the adoption of the provincial franchises, as suggested in the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), as being better adapted to the circumstances of the Dominion and of the Provinces than the franchise embraced in the clauses of the Bill now under discussion. I believe most sincerely that, while we are attempting to weld ourselves into one nationality, it is extremely injudicious, leaving the legality of the proceeding out of question, that a matter of this kind should be pressed to the front when there are so many others on which so very largely diverging views are entertained by the different Provinces. In Ontario the municipal and provincial regulations in regard to our Franchise Act have been sufficiently long in operation to give the electorate a fair opportunity of becoming acquainted with them. Lately, there has been a change by the introduction of a new franchise, which necessarily will require a new acquaintance with our electoral matters. In the face of that, we are asked to impose upon the community a second franchise, more involved still, more intricate in its provisions and in its working than any franchise which has hitherto been in operation in that Province. That, I believe, is a still more cogent reason, as far as some of the other Provinces are concerned. In those Provinces where universal suffrage has prevailed heretofore, it must be with them a matter of great concern indeed, that they should revert to a franchise in which there are so many provisos, in which there necessarily arise so many difficulties to those who have not had in the past any very intricate machinery to carry out the provisions of the electoral law. It appears to be conclusive that complication will be avoided by the adoption of the provincial franchise for all the Provinces. It appears to me that by adopting the machinery that is at present in existence, not only will the expense be materially lessened to the Dominion, but the existing machinery will, wherever it exists under the local law, be utilised for the purposes of the franchise under this Bill; consequently, I believe that fact in itself is a very strong reason why we should follow the principle that has heretofore prevailed in the election of representatives to this House, and that is, that the different provincial franchises should in all cases prevail. But we are more impressed with the importance of recognising that principle from the fact that we are now, by this Bill, interfering with a great many franchises of a vastly divergent character. Now, when such great changes are proposed, it would be expected that, in some sense, at least, we would have had evidences of some very decided demand for the change. But I ask this committee to look through all the public journals of the past two years—and they are at liberty to go still further back than that—and produce for me any evidence that the public mind has been at all moved in connection with this matter. I say there has been no demand for a change in the electoral franchise. Hon. gentlemen opposite have claimed that this question has been before the country for a sufficient length of time to admit of its provisions being understood. Now, if that question has been before the country for that length of time, if there existed any strong public feeling in its favor, it would have asserted itself; but I say most unhesitatingly that not only has there been no public feeling expressed in its favor, no particular demand for it, but that it is only since this question has become actively prominent in this House that a majority of the public journals throughout the country have made any reference whatever to it. That, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, establishes conclusively that there has been no demand for the measure by the country. We know that, so far as the Province of Ontario is concerned, the question of an alteration, or a lowering, of the franchise, was debated throughout that Province in the year 1879, and we know that in that year, if I am not mistaken, the Legislature indicated its will in that direction. We know that not only was that the case, but that at party conventions held subsequently, which conventions represented a very large fraction of the electorate of the Province, expressions of opinion were given in favor of lowering the electoral franchise in that Province. But we find no such expressions of favor in reference to the franchise now proposed to this House. Now, Mr. Chairman, it was urged by the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), in discussing this question the other night, that if this franchise was objectionable, those who had objection to it should have raised the question at the bye-elections that had taken place throughout the country. But I ask the attention of the committee to the fact that those who had proposed this alteration in the franchise did not ask the public to endorse it. There is the fact before us that, from the year 1872 until now, the matter never appeared to be seriously entertained—never reached, at all events, the point when there appeared to be a serious intention of passing such a law; and under these circumstances it was a fair presumption that it was not one of the active political questions before the country at any of these elections. I hold that such reasoning as that adopted by the hon. gentleman cannot be accepted by this committee as being a justification for the adoption of this Bill, or of the clause that we are now discussing. The hon. gentleman to whom I have alluded suggested that we should not go lower than a $300 franchise on real property in cities and towns, and a $150 franchise in counties. Now, the Ontario franchise is lower. Hon. gentlemen are aware that the Ontario franchise, in that particular, is materially lower. I will say that I am aware that by the Ontario franchise, as it existed until the recent change was made, that is, a franchise similar, in respect to real property in cities and towns to that proposed in this Bill, a great many working men were disfranchised. I am aware that there were many men in occupancy of property who could not qualify under the present qualification; therefore, so far as Ontario is concerned, the present franchise in that respect is decidedly objectionable. Now, it has been urged, besides, that the present franchise exists in its entirety since it was originally introduced. It has been urged that the Bill itself exists in its entirety since it was first introduced. But leaving aside the question of this measure being similar to that introduced in 1870, I am prepared to dispute the proposition that even in respect to the clause that is now under discussion it was similar to that

introduced in 1882. I think that fact is quite apparent, when we recollect that that important factor that occupied the attention of this House for such a length of time—the Indian franchise—was not in any previous Bill under the same title submitted to this House. Now, I say, Mr. Chairman, that with these facts before the committee it is unfair, it is unjust to the country, to press a measure of such vast consequence at the present time. It is only now that the people of this country are becoming awakened to the issue that is being debated in this House; it is only now that the provisions of this Bill are being thoroughly understood; it is only now that the people of the different Provinces have an opportunity of expressing their will by petition to this House. I believe sincerely that, whether this franchise is correct or not, whether it is one that meets the wishes of the people of the Dominion, as a whole, or not, under these circumstances it well becomes this House to delay passing such a Bill as this until such time as the people have had that opportunity of discussing these provisions, which they certainly ought to have. I am satisfied the details of this Bill are, by no means understood by the people, and while they are gradually becoming acquainted with them through the discussions that are now taking place, and are gradually awakening to the attacks that are being made on their electoral rights, their awakening is too recent and the opportunity of giving expression to their will has not yet been afforded to that extent which justifies this House in proceeding with the Bill at the present time. I believe, most sincerely, that the duty of this House is to leave a Bill of this important character before the people, with the discussions that have taken place and the differences of opinion that have been expressed, until another year, when, coming back from having had interviews with the electors of our different constituencies, we would then be able more definitely to express their views. This Bill differs in one material aspect, and that is with respect to the Indians, from the Bill introduced in 1882. This Bill differs also every materially in another vital respect from the English Bill, of which this Bill is represented to be the counterpart. In regard to the revising barristers, this Bill differs very materially from the English Bill, on which, as I have said, it proposes to be based. In England, the revising barrister is, in fact, a revising officer. Under this Bill he will not only be a revising officer, but he will practically frame the list, and he will frame the list under circumstances entirely different from those under which the revising officer in England does his work. If that is the case, and if it consequently affects the electoral franchise so materially, that fact is another justification, in my opinion, for the appeal I have made for a postponement of the consideration of the Bill. We have had some very strong statements from hon. gentlemen opposite to induce us to adopt a franchise of our own in preference to that existing in the Provinces. It has been alleged that in the Province of Ontario, at all events, the assessors are negligent of the duties imposed on them, and that they by no means carry out the spirit of the election Act. I was very sorry indeed to hear that statement made in regard to the Province from which I come. I am glad of the opportunity of refuting most emphatically, so far as my experience goes, such statements, and I am satisfied that the duties of the assessors have been very efficiently and satisfactorily performed, and that those duties could not be performed with greater care or more regard to the due intention of the Act than they have been performed by the assessors through that Province. We are asked to assume, by one of the clauses of this Bill—fault having been found with the assessors—that the revising barristers will do the work better. The force of that contention is considerably weakened when we remember that those assessors are appointed for a purpose entirely different from that implied in the preparation of

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex).

voters' lists. In the different Provinces, municipal bodies require to raise taxes. Those taxes are raised on a definite and well-understood valuation of property. The assessors are required to assess the different properties, not as being different properties, independent of one another, but in their relation to one another, and, consequently, every man has a direct interest in seeing, not only that his own property is rightly assessed, but that his neighbor's property is correctly assessed as well. That is a matter entirely independent of the preparation of voters' lists. But when we come to the question of the revising barrister, we find there is no such influence as that to guide him, and no such counteracting influence to prevent him doing an injustice. Not only is that so, but practically he is absolute, as regards the control of the electoral list within the constituency with which he deals, and, if he chooses, there is no provision in the Bill by which he can be prevented from making his nominee the representative of the particular constituency in this House. It is not fair that an electoral franchise such as this should be adopted by the committee, if only for the reasons that I am now urging.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. CAMERON. If hon. gentlemen will kindly refrain from calling, question, they will see that my arguments all tend to support the line I am taking.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). That is no argument.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. gentleman finds very little argument on this side of the House. It took fifty-seven hours to convince the First Minister, with respect to the interpretation of the Indian clause. We are attempting to show what the influence of the passage of this clause would be on the electoral franchise of this country, and we are not going to refrain from doing so, even under the hopeless circumstances in which we are now placed. With respect to the revising officer, I hold that the present law should not pass, because the duties of that officer, under our system, are entirely different from those of a revising barrister in England. As the laws in the Provinces stand, and I speak with some confidence with regard to Ontario, the municipal assessor, on whose report to his municipal council the voters, list is based, is amenable to the law, and he is amenable to dismissal by the municipal council, unless he complies with what is just and proper, with reference to the preparation of the assessment roll. But here there is no provision by which the revising officer can be called to account. He is absolutely independent of every one, except the member of this House whom he may have aided in securing his seat, and that, I say, is in itself a vital blow at free institutions. It is ridiculous that this Parliament should be placed in the position——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is not in order. The question of revising barristers and their duties does not come up under this clause.

Mr. CAMERON. I was attempting to show, Sir, while another gentleman than yourself occupied the Chair, that the revising barrister, under this clause, necessarily exercises such wide powers——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. MULOCK. I think when there is a doubt as to whether an hon. gentleman is in order or not, it is the usual, if not the general rule, for the Chairman first to intimate his doubt, and then, if the hon. gentleman thinks he is in the right, to permit him to have an opportunity of discussing the point.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. That is just what I am doing.

Mr. MULOCK. I did not know whether it was your final judgment or simply a doubt.

Mr. CAMERON. My reasoning was that this clause in the Bill should not pass, because, under it the franchise is given so completely into the hands of one man that it becomes vital to the freedom of this Parliament as a representative body. If I proceed on that contention it will be from no desire to go beyond the limit of what is the legitimate discussion of this particular clause. I have no other wish than to defer to your ruling in all questions of that kind. It is said that the franchises in the different Provinces lead to confusion, but I must myself own to an incapacity to see the force of that reasoning. I cannot see the force of the argument, that because I do not thoroughly comprehend the franchise as it exists in the Province of Quebec, therefore I cannot fully exercise my rights as a citizen of Ontario; and I think there is considerable force in the observation of those who preceded me, and in the argument that suggested itself, in the fact that the complication of franchises in the same Province is something much to be deplored. We know, that in Ontario there is already more than one franchise, although they are largely similar. We know that, for municipal purposes, women, having the same qualifications as men, have the same right to vote. In the rural municipalities in Ontario there is a lower franchise for municipal purposes than for parliamentary purposes, and these differences are sufficiently complex to puzzle the average voter in the majority of cases. I have found that even in the electoral franchise, for parliamentary purposes it was sometimes reasonably hard to interpret its provisions. Now, if that is the case with reference to one franchise, if it sometimes involves questions hard to unravel, it must necessarily follow that duplicating that franchise—assuming that the present is no more complex than that—is going to make the question of a man's right to vote much more complicated still. I hold that it is one of the first and most imperative duties of this House to make the franchise so simple that no man shall be debarred from his right to vote if he is justly entitled to it. I say further that the passage of this clause will most decidedly complicate the franchise in the different Provinces, complicate the franchise, I say, to such an extent as practically to disfranchise many men who, under a provincial franchise, will assume, and will certainly have, a perfect right to vote.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Who are they?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. WHITE. I have a right to ask a question. Who are those who will be disfranchised?

Mr. CAMERON. I welcome the hon. gentleman's interruption; it is a perfectly fair question, but evidently he does not understand the drift of my argument. What I said was this: that the complication of franchises was in itself prejudicial to the interests of the elector, leaving out of the question altogether the one which the hon. gentleman raises, as to whether the one franchise is lower than the other. I say that in itself it is a misfortune to have any more than one franchise, even if it is for two Houses.

Mr. WHITE. You said it was going to deprive a large number of parties in the Province of Ontario who had votes under Mr. Mowat's Act. Let us know who they are; point that out.

Mr. CAMERON. I intend dealing with that particular phase of the question in due time; I will show where the Ontario franchise is much lower than this is, and I will show that there will be a great many people, not only in Ontario, but in British Columbia, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba, and perhaps Quebec disfranchised under this Act, who have votes under the Provincial Act. But that is not the particular phase of the question I am now dealing with. My contention is that a variety of franchises in itself raises questions in the minds of the electors which are apt to prevent them going to the polls, because they have doubts as to their right to vote.

Mr. WHITE. That is not answering the question.

Mr. CAMERON. I have had some experience in elections, and I have seen cases where a man having a doubt—perhaps really an absurd doubt—as to his own right to vote, had the moral courage to say: I do not care what legal interpretation you put on that doubt, still it exists in my mind, and I will not go and poll my vote if I feel that I have not the right to do it. I am proud to say that there are many such cases, because evidently the existence of such cases shows that there is a moral responsibility in connection with the exercise of the franchise, and a franchise exercised under such circumstances will never be exercised except in the direction which men believe is right. I stated that this was a question of various franchises for each Province, as against one franchise for all the Provinces. Now that being the case, I strongly contend that the various franchises which are in force in each Province are certainly more acceptable franchises for those Provinces and ought to be adopted. I have no better evidence of the correctness of my contention than the fact that hon. gentlemen from Prince Edward Island, though supporting this Bill, have eliminated therefrom their own Province, have in effect said: It is all right for the rest of the Dominion, but except us. Now, if the principle of uniformity is an essential feature of this Bill, if it is demanded throughout the country, surely it is demanded in one Province as well as in another; and if it is not demanded in one Province, what right have the representatives from that Province to come here and say that it is demanded in another? It looks very much like the man who said he did not object to a boil, only he liked to see it on another fellow's neck. I referred, a moment ago, to the alleged dissatisfaction existing in the Province of Ontario in regard to the local assessment. I said that so far as my experience went, no such dissatisfaction existed; but there are reasons why such dissatisfaction should not exist, independent of the appointment of the assessor by the municipal council, and independent of the assessor himself. We are aware that in the Province of Ontario—and it has been demonstrated that similar laws exist in some of the other Provinces—the local assessor is, in the first place, circumscribed in his operations by the fact that he is dealing between individuals who closely watch his actions. Every individual in the municipality is equally interested as to what the assessment should be. Not only so, but he is aware that an appeal lies from the assessor to the municipal council; and if the municipal council is disposed to wrong any individual, he has still an appeal to the county judge, and if his appeal is held to be just, the municipality is saddled with the cost of that appeal. With all these precautions, I hold that a franchise having such machinery for its preparation gives much greater security for a full and free expression of popular opinion than one prepared under the machinery provided by this Bill, if for no other reason than the fact that the official to be charged with the carrying out of the franchise proposed in this Bill is amenable to nobody outside of this House; this House, if the Bill passes, is practically his nomination. If that is the case, I hold that we ought to adhere to our provincial franchises. We ought to adhere to them, because they are prepared by bodies and for purposes entirely independent of this House, and therefore they are independent of any such influences as the revising barristers can exercise in the preparation of the voters' lists. If we had no better reason why we should adopt our municipal franchises, and the preparation of the voters' lists than we have, we have the fact that the municipal franchises are adopted as the basis of the voters' lists in England, where the revising barrister has been made an

official under their electoral law. A franchise, under all circumstances, should be a freedom of choice. I do not conceive that an election under the complicated provisions of this law would, by any means, be a freedom of choice. It has been already conceded by some hon. gentlemen opposite—and I believe that before this discussion closes it must come convincingly to the minds of many others—that a revising barrister, who undertakes to prepare a voters' list under the clause now being discussed, will have ample opportunities to do as he pleases under subsequent provisions of the Bill, and consequently freedom of choice is not secured. There is no doubt that any Government is liable to abuse the trust placed in its hands if it receives too much power, and I say that to adopt this franchise and the machinery provided for the preparation of the electoral list under it is giving undoubtedly too much power to any Government. It is giving a degree of power which it has never before been suggested to give in any electoral franchise submitted to any deliberative body. My contention is that we should leave the question of the franchise to be settled by the different Provinces, because with the laws of the different Provinces the local bodies are intimately acquainted. These bodies are charged with the duty of selecting men particularly capable of preparing the assessment rolls; they select men who have an intimate knowledge of the value of property in the different localities, and who, besides having that intimate knowledge, are capable of making a fair estimate as between man and man, of the properties they are called upon to assess; and by these means they are afforded an opportunity of estimating accurately values which no man appointed to carry out the provisions of the clause we are discussing can possibly have. They have all the incentives that arise from their close contact with the community, which is closely watching them in those matters that affect their properties, their material interests, and their relationship with one another, to exercise great care, while the machinery provided for carrying out the franchise now proposed offers no such incentive. This machinery is provided for this particular purpose, and it is not at all accompanied by the guarantees, the moral restraints, the material and the local restraints that accompany the preparation of assessment rolls under any of the local municipal bodies. I will now discuss for a moment the question raised by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) as to the relative liberality of the present electoral law in Ontario and the proposed law. The hon. member for Prince (Mr. Hackett) remarked that the proposed franchise will not curtail the electoral franchise in Ontario, as settled by the Act recently passed there, in any material degree. I am prepared to show that, on the contrary, it will, to a considerable extent, curtail the Ontario franchise. We must remember that the Ontario law, if not entirely off the Statute Book, is a moribund law, and that the franchise with which we have to compare the one now proposed is that recently adopted by the Ontario Legislature.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. We are discussing the clause relative to cities only.

Mr. CAMERON. In the proposed law for a Dominion franchise the value of real property entitling the holder to a vote in cities and towns is $300; under the act recently passed in Ontario it is but $200. Consequently, in that material particular all those people whose properties are assessed at between $200 and $300 will be disfranchised. In the Province of New Brunswick the real property qualification is $100, while in the proposed Dominion franchise under discussion it is $300. In cities and towns, a leasehold or rental or occupant franchise, under the Dominion franchise, is proposed to be $20 a year rental; in Ontario it is a real value of $200. The occupant franchise in cities, under this measure, is the equivalent in yearly rent of $300, and in counties and villages $150, while both are, by the Ontario Act, fixed at $100. In cities and towns the income franchise, under the proposed clause, is $400, while in the Ontario Act, it is but $250. There is also a very material difference between the land owners' franchise in this Bill and that under the Ontario Act. In cities and towns it is only the son of an owner who can by this measure secure a vote, but in Ontario all the sons of mature age, of every man assessed on property in cities or towns of the value of $400, and in townships and villages of the value of $200 or of twenty acres of land, can vote. Not only is the Ontario Act more liberal in that respect, but I think it is more liberal in another respect, which I will proceed to point out. In the subsequent sub-section of this clause which we are discussing, it is provided that the father and all the sons may vote if the property is of sufficient value to give, when divided, an assesment of $400 each, or the father and such of the sons may vote as the property will allow, divided into assessments of $400 each; but, under the Ontario Act, provided the property is valued at $400, all the male members of the family who have been living for six months in the year on the property will have a vote. I will admit, of course, that this franchise is in one respect more liberal than the Ontario Act. I am prepared to admit that under the construction placed on the clause enfrachising the Indians this measure will materially increase the number of Indians who have a vote in the Dominion elections over the number who will have a vote under the Indian enfranchising clause in the Ontario statute; but I am also prepared, when opportunity offers, to take exception to that. In a brief discussion which took place a few nights ago, in regard to the Ontario franchise, it was pointed out that the statements made on this side as to the contraction of the franchise under this clause was not correct, because the Province of Ontario recently passed an Act which allows only one vote to each individual. Now, I hold that independently of that, we will have more voters on the Ontario list than under the franchise. The question is not whether one man should have one hundred votes, but the principle should be that the franchise should be spread over the community as equitably as possible. If a man is to have as many votes as there may be municipalities in which he has property, the man who has only one vote is done an injustice. It often happens that the man with one vote has a larger amount of property and pays more taxes than the man who has a vote in several municipalities. Independently of that, I believe that, as our taxes for Dominion purposes are not collected on any property qualification, or by direct assessment, proportioned to the value of the property owned by every individual, we ought, in justice, to say that there shall only be one vote for each man. In that respect the present franchise is decidedly defective. With the involved franchise contained in this clause, a great many efforts are likely to be made to poll graveyard votes, faggot votes, illegal votes of every kind. Very recently two men were convicted in Toronto for the practice of frauds under a franchise embodying similar provisions to this, and if they were convicted under a franchise providing many safeguards, it is still more possible under this franchise. I was asked to defend my proposition, that this franchise is much less liberal than that in the different Provinces. In Ontario the income franchise is $250; in this Act it is $400. There is a very material difference, which will affect the votes of very many individuals. In the Province of Ontario there is provided a wage earners' franchise, which only requires that a man should give a notice of a particular kind to the assessor and the assessor is bound to put his name on the roll. That man's right to vote is recognised independently of his paying municipal taxes. To him, it is practically a man-

hood suffrage. All he is required to do is to state positively that he is able to earn or is earning $250 a year. Where is there any provision in this Bill of a similar character, which enfranchises the workingman as that does—which allows a man earning $250 a year to have the franchise, as there is in the Ontario Act? The answer of those hon. gentlemen who contend that the Ontario Act is less liberal than this, is: You have swept away the facilities for one man having more than one vote. That is one of the best features of that Bill, and for this reason, that it embraces a larger number of individuals within the electorate at the same time that it may exclude some who, under the provisions of this Bill, might have a vote. If there was only that one provision to commend the provincial franchise in Ontario, I believe the people of that Province would prefer that franchise to the one now under discussion. There is another very material section of the people disfranchised by this Bill. A very large number of the most intelligent of the community in the different Provinces earn their living by teaching; and there, I say, is no more intelligent class of people in the Dominion than those who are engaged in teaching the youth of the different Provinces. I find that, in Ontario, in cities the highest salary paid to a teacher is $1,100 and the lowest $400. In both of these cases it follows that the teacher, if he is unable to qualify on anything else, will still be able to qualify under the income franchise. But, when we come to towns, we find that, while the highest salary paid to male teachers is $1,000, the lowest is $240. Consequently, the latter is disqualified by $160 in the Dominion Bill and by $10 only in the Ontario clause. Of the whole 362 male teachers in the public schools of Ontario the average salary is $385. Consequently, a very large number of that very important class in the community, which I belive moulds the youthful opinion in political matters as well as in educational matters, and I believe judiciously and well, and in the very best directions, leaving out the question of political direction entirely, but imbuing them with the principles of civil liberty in its highest form, are disfranchised under this Bill. Need hon. gentlemen opposite ask any further evidence of the fact that this proposed franchise curtails the liberties of the people very materially, as contrasted with the Ontario franchise. Now, I find that the average salaries of the 3,067 male teachers in the Province of Ontario was, in counties, $385 a year. Let me next look at the Province of Nova Scotia. There were 714 male teachers in that Province in the report of the last year which I was able to refer to, and the average salary of teachers of the first-class was $388.58. Now, it follows that a very large fraction of the teachers in the Province of Nova Scotia who may not happen to have real property or who may not be tenants or occupants will be disfranchised. In the second-class of male teachers, the number will be much larger still, because the average salary is only $272.24. In the county of Inverness the average was only $190; in Victoria, $192; in Lunenburg, $209; in Shelburne, $320. Now, in all these counties of the Province of Nova Scotia, taking the average in the county as a whole, all the teachers will be disfranchised, except where they approach the sum of $400, a sum which is much beyond the average of the salaries paid either to the first or second-class teachers in that Province. But when we come to the third-class teachers, a class which is the most numerous in the majority of the Provinces, we find that their average salaries are $198.96 a year; and although I was not able to ascertain what was the highest average salary to the third-class teachers, I believe I am safe in saying that all the third-class teachers in that Province are practically disfranchised under this Bill. Now, let me refer to the Province of New Brunswick. The last report of the Superintendent of Education to which I was able to refer was for the year 1882. I find that the average salary of the male teachers of the first-class was $508; consequently, these will not be disfranchised; but in counties, in the majority of cases, that average was under $400. In Sunbury the average was $328.15; in Victoria, $337; in Queen's, $340; in Albert, $370; in Carleton, $375; while it exceeded $400 in the counties of Kent, St. John, York, Restigouche and Northumberland. In the second-class the average salary paid was $315.40, running from $265.54, in Sunbury, the lowest average, to $341.74 in Charlotte, the highest average. For male teachers of the third-class the average was $235.80, the lowest being Madawaska, $181.66, and the highest in Northumberland, $315; showing conclusively that in all these constituencies male teachers of the second and third-class are practically disfranchised under this Bill. In the Province of Quebec this disfranchisement is especially the case; although in the cities of Quebec the salaries range well up to $1,000, still there are 156 teachers who have an average salary of less than $200. In Prince Edward Island, while male teachers of the first-class have an average salary of $465.46, male teachers of the second-class have only an average of $305.78, the highest salary being $450 and the lowest $225. The third-class teachers have only an average of $228.64, the highest being $450 and the lowest $180. In that Province there are only thirty-four teachers of the first-class, while in the second and third-class there are 222 male teachers. Consequently, this Bill practically disfranchises a very large fraction of the teachers of that Province. But it must be remembered that in that Province all the male teachers at present have votes, under the manhood suffrage prevailing there, because, under the system prevailing in that Province, every man who pays his poll-tax has a right to exercise the franchise. But this Bill proposes to deprive him of that franchise; you propose to deprive him of a right that he has exercised for the last thirty years. It is not to be assumed that the number is a small one. When we find that in the teaching profession alone no less than 222 males, out of 256 are disfranchised, you must necessarily be disfranchising a large fraction of the male electors of the Province. In Manitoba I find that the average salary for males in the city of Winnipeg was $58 a month; consequently few will be disfranchised in Winnipeg. But looking over the towns and villages of the Province as a whole, I find that the average salary for teachers is $32 a month. Assuming that they are paid a yearly salary at that rate, the whole of these men are practically disfranchised. Now, if so large a number of the teaching profession are to be disfranchised under this Act, it is fair to expect that other classes will be similarly deprived of their right to exercise their franchise under this clause. I think the estimate of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron), that 150,000 people will be disfranchised under the operation of this Bill, is by no means an exaggerated one. There are many men in the towns of Ontario who do not earn $300 a year, who might yet be possessed of the franchise as wage-earners, or as voters under the income franchise, if the Ontario franchise prevailed, who will be deprived of the franchise under this Bill. In many instances those are among the most intelligent and most active of the community. In a very large number of cases they are young men who gladly take advantage of the opportunity to exercise the franchise, and who, possessing the franchise, will make themselves acquainted with questions that arise in public discussion to a degree that very often does not happen with those who are older than they in years. It is to the young people this country must look for the future we hope to realise; it is to those who are younger than we; those to whom we intend to leave whatever there is in this country, and in taking the step now proposed we are taking a step that I very much fear those who follow us will severely censure us for in years to come. We are assuming a responsibility in submitting a proposition to abandon the franchises existing in Ontario and New

Brunswick, so far as income goes; in Nova Scotia, in Prince Edward Island and in British Columbia, we are going to deprive the very flower of our country of the right which should be inalienable to every man who contributes to the taxes of the country. I trust this clause will not be adopted, and that the provincial franchises will be adhered to, and we should follow, particularly as the principle of uniformity has been abandoned, the course suggested by the members for Prince Edward Island, and adhere to the provincial franchises in all the Provinces. In doing so we would eliminate what I believe to be a very great source of difficulty and a source of serious consequences. It is for those reasons I implore members of the committee to hesitate in adopting this clause, and I urge them to adopt the amendment. I do so seriously, believing that what I say is true, namely, that difficulties of a grave character will arise, the consequences of which cannot be in every instance anticipated. In depriving so many of the right to vote which they now possess under the present franchise, we are depriving them of that growing interest in the country's welfare which we consider it desirable they should possess. We are practically urging them, in some instances, to go to the neighboring country, where there is virtually manhood suffrage in operation. It must not be assumed that the right to the franchise is, to young men, a matter of no consequence. It is one of the most sacred trusts that can be given to them, and they realise that fact to an extent equal to the largest land owner in this Dominion. The young men are growing up to realise the live questions of the country, and under those circumstances it becomes a grave matter to say that while they now possess the franchise they shall not in future possess it. If there is any direction in which we should go, I say unhesitatingly it is in the direction of manhood suffrage. I believe the opinion of this country has been growing in that direction, and that the only result of the passage of this Bill will be an immediate and peremptory demand upon this House to give manhood suffrage to every citizen of the Dominion. The only practical result I can anticipate from the passage of this Bill, if it does pass, is the adoption, in a very short time, of the amendment moved by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), a motion which, if provincial franchises are to be departed from, I hope will be adopted by this House.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have obtained another follower.

Mr. CAMERON. I am proud to be a follower of the hon. gentleman on all occasions when I find him as right as he is on this occasion. I want him to make similar efforts on other occasions. I am reminded by my notes that the hon. member for Prince, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Hackett), in discussing this clause of the Bill the other night, stated that in that Province they adopted the principle of registration in connection with manhood suffrage some years ago, but they were induced to abandon it on account of expense. It has been urged very strongly on this side of the House that the present clause ought not to be adopted, because it would involve a very material addition to the taxation of the country, and I had no idea that we had such an example as was afforded by the Province of Prince Edward Island under the adoption of a similar registration Bill. That affords a reason why we should hesitate before pressing this matter to an issue. I believe the question of expense is involved in the consideration of the motion and amendment, and it is particularly pertinent when we realise that the municipal machinery provided by the Provinces practically does all we require, without any expenditure whatever to us. If that is the case, does it not look as if it is foolish for this Parliament to assume all the expenses, trouble, doubt and annoyance involved, not only to candidates, but to the electorate, by these clauses. We shall have not only to find machinery to put these clauses into operation, but we shall have to find the decisions of the courts on the clauses and expressions. These are all liable to receive interested constructions by the different political parties. They will be liable to biased constructions given by revising officers, and under all the circumstances the community will be put to trouble, and difficulties will arise that will necessarily involve an appeal to the courts, in order to their determination. Now, under the similar Act in England—though I do not admit it to be similar in all its provisions—but the Act on which the present is professedly based, we find that the decisions have been innumerable. And, Sir, if it is the case that these decisions embrace volumes of the court records, if treatises had to be written in order to elaborate these interpretations, it follows that the franchise proposed is much too complicated for a country such as ours. I have urged that as an ultimate resource we ought to adopt manhood suffrage as the franchise for this Dominion. I believe that is the ultimate result of all our interference with provincial franchises, but I do say it would be much preferable, at the present time, with the differences of feeling which exist in the different Provinces, that each Province should move in that direction as fast or as slow as it chooses. If the present Conservative minority in the Local Legislature of Ontario choose to agitate for manhood suffrage, and if a majority, as a consequence of that agitation, comes to the conclusion that that principle shall apply, so far as Ontario is concerned it becomes adopted there. But if, on the other hand, an agitation arises in its favor throughout the Provinces, under the principles of this Bill, they will require to agitate over the whole Dominion before they can secure what they consider to be their rights, and the delay which may occur in consequence of the effort necessary to get a majority of the people in this Dominion persuaded that it is the proper course, may make them so restive that a great deal of dissatisfaction or worse would result. I believe that by adopting the provincial franchises we are saving ourselves from very serious consequences in that direction, and that for that reason, if for for no other, we should allow each Province to move in its own line, without reference to the other Provinces. The fact that the principle of uniformity has been departed from already shows that the argument that uniformity is absolutely necessary has fallen to the ground. And I ask this committee, even if that principle had not been departed from, by the amendment giving universal suffrage to Prince Edward Island, still, what difference does it make to the representation in this House whether its members definitely determine by statute—which we cannot of ourselves alter or amend—what difference does it make to the representatives in this House whether in the one Province they have manhood suffrage and in the other Provinces they have qualified franchises? I hold that if there is any difference it is much less than the difference which arises from an interference by this House with the franchises which exist in the different Provinces. When the present Dominion election law was introduced the present First Minister protested very strongly against the proposed interference with the then existing law in Prince Edward Island. He urged, at that time, that it was an unjustifiable interference with the rights of that Province, and he expressed himself against a contraction of the franchise, so far as Prince Edward Island was concerned. He said he was convinced that the people of that Province would take note of the great violence which was being perpetrated under what he characterised as an uncalled for and an unjustifiable interference with their franchise. Cannot we, in Ontario, appeal in the very same language on behalf of that Province to-day? Cannot we say that it is an injustice to those who are enfranchised under the Act of the Local Legislature that they should be deprived of the franchise by the clause now under discus-

sion? I think the First Minister's own argument against himself is the best I can quote in this particular, and I think, after that argument, hon. gentlemen opposite ought to hesitate in making any alteration in the electoral lists of the different Provinces at this time. One reason why the hon. member for Prince, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Hackett) urged that they should be exempted from this law was because they were isolated, because, as he stated, they were shut up by ice from the other parts of the Dominion. I do not know whether that is a sufficient reason or not, but I will try to find an equally strong reason why the Ontario franchise should not be departed from. In some periods of the year the weather in the particular neighborhood I come from is exceedingly warm. The thermometer rises there to a degree which is scarcely experienced in any other part of the Dominion, and for that reason I think our provincial franchise should not be departed from. I think the reasoning is as cogent in one case as in the other. An hon. member beside me suggests that if there was any direction whatever in which the franchise for Ontario should be changed, as the result of climatic influences, it should be in the direction of expansion rather than contraction in Ontario, as it is in Prince Edward Island. I only hope, if the franchise is interfered with to such an extent that the provincial franchises will not be adopted in this House, the amendment of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) will prevail, because I believe manhood suffrage to be much preferable to the limited franchise proposed in this Bill. Under these circumstances, I need not say that I strongly urge the adoption, by this committee, of the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I believe that it meets all the circumstances of the case—that by its simplicity, by avoiding the complexity that arises from the existence of two franchises for the two Houses, it commends itself to the people of the different Provinces. I believe that when the people of the Provinces realise the results of the imposition upon them of a franchise of the kind proposed in this Bill, they will insist, with all the might they are possessed of, that it should be simplified, either in the direction of the provincial franchises or in the direction of universal suffrage. I believe that it only requires that the franchise should be put into operation to raise throughout the majority of the Provinces such a storm of indignation at its provisions that the only recourse left to this Parliament will be the adoption of manhood suffrage. I realise the difficulties that will arise in the very first elections that will take place under this franchise, if adopted. In many constituencies its complications will be found to be so great that a great many men will be deprived of what ought to be an inalienable right; and on that ground, I protest against its adoption. I protest against this Bill, also, because it confers the franchise on the Indians, men who are not entitled to the exercise of a similar right to that conferred upon the free people of this Dominion. I protest against it because while it qualifies the franchise to the white man it practically gives it unqualified to the Indians; and the franchise necessarily meaning the freedom of choice, every Indian vote that is cast has so much of a counteracting influence over that of every man who is enfranchised under the clause we are now considering. With the ample provisions that are made in the statutes of this Parliament with reference to the enfranchising of Indians, it is only fair that they should remain in the same relation to the rest of the people of this Dominion that they occupy at present under that Act. It is not fair to place them practically in a better position, to enfranchise them, independently of all property or income qualification, such as is required of every white voter. Now, I want to show that under the franchise now under discussion a practical injustice will be done by the enfranchisement of any one occupying a position similar to that of the Indians; and in the English Act that principle has been recognised. There it has been held that those in receipt of alms have no right to the franchise. Persons who are or have been within a certain time obliged to depend wholly or in part on elemosynary assistance have been held to be disqualified by the common law, not only because of their indigence they were unable to exercise the franchise, but because of their dependent situation their voices were no longer free. Now, that is exactly the position of the Indians; and yet it is now proposed to put them in a position of equality with white men, and to give them the right to vote without the qualification that is required from white men.

Mr. BOWELL. The question of the Indians has been settled.

Mr. CAMERON. The hon. gentleman evidently does not appreciate the point of my argument. I am very sorry he does not. I know that it took the hon. gentleman a considerable time to understand the points made on this side of the House the other night, with reference to the Indians, and I think there are further points with regard to the bearing of this clause on the Indians which I wish to press home to-night.

Mr. BOWELL. There is nothing in this clause with reference to the Indians.

Mr. CAMERON. My contention is that a man occupying the position before the State that the Indian does, has no right to be placed on an equality with the white man.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I called the hon. gentleman's attention before to the fact that we are dealing with the qualifications of voters in cities and towns. If he will bring his argument to bear on that subject I shall be quite ready to hear him.

Mr. CAMERON. I have attempted to show the connection between the enfranchisement of Indians and the enfranchisement clause which is now being discussed. I say it is an injustice that a man should be deprived of a vote simply because he cannot meet the qualification this clause demands, and that an Indian who is not required to possess such qualification should have a vote.

Mr. BOWELL. If he has not that qualification he certainly cannot vote.

Mr. CAMERON. The Minister of Customs, I understand to say, that the Indian is required to have similar qualifications. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) disputed that point, and there has been no answer to his contention. I, consequently, have a right to assume that his contention was correct, and that the tribal Indian, without his property being separated from the band, will have a right to vote under this Bill. If that be the case, as was contended by the hon. member for West Huron, the men who are deprived of the right to vote in cities and towns are being treated very unjustly. In further establishing the position that I took, I proceeded to show what was considered sufficient to deprive a voter of the right to vote in England. There they have a qualified franchise, but very often there are certain voters who are considered not to be sufficiently free to exercise the franchise.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. We are now dealing with the qualification in cities and towns and the amendments proposed thereto, but not with the qualification as to who should exercise the franchise outside of cities and towns.

Mr. EDGAR. The amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is to substitute, instead of the clause No. 3, the provincial franchises, the whole provincial franchises, not in cities and towns, but in counties as well.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I know what is before the Chair. The motion is to amend the third clause, which deals with the franchise qualifications in cities and towns, and not in counties; and the hon. gentleman is not relevant in discussing matters outside of cities and towns.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, what is the scope of the amendment of the hon. member for King's, P.E.I. (Mr. Macdonald)? I would ask you whether, in asking that Prince Edward Island be exempted, he has asked that only the cities and towns of Prince Edward Island be exempted?

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I can only read the amendment. Mr. Macdonald moved an amendment to the amendment, that all the words after "that" be struck out, and that clause 3 be amended by inserting after the words "every person shall," at the beginning of the same, the words "excepting the Province of Prince Edward Island."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is that amendment confined to the cities and towns of Prince Edward Island?

Mr. MULOCK. Does not the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) propose that we should adopt the franchises for the whole of the municipalities in the Provinces, and not only the cities and towns. If I understand his amendment rightly, it proposes that we should adopt the provincial franchises throughout. If the amendment is larger than the original motion it should have been ruled out of order; if it is in order, then reference can be made to the country municipalities as well as to the cities and towns.

Mr. BOWELL. The amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk only refers to section 3, and section 3 only refers to cities and towns. The amendment, therefore, only asks that the provincial franchises for cities and towns should be adopted; and if the hon. member for North Norfolk wants it to apply to the whole of the Provinces he would have to make a motion to that effect when we come to the clause relating to counties.

Mr. MULOCK. If this amendment to clause 3 were adopted it would be far more expansive than the hon. Minister of Customs suggests. Perhaps I may be permitted to read it. This proposition is not that voters in cities and towns shall possess such and such qualifications, but:

That all the words in section 3 be struck out, and the following substituted: "Subject to the exceptions hereinafter contained, all persons qualified to vote at the election of representatives to the House of Assembly or Legislative Assembly of the several Provinces composing the Dominion of Canada, and no others, shall be entitled to vote at the election of members of the House of Commons of Canada for the several electoral districts comprised within such Provinces respectively."

If that amendment is carried the committe would be committed to the words of this resolution, which would supersede every other provision in the Bill which contemplates a qualification. I think it is not capable of any other interpretation. If it cannot be argued on the basis of the language contained in it, it should have been ruled out of order at an earlier date; but it has been argued on that basis for two days, and now it is too late to change it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think sufficient has been said——

Mr. PATERSON. I speak on the point of Order.

Mr. BOWELL. The member for Brant asked you a question. There was no point of Order raised.

Mr. PATERSON. I am speaking to whatever the hon. gentleman spoke to; if I am out of order he was out of order. The motion is that all the words in section 3 be struck out. If so, what have you about cities and towns? Have you a word left? Not a word. Therefore, cities and towns do not come in at all. (Amendment read). The amendment refers to all the electoral districts within all the different Provinces; so that, for the Minister of Customs to dictate to the Chair, to attempt to lecture the Chair as to its duty, to prevent others from addressing the Chair when he himself has addressed it, is rather an arbitrary proceeding on his part, that he will find gentlemen on this side are not prepared to submit to. I submit it is impossible for the Chair, as I understand it, to maintain the contention of the Minister of Customs. I will read the amendment again. (Amendment read). I submit that the member for West Middlesex (Mr. Cameron), in speaking about the enfranchised Indians, is speaking within the words "and no others;" for, under the Franchise Bill of Ontario, the unenfranchised Indians are not allowed to vote.

Mr. MULOCK. Supposing this resolution were an Act of Parliament, because if the committee adopts it, and the House adopts it, and the Senate adopts it, and the Governor General adopts it, it becomes an Act of Parliament, can it be contended that an elector in a township or in a village would not be affected by it. It provides a franchise for every elector. It cannot be capable of being cut down to any particular municipality. It is general in its effects and supersedes every other system of franchise.

Mr. EDGAR. More than that; the words of the amendment are those of the law under which the whole electoral system of the Dominion is being worked to-day. They are exactly the words of the 40th section of the Electoral Act of 1874. If that does not enable those who speak to the amendment to discuss the whole question of the electoral franchises, I do not think any language can be used broad enough to do so. Does not every amendment which begins in that way substitute for the original words the words of the amendment? It is the amendment which is before the House. If it were limited to some particular portion further on in that section, after the words "cities and towns" are used in the enacting part, there might be something to say in favor of the point of Order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The member for West Middlesex has the floor. I repeat what I said before to him, that we are now discussing the qualification of voters in cities and towns. Then comes clause 3, to which an amendment is moved. It is not necessary for me to give my opinion as to the effect of the words. I have been asked the question, and it is for the House to decide how far the said amendment goes. The third clause deals with the qualifications of voters in cities and towns, and it is proposed to strike out that clause. The next clause, the fourth, deals with the franchise in counties. Now, I think that when we are discussing the qualification of voters in cities and towns on this amendment, the hon. gentleman should confine his remarks to the qualification of voters in cities and towns. I so rule, and I ask him to do so.

Mr. CAMERON. That will shorten my remarks, and I regret it, because an hon. gentleman opposite asked for some information as to the relative franchises in Ontario, and asked me to substantiate my assertion that the Ontario franchise was the more liberal of the two. In counties and villages the difference is equally material; the restriction is equally large on this franchise in cities and towns. The wage-earners' franchise, to which I alluded, is not embraced in the clause under discussion. In the Ontario franchise as I stated, every wage-earner, every mechanic, every laborer, who earns $250 a year, has the right to vote. Here the mechanic or laborer, if he is not an occupant or tenant paying $20 a year rent, or the owner of real estate worth $300 a year, or having an income of $400 a year, has no right to the franchise. It is a fact in the west that within the last two years the opportunity of earning the minimum under the income provision has been materially restricted. Many men who, a few years ago, were earning $400 a year, cannot do so to-day. It follows that if the $400

income franchise is still persisted in a great many earning now $250 a year, and who possess the franchise under the Ontario Act, or will possess the franchise, in case the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is adopted, will be disfranchised under this Bill. I regret this very much. I believe there is no more intelligent class in our Province than the young men who are beginning to commence life for themselves, and who will, in a few years, be in a position to vote by the acquisition of property. It is a decided injustice to many workingmen in cities and towns, to many young men, who are school teachers, in some instances, or clerks in stores, and who will be deprived of the right to vote under the provisions of this Bill. When hon. gentlemen opposite say that the franchise clauses of this Bill are as liberal as those recently adopted in Ontario, I want them to remember and to defend the difference that arises in the points I have mentioned. It is no defence to say that because in Ontario they have adopted one system, that because some men will not have more than one vote under these circumstances, the franchise is lower under the provisions of this clause than it is in Ontario. Sir, the right of the franchise is the test of its liberality. It is not whether one man has one vote or twenty votes, but the question is how many men have one vote. It is the number of men who have one vote that is the true test of the electoral franchise, and I say that in that respect this franchise is much more restricted than the Provinces demand that it should be. But in addition, we have the right, under the Ontario franchise, for the son of every landowner or landholder of a particular value, to exercise the franchise; while under the Dominion Act the right is only to be exercised by the son of a landowner. In Ontario they practically enfranchise the son of every man who is in possession of a holding, whether in cities and towns, or in counties, but the present Bill restricts the suffrage as to the individual who will be entitled to it. Because the sub-section of this clause reads:

"And the eldest or such of the elder sons as the value of the real property when equally divided will qualify,"

Shall have the franchise, leading, in my opinion, to the result, that if the elder son happens to be separated from the parental roof, happens, in fact, to have begun life on a holding of his own, whether in a city or town, or elsewhere, then none of the younger sons will have the right to participate under the provisions of this clause. That restricts the franchise very materially, and the construction, if not as I interpret it, is so indefinite that the revising officer will be at loss how to act. I trust the committee will see the full force of this contention that I now make, because, while it does not involve the most essential question under discussion, it involves a very material one; because, if the construction is, that none but the elder son of a landowner can participate in the right to vote as such landowner's son, I hold that a very material contraction in the intention of the Act will take place. I believe it to be the wish of the committee that the right to vote on a certain property should not be restricted to the eldest son, which would be doing a material injustice to younger sons on the same property, but that all the sons who can qualify under the estimated value of the property should have the right to vote. I draw the attention of the committee to the fact that the press has not discussed this Bill. Not until we have become actively engaged in the discussion of the Bill have the leading journals taken notice of it. I am justified in saying that, although it has been stated that the press has discussed the matter during the last two years, no editorial notice was taken of it by the Hamilton *Spectator* and London *Free Press* until the 23rd April and 29th April, respectively. If those journals, which represent hon. gentlemen opposite, have given no utterance on this question until those dates, it is a fair presumption that the people are not acquainted with the provisions of this Bill. It was urged by a journal in this city representing hon. gentlemen opposite that a petition presented to the House yesterday, in regard to this matter, was not presented as the result of an acquaintance with the provisions of this Bill. It was, in fact, alleged that the gentlemen who had signed it had no acquaintance with its provisions. If these statements are true it admits our argument as to a lack of discussion of the Bill, and we should hesitate before we pass the clause now under discussion and bring the Bill into operation. The Toronto journals have made no reference to it, other than by references in the report of the proceedings of the House, before the present week. The length of the sitting last Saturday induced the Toronto journals to give active attention to the provisions of the Bill. The *News*, *World* and *Telegram* had no references unless they were subsequent to last Friday; and does not that fact go to show that public opinion has not had an opportunity of being formed. The hon. member for Prince Edward Island urged that manhood suffrage should be retained in Prince Edward Island. While I agree with that contention, I think it is equally reasonable that the same rule should apply to the other Provinces, and that it is equally reasonable that Ontario, which has recently adopted a Franchise Bill, should be allowed to retain its franchise. I trust the clause under consideration will not be adopted, but that the provincial franchises will be retained. If the committee decline to do what is just and right, I hope, as an alternative, the amendment in favor of manhood suffrage will at once and forever prevail. Leaving out of consideration the principle that we ought to demand an extension of the franchise in the direction I indicate, there is a very forcible reason in the fact that it would simplify what, under the present circumstances, will be a very involved piece of legislation. Besides, it is to be remembered that the proposed franchise deprives men in many of the Provinnes who are equally well constituted with us—deprives them of the right of exercising the franchise. Under those circumstances, I think the committee should hesitate, and should adopt either of the two propositions I have suggested in preference to that suggested in the Bill.

Mr. GILLMOR. I think it is quite impossible that this committee can deliberate calmly while such a state of hostility and contention exists in Parliament as now exists with regard to this great question. I think the time has arrived when a reasonable decision should be arrived at between the two parties who have been fighting each other in Parliament up to this time on this great measure. My attention was called to an article in the Montreal *Herald*, of which I believe the hon. member for Northumberland is proprietor, and I think that article, coming as it does from a supporter of the Government, makes a suggestion which the Government might accept without any loss of dignity. In fact, I think both parties might adopt that suggestion without any loss of dignity, and thus allow the business of the country to progress. One of the strongest objections I have to this Bill—and I have many—is that it interferes with the provincial franchises. I have not heard any arguments urged by the Government or their supporters why the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk, in favor of retaining the provincial franchises, should not be adopted. I say I have heard no reasons given. Of course, they must have reasons in their own minds or else they would not have proposed this measure. It is said that this measure is necessary for the good government of this Dominion. I do not agree with that proposition. I think the provincial franchises are the best. Then, it has been argued that this measure is constitutional, but I have not heard anyone on this side doubt it. Nobody doubts it. But the expe-

diency of this measure is another question. We know that many measures may be constitutional which may not be expedient. It occurred to me, when the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster) was giving a very logical argument with regard to the constitutionality of this question, that he might as well have undertaken to prove that two and two are four. There occurred to my mind, in this connection, the question of building a railway bridge across the falls at St. John. It was constitutional to grant a charter for that bridge, and it was equally constitutional to refuse to grant it. Nobody would propose that simply because this measure was constitutional the Government should introduce it on that ground. The question is whether it is expedient to substitute a Dominion franchise for the franchise existing in the Provinces at the present time. I believe that no arguments have been adduced to show that the Dominion franchise would be better. No member of the Government, and no member supporting the Government, has attempted to produce an argument to convince the House that a Dominion franchise would be better, or that the time had arrived when the good of this country demanded a Dominion franchise. Where have there been any complaints of the present system of franchise upon which members are elected to this House? There have been none; I have heard of no complaints existing—no communities have found fault with it, none of the press have found fault with it, none of us found fault with it, until this measure was introduced. And even if it were necessary, I think a more inopportune time could not have been selected by the Government to introduce a measure of the vast importance of the measure now under consideration. I believe that every member of the House shares with me that opinion; I have no doubt about it. Here, at the close of a long Session, already the longest for many years, when there is much public business to be done, when the Estimates have to be passed, when all these measures referred to have to be considered—this is not the time to introduce a measure of this kind and allow sufficient time for its discussion. If I had the power to advise the parties I would say: Make a reasonable compromise. It would not impair the dignity of the Government or its supporters, or the opposition to that Government in Parliament. I believe that the compromise suggested by the article I have referred to in the Montreal *Herald*—a compromise hinted at in the *Gazette*, though I have not read that paper—would be a proper one. Let this measure, which has never been discussed in this Dominion by the people or the press—let it go after this discussion; the people are now aware of its importance; they are able, through the press and through the speeches in Parliament, to understand it intelligently, and I repeat it will be no loss of dignity to the Government to accept that compromise, under all the circumstances, seeing that the Bill has been met with a reasonable and rational opposition. It is difficult for the Government and its supporters to believe in this measure, and they do not believe in it, but there are certain features of this Bill as to which those must be blind who do not see a party advantage in them. There is no doubt about it. I believe if it was a measure which was going to afford all parties fair play it would not be pressed so tenaciously; it would not be brought in at this time and pressed day after day and night after night. Mr. Chairman, the Opposition, in this matter, are fighting for their political existence. Nobody can read the Bill and listen to the discussion of the Bill without seeing that, in almost every line of it, advantage can be taken of the party who are now opposing it. I have not lost faith in human nature; I regret that men will take advantage; I like a fair fight and no favor; I like fair play, and I know there are many members on that side who like fair play——

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Who are they? Name them.

Mr. GILLMOR.

Mr. GILLMOR. Fair play in everything except at elections. No hon. gentleman on either side has attempted to deny the constitutionality of the system which now exists. The two systems stand side by side, both being constitutional. I prefer the present system to the one which is proposed, because I think it is more inexpensive; because it is less annoying; because I think the people are satisfied with it; because I think that it would be a retrograde movement and expensive to change it, and therefore I oppose the change. I oppose it because I have never heard any objection to it. I have never heard any gentlemen on the Government side undertake to show that there were evils existing under the system which the Bill proposes to remedy. There is a very fine theory, but it is only theory—there is perhaps something in it—that this Parliament ought to have the right to fix the franchise for the election of its own members. At first blush that would seem to be an advantage; but what matters it to any member of this House what franchise was used in electing him to Parliament? And until this discussion came up I do not suppose one member in ten cared whether it was a property qualification or universal suffrage? The constitution provides that the Provinces cannot send more than a certain number of members, and that they should be elected by the majority of the votes of the respective constituencies they represent; that is all that interests us. If this measure is carried, I think it will create a great deal of confusion in the different Provinces. We have our systems at present; they may have their imperfections, but they have been carried out from year to year without any trouble. We have municipal institutions in New Brunswick as in other parts of the Dominion, and it was only after long years of struggle that the people obtained the right to manage their local affairs. They have now the right to regulate the voters' lists, and can you imagine any people more capable of regulating them than those whom the people living in the different parishes and counties elect to their municipal councils? They are acquainted with all the circumstances of the people, their habits and customs, and with the value of property in their localitities, and every year they are required to fix up the lists; and I have not heard any complaint. Sometimes men are left off, not designedly but accidentally; but there is no discord in the county I represent and none throughout the Province of New Brunswick, that I know of, on that score; and I think the people would be very much surprised if instead of progressing, they found us retrograding, by adopting this measure. We should have revising barristers, irresponsible parties coming down there, to look after the voters' lists. The people cannot turn him out next year if he makes a mistake or willfully does what is wrong, or is incompetent. With us, that can be done at present; but we have no authority over the revising barrister. I am fully convinced that the provincial franchises are the most desirable. Both of the systems, the one in practice and the one proposed, are constitutional; but I think the one now in existence preserves the rights of the Provinces very much better than the one introduced in this Bill. I think it is a blow at the federal system. With regard to the qualification, I do not wish to take up your time at present to go into what I conceive should be the basis of the franchise, because that is a large question, and there will be other opportunities during the discussion of this Bill to deal with that. I may venture, however, to state that if we are to have a uniform franchise, it is, in my opinion, quite impossible to have uniformity, which means the same thing, unless we come down to manhood suffrage. I have always been in favor of manhood suffrage, and I think the bringing into Parliament of this measure to regulate the franchise, must inevitably tend to universal suffrage. It has been proposed by one hon. member for Prince Edward Island. Now, I should like to look at that hon. gentleman; is it

possible that any man can be found in this House supporting this measure, who expects that one Province is to be allowed to retain its local franchise and its local institutions while all the rest of the Provinces have to come under one uniform franchise? There can be no uniformity in that, and I am surprised that any hon. member could propose that unless he were willing to give it to every other Province; and if he is, he will vote for the amendment in your hands. I repeat that I think now that this matter has been very fully discussed. Of course, I realise that it is a sort of conflict between two parties, and that one will not yield to the other; and I can understand that things may be so important to contend for that they should hold out to the end. But there will be an end to this sort of thing, and I think it is a reasonable proposition that hostility should now cease, and that we should come here after the recess, prepared to discuss this matter, knowing what the views of our constituents are. We may come back with different views from those we now entertain. We may find that the majority of our constituents want a Dominion instead of a provincial franchise. I do not know whether they do or not; but I think it is only reasonable that we should consult them, and I would like to see both parties agree, without any compromise of dignity, to leave this matter until the next Session of Parliament, and then come prepared to discuss it fairly, with new light, and with a knowledge of the wishes of our constituents, which every man ought to possess. I wish to act in accordance with the views of these who sent me here. This Bill propses to change the franchise. If adopted, it will send me back to a different set of electors from those who sent me here. I know that it will disfranchise a very important class of persons in the Province from which I come. It proposes no personal property qualification. I know that there are a considerable number of persons in my constituency who have at present the right to vote on the personal property they possess; many of whom voted for or against me at the last election, but who will now be disfranchised. I should be very sorry to return to them and feel that I had been the means of disqualifying such men, who are intelligent, and who ought to be electors. In some constituencies I know it will add some to the list of voters; a considerable number of tenants will be added; but, taking it all in all, the system is a confused one, subject to a great deal of trouble, and must necessarily cause a great deal of difficulty in knowing just who is and who is not qualified to vote. This Bill proposes a real property qualification of $150 in rural districts; our qualification is $100 worth of real estate. This Bill proposes to give the franchise to farmers' sons. I do not see how we can consistently vote for that and not give it to other young men who are equally intelligent and patriotic, and capable of exercising the franchise. The truth is, a great deal of the cause of this evidently originated from the rivalry between the Dominion Government and the Government of Ontario, to see who will get ahead, and the farmers' sons seem to be the only class of young men they consider worth conciliating. In my constituency there is a large class of fishermen, and I know of no young men in the Province who are more deserving of the franchise than they; and with regard to remaining at home in the country, there is no class of our population that remains so continuously at home as the fishermen. While the farmers of New Brunswick have been leaving the country, while the sons of artisans and mechanics go abroad, the fishermen remain at home; and, according to the census, they are gradually increasing in numbers. From their intelligence, I should say they deserve the franchise just as much as the farmers sons. Why the sons of artisans and the young men in commercial business are left out I cannot say. All these questions arise, and then the question of manhood suffrage comes up, which I have always been in favor of. I do not know that my constituents are in favor of it, and I would rather be excused being called on to vote on that question, unless it is forced upon us and we have no alternative. This Bill is a total revolution of the electoral system of the Dominion, and demands a great deal of time for consideration. The Government may say we are taking up more time than we ought, but when the leader of the Government said, in the early history of the measure, that it would take the most of the Session to discuss it intelligently and arrive at a proper conclusion, re-adjust and re-arrange the franchise, so that a fair and uniform franchise would be fixed for the whole Dominion, he has no right to complain of long discussion now. I am surprised that, after making this admission, he should, at the close of a long Session, introduce this measure. Of course, the majority have the right to rule, and they say they are responsible. But they have no more responsibility than those who oppose them. The Opposition represent very nearly one-half of the electors of the country, and they are as equally responsible as the Government for the legislation that passes here; they are responsible for the part they take in legislation, and if they consented to allow a measure, which they believed to be iniquitous, to pass, they would be responsible to the people for that as well as the Government. If I had the power to conciliate the two parsies I would say to the Government: Withdraw this measure; let us go on and vote the supplies; let us consider the various measures that must be considered, and return to our homes, and give this measure a full and thorough discussion before our constituents, so that we may be prepared to come back here and vote for a system that will meet the wishes of the people. I do not wish to trouble you, Sir, or the House, with regard to the Indian question and other questions. The time for that, I presume, will arrive when the motion of the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) for the introduction of manhood suffrage will be put.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth). This is an attempt to introduce, for the first time, the uniform system of the qualifications of the elector, throughout the whole Dominion, but in addition to that there are one or two other elements involved that make the Bill of still greater importance, that make it a still greater departure from the principles which have guided, heretofore, the various franchises in the different Provinces. I spoke at some length the other evening on one of these questions, to which I will briefly refer, because I feel it to be of great importance. Heretofore, the principle upon which the franchise has been conferred upon the electorate of the country has been that the basis of the franchise should be the possession or occupation of real property of a certain value, or the possession of a certain income, the assumption being that a citizen who is capable, by his own efforts, of earning a certain income or acquiring certain property, gave a pledge by so doing, that he was competent and fairly entitled to take an intelligent interest in the affairs of the commonwealth. Upon these two lines, heretofore, the franchise has been framed in the various Provinces, but on this occasion we find a new element introduced, an element that gives to a certain class the privilege of exercising the power of voting without assuming any of the responsibilities of citizens. I consider that in that one step we are making a radical change in the system under which, heretofore, our affairs have been administered. I refer, of course, to that clause of the Bill which gives the franchise to the Indians who are wards of the Government. I cannot understand on what principle they are given the right to vote. It can only have one effect, and that is to lower the standard of qualifications for citizenship and give the right to say who shall make our laws to those who will not be amenable to them. To-day that right is to be given to the

Indian population of the country, who are not amenable to the laws of the country, as other people are, but who are under the control and the guidance of the Government. I think it unwise that the right to vote should be conferred upon any individual who is not in a position to exercise that right intelligently, and to assume the responsibility that the misuse of that privilege may entail upon him—people, in fact, who are in such a position that it matters not to them which of our great parties administer our affairs. The policy in both cases would be the same to that class. They would find no difficulty whatever, because the system of tutelage under which they are placed is a fixed system; they are not free agents, and they have no right to impose responsibilities on other citizens which they do not share themselves. I feel strongly on that question. I feel that we are introducing an element of discord into our institutions which can only work unsatisfactorily and must always be a blemish on those institutions. In looking back, each in his own Province, we pride ourselves upon the progress of our institutions, and when gentlemen on both sides of the House go back to their constituents at the end of a parliamentary period, they have satisfaction in pointing to any measure which has the tendency to enlarge the scope of the exercise of their rights by those constituents. But I do not think any hon. gentleman, on going back at the close of this parliamentary term, if this Act should become law, would congratulate himself or his constituents on the Indian having a vote, as one which would advance our institutions in the eyes of the community or which would in any way advance our civilisation or culture. It cannot be pretended that it will be of advantage to those individuals themselves. The mere fact of their going to the polls once in four or five years, and depositing their ballots, and going home again, cannot be called a very elevated matter for the Indian. I should feel glad to accept any measure which would make the Indian a good citizen, but no gentleman opposite has attempted to show that this would benefit the Indian in that respect. When the question of a uniform suffrage came before the House, in 1874, I felt an interest it it. At first sight it is an attractive idea that we should have a uniform qualification for the electorate, as well down in the little island by the sea as in the great Province of Ontario, on the fertile plains of the west, and beyond the Rocky Mountains in British Columbia. But on sober second thought, and after the discussions of the questions involved, it was felt that the apparent advantages which might accrue to this Dominion would be far overbalanced by the disadvantages. If our political organisation had commenced with the Dominion, and this central Federal Government had been the Administration from which the others sprung, I could have understood that it might have said to the Provinces which it created, that such-and-such shall be the principle on which the electorate for the Dominion shall vote, but in the only Province which has been created since the Dominion was formed, the Province of Manitoba, we left them just as free as the older Provinces to select the mode of representation which they might choose. That being the case, we must all agree that there were ten times stronger reasons why we should not attempt to enforce any particular system on the different Provinces. They had a history extending back, as regards some of them, for over a century, during which they have developed according to the different circumstances in which they were placed. Amongst our friends by the sea, the shipping and commercial interests have developed very largely, and as one result of that, they have gone more towards the sea, and the fishermen and the sailor form a large element in their population. In Ontario we have developed very largely a purely agricultural population, and of late years there has been engrafted upon that a very large manufacturing interest. Again, we find the new Province of Manitoba, which has just entered upon a political existence, has adopted manhood suffrage, recognising, in its start in life, the principle towards which we are all travelling, and which I am satisfied it is only a question of time before we shall all reach, the principle that the individual, as a man, with the ordinary guarantees for good conduct, is the basis upon which representation to this House should be placed. Now, we find that each Province has developed according to its own peculiarity, its own qualifications for the election, not only of its own local representatives, but for representatives to this House. We do not find in practice that when members come together here, elected under circumstances so diverse, that they are able to say to one: You have been elected by manhood suffrage; or, to another one, you have been elected on a more restricted suffrage, or elected on a property qualification of an exclusive cast. But while we have been elected under circumstances so diverse, we all feel that we have a common bond of union and common interest in this central Government. I feel that in allowing each Province to maintain its respective local institutions we provided a strong guarantee that the federal principle should be fairly accepted in those Provinces, and that they would feel, while controlling their own local affairs, that they were free members of a larger Confederation. As to the question of convenience, until it can be shown that the provincial franchises have positively worked injustice to any party, this point should not be lightly valued. We find that some of the Provinces have existed with their political institutions for over a century, while this Dominion itself is only seventeen years old, and during that time the system under which we have had representation has worked admirably, a fact which, in itself, is the best guarantee that there is nothing unjust in our present arrangement. I do not dispute the right of the central Government to fix the franchise for the election of members to this House—I think that is clearly within their rights; but we all learn by experience that, both in political matters and in social life, it is not always desirable to stand on the extreme edge of our rights, and that it is necessary to do many things from expediency without giving up our rights. I have already remarked that, even if your Provinces were all settled by the same race, the peculiarities of development, the local circumstances in which they exist, would develop material differences. But we have in this country one Province peopled by a race entirely different, with different political institutions, with a history that reaches far into the past, associated with another country, and while that Province is as loyal to our Queen and Confederacy as any other, they have heretofore shown themselves very strongly attached to their provincial rights and their peculiar institutions. Now, Sir, I say that under the circumstance that the population of Quebec speaks a different language, the permanency of which we recognise in the House by having our Records preserved in French, it seems to me a wise thing to ask ourselves wherein will we be able to effect the uniformity of qualification for the electorate that shall elect the members of this House. Now, that Province has shown itself strongly attached to its peculiar local administration. I find no fault with that. I have more respect for the individual who feels a strong attachment for his own local institutions than I do for him who professes patriotism for a central government. I have no sympathy with those who taunt upholders of provincial rights with being mere petty parish politicians, and with being small potatoes. We want, say they, to spread our ideas abroad, so as to take in the whole Dominion, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. So do we; but I tell you that I cannot understand how you can build up this Dominion and extend our Confederacy from shore to shore without preserving intact the rights of the various Provinces that constitute that Dominion. I believe that the individual who stands up for the rights of his Province against the encroachments of the Federal Government is a far

better citizens than the man who quitely stands by and allows the Federal Government to assume rights that belong to his Province. Apply that to the franchise. Ask yourselves, under what circumstances can we hope to assimilate the franchise to our fellow citizens in Quebec? Take, for instance, this very Bill we are discussing. The first advantage that the leader of the Government presented to us was that it was going to effect uniformity. But how long was it discussed here until it began to be evident that it was only a nominal uniformity, and when we heard hon. gentlemen opposite rising to express their sentiments, we found them as diverse as possible on many questions involved in this Bill. When the leader of the Government introduced this measure we had barely taken one step before it became evident that there was one feature, the repugnance to which was so strong that it was apparent the whole Bill would have to be sacrificed, or that particular section would have to be dropped—I refer to the clause respecting woman suffrage.

Mr. LABROSSE. I rise to a question of Order. We are not now discussing the question of woman suffrage.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is in order.

Mr. LABROSSE. The hon. gentleman is talking about woman suffrage, which is not under discussion.

Mr. BAIN. That question showed the impossibility of a uniform franchise. And it was expunged. The next difficulty arose with respect to the clause regarding Indians, and Manitoba and British Columbia Indians were excluded. Here again the impossibility of a uniform franchise became apparent. The next proposition was an amendment in a different direction. The First Minister proposed to exclude the Mongolian race from the franchise, and in deference to members from British Columbia this was done.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I hope the hon. gentleman will not re-open the question.

Mr. BAIN. This is another illustration of the impossibility of passing a uniform franchise in this Dominion. Prince Edward Island asks to be exempt from this Bill, and an injustice to Prince Edward Island will be done if this Bill passes in its present form. As regards Ontario, while some hon. members might desire to have an extension, yet it could not be charged that this committee would do wrong if it did not extend the franchise to all citizens, as in Prince Edward Island; and that now, with our boasted progress, we are taking from them the privilege they have enjoyed for the last thirty years. Sir, they would be less than men, they would be a discredit to the constituencies of the island, if they did not protest vigorously and forcibly against having that right taken from them. Under these circumstances it is perfect folly to say that a uniform franchise should be applied to all the Provinces constituting this Confederacy, or that it would be nearly as effective or satisfactory as the system under which we are operating. There are one or two other questions involved in this matter, to which I should like briefly to refer, as showing in what respects this attempt at uniformity and centralisation of power in the hands of this Parliament operates to the detriment of the various Provinces. Before the last general election the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government made a statement in Toronto with regard to the local license system in Ontario, and he said he intended to teach the little tyrant Mowat a lesson.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. BAIN. I am referring to what is known as the McCarthy Dominion License law.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman cannot discuss the license law under this clause.

Mr. BAIN. I do not propose to discuss it. I was simply going to show that even in that matter, an ordinary matter of simple administration, it was utterly impossible to introduce uniformity. In that Act we had to introduce an exception in favor of one particular Province. We had to provide that Quebec, in certain local matters, should be excepted, and I remember that our friends from British Columbia were anxious that they should be excepted from that Act, which was intended to introduce uniformity in all the Provinces, and I refer to that as an illustration of the practical impossibility of introducing any uniform system into the great majority of things, which will apply equally to every Province of this Dominion, and not work unsatisfactorily to some of them. Now, Sir, with respect to these matters, if we are to consolidate the various Provinces into what we are all desirous to see—a solid, united Confederacy, built up strong in the preservation of local rights, and feeling an attachment to the central federal interests, this system of attempted uniformity will not be effective, because we have already had abundant evidence that there is a strong feeling of discontent with many of the provisions of this Bill, on the part of some hon. gentlemen, because it does not go far enough, and on the part of others, because it goes further than they feel the people they represent will justify. In addition to that, I say that while I have no disinclination to see Ontario brought forward as the leading member of this Confederacy, I have no hesitation in saying that it is unfair in principle to take what is practically an Ontario franchise and impose it as a uniform franchise, to be applied to all the other Provinces. I recognise that there are differences in the local circumstances under which we exist. I think that inside the united federal system we should give each of the Provinces as much freedom as possible for the development of its own peculiarities and the working of its own institutions; and as we have been working for the whole lifetime of this Dominion under this system, satisfactorily, it will require stronger reasons than I have heard during this debate to induce me to substitute for that system one which, while professing to be uniform, has already wandered as far as possible from that uniformity, and unless it is false to two or three members of this Confederacy, must inflict a grievous wrong to many electors of Prince Edward Island. I wish to draw the attention of the House to an extract from the Montreal *Gazette*, written, I presume, by my hon. friend from Cardwell, at the time the Franchise Act was under discussion, in 1874. Now, I have no sympathy with men in this House who rise and read extracts of what some gentleman has said in previous years and under different circumstances, and then say that, because to-day he holds a different opinion, therefore he has contradicted himself and that he must be wrong. I have no sympathy with that class of scrap-book orators. I confess that my feeling in that respect is clearly expressed by the late Artemus Ward, who thought it was a mighty limited cuss who could not get himself up except by pulling another down. Now, I do not read this extract for the purpose of saying one word disrespectful of my hon. friend; but I want to read it for the purpose of showing how clearly it expresses to my mind the whole facts, concentrated in the highest degree, that affect this question:

"No one would dispute that it will be better, if it could be had without any serious inconvenience or expense, that we should have a uniform franchise for electors in the representation of the people in the House of Commons. But it is, to all intents and purposes, impracticable. It would require the appointment of local officers to make out voters' lists, and would, in its results, involve an amount of trouble and expense altogether beyond the advantages to be derived from it. The people, as represented in the Provincial Legislatures, have the same interest in a fair and equitable representation in Parliament as have the same people as represented in the Parliament of Canada, and they may fairly be entrusted with the duty of determining a franchise based upon their local peculiarities and their municipal system. Under the

responsible system which prevails in Canada, it is of the highest importance that Executive influence should be reduced to a minimum in the matter of parliamentary elections, and everything that tends to that end should be hailed with satisfaction by all who desire a free and untrammelled representation of the people in Parliament."

If I talked to this committee for two hours I could not express in more concise or effective language the whole facts involved in this discussion. They are put with clearness and calmness and pointedness, and hon. gentlemen opposite, if they grapple with this question on its merits, will find some difficulty in answering the arguments that appear in these few sentences. They are my sentiments on this question. I will not refer to the expenses that must attend the preparing of two different classes of voters' lists, and all the difficulties that must attend their revision and correction. I had intended to compare at some length the existing franchise in the Province of Ontario with the one proposed in this Bill. I recognise in my Province, and I am sure every other hon. member will recognise in his, that the franchise that existed five or ten years ago is not adapted to the local necessities of to-day. The development and advance of the various Provinces make in necessary from time to time to revise the electoral qualifications, and in this respect my own Province has seen fit to take a long step forward in the direction of manhood suffrage. The leader of the Opposition in the Ontario Legislature, who represents the Conservative element of that Province, has announced himself in favor of coming directly to manhood suffrage in provincial matters, and he claimed that he voiced correctly the sentiments of the Conservative party of Ontario, and his friends in the House stood up and voted with him. This shows that the Conservatives of Ontario, when free and untrammelled, are prepared to step out to the vantage ground now occupied by Prince Edward Island and British Columbia; while here, from the circumstances that surround them, they are content to remain on the ground which we have left in the Province of Ontario. I feel, under these circumstances, that it is safer and wiser to leave the franchises in the hands of the different Provinces. Unless greater difficulties arise in the future than have arisen in the past, it will be wisdom to let well enough alone, and to administer our institutions as they have been administered with so little difficulty during the last seventeen years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is quite evident that the gentlemen of the Opposition have not had a full opportunity of discussing this measure. I think we should give them every opportunity of doing it without injuring their health. I would therefore move that the committee now rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Committee rose and reported progress.

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

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 2:05 a.m. Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 8th May, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY PROPOSALS AND THE "MAIL" NEWSPAPER.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to call the attention of the House, and the Government to the fact that the paper which was submitted to Parliament yesterday afternoon containing the proposals with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway, appears to have been presented in the first place to the proprietors of the *Mail* newspaper. That it must have been in their hands the day before, because it appeared in the paper that morning. I think that if that paper was ready for presentation, the House ought to have had it first rather than the party organ.

Mr. POPE. It came down as soon as it was ready.

Mr. BLAKE. But the *Mail* newspaper got it before it was ready.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me the hon. gentleman ought to give some further explanation of this. Either he has deliberately furnished it to the newspaper in advance of furnishing it to the House, or a gross breach of confidence has been committed by some person in his employ, and he ought to say which it is. It is neither more nor less than an insult to the representatives of the people that newspapers should receive documents of this character before the House is put in possession of them.

Mr. POPE. I do not think there is any breach of confidence or anything of the kind. I think they may have ways of getting it from the printer, or they may get hold of it some way that I do not know anything about. We see these things in other newspapers as well as the *Mail*; we see them in the *Globe*, and I do not consider myself responsible for the *Globe* or any other paper picking up this thing from the printing office, or any other place.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman deny that he furnished it?

Mr. POPE. Yes, I do.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

The House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. JACKSON. I have not occupied the time of the House very much in the past, and I claim its indulgence for a short time while I state some objections I entertain to this Franchise Bill. I object to the Bill because it takes away from the Provinces the right to fix their own franchise in regard to returning members to this Parliament. I object to this Bill on account of the complications it will cause, believing that, if it becomes law, the people of the country will not be able to understand its meaning.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think I moved last night that the committee rise and report progress, and so I have the floor.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that the hon. member who moves the motion that the debate be adjourned has the floor. I do not understand that the rule applies to this case; but under any rule it does not apply to the hon. gentleman who has not availed himself of his privileges. That privilege cannot be claimed if the hon. member did not claim the attention of the Chairman until another hon. gentleman had proceeded some time with his speech.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We do not move an adjournment of the debate in Committee of the Whole, as the hon. member knows. I claim my right.

Mr. BLAKE. I have said that the privilege can be claimed by the hon. gentleman if he claims it at the proper time. If another hon. member has proceeded, the hon. gentleman has no right to interpose with a speech.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Very well, Sir, I submit to this continuous process of obstruction.

Mr. JACKSON. I was about to state my objections to this Franchise Bill. I object to this Bill on account of the complications it will cause if it becomes law, the people of the country not being able to understand its meaning, and it will therefore lead to a great amount of trouble. I object to this Bill because of the enormous expense that will be incurred in carrying it into operation, an expense which is unnecessary and might have been saved. I object to this Bill because it is a usurpation of power, taking away from the Provinces rights which are now vested in them to make their own laws for the election of members of Parliament. I object to this Bill on account of the revising officers being appointed by the Government; these officers making up the list and revising it themselves, and there being no appeal on points of fact. I object to this Bill because the revising officers, being strong partisans appointed by the Government, will have the power in constituencies where the majority is not over 150 votes to wipe out that majority and return candidates of the party in power, which means wiping out of the Reform party in Ontario.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman must be aware of the rule that prohibits an hon. member from reading his speech.

Mr. JACKSON. I was merely reading the objections I have to this Bill, which objections I desire to proceed to explain.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I ask that the hon gentleman be not interrupted. Although it is strictly the rule that an hon. gentleman has no right to read his speech, we have adopted the habit so much, and we have allowed it to pass so often, especially during the late debate, that I do not think the hon. gentleman should be made an objection.

Mr. JACKSON. I was about to state that in the Province of Ontario there are 40 constituencies where the majorities are not over 150, and if this revising barrister has the power placed in his hands to make his own voters' list and revise it himself, from which there is no appeal, the Reform party in Ontario will be entirely wiped out. I object to this Bill because it does not specify what salaries the revising officer and bailiff shall be paid, but it leaves the Governor in Council to decide the amount of salary. Those officers beings servants of the Government and paid by the Government, their temptation to do wrong is doubled. Those are the principal objections I have to this Bill, and I desire to make a few remarks based on them. We members of this Parliament are sent here by the people of the different Provinces, individually elected by the electors of our respective districts. We are sent here to legislate and enact laws for the well-bing and prosperity of the country. Can any hon. gentleman tell me that this Franchise Bill is necessary to the well-being and prosperity of this country? I claim it is not. Can any hon. member tell me any good reasons that have been shown to this House why this Bill should be passed; why this change of the electoral franchise should be made? Has there been any demand made by the people for it? I claim there has not. The First Minister, in explaining the Bill, stated that it was necessary on account of the different franchises prevailing in the Provinces; and he referred to the fact that people on different sides of the Ottawa river elected representatives to Parliament under different franchises. The hon. gentleman declared that if this Bill was passed, it would cure the discontent that prevailed on that account. I ask him whether such a state of things has not existed for the last eighteen years; whether the Provinces have ever had the same franchise during that period? No. Ontario and Quebec has each had its own franchise, and there has been no discontent. And if there has been no discontent in the past, I can tell the hon. gentleman that he is sowing seeds of discontent by bringing in this Bill. The hon. gentleman says that, the British North American Act gives this Parliament the power to make its own franchise. We know that Act gives the power; but does it give the right? Power is absolute; right is justice. Is it just to the people of the different Provinces, that the franchises under which they elected representatives here, should enact a law taking away from them the right to send members to this Parliament. I claim that it is not justice. Her Majesty's representative, the Governor General, has the power to disallow any Bill passed by this House. But has he the right to do so? I say no, unless the law is of such a character that it is not desired by the people and is not in their interest. Now, Sir, the hon. member for King's, N.B., said that the members of this Parliament were here to register the opinions of the Government, and for no other purpose. Well, Sir, I say, if that is the case, this Parliament is a farce and there is no need of an Opposition.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise to a point of Order. Will the hon. gentleman be kind enough to repeat what he has just said, as to the statement of the member for King's, N.B.? I did not quite catch it.

Mr. JACKSON. I said the hon. member for King's, N.B., stated that this Parliament was here to register the opinions of the Government, and for no other purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, Mr. Chairman, I beg to say distinctly——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOSTER. I beg to say distinctly that I did not make that statement.

Mr. JACKSON. I have *Hansard* here, and I will read what the hon. gentleman said. The hon. gentleman was replying to a speech made by the hon. member for West Ontario, and speaking of the discontent which the hon. member for West Ontario said existed in that country, he made these remarks:

"Sir, he asks the question: Is this Parliament here to register the opinions of the Government? I will answer that question very shortly. In one sense Parliament is here to register the opinions of the Government; in another sense it is not. If the proposition is that Parliament is simply to shut its eyes and stop its ears, and, when the thirteen members of the Cabinet bring down their measures to swallow them, without the opportunity of accepting or rejecting them, then Parliament is not here for any such purpose. But if the question is whether Parliament is here to register the opinions of the Government, who are put in power by the majority of the people, and who have the confidence of the people, I say that Parliament is here for that and no other purpose."

This Parliament is here by the majority of the people, and if so they should have the confidence of the people, and therefore the hon. gentleman says that this Parliament is here to register the opinions of the Government, and for no other purpose. If that is the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite, and it seems to be their opinion, I say this Parliament is a farce. If that is the course to be adopted all that will be necessary in the future, when a general election takes place, will be for the political party who succeeds in the country, to come and take possession of this House, and go on and run the affairs of the nation, and there will be no necessity whatever for an Opposition to come here. I claim that the respectable minority in the country have rights which demand protection in this House as well as anywhere else, and can any hon. gentleman tell me that he is not the representative of the minority, as well as the majority? Do we not come here to enact laws for the benefit of the minority in the country, as well as for the majority? I say if the respectable minority which now exists in the country are not to have any representation, if their rights are to be ignored, it is time that that state of affairs is remedied. Do not the minority in the Provinces pay a portion of the taxes; do not

they assist in contributing to the revenues of the country, and have they not a right to be represented in this House? I claim that the Opposition in this Parliament have their rights, and their right is to stand up here and defend the minority in the country. I claim that this Franchise Bill is an injustice to the people of this Dominion and should be opposed at every stage. The people of this country are becoming alive to the effect of the propositions in this Bill; they are becoming indignant, as we can see by the petitions which are now coming in to this Parliament. Sir, I believe that this Bill is a blow at the Province of Ontario, that it is intended to wipe out this little band who are here to-day fighting for the people's rights throughout the Dominion. I believe that this Bill is intended to destroy popular rights and free elections in this country, and to establish a despotism whereby one man can say who shall be elected to this Parliament. I believe it is intended to take from the people their right to say who shall represent them in this Parliament, and to place that power in the hands of the Government of the day—a power which they can use for their own purposes. Hon. gentlemen say that municipal elections in Ontario are carried on on strict political lines. I admit that in a great many cases they are. I admit, for the sake of argument, that municipal elections are carried on on political lines; I will admit that the assessors making up the voters' list are strong partisans. Hon. gentlemen say they can see no difference between the system as it now exists, where these assessors and makers of the voters' lists are strong partisans, and a system of revising barristers—that will make no political difference, no material difference. I claim that there is a very marked difference. I claim that in no constituency in the Province of Ontario, and I doubt if there is one in the Dominion of Canada, where all the municipalites are of one political stripe. Take the average of the electoral districts throughout the country, and especially throughout Ontario, and they have six to eight municipalities. One municipality may elect Conservative officers, and that municipality may give an advantage to the Conservatives, and a disadvantage to the Reformers. The next municipality will elect Reformers, and in that municipality the Reform party will have the benefit, and the Conservatives the disadvantage, and therefore they are on the whole evenly balanced. Each electoral district is nearly equally balanced, and there are none where all the municipalities are of the same political stripe, so that there is a fair chance for both. But, Sir, when you give a revising officer the power to pass through a whole electoral district, he will have the making and the revising of all the voters' lists, so that I claim that the difference between the two systems is very marked. The difference is so great that it will entirely wipe out the Reform party in the Province of Ontario. I do not know whether I shall be able to convince hon. gentlemen opposite that that is the case, because they do not like to be convinced; and if they are convinced they will not acknowledge it. But I think I shall be able to convince the people of the country that such is the fact, and if I succeed in doing that I shall attain my desire. Now, the *Mail* newspaper of the 5th of May stated that 319 speeches had been delivered in this House on the Franchise Bill up to Saturday night at twelve o'clock. Well, suppose that is so; the exhibition that was made here on Saturday night last proves that 319 speeches, and possibly as many more, are necessary to convince hon. gentlemen opposite of the provisions of this Bill. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House had been here in continuous session for 57 hours, talking to convince hon. gentlemen of the provisions of the Bill; and yet, after all that talking, and after exhausting their physical strength in giving hon. gentlemen a fair test of their mental and oratorical powers, they failed to do so, and the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) had to call upon the First Minister to prove the correctness of his statement as to the nature and intention of the Bill. Is it not necessary to discuss these matters after such an exhibition as that? If it has taken so many speeches, mostly upon one clause, to convince hon. gentlemen, I am afraid that your patience, Mr. Chairman, will be entirely exhausted before they become acquainted with all the provisions of the Bill. Hon. gentlemen say that we are obstructing legislation. The fact I have stated shows, that there is no intention of the kind, but that the object is merely to exhibit to people the enormity of this Bill. Some hon. members say that this Bill is patterned after the English Bill. I deny it. By the English Bill, the revising officer is appointed by the judge; he has nothing to do with the making of the voters' lists; he merely revises it, as the county judge does in this country, striking off or putting on such names as he thinks the interests of justice require should be struck off or put on. Hon. gentlemen say that this Bill is an enlargement of the Ontario Franchise Bill; the Toronto *Mail* of the 5th May makes the same statement. Well, I can only see two ways in which it enlarges it. As the law now stands in Ontario, one man has one vote, but this Bill provides that one man shall have two, three or four votes, according to the property he owns. If he owns property in different electoral districts, he has votes in those different districts. Under that arrangement the representatives here are not elected by the majority of the people. Another enlargement is the clause which gives to a tenant the right to vote on a rental of $2 a month, $6 a quarter, $12 a half year, or $20 a year. It does not say what the property is to be worth. But if a man pays that amount of rent, he is a voter. I claim that that clause will give votes to thousands of people in the cities and towns who ought not to have them under system of property qualification—people living in hovels and small tenements that are not worth $300. Therefore, these people will be voting on property on which the owner cannot vote. That is an enlargement of the franchise. But, except in these two particulars the Bill, instead of enlarging the franchise, very much contracts it. There are tens of thousands of people in the Province of Ontario, enfranchised to-day who will be disfranchised under this Bill. In cities and towns it requires a property qualification of $300, whereas the Provincial Bill requires only $200. Therefore I claim that wherever this Bill enlarges the franchise it enlarges it in the wrong direction. I claim that one man should have one vote and no more, in that way we get the true representation of the people. We do not want the representation of a man's wealth here; we want a representation of the people. If a man is allowed to vote according to his wealth, we never will get representation of the people. The hon. the Secretary of State, in speaking on this subject, said that the judges would make proper revising officers. I agree with him in that respect, but we have no assurance that they will be the revising officers. If it were intended they should, there are not enough county judges to fill those offices, and besides they have too much business on hand to act as revising barristers. Therefore these officers must be barristers.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman cannot discuss a clause that is not before the committee.

Mr. JACKSON. These barristers reside in towns and cities as well as in the counties, and therefore I think they come under this clause.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. We are discussing the qualification of voters in cities and towns and the amendments moved thereto, which have nothing to do with the revising barrister.

Mr. JACKSON. I accept your decision, Sir. Then there is the question of expense. The provisions of this

Bill cannot be carried out without an expense of at least half a million dollars per annum, which means for a Parliament elected to this House for 5 years $2,500,000, an expense entirely unnecessary, not desired by the people, and which will be forced on the people by the majority in this House. I do not intend taking up the time of the House longer. I have taken up but very little time in the past and intend doing so in the future, and therefore, Mr. Chairman, I will leave the question in the hands of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I simply wish to set myself right with reference to a statement made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. He said I declared this Parliament was here to register the opinions of the Government, and for no other purpose. What I ask now is that all that I said should be taken together. It is evidently unfair to select a part of a sentence in a paragraph dealing with one subject and let that go as a whole. What I said was this:

"In one sense Parliamsnt is here to register the opinions of the Government; in another sense it is not. If the proposition is that Parliament is simply to shut its eyes and stop its ears and, when the thirteen members of the Cabinet bring down their measures, to swallow them, then Parliament is not here for any such purpose."

Again I said:

"But if the question is whether Parliament is here to register the opinions of the Government, who are put in power by the majority of the people, and who have the confidence of the people, I say that Parliament is here for that and no other purpose."

Parliament is certainly not here to register the opinion of the minority. The Government is but the mouth-piece of the majority elected by the people, and the measures the Government bring down are but the measures which meet with the collective assent of the majority. If there is any proposition that is true, it is this, that if any measures should pass Parliament they are those that are presented to Parliament by the Government, endorsed by the majority of which the Government is the executive.——

"And when a body of men in minority set up their will against the representatives of the people sent here to support a Government, I think that gentlemen who propose that are proposing something which is against the genius of our Government, and we might as well give up all responsible government if that is to be the rule. I give the Opposition right to full and free discussion, but when they have fully and pertinently discussed a measure, when they have taken up the issues involved in a manly and fair spirit of criticism and investigation, applied according to fair rules, I say when they go one single step beyond that it is not criticism but it is obstruction, and that it is against the genius and the spirit of our constitution."

I think any candid man, on reading all that I said, will understand my meaning.

Mr. MILLS. And that proposition would apply quite as well to a proposition of the Government to annex this country to the United States as to that under discussion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I suppose the hon. gentlemad would not object to that.

Mr. MILLS. No, it is the hon. gentleman himself who favors that proposition.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If it should come it will be from his Government.

Mr. MULOCK. It is satisfactory to find that our friends on the other side are amenable to reason and occasionally desire to retrace their steps. It is satisfactory to find that some of them, at least, have a glimmering of conscience yet left, and would gladly recall these words which are on record. No doubt we are thankful to the hon. gentleman who offered this explanation of his remarks, but his explanation is but an endorsement of what is on record; no doubt we are thankful to him for his views and opinions as to the privileges of members of Parliament; but when he stands up here and ventures to criticise the action of Her Majesty's Opposition and dares to intimate that in dealing with a question so important as this their conduct is dictated by other than a sincere desire for the welfare of the country, he assumes to put himself in the place of others. He has no right to set himself up as a judge of the consciences of others. Now, what is his attitude upon the position and duties of members of Parliament. Let us take the sentiment that he had expressed to-day, which is but an endorsement of what he expressed a few days ago. Let us take his pretended correction, which only shows that, after reflection, his conviction is not improved. We cannot excuse him from the expressions here on any ground that they were stated hastily in debate, because he has had an opportunity, between the time that my hon. friend from Halton referred to him and the time of his rising, to re-read the words he uttered before and to offer us his explanation. Let us see wherein he makes the matter perfectly clear, let us see where he stands as the representative of the people in an institution which is supposed to be free and unbiassed, every member of which is supposed to come here with his mind unbiassed and prepared to consider all matters upon their merits, and not to hand over his judgment to any given set of men. What does he say? After elaborating and discussing two views, for he is an hon. gentleman who would like to be on two sides at once if he could, he finally settles on one side. He had to get down from the fence, and this is the step on which he got down:

"But, if the question is whether Parliament is here to register the opinions of the Government, who are put in power by the majority of the people, and who have the confidence of the people, I say that Parliament is here for that and no other purpose."

Was there ever a more absurd proposition stated on the floor of Parliament by a person pretending to have his senses about him? Was there ever a more absurd proposition offered to intelligent men in an institution such as this? The hon. gentleman means to say that, when a Government is placed in power, from that time to the end of its tenure of office, for five years under our Act, every man who was elected to support that Government has no right to think for himself at all during that whole period of time——

Mr. FOSTER. I said no such thing.——

Mr. MULOCK—no matter what the measures are, whether good or bad, so long as they are endorsed by the Government which, he says, was at one time in the possession of the confidence of the people, from the very fact that at the commencement of their term they had the confidence of the people, he is here to register their decrees.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MULOCK. They may hoot and laugh as they please; I am speaking as I feel. He is in the position of announcing his political creed to be:

"He always voted at his party's call,
And never thought of thinking for himself at all."

That may be his view of his position here, and I should say that he has acted very consistently in that line, but I think it is not the view of his hon. friends who surround him or the view entertained in Parliament in days gone by. We have known, in times past, that the Government presided over by the same able Premier has been more than once deposed from office during its term, with a Parliament fresh from the country. If we recognise the doctrine laid down here, on what principle did the Parliament of 1873 vote want of confidence in the Government of that day? They were elected, they had confidence in the Government. The people had confidence in the Government at the time that Parliament was elected. On what principle, reconcilable with the doctrine laid down here, did the members in Parliament assembled withdraw their confidence from the Government? Why did they not follow out religiously the doctrine laid down?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. MULOCK. If the question is whether Parliament is here to register the opinions of the Government who are put in power by the majority of the people and have the confidence of the people, why did they not say: We are here now for that purpose and for no other purpose? Why did they not give that answer to every argument or reason which was advanced why they should withdraw their confidence from the Government? Manifestly because they were intelligent people and knew their duty was different, and that, whilst they were sent to support the Government in all its good measures, they still reserved to themselves the right, as it was their duty, at all times to sit as a check upon the Government, and, when it was deemed proper by them, to withdraw their confidence and support. I am amazed, therefore, that any gentleman should present this as his mature views as to the duties of members of Parliament.

Mr. MILLS. They are not matured.

Mr. MULOCK. No, I apologise, I did not intend to give an attribute to those views that they did not possess, but they are as matured, probably, as they ever can be under the circumstances. Now to refer to this question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MULOCK. This is not the first question on which interruptions have taken place, which have been profitless to the interrupters, and have to some extent retarded the progress of debate. The subject we have in hand is one of the very gravest importance. I can conceive of no subject being transferred to this arena and entitled to more careful consideration than the one in hand. It involves consequences far reaching in their effect. We have the assurance of experienced statesmen that the consideration of a question of this kind and of this gravity can only be approached after the most mature consideration, after the question has been a public, live question for a length of time, after the public mind has been directed towards it, after the representatives of the people have had ample opportunity to consider it and to interchange ideas with those whom they represent; and, because it has had in the past such treatment, because such a question in the past has been held to be entitled to such careful consideration, we, because we are in a minority, as my hon. friend from King's, N. B., (Mr. Foster) would say, have no place here to criticise, no right to express opinions, or to exercise the powers that were given to us and discharge those duties that are expected of us, but we are here, as he is, he thinks to act the part of mere puppets, and assent to the will of the majority represented by the Government of the day. That has been somewhat the *rôle* of hon. gentlemen opposite, and, without desiring to say a word to offend them, I do not think it was creditable to the dignity of Parliament, or to the issues involved, that we should find, for instance, my hon. friend, the Minister of Customs, reclining here comfortably asleep.

Mr. BOWELL. I had better be here than drinking down stairs.

Mr. MULOCK. He knows as a rule that he is quite a wakeful man. I agree with him that he would be much better employed in going to sleep than in engaging in worse practices, but I do not think it is creditable to a Government or a party that they cannot answer argument with argument; I do not think it is creditable, on a great issue like this, that, when argument is advanced by one party, we find the party on the other side taking to their beds; I do not think it is creditable to the dignity of Parliament or worthy of the great subject we have in hand that hon. gentlemen opposite, in presenting to Parliament a Bill of this character, a Bill fraught with such serious consequences, in the future as well as the present, should force it through Parliament simply by voting power rather than by conviction resulting from mature debate. Now, Mr. Chairman, what views have we had expressed upon this motion and this amendment by any member of the Government? My hon. friend, the Minister of Customs, has never ventured to offer an opinion upon it. The Minister of Public Works, who has been constantly in the House, has not ventured to give an opinion on the merits of this measure. He seems to possess great staying powers, and an even temper—not like my hon. good natured friend, the Minister of Customs, who, at times, loses control over himself. The Minister of Public Works follows a different rule. He has confidence in his staying power. He does not exhaust himself by sudden sallies, but he waits till the only effective time, the time for voting, arrives. The only member of the Government who ventured to express an opinion on this measure, was the Secretary of State, but as he is not present at the moment I will not speak of him now. We have had a few remarks on this measure by some hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) expressed himself, and what did he say? He complained that there was a great deal of time wasted in this discussion. Well, I can only answer that observation by saying that his friends helped to waste a great deal of that time, and attempted to stifle discussion for a considerable time by all the known arts. The hon. member for Montreal Centre announced a curious proposition. He said the Confederation Act was passed without an appeal to the people, and therefore Parliament might just as properly pass this Bill without appeal to the people. Well, what is the difference? The Confederation Act was passed, it is true, without an appeal to the people; but was it passed without the people knowing of the measure? Was it passed in opposition to any great political party in the country? Was it passed without due consideration? Was it passed before it became an issue? Why, Sir, you know that the question of Confederation had been an issue before the country on several occasions, both at general and by-elections. The Confederation Act, in some of the Provinces at least, had been endorsed at the polls before Parliament endorsed it. But how many men in the country knew anything of the existence of this measure until within the last two weeks? How many men to-day know that their rights are going to be endangered by this measure? Can you compare the two Acts? Now, Mr. Chairman, on what ground are we asked to pass this Bill? A number of hon. gentlemen have expressed themselves in favor of this Bill and every part of it. Who are those hon. members who have thus committed themselves to every part of this Bill, including section 3, now before the committee? I suppose the Premier will say that he endorses section 3, because it will help to carry out the great object of this Bill—uniformity. He urged the adoption of this Bill on two distinct grounds, one, that of uniformity; the other, that the Dominion should control its own franchise. As to uniformity, I think that pretention has long since been abandoned. But I complain that all the hon. gentlemen who have spoken in favor of this Bill have shown that they are not familiar with its scope. My hon. friend from East Gray (Mr. Sproule) was going to support this Bill and this clause, because it would limit the franchise to enfranchised Indians. He was wrong. The First Minister pointed out that he was wrong, and then he was going to support this clause because it did not limit the franchise to enfranchised Indians. My hon. friend from King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), who is so clear-sighted, and whose views on the duties of Parliament are so correct, was going to support this Bill for the same reason as the hon. member for East Grey; but when he found that his reason for supporting it was all wrong, then he was going to support it because his reason was all wrong. My hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Dawson) was going to support it for the same reason. His argument for supporting it was exploded by the Premier, and when it was exploded

he was going to support it because the Premier had exploded his argument. My hon. friend from Ottawa County (Mr. Wright) announced, in the speech he made on the motion for the second reading of this Bill, when, if I remember rightly, he seconded the motion, that he was going to support this Bill, including section 3, because it proposed to give the franchise to women. Well, where is his argument now? What does the gallant King of the Gatineau do now, that women are not going to be enfranchised? He supports it now for the very opposite reason that he had for supporting it when the Bill was introduced. The hon. member for Kent, New Brunswick (Mr. Landry), is going to support it because it did not propose to enfranchise the tribal Indian; and when he found it was going to enfranchise the tribal Indian, I suppose he will still support it because it proposes to give the vote to the tribal Indian. Now, I see the Secretary of State in his place in Parliament. Why was he going to support the Bill? He was going to support it because it in no way endangered the franchise, because while this Parliament was going to control the franchise, the machinery of this Bill would be so perfect that it would in no way curtail the rights of any man, that the safeguards provided by this Bill were exactly the same as the safeguards under the existing system, and for these reasons the Secretary of State recommended Parliament to adopt this measure. Why, Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of State, like all those other hon. gentlemen, took the whole measure on faith. I do not suppose he saw the Bill—ever saw one clause of the Bill, but simply endorsed it as some people endorse their prayers, by referring to the original document and saying: "Them's my sentiments." I suppose that is the principle adopted by most of the hon. members opposite; at all events, we learn from the hon. member for King's, N. B. (Mr. Foster), that that is his guide in discharging his party duties here. Now, we have a new element cropping up in the amendment moved by the hon. member for King's, P. E. I. (Mr. Macdonald). He has moved an amendment to the amendment, to the effect that Prince Edward Island shall retain manhood suffrage that she has at present. He did not venture to indulge in argument to any extent why Prince Edward Island should be excepted from the general provisions of this Bill. But he moved the amendment. Where was his argument? His whole argument was this: We should enjoy our separate provincial rights, but no other Province should do so. How kind of the hon. member to set himself up as the guardian of the other Provinces; how kind and considerate to ask to have a law passed which did not apply to his Province, but would apply to the other Provinces. On what principle is it that a law passed by the general Parliament of Canada shall be exceptional in its character? If our laws are to be accepted by the people, should they not be of that fair character which enables them to be extended to all people, irrespective of provincial and other differences; and yet the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment to the amendment has kindly informed the House that this measure is an iniquitous measure as regards Prince Edward Island, but is a perfectly justifiable measure as regards the other Provinces. That is the hon. gentleman's argument, and he proposes to support the Bill if Prince Edward Island is relieved from its effects But is Prince Edward Island is not relieved, I ask the hon. gentleman what will he do. What will all the members for Prince Edward Island do? Will they then find the measure perfectly right? If so, what does the hon. gentleman mean by moving the amendment to the amendment? He cannot possibly reconcile the two positions. Let us now take the hon. member for Prince. That hon. gentleman gave us a slight history of some local affairs in that Province. He told us that in 1874 a measure was passed by the Local Legislature of that Province, whereby a large number of electors were disfranchised. In glowing terms he depicted the wrong done on that occasion. Well, if it was a wrong for the Local Legislature to disfranchise a large number of the citizens of that Island, is it not a wrong to-day for this Parliament to produce precisely the same results by its legislation. I therefore ask the hon. member for Prince what will his course be, when this amendment has been voted down, as I understand it has been arranged that it will be? Will he then support the original Bill with all its clauses? Will he then support this Bill, which will disfranchise a large percentage of the constituents who elected him, or will he resist it as a whole because that one part which is bad is common both to the Bill of to-day and that of 1874? We shall see what course those hon. gentlemen will pursue when the amendment to the amendment is voted down. British Columbia will also be affected by this measure, and I call the attention of the hon. members from that Province to a paragraph appearing in the Montreal *Herald*, of this date, in which reference is made to the contemplated action of the representatives of British Columbia upon this question. I understand that in British Columbia they have a most liberal franchise, practically manhood suffrage, and, of course, if this measure is passed in its entirety, British Columbia electorate will be to a large extent disfranchised.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). They will not; I beg your pardon. They will scarcely be touched at all.

Mr. MULOCK. I am told this Bill will largely curtail the franchise in British Columbia.

Mr. BAKER. You are misinformed.

Mr. MULOCK. I submit that the Bill will have that effect. Let us see what the Montreal *Herald* says as to the hon. members for British Columbia on this point. Speaking of what is said to have taken place at a caucus of the Conservative party, the correspondent says:

"Here one of the Prince Edward Island delegation remarked that their Island had manhood suffrage, and any attempt to limit it would prevent a Conservative being returned. This gentleman further observed that, as wages were very low on the Island, the wage-earning power was much less, and it placed the Island people at a disadvantage as regards the effect of the Bill upon the voters as compared with other parts of the Dominion.

"To this Sir John replied that manhood suffrage also prevailed in British Columbia, and that the representatives from that section were prepared to accept the Bill, and he believed that he had made the qualification so low that it would in that Province deprive but few people of votes that they now possessed under manhood suffrage.

"He went on to say that the low rate of wages in Prince Edward Island was worthy of consideration, and it might be well to consider how far he could meet the Islanders by reducing the qualification for that Island even at the risk of interfering with the symmetry of his Bill."

We have it stated here that there is a certain franchise in British Columbia different from the franchise proposed to be adopted. We have it on the admission of the First Minister that the proposed franchise would disfranchise some of the electors of British Columbia. We have it stated here that the representatives of British Columbia have given their adherence to this measure; that they have, purporting to represent their Province, bartered away the rights of those who are proposed to be disfranchised.

Mr. BAKER. I rise to contradict that statement. We have done nothing of the sort; at least I have not.

Mr. MULOCK. I am glad to know it and no doubt the hon. gentleman truthfully contradicts that statement; because I can conceive of no greater wrong being done by a representative of a Province than to purport to represent his people in such a matter as this, and without consultation, without authority from them, without their knowledge, to barter away those rights that have been obtained for them by the statute of their own Province. I cannot conceive that any hon. member has a right to barter away such rights. When the Local Legislature passed the Bill giving the vote to certain of its

people, those people then under the Confederation Act became entitled to vote at elections for members of the House of Commons of Canada. They hold those rights; and on what principle can any member who purports to represent them for certain matters pretend to stand up in this House and say: I choose to hand over those franchises to the Dominion Government, or I choose to wipe them out. If a member can do that, what can the leaders do? If a representative can barter away the rights of one free man, he can barter away the rights of everyone. If the representatives from British Columbia and Prince Edward Island can come here and give their sanction to a Bill that disfranchises a portion of their constituents, they can come here and give their sanction to a Bill disfranchising all their constituents; they can assent to a Bill to wipe out the entire system of representation. It is idle, therefore, for the Government to say with respect to this Bill that they have the endorsement of the representatives of the people. If the measure is right, they will have the endorsement of the people to the measure. If the measure is wrong, no assent given on the floor of Parliament will bind the people.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the members from British Columbia had bartered away their rights or the rights of their constituents. The subsequent expression is unparliamentary. To accuse an hon. member of bartering away the rights of the people would be highly improper, and if the hon. gentleman made use of that expression I would ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not know how their rights are going to be taken from them. I suppose the principal question is, whether they have given their sanction to any of the rights of their constituents being taken from them. In regard to British Columbia, I may say that my reason for using that expression—which of course I withdraw at your request, Sir——

Mr. RYKERT. Of course; you have got to do it.

Mr. MULOCK. I do what is my duty, not under compulsion, but from a sense of duty. It is stated that the British Columbians are giving their assent to this measure because the Chinese are not going to be enfranchised. The representatives of that Province, or some of them, made no objection to this measure when it was introduced, although it proposed to give the franchise to the Chinese, but as soon as the Opposition pointed out that the effect of the Bill would be to enfranchise the Chinese, then the Premier gave notice of an amendment whereby the Chinese should not be enfranchised. Now, surely if it was wrong to give the franchise to the Chinese, then the franchise should not be given to the Chinese, and a sense of right and duty ought alone to be sufficient to prevent the wrong being done. The Government have no right to exact as a condition for not enfranchising the Chinese, that for that consideration they shall obtain certain rights of the people. If those terms have been imposed on the representatives of British Columbia, then those gentlemen have certainly shown themselves extremely weak, if they have been induced to give a silent assent, as they have been, to this measure, which will disfranchise a certain number of white people in that Province, merely to escape the greater evil.

Mr. HOMER. I wish to say that the hon. gentleman has made an entirely wrong statement with regard to the Chinese.

Mr. BOWELL. It is scarcely worth while noticing it.

Mr. REID. You had better leave British Columbia alone.

Mr. MULOCK I think British Columbia is being left alone by its representatives, and it is the duty of every member of this House to have a view, not only to his own Province, but to all the Provinces, especially when we know that the members from British Columbia complain that their influence with this House and with the Government counts for nothing, and that whatever advice they give the Government is overruled by the advice from, I think it is Mr. Trutch. That is a great grievance with the members for British Columbia——

Mr. HOMER. We do not admit that even; you are wrong again.

Mr. CHARLTON. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that my hon. friend was lying all the time? That was rather unparliamentary.

Mr. RYKERT. One at a time.

Mr. MULOCK. As I was saying, a number of these gentlemen, for a great many inconsistent reasons—reasons which have no existence now if they had at one time—are supporting this Bill and this particular clause. They went it blind at the beginning, and they are going to go it blind at the end. However, there is one common ground upon which they all unite. They may have differences about the Indians, the Premier may wish to enfranchise Pie-a-Pot and the rest, and other gentlemen may not wish it, the members for British Columbia may sit silently when the people are being disfranchised, my gallant friend from Ottawa county (Mr. Wright) may sit quietly and support the Bill when the franchise is denied to women, but there is one good safe standing ground for them all. There is one thing they are still agreed upon—not a reference to the matter—they are absolutely indifferent to it, and yet it is a matter to which I think all of them have an eye. I have not heard any of them yet getting up and objecting to the revising officer and his powers.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). We have not got to that yet.

Mr. MULOCK. Perhaps when we get to it we will see whether it is a provision which will meet with universal approval.

Mr. MACMASTER. Stick to the text.

Mr. MULOCK. My hon. friend from Glengarry (Mr. MacMaster) is extremely anxious for me to proceed. I think if he has any views on this question he is quite capable of enlightening the House, but he would appear to prefer exercising that supreme duty of an intelligent supporter of the Government, in whom the people have confidence—to remain here and become a mere registrar. I say this Bill and this clause seem to rest the franchise upon a property qualification. But yet we have a mongrel kind of qualification. We have a property qualification, but where does the uniformity come in there? In towns we have one kind of qualification on property, and in cities another, and as we go further down we cannot ignore the fact that there are more than town and city electors, and we come to various very confusing qualifications. Where does the uniformity come in when you say that a man shall qualify on his fishing tackle or boats? What is the use of such a property qualification, say in the North-West? Why should we not rest the qualification of a man's appliances for earning a living—on his chattel property which he uses in his calling or employment. Why not when you come to Ontario and the North-West, allow a man to qualify in respect of his horses and his cattle? Why not allow a cabman to qualify on his cab and horse? Where does the uniformity come in when we find one special kind of qualification, only applicable to one part of the Dominion, and in another part of the Dominion we find a vastly different kind of qualification? The uniformity proposition is almost too absurd to need argument to expose it. You talk of property qualification, but what is proposed to be done? It is proposed to enfranchise the Indians who have not the property qualification,

and it is proposed to give the vote to a man who has not a cent in the world, because he happens to be the husband of a woman who owns property. Was there ever anything more absurd than that? Yet these hon. gentlemen say that this franchise is based on uniformity. Then we have the manhood feature of the vote given to farmers' sons and the sons of owners of real estate. I think we should agree with the sensible remarks of my honorable and independent friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) when he characterised these franchises as mere fancy franchises, calculated to embarrass and deceive and to open the door to all conceivable kinds of fraud.

An hon. MEMBER. He did not say so.

Mr. MULOCK. I am becoming a convert to the proposition foreshadowed by the amendment, resting the qualification on manhood suffrage, and more largely dealt with in the resolution by the hon. member for Northumberland. In theory I am opposed to that principle. I am unable in theory to quite satisfy my mind that it is the best system of qualification. But when I see the dangers surrounding any other system, then I fly to it for refuge as the lesser of two evils. But in doing so another embarrassing question arises. Whilst I should be willing to take the responsibility of extending the franchise in the Province from which I come, I do not feel justified in forcing that franchise upon an unwilling Province. If Prince Edward Island's Legislature has declared in favor of manhood suffrage, that is to me a reason why I should not vote differently from the manner in which the people's local representatives have voted. How can a single individual in this federal assembly know so well the wishes and wants of the people of Prince Edward Island as do the people of that Province themselves? If they have adopted the simple and inexpensive system of manhood suffrage, which has been in force now for many years, and which sends to this House such representatives as we have here—although one I believe, represents in a curious way the doctrine of minority representation—I feel that I am absolutely precluded from interfering in any way with that system. For that reason I favor the amendment to the amendment as a simple act of justice to the people of Prince Edward Island—as a duty on my part not to interfere with their decision arrived at in the manner I have indicated. The same remarks apply to British Columbia. It is true, we have nobody speaking on behalf of British Columbia in this House; it is true, no person has yet told us what the position of the people of British Columbia on this question is; but I suppose we can properly infer that the statutes of that Province represent the wishes of its people; and if the members from that Province come here, and either by their silence or their strongest argument endeavor to induce this House to alter the system adopted in that Province, to the prejudice of a single individual, my answer is, you have no authority to make such a request or to cede away those rights. I deny that they have the right, either by their silence or by their voices, to come here and sanction any legislation calculated to curtail the rights of the freemen of British Columbia. In other Provinces we find a different state of affairs. In Manitoba, I am told, the franchise is very broad, almost manhood suffrage. But the Province of Quebec, we are told is opposed to manhood suffrage. The people of that Province have, through their Legislature, adopted a system of representation based on taxation. That system has been in force ever since Quebec has been a separate Province; it did not even originate then, but was handed down by the old Province of Canada. That system is in force in the Province of Quebec to-day; and therefore we must assume that it is approved of by the people of that Province. That being the case, I do not feel justified in giving my voice in favor of forcing manhood suffrage on the Province of Quebec. And so we could go through all the Provinces and apply the same reasoning, which brings us to but one conclusion—each Province in the Dominion has its rights, which we must not interfere with. This is the only satisfactory way in which we can provide for a system of representation. Now, there is great danger in my opinion in this Parliament interfering with those rights. It is perfectly clear that the British North America Act contemplated each Province being represented as a Province, for it assigns a certain number of members to the Province of Quebec, and taking that Province as a standard, assigns a certain other number to the Province of Ontario, a certain other number to the Province of Nova Scotia, and so on with the other Provinces. If the Provinces as such are to be represented, the slightest interference on the part of the Federal Government with the autonomy of each in choosing its representatives is to that extent an interference with provincial rights. Now, I have no sympathy with this Bill. The Bill is centralising in its tendency. It centralises in the Parliament of Canada, practically in the executive of the day, certain powers in regard to local representation. The Government of the day, under the machinery contemplated here, has certain control over the elections in the Provinces. Having that control, having a machinery, the artificial character of which will more or less obstruct the free expression of public opinion, they will be able to some degree to affect the expression of public opinion at the polls in the various Provinces. See the danger of that. I invite the attention of the minor Provinces to this question. In any Cabinet there is a dominant party, and the more power you give to the Government of the day, the more power you give to the dominant party in that Government; and the more power you give to that dominant party, the more you render it independent of the minor party, the servient party, and the less control in the affairs of Parliament you give to the representative of the minor party in the Cabinet. We know that the ambitions of men often incite them to obtain more power perhaps than they should have. I will put the case of a strong Province for instance, the Province of Ontario, which is numerically stronger than any of the others and has a greater representation in Parliament—suppose that that Province and the Western Provinces form a combination by which their representatives will become the dominant party in the Cabinet, they, by the machinery of this Bill, will be enabled to go down to the weaker Provinces and control the expression of public opinion in them; they will be able by the Government prestige to use the power of their own Provinces against the interests of the minor Provinces, in the minor Provinces themselves.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). How?

Mr. MULOCK. How does any Government exercise influence in any Province in any election? When an election comes on what influences are resorted to in order to affect public opinion? One man sets himself up as the Government candidate; that fact itself gives him an advantage over his opponent, and giving the fact that the leader of the dominant party in the Cabinet controls all the patronage, besides the fact that, under this Bill, he will control the voters' lists also, he can have men elected who will sustain him against the very Provinces that send them here. What sort of a Cabinet will you have when the dominant party in the Cabinet centres in itself all power? This is a matter that much more deeply concerns the minor Provinces than the larger. By it the minor Provinces can be crushed out and the Premier can render himself independent of them. I should be far from imputing to him such objects or motives; but I cannot help seeing that in the hands of designing men this is a power that might be utilised in that direction. For these reasons

I have no sympathy with any particular of this scheme; my sympathy is with the system that prevails to-day. My hon. friend, the Secretary of State, said that under this Bill the electors will have the safeguards they have to-day. I question that, but that point I will discuss later. We all, I think, admit that, under the prevailing system, the control of the franchise is in the hands of the people; but, under the scheme proposed, it is intended to place that control in the hands of the Government. I cannot shut my eyes either to the fact that the adoption of any part of this measure will involve a considerable outlay of money, and I regret that it appears impossible for any member of the Government to bring in any legislation which does not involve an addition to the Civil Service. When we temporarily ceased discussing the Bill the other night in order that we might have a little rest, I thought that meant a rest to the exchequer, until I was shocked to learn that it was simply a rest from the consideration of the Bill in order to duplicate the librarianships. If one were to review every Bill that has been passed this Session, he would find the same purpose running through them all, and that purpose is to find places for people who have rendered services to the Government. This measure is the crowning measure in this regard. The hon. the Secretary of State will now have to take a very minor place in this Cabinet. He brought in a little Bill that was only going to find places for three examiners and a few minor—shall I say villains?—the chief of the Government, as a sort of preparation for this, brought in a Bill the other day to appoint two librarians instead of one, and the Postmaster General asked Parliament to allow him to appoint as many superintendents of letter carriers as he might deem necessary; and perhaps, if we look at some of the other Bills to which Parliament has given attention, we may find that provision has been made in them for places for the faithful. This Bill, however, is the crowning Bill of all. Talk of 1874, when the moribund Government appointed 450 landing waiters and other officers, this Government have eclipsed that feat to-day. That was a glorious transaction in 1874, which did them infinite credit, but here is a scheme that outdoes all their past efforts, and which, in its originality, is unsurpassed in the history of any country. I cannot give my endorsement to a scheme of this character, a scheme injurious in every detail. The feature of expense involved in the adoption of this resolution in itself ought to be sufficient reason for the Government ceasing to press it. We have before us a most serious outlook. I do not refer to our known financial position; I leave that to others to deal with. We know what our bonded debt is, but can any man tell what we are going to pay for our unfortunate troubles in the North-West? I submit that, until we have settled that bill, until we find out what we are to do, what it is going to cost us to suppress those troubles and to indemnify the unfortunate settlers, it would be better for us to husband our resources and see how much is going to be left. I presume that we shall have to compensate those settlers, but even if we have not, we shall have vast expenses in connection with the North-West and the administration of affairs generally, and those are considerations which to my mind are sufficient to cause any prudent man to hesitate before adding anything to the expenses of Government. Why should we adopt this franchise with all its incidental inconveniences? Has there been any outcry against the existing system? It is simple, it is inexpensive, it is controlled by the people. If there are at times abuses, the people in whose hands the system is are themselves to blame; but here, if there is an abuse, who is to blame? At present the people who are to blame are the people to complain, and they cannot complain because, if there has been any abuse, it has been on their own part; the whole matter is a domestic one among themselves; and therefore the Acts of this Parliament are

accepted by the people loyally as the Acts of the chosen representatives of the people. But adopt this scheme, with all its incidental features, and then let there be a complaint that there have been abuses, and that will be of a very different character. The people will feel that the Dominion Government has taken upon itself an unnecessary responsibility, that it has clothed itself with a great deal of power, and, the more power the Government has in managing the machinery incidental to elections, the more duties and obligations are cast upon them and the more they are exposed to public censure, should there be any possible ground for it. Why should the Government put itself in a position to have its acts not appreciated, to be found fault with, to have even the Acts of Parliament itself not accepted with resignation by the people? For, if once it goes abroad that the persons nominally representing the people are not their true representatives, that moment you strike a great blow at Parliament itself, and whatever is calculated to weaken the confidence and respect of the people in the legislation of Parliament is an act to be greatly deplored. Surely the Government have enough to fill their time without taking this additional trouble on their hands. We know they are hard worked, that the cares of office weigh heavily upon them, and that the management of this country is by no means an easy one. Why should they hamper themselves with details of this kind? Why should they not rest their claims to confidence upon the merits of their measures rather than upon such artificial machinery as must be the outcome of a measure of this kind? My hon. friend from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) remarked that it was clearly contemplated by the Confederation Act that Parliament should pass this Bill in all its features at an early date. He cited from the Act to show that the qualifications for election and for voting in respect to the Dominion Parliament should be the same as in the Provincial Parliaments until the Dominion Parliament ordered otherwise, and upon that he argued that, because a power was left to this Parliament to provide a franchise for itself, this is the precise scheme contemplated by that Confederation Act. I cannot agree with him in that. I cannot conceive that the Confederation Act contemplated the adoption of a scheme which had no existence at the time, of which there was no parallel in existence, the like of which has never been presented to the eyes of mortal men before, and yet we are told that this is the scheme which was contemplated by the Confederation Act. If we were asked to say what kind of scheme the Confederation Act contemplated where would we look for guides? We should say: This is a scheme passed by the Imperial Parliament to apply to the Dominion of Canada, which is composed of a certain number of Provinces; this Confederation Act accepts the machinery of the Provinces until the Dominion Parliament shall adopt a scheme of its own. Does not that imply at once that, when the Dominion Parliament sets to work to formulate a scheme of its own, that scheme should substantially harmonise with the existing schemes? What scheme was there in existence either in England or in any of the Provinces like unto this before us? In all the Provinces at the time, the preparation of the rolls was in the hands of the people, and in England the management was not in the hands of the Government, therefore, my hon. friend from Montreal Centre cannot argue from the Confederation Act that that Act contemplated anything like the measure we have before us to-day. I submit that this motion of the Premier for the adoption of the third clause should not be carried for several reasons. I do not think that, in an important measure of this kind, mere majorities ought in good faith to govern. I admit that their votes are greater than the votes of a minority, and that as a matter of arithmetic they can govern, but, in a measure of this kind, I think it would be better for the

country if it were not carried simply by a majority of votes but were carried with the substantial concurrence of the people and the people's representatives. There is no consensus of opinion in this House in the measure. The Government supporters do not unanimously endorse it, and that is, to my mind, a cogent reason why its consideration should be deferred until all the features of the scheme can be analysed, and then, perhaps, its various inequalities and defects can be removed. If we may draw inference from what we see within the walls of this chamber, what do we find? To begin with, none of the Government know anything about the measure except the Premier himself, or, if they do, they keep it a dead secret. Of course, I always except the Secretary of State, who had such an accurate knowledge of one branch of it, a knowledge, however, which, unfortunately, is not sustained by the clauses of the Bill themselves. A majority of the members opposite seem to be quite unfamiliar with the provisions of the Bill —of course, I except from that proposition, and always shall in future, the intelligent and constitutional representative of King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), to whom I would suggest that in future he should give a power of attorney to the Government in his absence; it would, in fact, simplify the whole business very much if all who entertained that view could proceed in that way. I cannot sanction this clause because I am afraid it has not the hearty support of the leaders of the Government, and I feel that they require some moral support in their efforts to exercise their own independence of action. They are afraid to express their views on this measure, if they have any. They probably feel that their views have been represented by what has already been said in support of the measure; and said by whom? By the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson), the hon. member for Kent, N. B. (Mr. Landry), the hon. member for King's, N. B. (Mr. Foster), and the Secretary of State. They, and our silent friends from British Columbia, have dealt so fully and ably with this measure, they have made it so lucid, that there is nothing more to be said in favor of it. Perhaps, if they were allowed, they might express views a little more in harmony with the views expressed in these 319 speeches which have been made on this side of the House. But this section 3 has not yet been argued convincingly by any hon. members.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). It has been ably done this afternoon.

Mr. MILLS. Section 3 has taken the place of section B.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Let it "be," then.

Mr. MULOCK. None of hon. members opposite have ventured to advise us what our action should be in regard to section 3. Now, I am waiting for light on this question. I want to know why I should be asked to vote for that section. I can be convinced, I am amenable to reason. Perhaps the hon. members from Prince Edward Island could tell us why we should vote for the amendment to the amendment. It is true, the hon. member for Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. Hackett), did, to some extent, endeavor to lay his views before Parliament, and I certainly think he adopted a manly course in that respect. Whilst I could not agree with his argument, still, I could not but appreciate the fact that, he was prepared not merely to give a silent vote but to advance his reasons. The only arguments that have been advanced, so far as I am able to judge, have been advanced against the measure. We had the eloquent and powerful speech of my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and we had powerful speeches—in fact, I may say that the whole 319 were powerful speeches. It has been admitted that it took 319 speeches to get one point into the minds of hon. members opposite; and is it not a subject for congratulation that after 140 members of this House sat in darkness for a whole week under misapprehensions, at last they received light through the magnanimous efforts of the hon. gentlemen composing Her Majesty's Opposition? We have undertaken to instruct the Government. As a rule, assent to measures succeeds a knowledge of those measures, but here the course has been reversed, and the supporters of the Government gave their assent in advance of the measure, and afterwards became acquainted with its provisions by means of the Opposition. Certainly it is not our duty to become schoolmasters abroad for hon. gentlemen opposite, and I do complain that they should cast so much labor upon us and make it necessary for us to lead them through all the mazy intricacies of this measure in order to ascertain its true inwardness, and then that we should be obliged so frequently to become their instructors. I think we have reason to complain that, when we do endeavor to give them light, they do not show that appreciation of our generous motives that is due from the receiver to the donor. In what manner have they received our efforts? It is true they have appreciated them in various ways, but in ways that to some extent have interfered with the effect contemplated by the able arguments, for it is quite impossible for the mind to be receptive to argument if a loud noise prevents the argument reaching the ears of the members to whom it is addressed. So that I say we have some cause of complaint if, in our disinterested labors, we have to some extent been thwarted by the bad conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite. However, it is gratifying to know that now they are giving their best consideration to the views offered, and it is a wholesome sign that good will come out of this, and that by giving their minds to argument hon. gentlemen opposite will become as convinced on other points as they have been convinced with respect to preceding points. The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) says, great is my faith. I always have faith. You remember the saying—I am almost afraid to recall it to my mind, but without meaning anything offensive I will repeat it—that

"While the lamps hold out to burn
The vilest sinner may return."

I am not going to give up hope so long as I see a considerable audience opposite listening to arguments. I understand we are only at the threshold of this question; we are just having a little preliminary skirmishing. Most of us have done our spring ploughing, and it will not be haying time till somewhere about the end of June; and by a proper system of relays we shall be able to attend to our private affairs, and at the same time discharge those high duties which we owe to our country. We shall have an opportunity to cement those friendships we have formed here, to become better acquainted with each other, and when at last the painful parting comes and we are obliged to go down from this chamber and follow the rabble from the Commons to the Senate, and say good-bye to the emblems of royalty, it will be with a pang and with weeping we will say: The Session at last is over. But when that time arrives I venture to hope—although the hon. member for King's, N.B., declares it is dangerous to prophesy—that Her Majesty's assent will not be given to a Bill respecting the electoral franchise. I do not think that any Bill on this subject will receive the Royal Assent unless at a period of time long after the usual time when the Session comes to a close. I mean by this, gentlemen——

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order.

Mr. MULOCK. I mean by this, Mr. Chairman, that I expect hon. gentlemen opposite will defeat themselves.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I ask the hon. gentleman to discuss the clause before the committee.

Mr. MULOCK. Section 3 of this Bill involves the whole franchises of this Dominion, the franchise of every Province, the consideration of existing systems and general

consideration as to the probable effect of adopting the system proposed in the Bill. These are grave questions, and in my opinion the time has come when hon. gentlemen opposite should address themselves to section 3, and when they have thoroughly thrashed out that section, we shall then know what is the conclusion at which we should arrive. The sooner they address themselves to that the sooner we will get through with the measure. But before this measure receives the sanction of Parliament it would be wise to refer it to the people. Now that it has been opened and pretty well looked at, but not yet at all understood by the people, the proper course to adopt would be to leave it in the hands of the people for a certain length of time. To do otherwise is to declare a want of confidence in the people. Why should not the people be permitted to know what is contemplated in regard to their welfare in this respect? It appears to me to be eminently a measure upon which they should be consulted, and I oppose the adoption of section 3 on the ground that the people have not been consulted about it. They know nothing about it, and we ought not to deal with section 3 without first consulting the people from whom our power is derived. I think the Government are doing a very unwise thing in urging this Franchise Bill through the House. The Bill has been pretty thoroughly discussed up to section 3. Section 1 was not much discussed, because it was a section which simply christened the Bill. Section 2 received some consideration, not thorough consideration, but some consideration. Now we are discussing section 3, which is so far-reaching in its effects that it would be wise for the Government to take the opinion of the people on it, not at the polls, not by a plebiscite necessarily, but to allow us to go home and hear what our people say about it. It is a long distance from here to British Columbia, and I venture to say that not one copy of this Bill has reached that Province. Perhaps I may be wrong strictly speaking, but I doubt if the people of British Columbia have as yet any notion whatever as a people in regard to the provisions of this Bill,

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. They had three months ago.

Mr. MULOCK. The junior member for Victoria says that three months ago the people of British Columbia knew all about this Bill. That takes us back to February 8, 1885. When was the Bill introduced into this House? When was it printed and distributed? Three months ago would be no less than two months before the Bill was introduced. Nearly two months before it saw the light of day. While the people of British Columbia may be a pretty smart people, I very much doubt if they were able to see this Bill before it had any existence. They may be endowed with foresight, but I doubt if the facts will sustain the assertion of the junior member for Victoria, that they knew all about it.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. They had it twelve months ago —two years ago.

Mr. MULOCK. Did we ever hear from those hon. members from British Columbia what they thought of this Bill when it was introduced? Did they discover that it proposed to enfranchise the Chinese? It was discovered when the Bill was distributed and when the point was raised by the members of the Opposition, and then for the first time when the point was made known by them, the members for British Columbia rose to move an amendment. They knew a lot about the Bill. If they fully understood it a year ago—if it was the very same Bill, why is it that the disturbance and excitement in British Columbia to-day, did not happen a year ago, and cause it to come in in an amended form, as we have it now before the committee. If they expected it a year ago, or three months ago, I would like to know what about the Indian question? Why was it necessary by an amendment to except the Indians of British Columbia?

An hon. MEMBER. They are not included.

Mr. MULOCK. They were included.

Mr. MILLS. And they are yet.

Mr. MULOCK. They apply to the Premier, and he has declared that the Bill will be amended so that the Indians of British Columbia and some other Provinces shall not be affected by the Bill. The hon. members from British Columbia told us that the people of that Province understood by this original Bill that the Indians of British Columbia, as stated in the Bill, were to be enfranchised. Will any hon. gentleman who ventures to assert that the whole of this Bill was understood by the people of British Columbia, say that the people of British Columbia were in favor of enfranchising the Indians? If not, why did not they stand up on the floor of the House and present the views of the people of British Columbia on that question? But not a man of them had the courage to stand up in the House and protest against the franchise being given to the Indians of British Columbia. And if it was understood by their silence that they assented to the provisions of the Bill, and if it was understood that the Indians were not to be enfranchised, why did they not stand up on the floor of the House, on the second reading of the Bill, and call the attention of Parliament to its provisions and ask at the proper time to have those provisions amended so as to harmonise with the views of the people of British Columbia?

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). Probably they know their own business best.

Mr. MULOCK. I fancy they will know their own business best when they know how their interests have been attended to in this House.

An hon. MEMBER. You will not care if they are not attended to. You will be glad.

Mr. MULOCK. Now I ask any hon. gentleman to tell us what arguments there are in favor of our accepting section 3. Has there been one argument advanced in favor of the proposition contained in that section. My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who is an authority on this question, says no. I do not accept everything he or any other man says or endorses, but at the same time his views on a question of this kind have very great weight with me. I feel that he is giving me an unbiassed opinion, that he is a disinterested observer, that he is an impartial person, and when therefore he tells me that as the result of all the discussion which has taken place, there has not been one argument in favor of our adopting section 3, I feel that I must accept his decision, because not only has it the weight of the hon. member for North Norfolk, but it harmonises with the inferences I myself have drawn from listening to this discussion. For these reasons the burthen of proof falls on the—I was going to say the plaintiffs—I say the burthen of proof falls upon hon. gentlemen supporting this Bill. They have not sustained their case, and therefore I submit their case falls to the ground absolutely, for want of argument, and it is not necessary for us to show affirmatively that this section should be adopted. For all these reasons I intend to vote against the original motion. I am asked to say something in favor of Mr. Charlton's amendment. As I stated before I do not wish to speak at any length upon this provision, because there are several other provisions which will have to be discussed.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). Will the hon. gentleman allow me to offer a suggestion. It is quite evident to the House that the hon. gentleman is suffering from a long continued and powerful mental strain, and to

relieve him from that pressure I should like to propose, Sir, that you make the hour six o'clock.

An hon. MEMBER. Let him give us a little more information.

Mr. MULOCK. That is one of the attempts of hon. gentlemen opposite to shut off discussion. The hon. gentleman ought to understand that Parliament is the proper place for discussion, the place where we are entitled to speak, and I protest against their endeavoring to stifle the voice of the people, as represented by the members of the Opposition side. However, as I was about to remark, I do not wish to deal at any great length with this amendment to the amendment, because there are other points to be taken up with regard to section 3 which will require considerable time, and I know there are a great many hon. gentlemen in the House who are extremely anxious to express their views. In fact every man now should be anxious to say what he thinks about this measure, and I shall rest my case at present upon what I have addressed to the House.

Mr. WILSON. I feel that I would not be justified in giving a vote upon the amendment, and the amendment to the amendment, without having an opportunity of expressing my views about the important question which those amendments involve. I feel that this question is a question paramount to all other questions brought before the House, and the questions now before the country. Sir, if you have any doubt as to the great importance that this measure really involves, the amount of interest dependent on the results of this measure, all you have to do is to turn your eyes to the papers at present to see the amount of agitation which has been aroused from one end of the Dominion to the other. Not only that, but this question is one that we all are deeply interested in, because this Bill may perhaps deprive one-half of those who are members of this House to-day, of seats in Parliament when the next election takes place. It is therefore a vital question to hon. gentlemen now occupying seats in this House. A question of that paramount importance should engage the careful consideration of this House, and it should not be left to one side of the House to discuss the nature of the Bill and the important results likely to flow from it. True, we have heard a few speeches from supporters of the Government; but they have been very few, and I ask whether those who have addressed the House have offered any reasons to show that this measure should become law I ask you to read over and weigh carefully the observations which have been made on that side of the House, and I think you will agree with me that not a single argument has been offered, showing the necessity of the measure or the important results likely to follow its adoption by this House. I know that the First Minister is anxious that it should become law ; I would therefore have expected that he or some of his supporters would have given us some arguments in support of the proposition. The burden of proof really rests upon them ; and I believe the country will hold them responsible, and will say to them : It was not sufficient for you to introduce a measure of this description into Parliament without explaining why it should be introduced. It is a measure which involves the dearest right of the British subjects; and to deprive us of those rights will cause the greatest irritation and annoyance and dissatisfaction throughout the country. If that be the case, are we not justified in discussing this matter? Are we to be told time and again that we are discussing it merely for the purpose of wasting time ? Are we to be told that we are obstructionists on this side of the House ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WILSON. My hon. friends say hear, hear. They might say that if they could in any way satisfy their own consciences that they are acting uprightly in maintaining silence in reference to this question. Sir, they speak of obstruction. Are we to allow our dearest rights and privileges to be trampled under foot by the dominant party of the day, and, if we raise protests, to be told that we are trying to obstruct the business of the House ? Sir, the question is too important to be allowed to go without proper discussion. I do not entertain any such views as have been expressed by the hon. member for King's, N. B., (Mr. Foster), that all that members have to do is to come to Parliament and record their votes on one side or the other. I believe we all owe a responsibility to those from whom we receive our power. The duty they impose upon us is a grave and serious one, and while we are their representatives we should act as our best judgment dictates, and endeavor to do our duty faithfully for those to whom we shall have to give an account. Now, I say that we are justified in appealing to hon. members opposite to give us some reason why we should be called upon to support the measure now before the House. I feel that I should be recreant to the interests of those who elected me to the position I occupy, if I did not discuss this measure fully and calmly, and after having done so, come to whatever conclusion my judgment would enable me to arrive at in the interest of the public at large.

Committee rose, and it being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

LONDON LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

The House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 76) to amend the Act respecting the London Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Macmillan (Middlesex.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex) moved that the following be added as clause 4 :—

"In case of the transfer of any stock by any shareholders of the Company, the transferrer shall, notwithstanding such transfer, remain liable thereon for the period of fifteen months from the date of such transfer, to the same extent as he would have been had such transfer not been made;—Provided always that in case of the bankruptcy or insolvency of the Company within such period such liability shall continue, notwithstanding the expiration of such period of fifteen months, until all claims against him by reason of such stock and all liabilities thereunder which would have accrued and been payable or to which he would have been liable had such transfer not been made have been fully paid and satisfied; nothing herein however to be construed as in any way releasing the actual holder of such stock from any liability he may have incurred or be under by reason of the transfer of the stock to him."

Amendment agreed to; Committee rose and reported, and Bill read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 80) to incorporate the Fort McLeod Ranche Telegraph Company.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Bill (No. 138) for the relief of George Branford Cox.—(Mr. Beaty.) On a division.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

House again resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. WILSON. I do not pretend to say, nor do I think any on this side of the House do, that the Dominion Government has not the right and the power to legislate in this direction, but they have an equal right and power in many other respects that it would be injurious to the well-

being of Canada to exercise. They possess the power, for instance, of disallowing all the Acts of the Local Legislatures, but it would hardly be prudent or right for them to exercise that power on all occasions. Then, admitting their inherent right to pass this Act, the question arises: Is there any necessity for it? If there be no necessity, and if injury to the Dominion, rather than a benefit, arises from it, I repeat is the Government justified in bringing a measure of this kind forward, and placing it upon the Statute Book, and I think I shall be able to show that it will be a greater injury to the Dominion than a benefit. In that case, I am sure that every hon. member, if it can be shown to him, that the advantage accruing from the passage of this Act is not commensurate with the cost which will be entailed upon the country, will agree with me that we should hesitate about passing the Act at the present time. When the First Minister introduced this measure into the House, he said that one of the objects of passing it was that it might to a certain extent do away with any hard feelings or bickerings on account of the inequality of the representation of the different Provinces. Where two men live close to the line, one in each Province, the Quebec man finds that the franchise is lower in Ontario than it is in Quebec, and the Ontario elector will have a right to vote, whereas the Quebecer will be deprived of that right. Now, if the hon. gentleman is so solicitous to prevent heart burnings in such a case, I think he should remember the effects that this Bill will produce throughout the Dominion. Let him go to any constituency, and he will find a provincial franchise more liberal than the Dominion franchise. An elector has been permitted to record his vote under the provincial franchise, and when the next general election comes on, soon afterwards perhaps, he goes to the poll to record his vote, and he will be told by the returning officer: Very true, you were entitled to vote at the provincial election, very true your name was upon the voters' list, but you must remember this is for the Dominion House, you are not upon the roll, and therefore have no right to vote. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, what would be the feeling of an elector under those circumstances? And what would be his feelings towards the Government who had passed a Bill putting him into that situation? The hon. gentleman, if he wants to prevent discord, ought to adopt the franchise prevailing in each Province. I am sure that after the first general election that took place, if this Bill should become law, there would be so much dissatisfaction and clamor that the Government would be compelled to revert to the old system. Suppose an elector is put upon the voters' list for the provincial franchise and he supposes his name is also upon the list for the Dominion franchise; time goes on and he makes no enquiry until about the time that an election takes place, and then he finds that he is deprived of a vote; surely no one can deny that in such a case there would be a great deal of that dissatisfaction and heart-burning which the First Minister so seriously deplored. But his great desire was that we should have throughout the Dominion a uniform franchise. Now, if the amendment of the hon. member for King's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Macdonald), prevails, such will not be the case. I am not in a position to say whether that amendment will prevail or not, but I think it is proper and right that it should, because I am a firm believer in the provincial franchise being used for Dominion purposes. But if that amendment should prevail, where is the symmetry of this Franchise Bill that the Premier so graphically described? Shall we then have one uniform franchise for the whole Dominion? Will there then be no discord existing on the boundary line between the two Provinces? Are the same list and the same rating to prevail all over the Dominion? I think not. If that amendment prevails the only proper course to be pursued by the Dominion, is to accept the voters' lists that are prepared by the Provinces. Now, if that amendment prevails, I ask you, Mr. Chairman, if it be right, if it be in the interests of the Dominion of Canada, that Prince Edward Island should in future vote upon the same rating as she has in the past? What right, what justification, has the Government to treat Prince Edward Island in a different manner from the other Provinces? I say that all the Provinces should be placed in the same position under the same circumstances. Perhaps we will find that British Columbia will be exempt from the operation of this Bill; or perhaps the members for British Columbia will be willing to allow a different franchise to be imposed upon them than the one they are now enjoying, and which, I believe, is giving uniform satisfaction to that Province. They are exempt, to a certain extent, because the First Minister knows that he announced a few evenings ago that the Indians of British Columbia were to be prevented from voting, while he is allowing a similar class of Indians to vote in the older Provinces. Is there any uniformity in this? Is there any symmetry in such a Bill? I have no hesitation in saying that a more infamous Bill was never attempted to be imposed upon a free and intelligent people. Now, I doubt whether there is one member in this House who really understands why it is that we are face to face with this proposition, not from the opponents of the hon. gentleman opposite, but from those who have been found ready on every occasion to vote for all the measures he has brought down. Hon. gentlemen opposite have allowed us to discuss the amendment proposed by the hon. member for King's P.E.I., without expressing their approval or disapproval of it. With respect to the Bill itself it has not been shown that any injustice is inflicted on the various constituencies by reason of the Provincial franchises, and no reason has been adduced for bringing forward this Bill at the present time. There has been no agitation in the country; there have been no petitions presented. True this measure has been introduced periodically for a number of years, but it was merely introduced and allowed to remain on the Order Paper, and at the end of each Session it was withdrawn. It was only reasonable, therefore, that we should expect the Bill would be treated in the same manner this Session. The only justification given for its introduction at the present time is that a franchise Bill has recently been passed by the Premier of Ontario. Is that any justification for introducing this Bill? Does the First Minister say that the recent Ontario Bill places the franchise Bill too low or too high? He cannot make such statements and continue to pose as the friend of the workingman. It is true, in the Ontario Bill a man is only allowed to vote once, namely, in the place where he resides. That is a principle we ought to adopt here, that a man whether rich or poor should have only equal influence as regards voting at elections with other men. If you adopt any other view it is that it is not intelligence, not ability that is the qualification to vote, but that a man votes on account of property. What right would I have to vote in three ridings simply because I own property in each? By such means I exercise more power and control than do other men who perhaps own as much property but have it all confined to one riding. Would such a property qualification commend itself to the House? I think not. Outside of that matter there is no justification whatever for introducing the present Bill. We know that at the present time it is notorious that individuals will seek to obtain property in different ridings in order that they may be enabled to vote for more than one candidate at the general election. If that is held to be a correct principle, then I say we should have plurality of votes; a standard should be fixed and a man possessing property to whatever amount he pleased, should have a proportionate number of votes. Hon gentlemen opposite dare not submit such a proposition to workingmen. This measure is most unsatisfactory, and I trust the people at the next general election will seek to remedy the

grievance inflicted and remove from office those who have endeavored to place them in a false position.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. WILSON. No doubt hon. gentlemen opposite are very anxious that this Bill should be carried, but unfortunately I would not be so particularly benefited as would some hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, Sir, it is very evident that this Bill will have a very serious effect on the general public. I feel, Sir, that this measure is a very important one, and I ask if at the present time it is right, proper or expedient that we should have two sets of voters' lists prepared in every town and city of this Dominion. At present we have a very heavy burthen upon us, and if we pass the Bill, that burthen will be increased. We are being asked to increase our burthens on account of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and not only so but we are borrowing from private sources so as to meet our obligations as they fall due. That being the case, and our financial position not being the best we could desire, is it wise on our part to pass a measure whereby the burthens of the people will be increased? What will be the effect when it comes to be known from one end of the Dominion to the other, that, without any justification or valid reason being offered by the Government, they should deliberately ask us to pass a Bill which will impose serious burthens upon the people. Some hon. gentlemen say that one justification for passing this Bill is that the present assessors do not do their work correctly. I say that the aspersion on the various assessors in the Province of Ontario—of which I know most—is not well founded; it is not correct to say that these assessors are partisan. I know a number, and no doubt every hon. member here knows a number of cases in which the municipality may be for the time being under the control of a majority of one particular side, and they frequently appoint an assessor of the opposite side of politics, and yet those assessors do their work efficiently and they take great pains to see that the roll is as complete as it possibly can be. Then those rolls are revised before the court of revision, appointed by the municipal council, where every man has a chance to have his assessment revised and to have his name put on the roll, if he is entitled to have it put on. If any man has any grievance it will be redressed before that court. If, however, the applicant is not satisfied, he can go before the county judge and make application to have his name put on, and under sworn evidence as to the value of the property upon which he asks to be enfranchised he is either placed on the roll or struck off. What better course could there be for purifying the voters' lists and making them correct? These hon. gentlemen say they have a great deal of trouble with these partisan assessors. What does that mean? It means, Sir, that under this Bill they are to be relieved from any trouble or responsibility in looking after the voters' lists. But is that fair or manly? It is striking below the belt, because we on this side will be placed in the position of watching those revising officers, so as to see that no man is to be placed, there who is not entitled to be put on the roll. Is that the kind of argument which supporters of the Government offer as a reason why this Bill should become law—a Bill which will impose heavy burthens—perhaps half a million of dollars, on the Dominion of Canada at the present time. Sir, I think you will say with me that this is not the kind of proposition to bring down, if hon. gentlemen have no better argument to support it than that. Then I say there are other reasons why, at the present time, we should not have this Bill passed. It is unnecessary for me to point out all those reasons, because there has been no argument offered by hon. gentlemen opposite why this Franchise Bill should pass, as it will entail inconvenience, expense annoyance and vexation; and, therefore, it should not at the present time become law, unless it is shorn of many of the objectionable features it now possesses. Sir, if it was in order, I would like to refer to the revising officers, but I am well aware that unless it is for the purpose of examining the voters' list, and saying who shall or shall not be placed on the roll, I might be said not to be in order. It strikes me we should consider whether any man should be disfranchised, and the probability is that if the revising barrister was a partisan some men would be kept off the roll, in towns and cities, that otherwise ought to be placed on the roll. Therefore it is a matter for serious consideration whether the Government of the day ought to be placed in a position to say who, in cities and towns, should or should not be placed upon the assessment roll. We can well understand that voters' lists in towns and cities ought to be carefully made up and carefully revised. We know that this Act will disfranchise many who are now enfranchised by the provincial Act. Therefore, I say every means ought to be adopted to prevent any partisan returning officer from being placed in a position to say who should or should not be placed upon the roll. We know that some of the municipalities now complain of the amount which it costs to look after and revise the voters' lists, and if we add another burden, indirectly, it is true, but nevertheless a burden, to these people, will they not have still greater cause for complaint and irritation. If we adopt the provincial franchises we should prevent the irritation that will arise if this Bill is carried. Estimates have been made of what the preparation of the voters' lists under this law will cost. We know that it will cost a very large amount of money, and we know that the country is not prepared at the present time to bear that large increase of expenditure. Now, Sir, will any one say to me that the franchises used in many of the Provinces is not lower than that proposed by this Government? An hon. member from Prince Edward Island stated that the Bill was lowering the franchise in the Province of Ontario. I think my hon. friend had not examined carefully the provisions of the Ontario Bill, or he would not have made that statement. Take the two Bills and place them side by side in comparison, and you will find that the franchise provided by the Ontario Bill is much lower than that provided by this Bill, and that the Ontario Bill enables many to be placed upon the voters' lists in towns and cities who will not be placed upon them under this Bill. I admit that the Dominion Franchise Bill will enable some to be placed on the voters' lists who are not now on the lists in Ontario, as, for instance, men who are living upon Government lands, Indians, and civil servants, individuals who look to the Government for their daily bread, and who are not in a position to cast an independent vote. These are the only individuals, I believe, who will be placed on the roll by this Bill who are not placed upon it by the Ontario Act. Is it right or proper that we should give the Government power to place on the roll individuals whose votes they can control, and thereby to prevent an honest expression of the will of the people of this Dominion? Therefore, I am strongly in favor of adopting the provincial franchises for the Dominion, as I believe no injustice, no wrong, no hardship will be inflicted upon anybody thereby. But there is another question. By the amendment moved by the hon. member for King's, P. E. I. (Mr. Macdonald), we are brought face to face with the question of manhood suffrage. I am one of those who have not, heretofore, had a very strong feeling in favor of manhood suffrage, although I had taken every opportunity of informing myself as to its working in the United States. But in view of the extraordinary and unjustifiable powers which are now being asked by the Government, it would be better for the country, in my opinion, that we should at once adopt the manhood suffrage principle and grant a vote to every man of ordinary intelligence. I am aware that much can be said for and

against that principle; I know that it is a Democratic principle; I am aware that many people look upon it as almost revolutionary. I can understand that our friends in Quebec may regard it with hostility; but in the only Province in Canada where that measure had a trial—in the Province of Prince Edward Island, where it has existed for perhaps thirty years—do we find any complaints against it? On the contrary, we find both Conservatives and Reformers there advocating the principle of manhood suffrage. That evidence furnishes a very strong argument indeed that we should adopt, if we are to change the suffrage, manhood suffrage. We have had that subject of universal suffrage frequently discussed. It has been discussed long ago; it has stood in the United States the test of time, and when we find that it is working well in Canada, what risk is there in our resorting to this system? True, it may be said that if we adopt manhood suffrage we will be liable, more or less, to have our elections influenced by a class of electors who really have no important interest at stake in the country, and who would be more or less amenable to undue influences in casting their votes; but are we entirely free from that under the present franchise? Have we not the existing evidence that a large number of elections are voided on account of the influences of bribery and corruption, and would those influences be very likely greater if we had manhood suffrage? Again, we know full well that every individual who contributes directly or indirectly to the maintenance of the State is really entitled to have a vote. Are not those people, on all occasions, compelled, if it be necessary, to defend the country and protect the laws and submit to the laws? And I ask hon. gentlemen if it is right or just that a man who is compelled to contribute to the revenues of the State and submit to its laws, and, in case of war, to protect the State, should be deprived, if we have any regard for manhood, of the right to say what law should or what law should not govern the State? You will allow me to read a few extracts bearing directly upon this important question. I believe the time is not far distant when all the barriers existing between the intelligence necessary to vote and the possession of a vote will be swept away, and every individual, be he man or woman, will have an equal opportunity of expressing his will as to how he should be governed. John Stuart Mill, one of the deepest thinkers and cleverest writers of the age, thus speaks of this exclusion:

"Two-fold requisites are not fulfilled by the expediency of the limitation of the suffrage, involving the compulsory expulsion of any portion of the citizens from a voice in the representation."

He says, further, speaking of those who are not enfranchised:

"Political discussion flies over the heads of those who have no vote and are not endeavoring to acquire one. Their position, in comparison with the electors, is that of an audience in a court of justice compared with the twelve men in the jury box."

John Stuart Mill then proceeds to show the evil of debarring the intelligent young men of the country from the right to exercise the franchise, thus taking from them any incentive to educate themselves up to the necessary qualifications, so that they may be in a position, when enfranchised, of recording their votes intelligently. [The hon. gentleman proceeded to quote further from John Stuart Mill]. Mr. Mill uses a very strong argument in favor of doing away with the barriers which are now placed before many intelligent individuals, so that they may become more intelligent and better citizens. Do you pretend to tell me that a man living in a house worth $300, in a town or city, is a better citizen, pays more to the State, would feel a greater desire that the law should be properly administered, would be a better soldier if war should take place, as unfortunately it has in this country, than an individual who is not possessed of that property? In many cases the man without a dollar of property would be the better citizen of the two. It is a proper time, when the Government is determined to sit here day in and day out, at seasonable and unseasonable hours, forcing us to remain at our posts and discuss these matters, for them to consider the whole matter, and if they do not feel in a condition to give that consideration to it now which it deserves, to allow the Bill to remain in abeyance, in order that they may see if they could not take the generous course of granting a vote to everyone who is entitled to be placed upon the roll.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. WILSON. Some hon. gentlemen seem very anxious that it should be carried. I suppose they mean manhood suffrage. I am very glad to hear the response from my hon. friends on the other side, and I hope that they will impress the universal suffrage principle upon the Government, and will record their votes with me in favor of it. John Stuart Mill says. It is better to give the franchise indiscriminately or to withhold it indiscriminately than that the giving or withholding should be left to a public officer. Is not this a strong argument against the course that the Government are pursuing, leaving it at the discretion of a public officer appointed by the Government to do the Government's bidding. We know that all Governments are desirous to keep themselves in the position they occupy as long as possible. We know what they have done in the past; can we expect any better of them in the future? They did their best to deprive hon. members on this side of the House in the past. Will they not attempt to scalp them in the future? It is dangerous to leave it to a public officer whether a man should be placed upon the roll or not. It is a vicious principle, it is an audacious attempt to wrest from the people the rights they have enjoyed for a number of years.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman must keep to the question.

Mr. WILSON. I will attempt to keep close to the question. I am well aware that there are sufficient facts in relation to the voters' lists in towns and cities for any man to occupy the time at his disposal in discussing. I know, that if we consider the Bill in that respect it will occupy a much longer time than my feeble abilities will allow me to occupy. It is an important question, and I am not surprised that you, Mr. Chairman, should ask me to keep to the question, as you feel a burning desire that it should be fully and thoroughly and efficiently discussed. Now, what does John Stuart Mill say? I do not think any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House can object to John Stuart Mill. They may object to the statements of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who bears the same name, but I do not think they will object to the statements of the English philosopher. This is what he says:

"However this may be, I regard it as required by first principles that the receipt of parish relief should be a peremptory disqualification for the franchise."

I wish the Government to pay particular attention to this statement. Now, do the Government intend to disqualify any of those to whom they are giving relief? It is true, hon. gentlemen opposite say, when we object to giving the Indian the franchise: Lo, the poor Indian, formerly was the possessor of all these broad acres, and in the march of progress we have deprived him of them. A nice expression on which to base a sentiment. I am just as sincerely a friend to Lo, the poor Indian, and I am prepared on this, as on every other occasion, to do ample justice to the Indian, if he be placed in similar circumstances to the white man. If he be removed from the disabilities under which he now rests, then, I say, by all means enfranchise him; but while he is receiving aid at the hands of the Government I say, in accordance with the statement of John Stuart Mill, it is a gross outrage that he should be enfranchised. I might

give hon. gentlemen opposite more quotations from John Stuart Mill, but they are wedded to their idols, and I might just as well leave them alone. They appear to think it is an absolute necessity that this Bill should pass, but why, I cannot comprehend. Why they should have such a burning desire to hasten this Bill through Parliament is unaccountable to me. There may be some reasons not yet developed. Perhaps hon. members opposite carefully kept their mouths shut for fear that in discussing this Bill its true inwardness would be made more fully to appear, and that the people would be roused to a still higher pitch of indignation than at present. I am convinced they ought not to place upon the voters' lists in towns and cities any individual who is receiving a gratuity from the Government. This is an important question. It is a question that is agitating thousands and thousands of people to-day. It is a question that I think has given you a great deal of anxiety, and perhaps your anxiety will be doubled when you go back to your constituents and they ask you why you allowed so many men to be disfranchised. I say we ought on all occasions, when an important matter affects the electorate, affects our masters, those who sent us here—we ought to consult them directly in reference to it. Is it not due to them? I say it is. Hon. gentlemen opposite say: Oh, we carried Confederation without submitting it to the people. Sir, as a Reformer, I do not hesitate to say that that ought not to have been done, but there was more excuse for doing it than there is to-day for passing this Bill, because at that time difficulties existed in the two Provinces which rendered it almost impossible to carry on the Government. I am opposed to any Parliament depriving the people of an opportunity of expressing their opinion on any measure, and of accepting or rejecting it. I cannot endorse the doctrine of the hon. member for King's. It is a dangerous principle, a revolutionary principle, that we should not apply to our people, and the country will hold us responsible for any action in that direction. The country will not approve of this measure being passed without the people being given an opportunity of expressing their opinions upon it; any other principle is wrong and contrary to the idea of Reformers or any other representatives of a free and enlightened people. I am prepared to vote for the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and also for the amendment to the amendment moved by the hon. member for King's P. E. I.

Mr. WELDON. When this Bill was before the House for the second reading, I had not an opportunity of expressing my views on its principles. This Bill makes very startling changes, and the mode adopted is a very strange one; but there is nothing more strange than the silence evinced by hon. gentlemen opposite. Although this is a revolutionary measure, the First Minister has not endeavored to show reasons why the change is necessary. I can recollect when other great measures were before Parliament no such silence prevailed. When, in 1878, the National Policy was brought forward, there were plenty of hon. members opposite ready to rise and defend it. When the Canadian Pacific Railway proposition was before the House we had abundant argument from hon. gentlemen opposite. But on this occasion, when a great change is being made in regard to the franchise, hon.gentlemen opposite are perfectly silent, although the Bill deals with the franchise, with the character of the people who exercise it, and with the mode of preparing voters' lists, and, in fact, makes radical and sweeping changes. When the Gerrymander Bill was introduced similar tactics were adopted. That Bill was hurried through in the same manner and with a similar object. Each day shows the importance of having this Franchise Bill fully and freely discussed. The press are now beginning to discuss it. We are constantly receiving communications with regard to it and letters asking for copies of the Bill. I call attention to the contrast afforded between the manner in which such a measure is brought forward here and such a measure is treated in the mother country to which hon. gentlemen opposite are so fond of appealing in regard to practice and other matters. In 1867, when Mr. Disraeli was leader of the Government, an announcement was made in the Speech from the Throne that a measure which would disturb the Reform Bill of 1832 would be submitted. That announcement was made on 5th February. Six days afterwards the hon. gentleman moved the consideration of the paragraph and that it be referred to a committee. Then, in a long, elaborate and able speech, the Prime Minister of that day gave a full account of the measure and its details. He went fully into the objects proposed to be attained, into the reasons for the various changes proposed, and then the matter was ably discussed. It was shown that the manner in which the subject was brought forward was irregular, and the order was discharged on 25th February. On 18th March, the right hon. gentleman introduced the Bill. Not content with his speech of 11th February, the Premier went into a full discussion with respect to the principles of the measure, the changes proposed, the scope of the Bill and the details, in a manner such as to enable, not only members of the House, but the public generally, to understand the measure and fully consider it. We find that instead of that measure being hurried through in the moribund hours of the Session, it was discussed between four and five months. With respect to the Bill now before the House, the hon. member for King's, N.S., the other night, seemed to think I had forgotten the 41st section of the British North America Act, with respect to the powers of this Parliament. I did not dispute the right of the Dominion Parliament to exercise the power of creating a Dominion franchise. What I do say is, that this right of the franchise is a private and civil right. It is a right which was secured to our forefathers, which crossed the Atlantic with them, a right which, in this country, has been most cherished and particularly guarded. I say that if the 41st section had been eliminated the other section would have given the Local Legislatures exclusive legislation upon this matter. The British North America Act was to carry out the union of several independent Provinces forming a federal union, not a legislative union. By that Act, certain matters were handed over to the Dominion, such, for instance, as navigation, banking, general regulation of trade and commerce, and matters affecting the whole Dominion; and when we come to the internal economy of the different Provinces, matters of a local and private character, relating to civil rights, were exclusively assigned to the Local Legislatures. Apparently, the general scope and intent of the Confederation Act was, that while matters of general concern should be dealt with alone by this Parliament, those matters which are connected with the internal arrangment and autonomy of the different Provinces should be left to the Provinces alone. Now, there is no matter more important, to my mind, in the way of internal or domestic arrangement, than that dealing with the right to vote, and I say it should be dealt with by the Local Legislatures alone. While the general scope of the British North America Act was as I have described, there were, very properly, certain checks and limitations imposed, in order that the Confederation might be worked out in unison and harmony, and those checks were given to this Dominion Government and Parliament. To the Dominion Government was given the right of veto whenever they thought it was necessary to prevent the Local Legislatures from trenching on the functions of the Federal Parliament, and thereby the Dominion Government were enabled to protect the interests of the Dominion against interference by the Provincial Legislatures in matters which were beyond their

powers. So with regard to the franchise. In order to prevent either party within a Province, or the Provincial Legislature, from interfering with the elections of the members to the Dominion Parliament, it was provided by section 41 of the Act of Union that, until Parliament should decide the matter, the laws relating to the franchise to this House should be the laws of the different Provinces at the time. That was done for the purpose, I believe, of enabling this Dominion to control and carry out the general scope of the Confederation Act, just in the same way as the veto power was imposed for a similar purpose. By the law of 1873 this Parliament decided that those franchises should remain the same, and by the law of 1874 this Parliament affirmed the principle of giving the right to deal with the franchise to the Local Legislatures. Now, we are called upon to reverse that legislation, and to deal with the matter as one not connected with the Provinces, but entirely as a matter for Dominion legislation. Now, I consider that as we have acted upon this principle for eighteen years, a change of this kind is one which should not be lightly made. There may be reasons fair and cogent why the change should be made, but hon. gentlemen opposite have as yet shown that no injury or injustice has been done by the present mode in which members are elected to this Chamber, and they have given no reason for so important a change. I take it, Sir, that when a Government propose such a change in our political and commercial position they are bound to bring forward their reasons for such a change, and more particularly when that Government professes to be conservative, professes to leave matters as they are until, absolute necessity requires a change, and oppose reform, on the ground that it is not necessary. I would ask what grounds have been given why such a change should be made?

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). Order, order.

Mr. WELDON. I do not know who the hon. gentleman is, who is sitting in the dark and calling out order. If he has a point of order, he has a right to state it, but I have a right to speak on the principles of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for North Norfolk, and the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Prince Edward Island. What reasons have been put forward, what grounds of public weal, that the change should be made? Or is it that party exigencies require it? Is this Parliament to surrender to party exigencies and party purposes without fairly and fully discussing the question? In justice to the interests of the country at large, I should be sorry if that principle is to prevail, and if so, it shows still more strongly that the reasons we pressed forward why this matter should be discussed are still more potent. When I proposed that this matter should stand over, and referred to the present condition of affairs, to the excitement existing, owing to difficulties in our own North-West, and the difficulties existing between Russia and England, the hon. member for King's, in reply, asked what that had to do with the franchise. I made that reference on the principle that the public mind was excited about these events, and was not in a position calmly to discuss a question sprung upon us, as this one was, at that particular moment. Events have verified what I then said. Matters have calmed down, and to some extent the clouds have dispersed in the mother country, and we find to-day that the matter is being discussed in the press, that public opinion is being brought to bear upon it, and under these circumstances, instead of making this radical change now, we should allow the matter to stand over, and not merely allow the matter to be discussed in this Chamber by one side, but let members on the other side give to us and to the country at large the reasons why they sustain this measure. Let these reasons be discussed by the press, and then at an early period of another Session, when the matter has been fairly and calmly discussed in the light of public opinion, I believe the result will be that we would have a Bill which would be satisfactory, not merely to a party, but to the public at large. In every Province, more or less, as education has increased, the franchise has been enlarged. It is contended by some who have spoken that this Bill has a tendency in the same direction, and that it largely extends the franchise. It has already been pointed out, and the very amendment we are now considering implies, that so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, it restricts the franchise instead of extending it. The hon. members from that Province, more particularly the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Hackett), pleaded in strong terms to have that privilege retained for the people of Prince Edward Island. He said it was a privilege dear to them. We can easily understand that, because when once a man obtains that privilege, which we regard as our pride and boast, he is very reluctant to part with it; and the hon. member was quite right in opposing any legislation that would take away that privilege from the people he represents. We know that in British Columbia, also, the Bill will restrict the franchise; and in New Brunswick it is going to interfere with it greatly. In that Province our suffrage is based on taxation, and under that principle both real and personal property is represented. This Bill, on the other hand, is based wholly on real property. That is undoubtedly the old principle, which formerly prevailed in the various Provinces of British North America and throughout the British Dominions generally. It was considered right to base the franchise on real property, because it was a fixture; perhaps the principle was an outgrowth of the feudal system. At that time real property constituted the bulk of the wealth of the country, and personal property was of little account. But as time has passed, and the industry and commerce of the country have developed, the positions have become reversed, and to-day the great wealth of this country, as well as of the mother country and of the United States, consists not merely in lands and territories, but in the enormous personal wealth produced by commercial enterprise. Therefore, to carry out properly the principle of property qualification, personal property ought to be represented as well as real property. In New Brunswick we adopted that principle many years ago; so that this Bill, in limiting representation to real property, will greatly restrict the franchise in that Province. What is our franchise in New Brunswick at present? Every male person who is a British subject, twenty-one years of age, and who has been taxed on real estate of the value of $100, on personal property, or real and personal property together, of the value of $400, or on income to the extent of $400, is entitled to a vote. That franchise is based on the principle that those who contribute to the revenues of the country should have a voice in the representation. As the hon. member for Queen's, N.B., pointed out, our Province is peculiarly situated in that respect. We possess a very large quantity of personal property of great value. The city I represent is perhaps one of the greatest shipowning districts in the Dominion. Those vessels vary in size from 2,000 tons down to 50 or 60 tons. Between 700 and 800 of those vessels are vessels under 100 tons. If you went to the register you would probably find that those smaller vessels represent 2,000 or 3,000 owners—men who have put all their earnings in them and run them for themselves. In winter they work as farmers, in the woods, or at other avocations, and as soon as the season opens they navigate these small vessels along the coasts and bays. They probably possess property in them to the extent of $500 or $600. We have also many large vessels which sail to foreign ports, and which do not, perhaps, return to that port for years; but if you examine the registry of one of these vessels you will find that perhaps twenty or thirty

people have an interest in it. Those people, in the electoral districts of the city and county of St. John, are taxed upon that property to-day, and have the right to go to the polls and vote. This Bill would destroy that right; and when the principle is put forward, as contrasted with manhood suffrage, that property should be the basis of the franchise, I contend that that should apply to personal as well as to real property. In all the counties along the Bay of Fundy, and through New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, the same state of affairs exists, which this Bill will have the effect of destroying. Then, as regards the two cities in the electoral district which I have the honor to represent, a very serious change will be made. In those cities there is a peculiar franchise, which has never been interfered with, except to be restricted to a certain extent on the basis of representation upon which New Brunswick has given the franchise to her people. The city of St. John is a city incorporated by royal charter, a charter granted in 1784 and confirmed by Act of Parliament. Among other franchises granted to the city is the one entitling a man who became free of the city to vote in its representation. The free men of that city were the persons who could exercise the right of franchise in addition to the freeholders, and they exercised it without restraint until the principle of taxation was adopted by the New Brunswick Legislature, with regard to all the other Provinces. Then it was provided that the rights of freemen should be curtailed to this extent, that they must be assessed to the extent of $10 each. By the measure now before us, that right will be entirely taken away. While the free men of the city of St. John can only vote for the person who is to represent that city, they are not entitled to vote for those who are to represent the city and county of St. John, so that the two sets of electors, although within the same bounds, are entirely different. That would be entirely done away with under this Bill. There is another, and a much more serious right, which this Bill will cut out. It is a right which arises under the peculiar position of the city of St. John, and also of the city of Portland, both being within the same electoral district. As I pointed out the other night, many owners of real property, recognised as real property, and therefore within the principle upon which the hon. leader of the House bases his franchise, will be entirely disfranchised under this Bill. The city of St. John was founded by Loyalists from New England and New York, who at the conclusion of the struggle between the colonies and Great Britain, had to leave their homes and endeavor to found new homes among the woods and rocks of New Brunswick. A city and town lot was laid out, called the town of Parr, laid and surveyed in rectangular lots; a number of the lots were granted, but a large number remained ungranted. Almost all the water lots remained ungranted. When the city was incorperated by royal charter, in addition to other franchises granted, it was also granted the property and the fee in all the ungranted lots lying within the bounds of the city of Parr, which then became the city of St. John. Those lots have never been parted with by the corporation, but have been leased at sums varying from shillings to, in some cases, £300 a year. Many of these leases were granted in the earlier part of the century, at very low rates, rarely exceeding £5 a year, and they vary in length, some being perpetual, others being for 999 years, and some for periods ranging down to twenty-one years. But the parties remained in possession, and valuable improvements were put upon the lots. Along the north and south wharves, where a large portion of the business of the city is done, you will find immense warehouses there, and other buildings erected upon property for which the holders are tenants at the rate of £2 or £3 a year. Under this Bill these men will be disfranchised, although they may own lots worth $20,000 or $30,000. They do not even come under the term "occupant," because the word "occupant" is so defined that it cannot, by any possibility, include a tenant; and as these parties are tenants of the city of St. John, and as the rent they pay is not sufficiently high, they will be disfranchised. The other portion of the city of St. John and the city of Portland stand also in a very peculiar position. Prior to the founding of the city of St. John, a grant of the land on which the city of Portland and the residue of the city of St. John stands was made to three persons. That was at a time when the whole Province of New Brunswick formed one county, the county of Sunbury, in the Province of Nova Scotia. The descendants of those three individuals, to a large extent, own that property to-day. It has never been sold, and the descendants of those gentlemen derive a large rental from those properties. In the city of Portland a large number of the people are holding on leases precisely the same as those which I described in St. John—small rentals, small lots, let years ago, before the value of the property increased, because it has increased by the buildings which have been erected. The northern portion of the city of St. John is in the same predicament. There are parties there who have rent rolls of from $15,000 to $20,000 a year from that property, derived from small rentals, in many cases less than $20 a year, because they are often only the rental of the ground. All these properties are improved, and the covenants of the leases are, that they shall be renewed at the same rents, or that the party shall pay for the improvements, so that practically, in most cases the lessees are the owners of the ground. These will be disfranchised; they cannot come in under the term "occupant," because that excludes a tenant altogether. I am sorry the Minister of Finance is not in his place, because he is a representative of the city of St. John and I am satisfied he would corroborate what I have said. I think that is a strong reason to show that persons who have local knowledge within the Province are the persons to deal with the different tenures and the different manners of holding; that the members in this House from Quebec, Ontario, and Nova Scotia or the other Provinces cannot deal with those matters as well as the Local Legislature itself. Almost the same remark will apply to the other Provinces. It was pointed out by one of my hon. friends that there were counties in the Province of Ontario where people would be disenfranchised, because they have not got their patents, or did not hold their properties in free and common socage. All these are matters of property and civil rights, over which the general intent of the Federation Act was to give exclusive jurisdiction to the Local Legislatures, subject to the provision by which this Dominion could check and counteract any any attempt to interfere with the proper working of the principle of federation upon which these Provinces were united. All these parties to whom I have referred, these merchants who hold these buildings in St. John and Portland, these householders who pay rent and taxes, and who, under our system, are allowed to vote, are disfranchised, and yet the Indians of that Province are to be allowed to vote. There is another point to which it is right to call the attention of the committee, and that is the peculiar position of the Province of Manitoba, and the question how far this Parliament can deal with the rights of electors in that Province. In 1870 the Act was passed to provide for the Province of Manitoba and for the qualification of electors. The 17th section makes provision for those who shall be entitled to vote for a member to serve in the Legislative Assembly for any electoral division, and the 5th section followed the wording of the 41st section of the British North America Act:

"Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides"—

Mr. RYKERT. Hear, hear.

Mr. WELDON. Wait till I get through.

"Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, the qualification of voters at elections of members of the House of Commons shall be the same as for the Legislative Assembly hereinafter mentioned, and no person shall be qualified to be elected or to sit and vote as a member for any electoral district unless he is a duly qualified voter within the said Province."

Mr. RYKERT. Hear, hear.

Mr. WELDON. If that had remained without alteration, probably my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) might cry "hear, hear;" but if he will wait till I get through, he will see that there was other legislation, which I hope he will digest.

Mr. RYKERT. So far so good.

Mr. WELDON. That provided, and I do not want to conceal it, in the terms of the 41st section of the British North America Act. In 1871 an Imperial Act was passed, and I think my hon. friend from Lincoln will admit that an Imperial Act will override an Act of the Parliament of Canada. That was an Act respecting the establishment of Provinces in the Dominion of Canada. It is not necessary to read the whole Act, because I only want to point out particular portions of it.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). Read it all.

Mr. WELDON. Perhaps my hon. friend from Montmagny would not understand it if I did, and I could not stay to explain it to him.

Mr. LANDRY. In French.

Mr. WELDON. The 3rd section provides that:

"The Parliament of Canada may, from time to time, with the consent of the Legislature of any Province of the said Dominion, increase, diminish, or otherwise alter the limits of such Province, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said Legislature, and may, with the like consent, make provision respecting the effect and operation of any such increase or diminution or alteration of territory in relation to any Province affected thereby."

Certain powers were given to the Parliament of Canada, and they have been acted upon in regard to that very Province of Manitoba in the increase of its territory. The 5th section introduced the Act of 1870:

"The following Acts passed by the said Parliament of Canada * * An Act to amend and continue the Act 32 and 33 Victoria, chap. 3, and to establish and provide for the Government of the Province of Manitoba, shall be and be deemed to have been valid and effectual for all purposes whatsoever from the date at which they respectively received the assent, in the Queen's name, of the Governor General of the said Dominion of Canada."

The 6th section was as follows:—

"Except as provided by the 3rd section of this Act, it shall not be competent for the Parliament of Canada to alter the provisions of the last mentioned Act of the said Parliament, in so far as it relates to the Province of Manitoba, or of any other Act hereafter establishing new Provinces in the said Dominion."

My hon. friend from Lincoln is an able lawyer, and he knows that the Imperial Act must override the provincial Act, and that, where two provisions are inconsistent, the last prevails. There was a provision that the Act of 1870, which became an Imperial Act by virtue of the 5th section of this Act, should not be altered, except by the power conferred in the 3rd section. We find a very curious proviso put in, and I think no person will undertake to say that it was ever intended that the franchise of the electors of Manitoba for the Legislative Assembly should be interfered with, because that right was not conferred upon the Parliament of Canada, but was left to the Province of Manitoba. This is what it says:

"But subject, always, to the rights of the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba to alter, from time to time, the provisions of any law respecting the qualification of electors for members of the Legislature, and to make laws respecting elections in the said Province."

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is an Imperial Act, and I think the principle will not be disputed that an Imperial Act overrides a Canadian Act. It seems to me it is a fair question of construction whether, under these circumstances, that statute of the Imperial Parliament allows this Parliament to interfere with the qualification of electors in the Province of Manitoba. It may not have been intended. No doubt, at the time that the Act with regard to Manitoba was passed, it provided, as I pointed out, that the same clause should prevail with regard to the British North America Act, so as to make that Province come under the same provisions. But the question is as to the effect of the sub-section with regard to the interference of this Parliament or our power to deal with the Act relating to Manitoba. It seems to me that reason, principle and expediency say that the provincial franchise is the best one to be adopted, that it is more in harmony with the principle of federation, that it is more advantageous, that it gives to the Provinces the right to regulate the franchise to the Local Legislatures, who best understand it, and who understand the position of the people of the country, who understand whether they are entitled to manhood suffrage, such as they have in Prince Edward Island and British Columbia, or such a suffrage as we have in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. In New Brunswick we give the franchise to persons who are taxed, not merely upon real property, but upon personal property. Now, the members from Prince Edward Island say they want manhood suffrage, and that principle would destroy one of the chief features put forward in this Bill—that of uniformity. We do not know whether that proposition is going to be accepted or not, but we find it urged with force by the member from Prince County (Mr. Macdonald) and his colleague, and my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. Davies). But if we are to adopt the principle of manhood suffrage let us adopt it in its entirety. If we give it to one Province let us give it to the whole of them. I appeal to the hon. members from Kent (Mr. Landry) and Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), whose counties border upon the gulf that separates New Brunswick from Prince Edward Island, whether they feel that the men on those shores are entitled to the suffrage while the men of New Brunswick should be denied. If we are to have a uniform franchise throughout the Dominion we must come down to universal suffrage. That will apply as well to cities and towns as to counties, and as well to one Province as to another. But when you come to the principle of revising barristers, the only safeguard that can be adopted to secure the franchise to all who are entitled to it, and to prevent these revising officers from tampering with the franchise—the only possible way to secure every man in his right, is to adopt the principle put forward by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). But if we are to have different Dominion franchises, then let us leave the whole matter to the Provinces. Surely, Mr. Chairman, we have a right to ask, on behalf of the people we represent, why this change is proposed, and why we are asked to adopt it. We have put forward many strong objections, and I think it is due to us that hon. gentlemen opposite should try to answer those objections, and to give some reasons for the changes it is now proposed to effect. My own opinion is that this change is not required in the public interest, that it is put forward purely and simply in order to meet certain party exigencies. Hon. gentlemen say: Oh, this matter has been before the country for years. No doubt, franchise Bils have been brought in before, but they were never proceeded with—at least, they never reached the stage where the principle has been affirmed, and where public attention has been called to them. And surely now, when this matter is brought forward, and when the Government are attempting to force it through with undue haste at this particular juncture, the people have a right to ask and to know why the change is to be made, and why it should be pressed forward at this time,

when the Session has already lasted three months. They have a right to know why this old Bill, that has been pigeonholed for three months, is now brought forward in the dying days of the Ssion. If it is a matter of such vast consequence as the Government pretend, they should have brought it forward earlier in the Session, when it could have been deliberately discussed and the principles understood by the public. I consider that no more important matter has ever been before this House, affecting in so large a degree the rights and privileges of the people, and therefore we ought to have had an opportuity of discussing it in a fair and legitimate manner. The people have not had an opportunity of discussing the Bill or of understanding its scope. I have been for some time trying to get copies of this Bill, and I believe that it was only three days ago that it was published for the first time in the Government organ of the city of St. John; it was only three days ago that the press of that Province has had an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the provisions of this Bill. Then, again, there is the question of the mode in which the lists are to be made up. I think that, in accordance with the principle of the British North America Act, and with the Act of 1874, the people of the Province themselves have the right to control the preparation of the voters' lists, and that is the principle on which we act in New Brunswick. The principle we have adopted, by which the parties who have charge of the voters' lists are selected by the people themselves and are liable to be dismissed if they do anything wrong, is a sound protection to our rights and liberties. That protection is, however, entirely swept away by this Bill, which places that power in the hands of individuals who are merely Government officers, and, whatever their intentions may be, they are sure to have a party bias. The whole principle is unsound and unconstitutional, and such power should not be placed in the hands of the Government, no matter what party is in power. The system adopted in New Brunswick is such that every man who is assessed upon property has a right to be placed upon the list, and it is impossible for a man, either by fraud or intention, to be kept off the list, or by favor or affection to be placed on it.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). Is there any appeal?

Mr. WELDON. There is a right of appeal to the revisers. I am in hearty sympathy with the amendment moved by the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). In this connection, I cannot help remarking that it seems to be a question between Ontario and the Dominion. References are constantly made to Ontario; and we, from the lower Provinces, feel overshadowed and overpowered by this contention that prevails. The franchise should remain with the Provinces. It is a right which, independent of the 41st section, they would have the power to legislate upon; and it is expedient they should legislate, because they are the bodies who best understand the wishes and conditions of the people. Another objection to the Bill is the question of expense; not merely the expense to which the Dominion will be put by appointing revising barristers, and the necessary machinery which, under the present system, is entirely unnecessary; but what I think is still more dangerous, is the expense with respect to the voter himself. Under our provincial franchise no expense is entailed on the voter, but under the proposed system such will not be the case. The plan should be so simple and inexpensive that every man entitled to vote will know that his name is on the list, and that when he goes to the poll there will be no objection raised. The hon. member for Prince, P.E.I., thought this would be a good Bill for all the other Provinces except Prince Edward Island, and he said it would not be a good law for that Province, because they had no registration; they had open voting and did not want a registrar, but with the ballot it was different. That hon. gentleman seemed to think that it was quite proper to saddle other Provinces with expense and to entirely change their franchises. During this debate the hon. member for King's, N.B., referred to me as an advocate of secession, although, he said, "he is not a Tory." I admit that I have been opposed to Confederation, and that I have used my best efforts to prevent New Brunswick going into this Union. From the day I took a seat in this House I have never regretted my course. If this Bill becomes law in its present shape the hon. member for for King's will find the feeling against the Union enormously increased, and where he found one man opposed to the Union he will find them by scores and hundreds, because they will feel this is another act of injustice.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland), I rise at this late stage of the discussion, not because I feel it is desirable that it should be prolonged, but because I desire, before the debate reaches its termination, that my protest shall be recorded against the manner in which this discussion has been conducted, against the length of time it has occupied, and against the heavy expense imposed on the people. The hon. gentleman who last addressed the committee, as well as many who preceded him, reproached hon. members sitting on this side of the House for not participating more generally in the discussion of this measure. I feel that the course which I have adopted, and which has been adopted by a large majority of those who sit on this side of the House, can be fully justified. I feel that when any member of this House has any information to impart, or any arguments to advance, bearing upon any question under consideration, arguments which are new or forcible, or pertinent, it is right and fair that that member should, under such circumstances, receive a respectful and attentive hearing. But, Sir, when hon. gentlemen pursue an entirely different course; when they rise, as they have done in the course of this disucssion, and state facts which are already familiar to us all; when they continue to repeat, one after another, arguments which we have listened to over and over again from those who have preceded them, I feel that any member of this House is justified in receiving their speeches with inattention and any other marks of disapproval which such conduct justly merits. I think, Sir, that this discussion has been useless, unnecessary, and unstatesmanlike. But I must, in justice to hon. gentlemen opposite, give them credit for the great ability with which it has been maintained. If, Sir, the possession of physical strength and endurance, if the possession of vocal power and volubility is to be the standard by which we are to judge of statesmanship, I must say that the Reform party of Ontario, particularly, have earned for themselves and for this Parliament a distinction for which we can find no parallel in past history, and no reasonable ground for supposing it will ever be equalled in the future. If, Sir, to talk longest and to say least can win for any hon. gentleman honor and renown upon the floors of Parliament, I feel that these same gentlemen must be remembered long after their leaders are forgotten. Hon. gentlemen have sought to justify the length of this debate by the importance of the measure which is just now under consideration. I feel, Sir, that this ground is not well taken. It is true that this is an important measure. It is true that this measure deals with the question of the franchise, a question which, above all others, is dear and sacred to the heart of every true lover of British institutions. But, Sir, it must be borne in mind that this is the third Session of this Parliament, the third time this measure has been introduced, and hon. gentlemen have had two years to study its principles and its provisions. Ample time has been afforded to discuss it with the people of this country, on the platform and through the press, and hon. gentlemen have come to this Parliament with their opinions largely formed upon this question. I feel that under such circumstances protracted discussion is unnecessary and can serve

no useful purpose. For my own part, I did not intend, from the first, and I do not now intend, to enter into any lengthy discussion of the principles of this measure. But I desire to say that I support this measure, first, because I feel that this Parliament has a right to say who shall elect its members; secondly, because I believe the measure which was adopted in 1867 was adopted as a temporary measure, that it was never designed by those who framed the constitution that the provincial franchises, or the franchises which might exist, from time to time, in the various Provinces of this Dominion, should form the franchise by which members of this Parliament should be elected; that the reasons which led to its adoption then have long ceased to exist and that therefore the system itself should be abandoned. I support this measure, thirdly, because I believe that the present system is lacking in the essential elements of certainty, stability and permanence, and the important element of uniformity, and therefore it should not be continued. I assume, Sir, that there is no gentleman on either side of this House who will dispute the right of this Parliament to pass this measure. It is true that a large portion of the arguments which have been presented by hon. gentlemen opposite have been based on the assumption that we have not this right——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). That we are seeking to infringe on the right which belongs to the several Provinces of this Dominion. But we have had a clear and distinct statement by the leader of the Opposition that this Parliament has a constitutional right to fix a franchise of its own, and I feel that I may fairly assume that the large majority, if not all of his supporters, share this same opinion. The only arguments, then, which have been advanced in opposition to this measure which have any force, are those which are based on the question of expediency. We are told that this measure is unnecessary, that our present system is working well, and that no change has been demanded. I feel, Sir, that that argument—to say the most which can be said for it—is an argument which has not much force. If an evil exists are we to wait until its consequences are proved to be so disastrous that public indignation forces us to adopt remedial measures? If a reform is needed are we to wait until the necessity of that reform becomes so apparent that a revolutionary spirit is created throughout the country? I feel, Sir, when an evil exists it is the duty of the Legislature to remove that evil, before its consequences become serious or widespread. I feel, when a reform measure is presented to this House, if the principles upon which it is based are sound, if they are just and equitable and right, if the changes which are proposed will improve the existing state of things, if the system which it is proposed to introduce is an improvement on the system which now exists, it is the duty of Parliament, under such circumstances, to adopt that measure without delay. Then, Sir, experience has furnished us with ample proof of the necessity for the proposed measure. It has shown us beyond doubt that the present system is far from perfect, and that a change is needed. In the Province of Nova Scotia, in 1871, an Act was passed by which all persons holding offices under the Dominion Parliament were disfranchised. A Dominion election followed, but before another local election that Act was repealed. This course of the Provincial Parliament shows, at least, that in that Province, at that time, it was not considered desirable that the same class of persons should exercise both the Dominion and the local franchise. In the Province of Ontario, last winter, an Act was passed by which non-resident property holders were disfranchised. Persons who are the most wealthy and intelligent in this country, who possess large interests, are deprived of the right of voting, merely because their public duties or their business requirements oblige them to reside in a different part of the Province from that in which their property is situated. In the other Provinces this same class of persons still enjoy the franchise. In many of the Provinces they vote not only in one constituency, but in two or more constituencies, where they have property. In some of the Provinces, at the present time, we have manhood suffrage as the basis of the franchise; in the other Provinces we have a variety of franchises based upon property or income qualifications. Now, Sir, I, for one, am willing to appeal to the judgment of any independent member of this House—I am willing to appeal to any constituency in this Dominion—whether such a state of things should be continued, whether such a system is based on principles which are equitable and just to all. Then, Sir, another important feature of our present system is its uncertain and changing character. The constituencies which elected us may, before another election, be entirely swept away. Changes the most important and most radical in their character may be made, and we are powerless to prevent them. Hon. gentlemen opposite have always professed a desire to preserve harmony among the different Provinces of this Dominion. I, for one, Sir, feel that the present system is not calculated to preserve that harmony, but that it is calulated to eventually promote provincial discord and provincial strife. It is well known that in the Local Parliaments of the different Provinces of this Dominion different political parties predominate. In one Province, where one party has a large majority in the Local Legislature, an Act may be passed adopting a franchise which will give that party a large representation for that Province in this Parliament; in another Province, where another party may have a large majority in the Local House, a different franchise may be adopted, with a corresponding result; what have we then? We have two parties in the House divided by provincial lines. Instead of having two great political parties divided on questions of public policy, instead of having them, as we have them now, contending for the prevalence of principles which affect the general good, we have them contending for the rights of particular Legislatures, to whose Acts they owe their presence here. I feel that if there is one idea above another to which we should at all times give prominence, it is the idea that we come here to legislate for Dominion rather than for provincial interests—that it is our duty here to legislate, not that we may obtain any sectional advantage, but that we may promote the general good, and protect equally the rights of every Province of this Dominion. I feel, Sir, that the evils which now exist and the dangers which may fairly be apprehended if this system is continued, amply justify the introduction of this measure. I feel that the power of this Parliament to pass this measure cannot be questioned. I feel that this measure is founded on principles which are sound and equitable and just, which have not yet and which cannot be successfully assailed. And, Sir, for these reasons, which I have briefly stated, I feel that it is the duty of this Parliament to pass this measure, and to pass it now.

Mr. LISTER. It is a matter of very great gratification to this side of the House to have succeeded at last in getting an hon. gentleman on the opposite side to say anything in defence of the measure we are now considering. I desire to say to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, that from the beginning of this debate to the present time there has not been, for a single moment, a dispute as to the legal right of this Parliament to pass a Franchise Bill.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Oh.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. member for East Hastings is very anxious to get 300 or 400 Indian votes. He knows that without these votes he would be defeated at the next election. I repeat that there has never been, from the beginning of this debate to the present time, a dispute as to the right

of this Parliament to pass a Franchise Bill. The question has been one of expediency; the question has been whether this Bill is in accordance with the true spirit and meaning of the British North America Act or not; and hon. gentlemen on this side have contended from the first that it was inexpedient and uncalled for. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has not gone into the principles of this Bill; he has not adverted for a moment to the intolerable provisions it contains. He has not said one word in justification of the revising barrister; he has not said one word in support of the provision as to the right of appeal; he has not said one word as to the enormous expense that will be incurred by this measure if it becomes law. His speech has been altogether one of generalities. It was quite unnecessary for the hon. gentleman to get up and tell us that he was going to support this measure. He sits besides the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), and that hon. gentleman has told us that his whole and sole duty in this Parliament is to record the wish of the Government of the day. The hon. gentleman did not require to inform this House of that fact; any person who has sat opposite to him during the last three Sessions must have seen that that was his only aim and purpose of sitting in Parliament. Now, the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) has told us that this discussion is useless. We know that the discussion has not been useless. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House were debating this subject for several days before hon. gentlemen opposite became aware that the tribal Indians had a vote, showing that something has been gained—that some valuable information has been given to hon. gentlemen opposite. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to say this discussion is useless, but let them look back a few years and remember that their leader then said this was so important a measure it would be impossible properly to consider it short of a whole Session of Parliament. If hon. gentlemen opposite are so anxious to have the Bill passed, why do they leave it to the dying hours of the Session before introducing it? Was it because they deemed the members of this House, in their desire to return to their business vocations, would allow to be passed through this House without discussion a measure which I characterise now, as I have characterised it in the past, as simply infamous. This measure is being considered by the people from one end of the Dominion to the other, and I will be greatly mistaken if its iniquitous provisions will not raise a storm about the ears of the Government that they little expected when they introduced it. I contend that this Parliament has no right to disfranchise the men who now have a vote. In the Province of Prince Edward Island, in the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba and British Columbia, men who now have votes will be disfranchised.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. LISTER. I say they will. I will prove to you that men throughout the different Provinces, who now enjoy the franchise, will lose it. I say this Government are deliberately taking away from them the highest and most cherished right of freemen, the right to vote. When a franchise has once been granted no Parliament has the right to deprive those to whom it has been granted of that privilege. What a spectacle this House presents to this country! Through the mismanagement of the men who occupy the Treasury benches our fellow countrymen are being slaughtered in the North-West.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The hon. gentleman is out of order in discussing matters that are not relevant to the question before the House.

Mr. RYKERT. Take it back.

Mr. LISTER. Yes, I will take it back.

Mr. RYKERT. Take a back seat.

Mr. LISTER. Not for you.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Order.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Hon. gentlemen on the other side should not be allowed to interrupt my hon. friend. I protest against his being called to order when replying to an insulting remark made by an hon. gentleman on the other side, for which that hon. gentleman was not called to order.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Hon. gentlemen have no right to call across the House.

Mr. LISTER. As far as the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) is concerned, I neither seek his friendship nor fear his enmity in the slightest degree. I say this measure should not become law, because there has been no demand for it from the country. From Prince Edward Island to British Columbia there has not been a single petition asking that a Bill providing for a Dominion franchise should be passed.

Mr. McCALLUM. I rise to a point of Order. This House adopted the principle of the Bill when the Bill was given its second reading. We are now on clause 3, and I hope, Sir, you will keep the hon. gentleman to the question.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). For the information of the member for Monck, I call his attention to the fact that we are discussing something else besides clause 3. We are discussing an amendment which proposes to substitute a Dominion franchise, and also one that proposes to exempt Prince Edward Island from the operations of the Bill; and the hon. gentleman will see at once that they give a range wide enough to take in the remarks of my hon. friend.

Mr. McCALLUM. I want to know what the question as to whether the people have petitioned for this Bill or not has to do with the Bill, since we have adopted its principle.

Mr. LISTER. I was going on to say that there has been no demand for a measure of this kind from any section or Province, or any portion of any Province, in the country. Since Confederation was established we have availed ourselves of the different franchises in the different Provinces. In 1874 that was confirmed by an Act giving the several Provinces the right to fix the franchise for members of this House, and no reason has since arisen for taking away from the Provinces that which we then gave them. Unless it can be shown that the working of the provincial franchise has been disadvantageous, that some serious wrong has been done to this House, that the country is suffering in some way in consequence of it, this Parliament has no right to take it away. In spirit it is a usurpation of the rights of the Provinces. They are best able to say what people shall send members to this House, and by this House taking it into its own hands, it takes the power of doing a wrong to the Provinces if it thinks proper. It is a great safeguard to the Provinces to retain the right of fixing the franchise. While some Provinces are opposed to an extension of the franchise, others have expressed themselves in favor of it. In Ontario, the Conservative party has been pledged to manhood suffrage, the leader of the Opposition there, when Mr. Mowat's Franchise Bill was being passed, having moved an amendment in favor of it. I do know what the wishes of the Province of Quebec are, but if they do not want manhood suffrage we have no right to take the power of forcing upon them a suffrage which they do not want and if we recognise the power of this Parliament to take away from the Provinces the right of fixing the franchise, it may be that, next year or the year after, the other Provinces will unite and force upon one Province, whether Quebec or any other, a franchise which may be distasteful to them in the extreme. It is safer,

better, and more calculated to promote harmony in every Province, that the franchise should remain in the hands of the people of every Province. Do we not give to members of this House the same vote that we give to members of the Local House, and how can we be injured? Are we not Ontarians? Do not the people of Ontario vote for members of the Local House, and do not the same people vote for members of this House? In injuring us they must of necessity injure the members of the Local House. It is inexpedient, unwise, dangerous, to take from the Provinces the right they have exercised since 1867. There is no complaint that this has not worked well. The hon. gentleman talks about uniformity. He is drawing a herring across the trail. It is not uniformity they want, but to strangle the Liberals of Ontario, and in strangling us you may be doing an injury to other Provinces you little dream of. The best proof that it is not uniformity they want is that the Government are willing that Prince Edward Island should retain its present franchise. Perchance, they are willing that other Provinces shall do the same. Then, the only ground upon which you build your structure and claim a necessity for this legislation is swept away. How is it that, in 1874, when a measure of this kind was before the House, hon. gentlemen opposite and their press took the ground that the franchise should be left with the Provinces? How is it that the Montreal *Gazette*, edited then by the member for Cardwell (Mr. White), and the Conservative press of Toronto and throughout Ontario, contended that the Provinces should retain the right? The arguments then advanced were unanswerable. It was argued that it was unwise to place too much power in the hands of this Dominion; that it was the duty of the House to minimise the power of the Dominion as much as possible; and if that was a cogent argument in those days, it is no less strong at the present time. Yet hon. gentlemen opposite to-day see the utmost necessity for such a measure. If there was no necessity for it in 1874 there is none in 1885. Attempting to take this power into the hands of the Dominion is attempting to strangle the electorate of the whole country and is invading the rights of the Provinces. If our Dominion is to be great and strong the rights of the Provinces must be maintained to the utmost, and instead of trying to deprive them of their rights you ought, if possible, to extend those rights, or, at all events, to secure them beyond peradventure. These repeated attempts by the Government, Session after Session, to wrest from the Provinces rights they have exercised in the past, creates a friction which will inevitably be dangerous to this Confederation. Do hon. gentlemen think that the country is taking no interest in this matter? I have talked with scores of Conservatives in the west in the last ten days, and I have yet to find a man to defend or justify the Bill now before the House. Is there a petition asking hon. gentlemen to force this measure through? Is there a fair-minded Conservative who wants a Bill of that kind? If our positions were changed, and Mr. Blake were leading the Government, and hon. gentlemen opposite were in opposition, they would oppose, as strenuously as possible, the measure now before the House; they would charge us with centralisation and with endeavoring to strangle them. Under that condition of affairs, the Opposition are bound, in justice to themselves and to the Liberals of Canada, to fight this Bill out fairly, honestly and strongly, to the very last moment. It is nonsense for hon. gentlemen opposite to get up and advise us. We do not ask your advice and do not want it. We know what we are going to do and what our duty is, and that duty we shall endeavor to do to the best of our ability.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Why do you give advice if you will not take it?

Mr. LISTER. It is said this Bill extends the franchise. I challenge the correctness of that statement. It is not nearly so liberal as the Franchise Bill of the Local Legislature, and it deprives men of votes who would have votes under the local Act. This Bill requires an income of $400 to entitle a person to vote; under the Bill of Mr. Mowat, it is $250.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Is that the law now?

Mr. LISTER. Yes; this law now makes it $400; under the Mowat Act it is $250.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is not law to-day.

Mr. LISTER. In addition to that, the Local Legislature has given to the wage-earner a right to vote.

Mr. RYKERT. It is not the law to-day; not until next January.

Mr. LISTER. It is the law of the land. It comes into force at the next election. Hon. gentlemen opposite have refused to give us any reason for the adoption of this measure. Why is it that its necessity is not pointed out? Why is it that the good features of this Act are not pointed out to the House and the country?

Mr. WHITE. They know all about it.

Mr. LISTER. The hon. gentleman knows more about the timber limits than he does about the Franchise Bill.

Mr. WHITE. I will give you mine for nothing.

Mr. LISTER. Why have hon. gentlemen been so silent in this matter? They appear to be afraid to open their mouths, for fear they might put their foot in it; and in what little they do say they try to avoid the real issue. They say nothing about the intolerable provisions of this Bill, and the press of the Conservative party follow the same tactics. I have before me the *Free Press*, the organ of the Conservative party in London, and I have before me the *Mail*, the Conservative organ of Toronto, and I find leading articles in those papers on this Bill, wherein they deliberately misstate what are the real issues of the Bill, not only as to one portion, but as to several portions of the Bill. I will read a portion of one of those articles:

"But when one comes to consider its provisions, it is found to be a measure that is destined to extend the franchise to many thousands who are now debarred from it"——

That is not true——

"by lowering the necessary qualification, in both town and county"——

That is not true——

"One of its most especial features is that it will permit so many young men of the country, so many that are volunteers to-day, to express an opinion on public affairs"——

Mr. WHITE. That is true.

Mr. LISTER. Oh, everything is true with you. We understand the hon. member for East Hastings:

"It has been boasted that the franchise that exists in Ontario is a very liberal one, and no doubt it has taken a considerable step in that direction; but this measure, which is to be applied to the Dominion franchise, goes still further in the direction of broadening the basis on which representation shall rest. It will permit every man, not otherwise disqualified, to vote at parliamentary elections, who earns as much as $400 per year,"——

Mr. Mowatt's Bill allows every man to vote who earns $250 a year.

"or a little more than $1 per day. Any one who has a piece of property in his possession of the value of $400, no matter where he may live, will be also entitled to a vote. Farmers' sons and the sons of mechanics living with their parents are also to be included within the scope of the franchise. In this, the provisions are of a far more liberal and far-reaching character than are those existing in Ontario, and which have been held up by the Grits to the admiration of mankind. But there is a further reason alleged, and that is that the revising barristers are to be appointed, before whom all questions affecting the rights of individuals to vote are to be heard and determined. And this, too, is to be called 'iniquitous,' 'infamous.' Seeing that the plan has been worked with eminent success in England for many years past, it will be difficult to make the people of this country believe that it is either infamous or iniquitous."

Now, Sir, the man who penned that article must have known that what he stated there was not true. No such system exists in England, as it is proposed to create by this Bill. In England, the courts are held by barristers appointed by the Lord Chief Justice and the senior judge of each summer assize, to revise the lists prepared by the overseer of each parish, when claims are made by persons omitted, and objections may be made to any name inserted by the overseers. Appeal is given on points of law to the Court of Common Pleas. The revising barrister, in England, is not the creature of the Government of the day, but is an independent man, appointed by the highest judge in England, the Lord Chief Justice, in certain counties; and, in others, the judge of each summer assize appoints the revising barrister. He is appointed only for one year, and sits simply as a judge. He is not authorised to make up the rolls. The voters' list is made by the parish officers, and the appeal is to the revising barrister, the same as our appeal is to the judge of the county court. He sits merely in a judicial capacity. But here you propose to appoint men who may do their duty with perfect fairness, but you are putting it in their power to do what is unjust. That is what we complain of. We say that the Government should not make it possible for this officer to tamper and trifle with the voters' lists; that they should not make it possible for him to prevent a man from voting. We complain that the men who will be appointed may be partisans, who may act in a partisan character. They may have the effect of defeating the wishes of the people of a county. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not suppose many hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House understand the system we have in the Province of Ontario; and it is not likely that many representatives from the other Provinces understand it, and I would take the liberty of adverting briefly to the law of Ontario with regard to the voters' lists. Now, in the Province of Ontario and the other Provinces, I apprehend we have a very simple system of preparing the voters' lists, a system that has been in force for a number of years and with which the people are perfectly familiar, a system that is inexpensive and that has given every satisfaction to the people of Ontario, and it is proposed to abolish that system and introduce an Act which is cumbrous, complex and expensive, a system which will impose upon an already overburdened people a cost of, at least, half a million dollars. If he was as familiar with the provisions of the voters' lists of Ontario as many members of that Province are, the First Minister would be willing to allow matters to remain as they are. I find that the clerk of each municipality is required, immediately after the final revision and correction of the assessment roll in every year, to make a correct alphabetical list in three parts, of all the persons of the full age of twenty-one years who appear by the assessment roll to be entitled to vote in the municipality. The clerk is then to deliver or transmit it by registered letter, parcel post or book post, ten copies of each, to the following persons: that is to say, members of the House of Commons, members of the Legislative Assembly, every candidate for whom votes were given at the last election, and the reeve of each municipality. In the Bill now before the House this feature is very objectionable: the voters' lists are limited to members of the House of Commons—that is as regards the preliminary list. The final list, as revised, is to be bought at 6 cents for every ten names. Everyone who has had anything to do with elections is aware that a large number of voters' lists are required. The result of this Bill, if passed, will be that the candidates, or whoever may take an interest in elections, will be compelled to have voters' lists printed at their own expense. In the Ontario Act the judge of the county court is to hold a court in each municipality in which there are appeals. Under the Dominion law he is to hold a court at some place in the electoral district. It is not very difficult to see that in case of appeal the persons appealing will be put to very heavy cost. The court may be held thirty, forty, fifty, or even a hundred miles from the place where the voter appealing lives. It involves the attendance of the voter and all his witnesses, and perhaps the employment of a lawyer to look after his case. Under those circumstances, the Bill passed by the Ontario Legislature is far in advance of the Bill which it is now proposed to make law. A large number of voters' lists have to be sent throughout the municipality. They are sent to different post offices; they are put up in the office of the clerk; in fact, there is a large number printed, and when an election comes there is no difficulty whatever in securing a number of copies, or, at all events, such a number as is necessary for use during the election. This Bill makes no such provision. It provides only for the distribution of two copies to the members for the time being. The manner of appealing, according to the Ontario Act, is simplicity itself. If a person desires to be put on the list or asks to have some names struck off he has the right of appeal to the judge of the county court; that is transmitted by the clerk of the municipality, and the judge fixes a day for hearing the appeal. From the fact that courts are to be held in several municipalities, it will not take a very long time to try a case. The number of cases, moreover, is few. Under this present Bill an appeal will cause great expense and great trouble, and people will often be deprived of their right to vote. I do not propose to discuss the question of the Indian vote, except so far as it relates to towns and cities. I see the Toronto *Mail*, the organ of the Conservative party, strongly advocates the right and the expediency of giving the franchise to Indians living on reserves. That paper misrepresents the position of the Liberal party upon that question; and, with the permission of the House, I will read an extract from the *Mail*, of 6th May, 1885:

"In our issue of Monday we exposed, in a way that no one has dared to challenge, the hypocrisy of the Opposition regarding the enfranchisement of the Indians. That policy of enfranchisement is one that the Grit party pursued during the whole of their term of office; and down to 1880 they were active advocates of it still. Their policy was indiscriminate. It included all Indians, those of the North-West as well as those of the older Provinces, and they looked on themselves as great moral reformers because they entertained so progressive a policy.

"The Indian franchise proposed by Sir John Macdonald could not by any possibility have covered the rebellious bands of the west; because it would be only by the merest accident that any of them would obtain votes; and not in any case till the territory in which they live has representation in Parliament. Mr. Mowat's Bill of last Session gave the right to vote to Indians in receipt of annuities, when not living with the tribe. The Dominion Bill simply goes a step further and gives these Indians the right to vote, when, having the property qualification, they still live among the Indians on the reserves.

"Sir John Macdonald proposes to limit the franchise to the Indians of the older Provinces; and this, though an apparent concession, leaves the matter as he intended it at first. There was no chance, or only the merest chance, of any North-West Indians obtaining the franchise. If they did obtain it, it would be by such industry, intelligence, sobriety and forethought as would entitle them to it by their possession of the property qualification.

"The agitation raised by the Opposition was false as to facts, and was hypocritical as regards their own past policy. There has hardly been a word said against the enfranchisement of the Indians now that is not a direct contradiction of what was said, from 1874 to 1880, by the same persons, in favor of enfranchising them. The public will, we feel sure, recognise the purely obstructive object of the Grits, and liberally discount their 'indignation.'"

Now, that article unfairly sets forth the position of the Liberal party, so far as the Indian franchise is concerned. What we protest against is, that the Indians of this country, living on reserves, under the control of the Superintendent General and his agents—we protest that so long as they are in that position of tutelage, so long as they are the minors and wards of the Government, upon whom the Government can exercise their influence, that they should have the right to vote. What we say is, that if those people are sufficiently intelligent to vote there should, at the same time, be cast on them all the duties of citizenship—that the rights of citizenship should not be given them without its duties and respon-

sibilities. We say that if they are not fit to exercise the responsibilities of citizens they should remain as they are until they are fit. To-day the Indian cannot be called upon to defend the country; he cannot hold any municipal office; he cannot be sued for a debt, and therefore we say that in the interests of the country they should not have the franchise, until they can also accept the full responsibilities of citizenship. Give them their lands and moneys, remove from them all the influence that may be exerted on the part of the Government, and the Liberals of Canada have no objection whatever to these men being made part and parcel of the great electorate of this country. But so long as they are in the present position I say it would be an outrage and a scandal for the Government of the country to confer on these people the rights of citizens. It has been properly remarked during the debate, by some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, that every measure introduced by the Government this Session involved an expense of money, in the way of paying place hunters. Sir, the Bill just now before the House creates a small army of office holders; no less than 630 of them, I believe, will be created by this Bill. Only yesterday a Bill was introduced into the House for the purpose of appointing an Assistant Librarian, whereby a considerable cost will be imposed on the country yearly, during the life of that officer. By the measure now before the House an army of office holders will be appointed, who will cost the country, at a low estimate, from a quarter to half a million of dollars a year. Is the country in so prosperous a condition, are our finances in so cheering a state, that at this particular juncture it is wise or expedient to appoint this large number of office holders and incur this large amount of expense? No doubt the hon. member for Lincoln will support this measure, for I do not remember that he has ever opposed any measure, since he has been in his present position, which had for its object the increased expenditure of the public moneys of the country. One of the strongest arguments in favor of retaining the provincial franchise is the fact that it is cheap, that it costs the Parliament of this country nothing. Hon. gentlemen opposite have taken occasion to cast aspersions on the several assessors throughout the country, but I think, if you go from one end of the country to the other, with few exceptions, the duties of the office of assessor have been satisfactorily discharged, and I think it is nothing but an unwarrantable reflection on those officers for hon. gentlemen to get up and say that this Bill is necessary because they have not discharged their duties. I think, Sir, it is dangerous to the electorate of this country for this Government to take into its hands the power it proposes to take by this Bill. I think it is a menace to the people of the country—a danger which has not been properly considered by hon. members of this House. When you consider that the whole electorate of this country will be subject to the whim and caprice of some revising officer, who holds his office from the Government, who must be a partisan of the Government or else he would not receive that office, I say that this is a danger to the commonwealth, and is a step which the country will not approve. Now, I oppose the measure before the House because it is an invasion of provincial rights; I oppose it because there is no necessity, and no necessity has been shown by hon. members opposite, for any such measure; I oppose it because it is expensive; I oppose it because I think it is dangerous to the country for this Government to take into its hands the power it proposes to take by this measure; and I oppose it because it takes from the people the right they have to-day to regulate their voters' lists, which is one of the safeguards of the liberties we possess in this country.

Mr. INNES. Hon. members on the other side cannot reproach me with having taken up any time in discussing this question, as I have not said anything on the subject before; but I feel, Sir, that it is my duty to make some observations upon it, and to state my objections to the measure now before the House. I have paid very close attention to the debate as it has gone on. It has been now prolonged for over three weeks, and it appears to me that the longer it is discussed the more objectionable it is discovered to be. If hon. members opposite are not acquainted with its provisions, it is not the fault of gentlemen on this side; for, as they themselves have acknowledged, it has been discussed in an able and exhaustive manner by the members on this side; and it is only in a sort of intermittent fashion that we have had any discussion of the measure by hon. gentlemen opposite. As I have said, I have watched the debate as it has gone on, and have noted the course of events in connection with it, and I came to the conclusion, some time ago, that hon. members opposite were by no means what we may call a happy family in regard to this Bill. They seem, latterly, to have very great doubts and fears, and many misgivings, in reference to it, while the longer the question was debated the more the courage of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House rose. I also observed, Sir, that there was by no means a harmonious family on the other side of the House with reference to the subject.

Mr. RYKERT. Oh, yes we are.

Mr. INNES. We were told, when the Bill was first introduced, that its great feature was to be uniformity—that it was to be presented to us as a whole, and was to be carried through as a whole; but we found before very long that one point after another was to be given up. The discussion had not proceeded very far in committee before an amendment was moved to strike woman suffrage out of the Bill, and after a spirited debate the Government gave way on that point, and allowed that feature to get the go-by. Not long after that the Indian question was discussed, and we had a sort of tacit admission from the hon. First Minister that concessions would be made on that point also. So that, instead of the Bill being carried through in its original naked deformity, as was proposed to be done, by the efforts of hon. members on this side of the House, in exposing the iniquity of the whole scheme, the hon. First Minister was obliged to make a concession, and agree to restrict the Indian vote to the older Provinces. Then, Sir, we found, not long after that, that an hon. member, a supporter of the Government, brought forward an amendment to leave to Prince Edward Island the franchise that has been in existence there, I believe, for over thirty years. Of course, we on this side are in ignorance whether or not that concession will be granted, but we have reason to believe that it will be. Here, then, are three concessions made already on the main principles of the Bill, although we have only, as yet, reached the third clause. Before this Bill is finished—and God knows when it will be finished, for we intend, I believe, to discuss as fully and as exhaustively all its remaining clauses as we have discussed it so far—I say before this Bill gets through the House it will be a wonder if the hon. First Minister will recognise his own offspring. Thus, we have seen the somewhat incongruous position of the Government with regard to uniformity. A good many reasons have been adduced on this side of the House why the Bill should not have been brought forward; but I have not heard any good reason yet advanced by any hon. gentleman opposite why a Bill of this character should be brought forward at this particular time. No necessity for it has been shown; the working of our constitution does not require it, because for eighteen years we have been living under our present system, to the satisfaction of every Province in the Dominion, so far as I know. We have heard no complaints against that system from any section of the Dominion. It is true the Government have been, from year to year, tantalising the country with a promise of a

uniform Franchise Bill; but it is only now that they come down with their measure and express their determination to carry it through Parliament, if they possibly can. We all remember that at the time of Confederation, in 1867, when the first Parliament of Canada met in this place, a uniform Franchise Bill was introduced, and then withdrawn; we recollect that, again, in 1869, a smilar Bill was brought down, but it never went to a second reading; and again, in 1870, a Bill of the same character was introduced early in the Session, was read a second time, sent to the Committee of the Whole, and considered twice in committee; but Mr. Dorion, now Chief Justice of Quebec, moved an amendment in favor of provincial franchises being used, and so strong was the feeling in favor of this principle that, after being discussed twice, the First Minister moved that the order be discharged, and it was discharged. It seems that the pressure was then so strong on the Government that the right hon. gentleman had neither the power nor the inclination to pass it at that time, but it is evident he has a stronger inclination now; perhaps he thinks he has a little more power, and will be able to keep his followers in line and force them to carry this measure through. Again, in 1871, a similar Bill was promised, but one of a temporary character only was introduced, so as to make provision for the general elections of 1872. In 1873 the Government, having come back to power, through the agency of money that was obtained in the way we all know of, the promise of a Franchise Bill was renewed, but it was only fulfilled in part; and again, in the following Session of that year, a second general Bill was promised, Prince Edward Island in the mean time having come into the Union. The Government, however, resigned, on account of the Pacific Scandal, before they had an opportunity of bringing that measure forward. In 1874, when the Administration of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) came into power, hon. members may recollect that, in the platform which he laid before the people at the general elections, he promised a Franchise Bill which would give to the Provinces the right to use their own franchises; and so solicitous was he for the preservation of the purity of the voters' lists that he objected to giving the county judges the right to vote, on the ground that they would have to revise the voters' lists. How very different is the proposal made now in the Bill under consideration. On the 21st April, in that year, the Hon. Mr. Dorion, in moving the second reading of this Bill, made, in the course of his speech, the following observations in support of it:

"It would be more satisfactory to assume the franchises and voters' lists of each Province, for the reason of greater economy. It seemed to him that the Legislatures of each Province were the best qualified to settle the franchise according to their own conditions, and the best qualified to take measures to secure the best provisions. Beside, so many franchises would, without doubt, lead to confusion. This was a consideration that must commend itself to the House. There was no question, if the Dominion were obliged to provide its own voters' lists, it would necessitate almost an army of officials and an immense amount of patronage, which undoubtedly would be used to influence the electors on behalf of the Government."

Those were the observations of the Minister of Justice of that day, in moving the second reading of the Bill, and I think it will be in the sense of this House that the same observations are just as pertinent, just as strong, just as cogent, as they were then. The Hon. Mr. Dorion referred here, not only to the trouble and confusion which would arise from having more than one system of voters' lists, but also to the unnecessary expense and to the power that would necessarily be given to a certain class of officials, who would not fail to use that power in the interest of the Government. That is one of the great objections that we have to the Bill now before us. I find, on looking at the *Debates* for that period, that there was very little opposition given to the Bill, even on the opposite side of the House, and I notice that our present genial Speaker, in his remarks on the measure, said:

"He was of opinion that, on the whole, the proposal of the Minister of Justice, with regard to the franchise, was the best that could be adopted; on the whole, he would give the Bill his hearty support and approval."

I have no doubt he is of the same opinion to-day, and I have very little doubt that a good many more hon. members opposite, if they were free to express their own conscientious views and opinions, would say the same thing. The Franchise Bill that was passed in 1874 by the Mackenzie Government was brought into operation in 1878 and gave general satisfaction. It resulted in the return to power of the present Government, and from that until 1882 we heard no word of a uniform franchise. Hon. gentlemen opposite seemed to be quite satisfied with the operation of the old system, a system which had been in existence from 1867 to the present. After the last general election in 1882, when we met here in 1883 a promise was made in the Speech from the Throne of a Franchise Bill; that Bill was brought down, but it was never moved to the second reading. Again, in 1883, the Government reintroduced the measure; the notice remained on the Notice Paper for a whole Session, and the Bill was slaughtered amongst the rest of the innocents at the close of the Session. It is only now that we have the Bill brought forward, almost at the end of this Session, after we have been here three months, when there is a very large amount of work to be done, when the Estimates scarcely are entered upon, when the whole question of a fresh loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway is to be brought forward, when the North-West troubles have to be fully discussed, and when nearly all the Government measures of any importance that are now on the Order Paper have to be considered and passed. One argument for bringing forward the Bill is that the franchises are dissimilar in character in the different Provinces; but I think that hon. members, on reflection, will see that such a system is best suited to the inclinations, and the wants and the genius of the people. It is best suited to their habits and customs; a franchise of that nature is more to their wishes than a uniform franchise would be. The people in Prince Edward Island have had manhood suffrage for many years; the people in the other Maritime Provinces have their suffrage; we, in Ontario, have our suffrage; in Manitoba the suffrage is different, as it is also in Quebec and in British Columbia; and if an attempt is made to bring in a uniform franchise now, the consequence will be that a large number of the inhabitants in all these Provinces will be disfranchised; the electorate will be curtailed in all the Provinces, even in Quebec, as was shown the other evening by the hon. member for Quebec, and it will be largely curtailed in British Columbia. Not only that, but if the Bill should go through in its present state a large and valuable class of population in British Columbia will be disfranchised altogether—I mean the miners. There is no provision for them in this Bill, and surely the hon. members from that Province, who seem to be so fast in their allegiance to the Government, will see that justice is done to that valuable class of the population, a class whom we may expect largely to increase if the mineral resources of that Province are developed. In the Province of Ontario, as has been shown by hon. members on this side, the franchise will be curtailed in many other respects. In that Province this Bill will disfranchise all owners in towns, and owners and occupants in cities and towns whose qualification is between $200 and $300. By this Bill the qualification of a voter is $300 in cities and towns. In Ontario it is $200. The qualification in townships, by this Bill, is $150. In Ontario it is $100. The income franchise in this Bill is $400. In the Ontario Act it is $300, and that income may be in cash or in kind. By that Act every person having $100 worth of property has a right to vote, but

this Bill makes the qualification $150, so that all between $100 and $150—which will take in many towns and villages —will be disfranchised by this Bill. Then the income franchise in Ontario is put at $300, and that income may be in cash or in kind. That is, where a laborer is engaged by the year, and receives, in addition to his yearly wages, his board, making up the amount to $300, this amount, by the Ontario Act, entitles him to a vote. By this Act, also, the sons of all the owners of the necessary property to qualify them are entitled to vote; the sons of tenants are entitled to vote; the sons of occupants are entitled to vote; sons-in-law living with the father-in-law, and grandsons living with the grandfather, who is a tenant or occupant, are entitled to vote. These are extremely liberal provisions in the Ontario Act, while we find no such liberal provisions in this Bill. Then, if we look at the cumbrous nature of some of the clauses, we find some that I am sure it will be very difficult for the ordinary class of people to understand, if they read the qualifications for themselves. Take, as an instance, the case of a tenant at a monthly, quarterly, half yearly or yearly rent. Under the provisions of this Bill this tenant will have a right to vote, provided he has resided in the place for a year, and has paid his rent for the last month, quarter, half year or year. Now, in order to get the name of a man of that kind on the voters' list a candidate, if he wishes to get the name on the list, must prove that he is a tenant, that he has paid his rent. You must fix the time that he has paid his rent, otherwise you cannot prove the payment of it. You will have, also, to prove that he has not left the place. Then, take the case of an occupant, whose name you wish to get on the voters' list; you have first to prove that he is an occupant, when he leased the property on which he votes, from whom he leased it, and that he has been an occupant of the place for a year. All this you have to prove before the revising officer, and in order to do so you must have a lawyer, subpœnas and witnesses—in fact, you have to employ the same machinery as if you had an important case in a court of law. I will read a few sentences from one clause of this Bill, just to show its cumbrous and complicated character:

"Is the tenant of real property within any such city or town or part of a city or town, at a monthly rental of at least two dollars, or at a quarterly rental of at least six dollars, or at a half-yearly rental of at least twelve dollars, or at an annual rental of at least twenty dollars, and has been in possession thereof as such tenant for at least one year next before the first day of November, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-six, or in any subsequent year, and has really and *bonâ fide* paid one year's rent for such real property at not less than the rate aforesaid; provided, that the year's rent so required to be paid to entitle such tenant to vote shall be the year's rent up to the last yearly, half-yearly, quarterly or monthly day of payment, as the case may be, which shall have occurred next before the first day of November in each of the said years respectively; and provided also, that a change of tenancy during the year next before the said first day of November in any such year shall not deprive the tenant of the right to vote in respect of such real property if such change is without any intermission of time, and the several tenancies are such as would entitle the tenant to vote had such tenant been in possession under either of them, as such tenant, for the year next before the said first day of November in any such year."

That is a sample of the involved manner in which the conditions and qualifications are laid down. I think you will find that the Ontario Act is very different in its construction and very easily understood. For the sake of drawing a comparison between the two, stripping both of the legal verbage, I will give them in brief form. These are the provisions of the Dominion Bill:

"1. The owner of real property, in towns and cities, of the actual value of $300, and in any other district than a city or town of the actual value of $150.

"2. The tenant of real property at a rental of at least $2 monthly, $6 quarterly, $12 half yearly, or $20 yearly, in any municipality, and has been in possession at least one year before the first day of November, and has paid one year's rent at the rate aforesaid.

"3. The *bonâ fide* occupant of real property of the actual value of $300 in towns and cities, and of $150 in any other district than a city or town; provided, that he has been in possession at least one year before the first of November, and has been for that time in the enjoyment of the revenues and profits thereof.

"4. Is a resident of a city, town, or electoral district, and derives an income from some trade, calling, or profession, or from some investment or charge on real property in Canada, of not less than $400 annually, and has derived such income and has been such resident for one year before the first of November.

"5. Is the son of a farmer or any one of real property, and not otherwise qualified to vote, and resident with his father (or mother) for one year before the first of November, as well as at the time of the election, if the value of the property on which the father is qualified to vote is sufficient, if equally divided amongst them as co-owners, to qualify as voters under the Act; otherwise, the right to be registered as a voter and to vote in respect of such property shall belong only to the father. Occasional absence for not more than four months in the year shall not disqualify a son as such voter.

"6. Is a fisherman and owner of real property and boats and tackle within the electoral district (but outside of any town or city) which, together, are of the actual value of $150."

Now compare the Ontario Act:

"1. Rated on the assessment roll as owner of real property of the actual value, in towns and cities, of not less than $200, and in townships and incorporated villages of not less than $100.

"2. Rated on the assessment roll as tenant of real property of the actual value, in towns and cities, of not less than $200, and in townships and incorporated villages of not less than $100.

"3. Rated on the assessment roll as occupant of real property of the actual value, in towns and cities, of not less than $200, and in townships and incorporated villages of not less than $100.

"4. Residing at the time of the election in the local municipality in which he tenders his vote, and has resided therein continuously since the last revised assessment roll, and derives an income from some trade, occupation, calling, office, or profession of not less than $250 annually, and has been assessed for such income, or has been entered on the roll (but not assessed) as a wage-earner, who for the twelve months next prior to being so entered, derived, or earned wages or income from some trade, occupation, calling, office or profession, of not less than $250.

"5. Duly entered and named in the assessment roll as a landholder's son, resident at the time of the election in the local municipality in which he tenders his vote, and has resided in the dwelling of his father for twelve months prior to the return by the assessors of the roll on which the voters' list used at the election is based. Temporary absence, not exceeding in the whole six months in the year, shall not operate to disentitle a landholder's son to vote under this section.

"6. Entered as a householder in the last revised assessment roll of the city, town, village, township or municipality in which he tenders his vote, and has resided in the municipality continuously from the completion of the last roll to the time of the election."

If we compare the conditions and the qualifications in the one Bill with the conditions and qualifications in the other, I am sure that any one will see that the adventages are all on the side of the Ontario Act, not only with regard to the liberality of the measure and the lowness of the franchise, but with regard to the distinctness and ease with which they can be construed and acted on, not only in preparing the voters' lists, but also in revising them. Another great objection which we have to the Bill is the manner in which the revising officers are to be appointed and the nature of their work. The manner in which they are proposed to be appointed will lead, not only to a great deal of patronage of a very bad kind, but that patronage again will lead to the appointment of a number of officers who will be simply creatures of the Government, and prepared to manipulate the voters' lists in a way that will allow them to do pretty much as they like. According to sections 17 and 24 the revising officer may hear the evidence on application. He is not, by the provisions of this Bill, to take down that evidence; he simply hears it and gives his judgment, and that ends the matter. There is no appeal; he is entirely irresponsible, so far as the voters are concerned, whether it is law or not, and the candidate has the right of appeal only on points of law, which, practically, means that he has no means of redress if palpable injustice is done him in regard to the fixing up of the lists. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend) used the word "fix," and the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Somerville), when he referred to it, emphasised it and called it "fixing up,' which I think is more correct. But this does not include all the power that the revising officer has by the provisions of this Bill. After going through the whole process in making up the lists, after requiring the presence of counsel, witnesses, bailiffs and clerks, and when the lists are supposed to be

complete, finally revised and made up, the 55th section says that the revising officer, of his own motion, may strike out the names of persons who have died or become disqualified, and change the names of others where the same are incorrectly entered on any list, and generally to correct such lists, as far as any information in his possession may enable him to do so, in order to carry out the intention of the Act. It being the intention of the Bill to "fix" the list in the interest of the Government, he has unlimited power to do with the lists whatever he pleases; and after the voters, the candidates and the bailiffs, have all done their work, he can commence anew and fix them up as he likes. Another very serious objection is the enormous expense that will be incurred by the appointment of these revising and other officers. This expense has been estimated at $500,000 a year, and there is no doubt that it will cost that amount, if not more. Then there is the very cumbrous nature of the Bill all through, compared with the Ontario Act, which is simplicity itself. It will be difficult to understand the meaning of the Bill, and a great deal of litigation will no doubt occur under its operation. We find that the Bill has not had that reception throughout the country that its promoters expected. Since the prolonged sittings of this House have taken place, an excitement has gone abroad which nothing can quell, except the defeat or withdrawal of the Bill. We find that very few Conservative papers are defending it on any good grounds, and if they are doing so, it is by misrepresentation. The honest Conservative press is either silent, or damns the measure with faint praise. We find, on the other hand, that the independent press without one exception, so far as I know, have denounced the Bill, and some of them in very severe terms. We have had no request for this Bill by the people; we have had no petition for it; there has been no means to secure an expression of opinion upon it by the country. But now, at this late period of the Session, an attempt is made to force it through without that proper discussion which every vital measure of this kind ought to receive. This measure may have consequences more vast than we have any idea of, to the welfare of this country. The present system is working well. It is in accordance with the desires of the people and their varying circumstances. It is suited to the several Provinces of the Dominion, and if we continue that system it would give equal satisfaction in the future. We have no precedent for the introduction of a system of this kind. The federal system, the system of State franchises across the line, as the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) so ably explained the other day, has been found to work most successfully for years. There is no uniform franchise in Great Britain—indeed, as I said, we find no franchise of this kind in any country in the world; and, considering the heterogeneous elements in Canada, considering the different nationalities, the different customs and habits of the people of Canada, I think that a uniform franchise would work very unsatisfactorily and have disastrous effects. It is indefensible, I think, in principle, and it is objectionable altogether in its practice. It looks as if the First Minister wished to make this Bill the crowning act in his political career, by attempting to hand over the country to his party, in depriving the Provinces of their franchises in the Dominion elections, and by adopting such a system of "fixing" the voters' lists, as will insure the success of that party. His policy has been all along one of expediency, having recourse to doubtful and devious methods; but it now looks as if this measure was one of necessity as well as of expediency, as if it were necessary to the very existence of the party. The First Minister, as I said, has introduced this measure for that purpose. We know he has done many daring things in his career; we know he has been guilty of many unscrupulous acts, but this exceeds in turpitude all his previous acts. He was never loath at any time to employ any political agency that he thought would be most suitable to obtain his ends; he was never ashamed to kick out any colleague from his Cabinet who was uncomfortable to him. He did not stick, even, at selling a railway charter, in order to obtain funds to bribe the electorate to keep himself in power. He did not scruple to gerrymander the constituencies for a new lease of power, and now, by forcing through this Bill, he seeks to gerrymander the constituents. Nearly thirty years ago he was arraigned before the highest court in the land for being the author of what is known as the "double shuffle," by which he captured the Government, and then he escaped conviction only by the skin of his teeth. Now he seeks to capture the country and the people by a shuffle of an equally disgraceful character. I do not know whether he will succeed or not; but one thing I do know, that sooner or later he cannot but receive the condemnation of the people, who will not for ever allow their sense of justice and fair play to be outraged by legislation of this description.

Mr. CASEY. The amendment and the amendment to the amendment open up the whole question of a uniform qualification for the Dominion *versus* provincial qualifications. I am sorry those two motions are arranged in the order in which they have been placed in the Chairman's hands. The amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) proposes to continue the existing system of allowing each Province to settle the qualification of its own electors. The amendment of the hon. member for Prince Edward Island proposes to continue that system in the island alone, leaving the rest of the Dominion subject to the uniform franchise proposed by this Bill. I should have heartily supported the amendment of the hon. member for Prince Edward Island if it had been moved as a substantive amendment to the clause, either before the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk, or after that amendment had been defeated, if such should happen to the case. I am compelled, however, to chose between an amendment providing that all the Provinces shall be allowed to retain their provincial rights in this respect, and a proposal that one Province out of the seven should be allowed to retain their rights, as they now stand, while the rest submit to the grinding uniformity imposed on them by this Bill. I find it is rather difficult to choose. Both motions I should like to have supported; but I do not see, on account of the order in which they come, that I can support the Prince Edward Island amendment as against the general population. In taking that ground I maintain I am not acting in the slightest degree contrary to the views of the hon. member for Prince Edward Island. If the amendment of the hon. member for North Norfolk carries, Prince Edward Island will obtain what the mover of the amendment to the amendment seeks to secure. Under the circumstances I feel, speaking for myself only, that I cannot support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Prince Edward Island. I quite agree with the reasons advanced, that the people of the island should make their own voters' lists and settle the qualification, and if the hon. gentleman, on the third reading, will move the amendment, I will vote for it. I do not know what the result of the voting on the amendment to the amendment will be. It was pretty generally understood that the Government had decided to accept that proposal. It has been rumored since that such is not the case. If that amendment was carried it will provethat a uniform franchise is not the *raison d'être* of this Bill. If the amendment to the amendment is defeated by the ac tion of the Government it will prove that they consider the interests of the island and the members representing it are of little account, compared with the interests of the party, and that they are willing to sacrifice their wishes in order to gain a little party advantage in the other Provinces. It is quite certain that the people of Prince Edward Island desire to continue their present franchise, or the hon. gentleman

would not have moved the amendment. If the Government accept the amendment, it will be infringing the principles of uniformity, which is stated to be one of the leading features of the Bill; and hon. gentlemen opposite are therefore placed between the horns of a dilemma, and either horn will impale them. Coming down to the alternative proposition, namely, that the franchise should be left as it is, and each Province should settle the qualification of its voters, I can hardly say I desire to continue the discussion on that point, for there has not been any discussion. Hon. gentlemen opposite, with very few exceptions, have not discussed the propriety of making this change. They have not recognised the fact that this Bill proposes to make radical and revolutionary changes; that it is not an amendment to any existing election Act, and it is not intended merely to restrict the franchise, but it is to make a constitutional change of a most radical and far-reaching kind. When I say radical, I do not mean it in the sense of liberal. I intend to show that this Bill is not liberal, not even moderately liberal, in its provisions; but I use it in the sense of going to the very root of the institutions with which it deals. It is proposed, I say, to change the constitution radically. They do not recognise that fact. If they did they would surely feel that the burthen of proof rests upon those who propose such a sweeping change, that it was monstrous for the Government to ask this House to make a sweeping change on the strength of the very few and slight explanations made by the Premier, that although that brevity might be pardonable at the commencement of the discussion it was monstrous that the reason for those radical changes should not be further explained in committee. They would feel that it was monstrous that men sitting here as the representatives of the existing electorate should allow a Bill to pass its several stages, the effect of which would be to disfranchise many of these electors, without uttering the most formal justification of the Bill, without venturing to offer the scantiest or barest explanation of the course they intend to take with regard to it. We have been charged with talking too much on this Bill. But if there is any charge to be made in connection with the matter it is that hon. gentlemen opposite have talked too little. The people have sent us here to discuss, and not to do as the hon. member for King's, N.B., said the other night—not merely to say "amen" to all the acts of the Government, for the five years which is is supposed to remain in power, not to carry out a cut and dried policy of any party, but to discuss, to justify and explain the measures for which we intend to vote, and to find fault with, and, if possible, break down those we intend to vote against. This measure is one that proposes to change the basis of the constitution, and is the most important measure that could come before the House. Although this question of a provincial *versus* a Dominion qualification has not been discussed by gentlemen on the other side in the House, it has been discussed by their press. I do not intend to go into the arguments which have been used at any great length. Many of them have been referred to to-night, and the drift of many of them is that the provisions of the Dominion Act are much more liberal than the provisions of the Act in the Province of Ontario; and as an Ontario member, I intend to refer more particularly to the qualification in that Province. Now, Sir, the *Mail*, the *Citizen*, and all the leading papers, and I suppose the small papers as well, supporting hon. gentlemen opposite, have been crying out that this is a liberal Bill; that the Ontario members who oppose it are acting against the interests of that Province, because they are opposing the enfranchisement of a large class who have not a vote under the present Act in Ontario and who would be enfranchised by this Bill. No pretension, Sir, could be much more amusing. I do not call it argument; it is simply an amusing mis-statemement of the facts. In regard to what classes of people is the Dominion Act more liberal than the Ontario Act? Is it with regard to those who claim to be qualified as regards ownership or occupancy of real property? If so, the facts are strongly against that contention. The Dominion Act says that the owner or occupant of real property worth $300, in cities or towns, or $150 in the country, or a tenant who pays $2 per month, $6 per quarter, $12 per half year, or $20 per year, shall be entitled to a vote. Now, whom does that enfranchise in Ontario who are not enfranchised by the Ontario Act? That Act says that every owner of property worth $200, in a city or town, or $100 in a township, shall be entitled to vote. Is it possible that the reduction of the amount of real property required to qualify a voter will disfranchise any person in Ontario? That is the position which the *Mail*, the organ of the Government, the official and inspired organ of the Government, takes. In Ontario the amount of real estate required to qualify a tenant is the same as that required for an owner or occupant. In the Dominion Act the eligibility of a tenant, whether in town or country, is determined by the amount of rental he pays yearly for the property—the value of the property is not considered. He may be holding a valuable property at a nominal rent and not get a vote, or he may be paying an excessive rent for property not worth it, and still get a vote. There is great room for inconsistency in this arrangement, and there is a peculiar provision that a tenant shall not be entitled to vote unless the rent is paid. We can see what the effect of this will be. The owner of a large number of small tenement houses, who has allowed his tenants to fall into arrears, say to the extent of half a year's rent each, can easily give those men a receipt to show that they have paid the rent; he can afford to loose half a year's rent once in five years. This means unlimited bribery, legalised bribery, for which you cannot put a man in the hands of the law. It puts an irresistible temptation in the way of proprietors of tenement houses in this way. Now, with regard to income, we may perhaps find here the class of persons whom the *Mail* says the Dominion Act will enfranchise while the Ontario Act will disfranchise them. By the Bill now before us, those receiving an income of $400 from any trade, calling, office profession, or investment in real estate, have a vote. Under the Ontario Act, those having an income of $250 from a trade, calling, office profession, or any investment whatever—not merely real estate—or who earns that sum as wages, or board and wages combined, has a vote. Here is another brilliant *Mail* argument. The Ontario franchise, which places the income qualification at $250, and qualifies wage-earners, and allows them to make that amount up partly by the board they receive in lieu of wages, is, according to the *Mail*, an infinitely less liberal franchise than that of the proposed Dominion Act, which says that nobody with less income than $400 shall qualify as a voter, and that income, if derived from investments, must be derived from investments in real estate alone. With regard to the next class, the farmers' sons, the largest class of voters perhaps in the Dominion, except those qualified by real estate, the Ontario Act, says the *Mail*, is less liberal than the Dominion Act. Let us see. The Dominion Act says that the sons of farmers—a farmer being a person who owns twenty acres or more of land—may be qualified as voters to the number that the value of the property will qualify at the rate of $150 per son, along with the father. There is no provision for qualifying the sons of tenants or occupants as farmers' sons. Now, what is the Ontario franchise? It says that when a farmer holds enough land to qualify himself, his sons, to any number to which he may be blessed with them, are also qualified. Then, take the landholding class. The Dominion Act says that the sons of landholders, who are not farmers, may be qualified in the same manner and to the same extent as the sons of farmers, namely, to

the extent that property would qualify fathers and sons jointly. Under the Ontario Act all landholders who own property to the extent of $400 in towns or $200 in the country, and as many sons as they may have, are qualified. Where is the greater liberality of the Dominion Act as regards the sons of landholders? It is quite clear that the franchise, as far as the sons of farmers and other landholders are concerned, in the Ontario Act is infinitely more liberal than that proposed to be substituted for it. My hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Innes) referred to the case of the fishermen. This is one case in which the Dominion Act appears, at first sight, to be more liberal than the Ontario Act. There is no special clause in the Ontario Act in regard to fishermen, I suppose because they are not a very numerous class in that Province, and it was not thought necessary make any special bid for their support. It seems that this provision to allow fishermen to qualify, partly on real estate and partly on boats and tackle, is a bid for the support of the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. At first sight it might appear possible that there might be some fishermen in Ontario who would not be qualified under the Ontario Act, but who might be under this Act; but there is another clause in the Ontario Act under which they will nearly all qualify, that is the clause including all who occupy houses. Under the householders' clause, which is a general clause, not framed with any invidious reference to any class in the community, all persons who occupy any habitable house within the local municipality where they tender their votes, are qualified. So that there is no point at all in which the Ontario Act is not as liberal as, or more liberal, than the Dominion Act. Now, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace) made a great deal of the point that the Ontario Act disfranchised a large class, in taking away votes from non-residents. That is not disfranchisement; the vote is taken from no citizen by that clause; the person who has a plurality of votes at present, who is a non-resident in one riding and lives in another, will still have a vote where he lives. But this clause in the Ontario Act adds largely to the voting power of the other classes of the community. The principle on which the franchise is based all the world over is that it is intended to represent the individuals who compose the nation. The correct principle is one man, one vote. There is an alternative, that is to base the franchise on property alone—to say that so much property should by represented by a vote. You must adopt the one principle or the other. If you say that the owner of property shall have one vote for every so many dollars' worth of property he owns, that would be a logical system, but an exceedingly bad one. But the present system of allowing a man to vote in as many constituencies as he owns land in, is not only bad, but one of the most illogical. If the whole of a man's land is in one riding he has only one vote. But if he happens to have invested his money in such a way that he has ten small parcels of land in ten ridings, worth $150 each, he will have ten votes. This system allows a man to buy votes; if he does not care to buy the electors to vote for him or his party, he can buy the power of voting himself, and any number of friends, in as many constituencies as can possibly be reached within the voting hours. It allows the rich man to buy votes, but does not put all rich men on the same footing, since it gives a man who has distributed his investments over several ridings more power than the man who has invested his capital in one place. There is no common sense in this; one of the best points of the Ontario law is that it does away with that long standing abuse; though, of course, such an abuse will be defended with great energy by those whom it benefits, such as the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace). Being sanctioned, as most abuses are, by hoary age, it has come to be almost regarded as a necessity; but once our eyes are opened it will be impossible for any hon. gentleman to say a word in favor of its retention. I should not wonder if the number of non-resident voters in Ontario would average something like 150 per riding, which would bring the total to something like 15,000. Here are 15,000 men who are voting twice, some of them three or four times. These votes may represent perhaps only 5,000 people, certainly not more than 7,500; since where a man is a non-resident voter, he has, at all events, two votes. To destroy this system of the plurality of votes, as provided in the Ontario Act, is not a disfranchising but an enfranchising measure. Now we come to another feature of the Bill, in which it really is more liberal than the Ontario Act. It enfranchises a class of Indians who are not citizens. By the Ontario Act every Indian who is a citizen, who is no longer under the thumb of the Government agent, who has taken his place among white men, can exercise the franchise on the same terms as white men; and even goes further, by enfranchising those who, though not resident on the reserve, still continue to draw their bounty money. But this Bill enfranchises Indians resident on reserves and who are thus under the control of the Government agent, and by including Indians who have no claims to citizenship whatever. By every such Indian who is put on the voters' list, a white voter will be disfranchised, because his vote will annul that of a full citizen. With regard to every class you chose to name, as far as Ontario is concerned, this Bill is, what one of our papers happily calls it, the Disfranchising Bill. To give you some idea of the number of people who will be disfranchised under it, I will quote from the census of 1881 a few figures, showing the classes most likely to be disfranchised under this measure. Laborers, in 1871, numbered over 78,000, and I think there are very few laborers who would be qualified to vote under the income franchise clause, whether in cities or towns or in the country. Men who are classed as laborers, apart from mechanics, apart from skilled labor, earn, in very few cases, $400 a year, and such of them as are not qualified in other ways will be disfranchised by this Bill, because they do not earn the income necessary to qualify them. I find, by reference to the report of the Ontario Bureau of Industries, that this class of people receive on an average something under $300 a year; I find also that the wages of farm laborers throughout Ontario average $264, without board and $174 with board, showing a difference of $90 a year allowed as compensation in board. This would leave the amount of wages with board required to qualify a farm servant at about $160, whereas the average wages of a farm servant, with board, are over $170. Therefore, this class is enfranchised under the Ontario Act while it is excluded under this. The laborers in towns, being better paid, no doubt, will be enfranchised in Ontario and disfranchised under this Bill. What proportion of the 79,000 are qualified in other ways I am not prepared off-hand to state, but probably not more than half or two thirds were thus qualified in that way, leaving at least 15,000 laborers alone, who now possess the vote in Ontario, disfranchised under this Bill. Raftsmen number 2,000, sailors 3,000, carpenters and joiners 17,000; a large number of these classes will be disfranchised. Commercial clerks number 12,000. How many of these would be likely to qualify under the $400 income franchise? Not more than a third, perhaps one-half. Probably not more than half the clerks have $400 a year, so that would leave about 6,000 disqualified who are now qualified in Ontario. Farmers' sons numbered 71,000. Of these all are qualified in Ontario, under the clause which gives all sons of farmers a right to vote, irrespective of the value of the property, but many will be disqualified under this Bill. Railway employés, 5,000; cabmen and draymen, over 1,000; carders and weavers, 3,000. All these are qualified as wage-earners in Ontario, and most of them will be disqualified under this Bill. Carriage-builders, about an equal number; factory operatives, about

an equal number; millers, about 3,000; painters and glaziers, 4,000; plasterers, 1,100; saddle and harness makers, over 2,000; sawyers and millmen, about 2,000; male servants, 5,424. Here is a large and important class who now possess the franchise and Ontario from whom this Bill will take it away. It is certain that, as a rule, they do not earn $400 a year. It is equally certain that they earn, either in wages or with board added, $250, which is enough to qualify them in Ontario. It is highly probable that very few of those male servants could be qualified in any other way, for they do not appear to be farm laborers or mechanics, but a separate class, and are probably single men living as servants in different capacities, and not likely to be qualified as occupiers of real estate. Stone masons, 3,196. These get rather higher wages than any other mechanics, but only for a comparatively short season of the year, varying from four to six months, and though their wages are high by the day, it is not probable that many would qualify under the $400 provision, though nearly all would under $250 in Ontario. My hon. friend (Mr. Mills) points out to me that, in his opinion, the $400 clause would not apply to wage-earners at all. It says, "Any trade, office, calling or profession," but I suppose it would not apply to men whose income, even if it amounted to $400 or upwards, was wages not derived from a trade, calling or profession. That is a point which I had not seen as clearly before, but I think it is an important one, to which the attention of the committee should be strongly drawn. The next class are teachers. Their wages are derived from the exercise of a profession, I suppose, and if a teacher received $400 or upwards, he might be entitled to a vote, though there would be a great question for the lawyers to wrangle over before the revising officer. There were 4,400 male teachers in Ontario, of whom a comparatively small number would be qualified as householders and in other ways—perhaps half. Teamsters and drivers, over 2,400. Then we have "various and indefinite," about 8,000, whose earnings must probably be quite small and their occupations trifling, or they would not be returned in this vague and unclassified way. There is the very important class of blacksmiths, who number over 10,000, most of whom would not be qualified by earning over $400 a year, and all of whom would be qualified under $250. Probably 6,000 out of the 10,000 who now have votes in Ontario will be disfranchised if this Bill becomes law. There are over 3,000 butchers. A considerable number of these have butcher's shops and stalls and hire labor, but a considerable number also work for hire. It is probable that at least 1,000 of these will be disfranchised. Boot and shoemakers number nearly 7,000. They are not, as a rule, very highly paid, and are not likely in most cases to own real estate, and are certainly not capable of qualifying under the Dominion clause, except, of course, such as own little shops worth $300. Coopers, over 2,000; and there are nearly 6,000 edge-tool makers, of whom a large number will be disfranchised. Foundry men, more than 3,000; gardeners and nursery men, 2,500; printers and publishers, over 3,000; tailors and clothiers, over 7,000. That includes, I think, in the census returns, not only workmen but some of the master tailors and clothiers. Still a large proportion, probably one-half, will be disfranchised by this Bill. I think it would be much more conducive to the information of those who study the census returns if in all cases the masters of establishments were separated from the operatives. After making all due allowance for those who are otherwise qualified amongst these classes, I estimate that about 125,000 who now exercise the franchise will lose it if this Bill becomes law. I may perhaps go more into detail if my figures are disputed. As the whole number of voters in Ontario under the former Ontario Acts was under 400,000, and these 125,000 have now been added, the disfranchisement means that about every fourth man who now possesses the vote will be deprived of it. One-fourth the population of Ontario entitled to vote under the present Ontario law, and who will be registered on the voters' lists during this summer, will be disfranchised by this Act.

Mr. RYKERT. Ha, ha.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. member for Lincoln laughs, but it is clear he has not given the slightest attention to the list. If the House wishes me to go into details, I will do so.

Mr. BOWELL. Let us have them.

Mr. CASEY. I have taken it for granted that of this 78,000 laborers none will be qualified under this Act—we know that none could be qualified under the income clause of this Act. I have considered it probable that two-thirds of those laborers might be otherwise qualified, and that would leave 26,000 laborers whom I calculate will be disqualified by this Bill. Of the raftsmen, I calculate that 500 might be otherwise qualified; the one-fifth the householders will be otherwise qualified; one-fourth the carpenters, and one-tenth the commercial clerks. Of course, as regards the commercial clerks, I have only taken 4,000 as not being able to qualify under this Act. But after hearing the point of law explained by the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), namely, that no amount of wages will qualify a man to vote under the Dominion Act, I must take the whole 12,000 commercial clerks as not being able to qualify under the Act. I think it will be a fair estimate that not more than one-third the shop clerks throughout the country are householders and qualified to vote on real estate. That would give 8,000 instead of 4,000. In fact, I think all the figures I have given are very moderate, and after revising them I hope to present them to the House at a later stage. I merely state now that, after making the most liberal allowance in the class of wage-earners alone, and farmers' sons, and for those who may possibly be qualified in other ways, it appears to be extremely probable that at least 125,000 persons will be disfranchised by this Bill. Now, I think the course of the Government press is extremely—I do not know that I can find a parliamentary word for it—it is not frank; that is, perhaps, the mildest form in which I can put it—not open and above board. Hon. gentlemen opposite and their organs outside have insisted that this Bill will enlarge the franchise in Ontario. That is the cry on which they are going to the country. But I have not heard a single member of this House risk his reputation by making such a statement here. Possibly the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) might do it, since he seems to take so much interest in the question; he might be willing to risk his reputation on the assertion that the Dominion Act was more liberal than the Ontario Act. I am quite prepared to meet any such assertion, because who ever compares the two Bills will see that a large percentage of people in Ontario will be disfranchised by this Bill. I am sure you, yourself, Mr. Chairman (Mr. Ferguson, Welland), as a representative from Ontario, will feel, when you look at the two Bills, that you have been grossly misled by the organs of your party. I might suggest how the mistake would arise in the minds of some people. It may have arisen from comparing the present Dominion Act with the former laws in existence in Ontario. So far as I can see, there is little difference between the two. The old Franchise Act of Ontario was not much more liberal than the Bill now proposed; but the one passed last Session is infinitely more liberal. It must be remembered that this is not merely a question of deciding whether one franchise or the other would be better. We are not setting up a new electoral system; we are dealing with a system which is in operation; we are dealing with rights now in the possession of the people, that they now hold under the constitution, and under the Act passed to carry out that constitution. As soon as an Act is passed in Ontario giving

the franchise to a certain class of people, these people have the franchise for this House. They are our constituents. They have the franchise for this House now, under the constitution and under the statute law. We are not now discussing whether certain classes should have the franchise or not, but whether we shall take away the franchise from such classes as now have it. I hope the House will see the distinction between the two cases. It is much more serious to take away the franchise from a certain class of people than it would be to propose, if we were starting a new Confederation, that such and such class should not have it. This question must be discussed in detail, for it is a question of detail. If we want to get at the comparative merits of the two systems of qualification you must go into detail, to see how many of each class are losing the franchise by the change, and then make up the totals. I believe my figures are substantially correct, as near correct as it is possible to get figures, where there are no absolute statistics, and that the result of this Bill will be to disfranchise about one-fourth of those people who are our constituents.

Committee rose and reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

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

Motion agreed to; and the House adjourned at 1:50 a.m., Saturday.

INDEX.

THIRD SESSION, FIFTH PARLIAMENT, 1885.

Abbreviations of well-known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remark or debate; Acts., Accounts; Adj., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; H., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; Intercol., Intercolonial; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; Ms., Motions; m., Moved; Neg., Negatived; N.B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-West Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Priv. and Elec., Privileges and Elections; Prop., Proposed; Que., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Reps., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys, Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmnt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; W. & M., Ways and Means; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y., N., Yeas and Nays; Names in italic and parentheses are those of the movers.

INDEX—PART II.

SUBJECTS.

*For Repairs and Working Expenses, *see* "Collection of Revenues."